Facilitator Resource Guide

Introduction

The 2018 Operations Team Coordination Training Refresher continues the practice of focusing on group, or “crew” problem solving activities rather than a lecture presentation format. The 7 components of TCT will be the guiding principle to emphasize as you lead this problem-solving session. The facilitator should be a trained instructor, someone familiar with the operations program and familiar with the TCT program (but does NOT have to be a TCT Facilitator).

This Team Coordination Training (TCT) Refresher reflects an emphasis on the 7 components of Team Coordination;

- Leadership
- Mission Analysis
- Adaptability
- Situational Awareness
- Decision Making
- Communication
- Assertiveness.

This training is part of the mandatory annual currency maintenance requirements for the USCG Auxiliary Boat Crew program, and must be completed by 31 Dec 2018 to avoid going into REYR status.

The format, takes the form of a group problem-solving session, rather than facilitated discussion. This approach will emphasize your role as a facilitator and, hopefully, make the training interesting for both you and your participants.

IMPORTANT: Do not deliver this as a straight lecture, the key learning objective is the interaction of small ‘crews’ (3-5 members) solving the problem presented and discussing what worked right and what went wrong.

Facilitators – TCT principles cover a lot of ground. This refresher course is intended to do just that — “refresh” those key learnings, not reteach them. Additionally, the refresher needs to bring into the sharpest focus the critical part that Operational Risk Management and GAR scores play in EVERY patrol both in planning and during the mission. Safety of the Crew is priority 1. The mission is executed ONLY when risks (which are always present) are reduced/eliminated to an acceptable and safe level. Routine MOM, Safety, and Training patrols are NOT mission critical and can be rescheduled when known risks are lower or eliminated.

See end of this guide for sample GAR form with instructions.
Facilitator’s Role

As facilitator, your role is to help participants discover new knowledge or discover new applications for knowledge they already have. This is not accomplished by lecturing. Lecturing is one of the least effective ways to promote learning. If you find yourself talking a lot and teaching numerous techniques and required actions in detail, you are probably talking too much. Trust that the participants have the answers, and you are there to help them discover new relevance for a familiar concept.

A facilitator creates a positive, interesting and challenging environment for the participants in the classroom so they, as a crew, can learn to solve problems and make better decisions for crew safety, the public’s safety, and accomplishing the mission.

A facilitator leads the learning, but allows the participants to go their own way…to a point, always gently steering the process so learning objectives are met…but also ensuring that participants learn to make decisions in a “team format”, similar to the “crew” onboard our air and surface facilities. Let the discussions happen, but do not hesitate to step if they get “off topic”.

Note:
The patrol story presents a scenario with several sub-plots describing problems, incidents or situations. This scenario paints a picture that, with some analysis, will lead the team to recognize core problems or issues among the crews in the scenario. The process is similar to what a physician goes through while diagnosing the disease in a patient from a list of specific “symptoms.” In this case, we want the participant groups to identify the symptoms (incidents or situations) indicating components of TCT which are not applied, poorly applied, misapplied, or even abandoned in the scenario, and, therefore, threaten the success and/or safety of the patrol. In addition, participants are to suggest a course of action for the scenario group to take to correct these deficiencies.

Note that the crew may appear less efficient and effective than normal to help stimulate the discussion.

Facilitator Responsibilities – Estimated timings below are just that “estimates.” Do not rush it this refresher is VERY important which is why it is required every year. Take whatever time is needed to reinforce the principles of TCT and help avoid complacency in all we do. The safety of you, the general public, and your shipmates is key to this exercise.

1. (10 min) At the outset of the session, organize the participants into “crews” of 3-5 members who will work together on the patrol scenario (case study). Ask them to appoint a recorder/reporter to take notes.

2. (5 min) Provide each group with a piece of paper, pencil, and 2 blank GAR forms. Tell them that the group is to:
   - Describe the elements in the story where they feel the principles of TCT were not followed.
   - Suggest a course of action or change in behavior that might correct the problem(s) or align this crew’s activity with TCT principles.
3. (10 min) Present the patrol scenario (see page 6-8). Be sure that everyone is clear on the scenario, but be careful not to give away answers. If possible, hand a copy of the story to each group. Be sure to have them complete the first GAR form, after reading page 6 but before reading/discussing the scenario itself. Have them complete a second GAR score as noted on page 7 in the scenario.

4. (15-20 min) Redirect the session into small groups. During the small group work, circulate among the crews and listen. Make notes for yourself, if needed. Allow the groups to struggle (discuss/disagree) a little in making their lists. They are developing a problem-solving relationship with their fellow crewmembers. Leaders may emerge in the groups (they usually do). Your job is to keep the groups focused on their question list and the determination of TCT components that have been either well or poorly employed during the patrol in the scenario, and to assist them by asking questions if and when they get off track or bogged down. Use the definitions of the TCT components below, your knowledge of the boat crew program and the targeted questions that accompany the scenario (beginning on pg. 9) to refocus groups that have gone astray. Try to ensure that everyone participates, and that no one “hijacks” the process because they are more experienced, or louder, or because others seem willing to just go along. If you hear something that is inappropriate or not consistent with good practice, intervene with a gentle comment so that the group recognizes the problem. Try not to take control of the session away from the crew, but get them “back on course,” then let them continue.

Now have them complete a final GAR form as a crew and review any differences in scoring based on the scenario conditions after reading page 8.

5. (15-20 min) Lead a focus session during which the participant crew reporters present their crew solutions to the other participants. Don’t indicate how you feel about one solution versus another! Only act as a clerk and record, in brief, the reports. When all crews have reported, ask the group, at large, to choose the better three solutions (there’s rarely one “right” answer) or to rank order the best solutions. Use the last 2-3 minutes to summarize the crew results (crews almost always find good answers, as a group) and, if necessary, interject one or two considerations that may have been missed.

6. (5 min) Thank the participants for their participation in the TCT refresher, and assist with any final questions or concerns. If there are suggestions from the group on how to improve the course, jot those down as well and forward them to the Chief, Response Projects and Educational Outreach email address found at the end of this guide.
Review of TCT Basics

This is the annual refresher course; materials for the Initial/5-Year Currency (4 hour) TCT class can be found at the Response Directorate web site http://rdept.wow.uscgaux.info/ under the “What’s New” tab in the left navigation column (reference is half way down the what’s new page. Or download the documents from our Workshop Archives page at http://www.rdept.wow.uscgaux.info/content.php?unit=R-DEPT&category=workshop-archives

Mission Analysis
1. Always conduct a risk assessment (and complete a GAR form) prior to a patrol, no matter how routine you believe the mission to be. Every mission is unique, contingency planning based on experience should include complexity of mission, environmental factors, crew fitness factors and any other circumstance which could impact the mission & your safety.
2. Develop escape/contingency plans for any potential risk scenarios.
3. Reassess risk AND GAR score throughout the mission when conditions change.

Situational Awareness
1. To make good decisions we must know what is going on around us. Plans are critical to success, that is for sure…but we must be ready, based on what we encounter during the mission, to change those plans, and/or use contingency plans as necessary.
2. Stressful situations, complacency and boredom will inhibit our situational awareness and increase the likelihood of poor decision making. Remember the 3 levels of human error:
   a. Slips ….. Misspeak
   b. Mistakes ..... Bad Plan
   c. Errors …. Flawed execution
3. Collisions are most often the result of error chains. Catch the slip before it becomes a mistake. Catch the mistake before it becomes an error. Good leaders catch errors, not people.

Adaptability & Flexibility
1. Adaptability is the ability to react to changes in conditions, crew fitness, equipment failures, etc. and is based on the “situational awareness” we mentioned above. How flexible are we? How receptive are we to differing opinions? Leaders do not necessarily have “all the answers”. Leaders do take advantage of everyone’s ideas and experience and they remain adaptable to new conditions and challenges.

Communication
1. Communication takes many forms. There are verbal and non-verbal (facial expressions, voice inflection, etc.) communication everyone uses to convey thoughts and ideas.
2. The key is to ensure that the person or persons we communicate with have a clear understanding of what we wish to convey. This is the ‘senders’ responsibility.
3. Good communication involves closing the “feedback” loop. We can ask for feedback, or we can observe behavior to be sure the message was received.
4. This feedback loop is a two-way expression, either verbally or non-verbally, which confirms the communication process was completed. Both parties are responsible for insuring the message received is accurate, understood, and effective.
Leadership
1. Leadership is not about giving orders. Good leaders do find ways to obtain the willing participation of others towards accomplishing a goal. That goal, in this case, must be consistent with the Coast Guard’s core values as well as consistent with the mission at hand.
2. Since we cannot “order” anyone to do anything, we must strive to achieve the respect, confidence, collaboration and loyalty of those entrusted to our care.
3. Remember all Auxiliarists have the opportunity to lead, regardless of their position.

Assertiveness
1. The Coast Guard values people who are assertive, but not aggressive.
2. Know where the dividing line is. The difference between these two characteristics is sometimes hard to see. The aggressive person seeks to bully his/her way through situations for their own ego or self-image…. while an assertive person cares about the “mission” more than themselves and their ego.
3. The assertive person will always communicate their concerns but they also, try to get a reasonable resolution when ideas are in conflict without stepping on top of those who may disagree.
4. Anyone, from trainee to QE, may notice something that requires attention in order to avoid a danger or achieve the objectives of the patrol safely. It is his or her duty and responsibility to speak up.

Decision Making
1. Making good decisions is at the heart of TCT. How do we ensure that we act or perform in a manner that maximizes mission safety and success and minimizes risk to ourselves, our crew, the public, etc.?
2. The elements of TCT all play a role in improving decision making. We define a problem or condition, seek information about that problem, analyze that information, identify alternatives and select one or a range of alternatives.
3. Then we measure our success or failure in order to adjust our course of action. This process can take us 20 seconds in the case of routine decisions, or 20 months in the case of large complex problems. The process is the same; …the depth of analysis and level of importance is always changing.
4. There is always time to consider other actions, use that time before you act.

Learning Objectives
- Participants will understand the importance of crew orientation of facility equipment as it relates to mission activities (Mission analysis).
- Participants will understand the importance of understanding your AOR and local hazards and plotting a safe course. (Situational Awareness, Mission Analysis)
- Participants will understand the need to maintain a lookout and remain alert to all conditions during the mission both operational and crew related. (Communication and situational awareness).
- Participants must understand the effects an incident, even a minor injury/accident, has on the mission and reporting responsibilities (Situational Awareness, Mission Analysis, Decision Making)

- Participants must understand the importance of assigned roles for all crew during the entire mission. (Mission Analysis, Situational Awareness, Communication, Decision Making)

Participants will identify at least three examples of good decision making by the crew in the scenario and/or others.

Participants will identify at least three examples of poor decision making by this crew & others.
The Patrol

Mission: Routine MOM/Training patrol for re-qualification for a crewman and night patrol training in prep for a Coxswain check ride.

Facility: 25 ft. cuddy cabin Grady White with 250hp Yamaha outboard engine, and newly upgraded GPS, split screen chart plotter, and radar equipment.

Weather: Visibility at start of patrol was 3 nm, skies overcast.
- Winds 10KT from E
- Seas 1-2 ft.
- Air temp high 60°F to low 70°F during the day, predicted to drop into the low 60s after dark.
- Water temp in the high 50s°F.
  - High tide of 0.8 ft. expected at 1926.
  - Sunset at 1844.
  - Last quarter crescent moon, visibility lowering.

CREW
- Coxswain, Ralph 7 years as a Coxswain, also the owner of the vessel.
- Crew #1, Marty 5 years as certified Crew and training for upcoming Coxswain check ride.
- Crew #2, Calvin 5 years as Crew, on a practice requalification check ride.

All crew members were qualified and maintained currency, including required TCT refresher and Ops workshop.

Venue: Stonington ME area of Penobscot Bay, Maine
Scenario: - At 1500 on 15 SEP 2017, 3 CGAUX members met at the town dock in Stonington ME for briefing before commencing a training mission, the first half of which was to be a practice requalification check ride for a crewman, and the second half was to be night ops for a coxswain in training for his check ride. The crew consisted of: Ralph, a coxswain of seven year’s standing and owner of the facility, a 21ft cuddy cabin Grady-White; Marty a prospective coxswain who was preparing for his check-ride; and Calvin, a requalifying crewman of 5 years. All had crewed aboard the facility together before and were used to working together in it, knew where everything was on board the boat and how she handled, and were familiar with the AOR, so the briefing was short. Even so, Ralph took the time for questions and comments from his crew.

(Winds were 10K from the E, visibility was 3nm, and skies were overcast when they left the dock at 1506. Temperatures were predicted to be in the high 60s to low 70s during the day, dropping into the low 60s at night, water temperature was in the high 50s. Calvin was asked for his estimation of GAR first, then Marty. Although Ralph thought their score could be a point or two lower because of crew experience and cohesiveness, he listened to their concerns. These were that skies would still be overcast and air temperature dropping with night coming on in the latter part of the patrol, so they would have to suit up in Mustangs with hoods up. This, they felt, would slow their movements and obscure their peripheral vision during the more challenging part of the patrol. Ralph took these into consideration, and the recalculated and agreed upon GAR was reported to the controlling Station. All crew members were in CGAUX issued life vests at commencement of patrol, but had both float coats and mustang suits with them on board in anticipation of the night portion of their patrol.

Complete First GAR Sheet

Instructors should pass out blank GAR sheets at this time and review how scores are calculated and how they are used to determine go/no decisions and mitigate risks, who has input, and what happens if crew members disagree. Note that calculating GAR is not an exact mathematical equation, and that, given similar weather, fitness, complexity, etc., different crews may come up with somewhat different scores.

First Exercise: Given this information students should each calculate their own GAR score for conditions at the commencement of this mission. Instructors should then break class into 4-6 person teams, and have them compare scores — what was the highest score, what was the lowest, and what were the differences between them based on? — and come up with a single agreed-upon score that takes into account any objections or reservations that may have been expressed. Then give participants the following information:

The GAR score the crew in this scenario came up with was 18, having given a score of 2 each for supervision, planning, and team selection, and 4 each for environment, event complexity
and team fitness, partly because half of the patrol would be under conditions of darkness in low light with a crew of only 3 on board. This score was well in the Green. *Now see how students’ assessments differ from this, and, more importantly, why? Which factors accounted for any differences in total GAR scores? What reasons do students give for these differences?*

Patrol commenced the activities for the evening at 1515 with Marty at the helm, Ralph positioned at his shoulder, and Calvin designated lookout. Once they had gotten well away from the pier and out of the Deer Isle thoroughfare, Marty took over lookout while Ralph put Calvin through steering, turning, making Comms with controlling Station, MOB drill, and approach to the pier when they returned to the town dock at 1700 for a 1hr dinner break.

Ralph radioed in that they were breaking for dinner and that he would have a handheld radio and cell phone with him so Station could contact him if necessary while they were ashore. At 1756, a call came in from Station that 2 kayakers ‘from away’ and unfamiliar with the area were reported stranded on a sandbar off of Pickering Island. They were lightly dressed and facing sunset at 1844 with high tide expected at 1926, when the bar would become submerged. Since Ralph and crew were closer to the kayakers than Station Southwest Harbor, which would need over an hour to launch and send a boat out to them, Ralph was requested to take his facility around to take the stranded paddlers on board. Ralph told their waitress to put his crew’s dinner on his tab, and leaving dessert uneaten, they ran out of the restaurant and down the pier to the boat. By this time, the wind had picked up to 15 K, was now blowing W, and was blowing the boat back on the dock. Ralph had Calvin tend the lines so they could spring the boat off the dock during which Calvin’s right pinkie was momentarily caught between the boat and the pier while Marty was at the helm and Calvin was calling into Station that they were resuming patrol and getting underway for Pickering I. When he saw Calvin sucking on his finger, Ralph asked him if he was OK. Calvin was in considerable pain, but didn’t want to have the SAR called off on his account, especially considering the plight of the paddlers, so he said he was fine even though his finger was swelling up and turning purple.

**Complete a second GAR**

*Students will protest that Ralph and crew did not do this. This is precisely the point Instructors want to make. Ask if anything has changed since commencement of patrol that would change their initial GAR score. What are they? How would they affect the ability of the crew to safely and effectively carry out their new mission. Explain that SAR missions are inherently some of the most dangerous we can do. They often occur under adverse conditions, and adrenaline rush may interfere with situational awareness. Ask if there is ever any reason to dispense with calculating a new GAR? Students will probably point out that this SAR is time sensitive. Ask if anybody has seen CG Alaska episodes that show Helo crews running out on the tarmac immediately after a distress call has come into their Comms center. Point out that all CG missions start with a briefing and GAR calculation (which, being less dramatic, are not shown). Ask what problems could arise that would interfere with safe and completion of this mission if mission analysis is not done first. Students will probably point out that situational awareness and decision making are sacrificed for speed. Ask what other TCT principles were neglected (leadership, communications, assertiveness).*
Meanwhile night was falling. A crescent moon had already risen at 1603, but was little help with fog rolling in, and the temperature was dropping. Ralph had everyone get into his Mustang. Since Calvin had what he thought was a ‘pinched’ finger, Ralph then called him over to the new electronics he’d just had installed, explained that he had entered a waypoint for the Island and told him to just follow the GPS course to it while Marty and he got lines, PFDs and other gear out on deck preparatory to taking the kayakers off the bar.

Calvin was unfamiliar with the new electronics with its split screen chart plotter and other bells and whistles, and knowing that Ralph had no time to waste filling him in on it, held on to the wheel with a death grip and followed the GPS course. What Ralph had forgotten to tell him is that there are rocks at the approach to the bar that are unmarked by a buoy which the GPS course would put him on, and there was no one on lookout. The boat had just scraped one of these rocks when Ralph grabbed the helm from Calvin’s hands, backed the boat off the rock and maneuvered the boat into the rapidly submerging bar and had Marty do a quick damage assessment of the facility. Ralph and Marty changed into their float coats, threw their Mustangs to the shivering kayakers and gave them a hand getting on board. Then Ralph sent them below to the cuddy cabin to keep them out of the wind while he steered past the rocks and took the boat back to the town dock in Stonington where he had Calvin call to arrange to have the kayakers picked up and taken by ambulance to Blue Hill hospital for evaluation. Marty was placed on lookout on the return trip to their mooring.

Ralph terminated the patrol at his nearby mooring with no debrief because by now Calvin was in intense pain from his probably broken finger. He and Marty got him off the boat and into a Ralph’s car for a separate trip to the hospital. While they were driving, the three agreed that a scraped bottom and a pinched pinky were not important enough to report as a mishap.
At this point, Instructors should have participants evaluate this last part of the patrol in terms of TCT elements.

**What did the crew do correctly during this entire mission?**
- Initial GAR calculated – input accepted from all crew
- Briefing done even though this was the regular crew
- Coxswain at the shoulder of helmsman as is expected
- Crew/coxswain were all qualified and current with TCT and Ops Workshop
- Rescued kayakers were given something warm and kept out of the wind on the return

**What did this crew do incorrectly during this entire mission?**
- No second GAR even after injury
- Mustang suits & float coats for 3 on a 21 ft boat does this leave room to maneuver even if they were stowed in the cuddy cabin?
- Situational awareness in rush to get under way probably caused the pinched finger
- Equipment familiarization was not part of the briefing
- No lookout posted on SAR and it was at night
- Injury Incident not reported
- Grounding incident not reported

Special emphasis should be placed on the fact that all three crewmen were taking steps to avoid reporting mishaps. Ask why students think the CG wants all mishaps, serious and not, reported. What use is that to ongoing safety initiatives and training materials?

Send your comments to:
Chief, Operations Projects and Educational Outreach Division  
Bruce.Pugh@cgauxnet.us (Document Version 1.3Final)

Davida Kellogg, BC-REI  
Bruce Pugh, DVC-RE  
Don Zinner, DIR-R  
Bruce Pugh, DIR-Rd  
Rick Saunders, DVC-RS
Surface Operations Risk Calculation Worksheet
Calculating Risk Using the GAR Model

**GREEN-AMBER-RED**

This worksheet should be used for all surface operations unless other GAR forms have been mandated by local OIA.

GAR is based on a team discussion to understand and evaluate the risks attendant to a mission and how they will be managed.
Risk management is what is important; not the ability to assign numerical values or colors to risk elements.

Assign a risk code of 0 (for no risk) through 10 (for maximum risk) to each of the six elements below. The discussion should start with the junior (least experienced) members first on each category.

**Supervision** – qualifications / experience / communications

**Planning** – details / clarity / vessel selection and condition

**Team Selection** – qualifications / experience

**Team Fitness** – physical / mental state

**Environment** – seas / visibility / wind / current / temperatures

**Event/Evolution Complexity** – details / tasks

---

**Total Risk Score**

GAR Evaluation Scale – Color Coding the Level of Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Code</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20</td>
<td><strong>GREEN</strong> (Low Risk)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td><strong>AMBER</strong> (Caution)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td><strong>RED</strong> (High Risk)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the total falls in the green zone, risk is at a minimum. If the total falls in the amber zone, risk is moderate and you should consider adopting procedures to minimize risk.

**If the total falls in the red zone, you need to implement measures to reduce the risk prior to starting the event/evolution.**

The GAR model should be used as part of planning operations, and should be continually reassessed as we reach milestones within our plans, or as elements change.

---
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