Crisis in the Classroom: Using Simulations to Enhance Decision-making Skills

Shawn Marie Boyne

An explosion rattled downtown Indianapolis approximately 15 minutes ago. The source of the explosion appears to be in the vicinity of Lucas Oil Stadium. Eyewitnesses report seeing a plume-like cloud in the stadium area. Although it is not clear what the cause of the explosion was, Indianapolis Metro Police Department Officials have placed local hospitals on alert. We will have updates as soon as they are available . . ..

There is no better way to capture students' attention than to detonate a "dirty bomb," or rather a simulated news report that a dirty bomb has exploded less than ten blocks away from the law school. Certainly this was no ordinary class session, but instead a well-planned counter-terrorism simulation involving forty students drawn from Indiana University School of Law-Indianapolis and the Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairs (SPEA) held in October 2009.[1] From the early minutes of the simulated decision-making exercise to its conclusion three hours later, the highly engaged students responded to a series of public safety crises while striving to balance competing objectives and operate within the boundaries of the law. This article describes the objectives and challenges of the exercise and explains why simulation training exercises are an effective pedagogical tool that introduces students to the inherent challenges that government decision-makers face as they seek to respond to national security challenges within the boundaries of the law.

The Backstory

My own introduction to non-clinic based experiential teaching methods occurred in the summer of 2006 when I attended the Summer Workshop on Teaching Terrorism (SWOTT) held at the University of Maryland.[2] The SWOTT program mixes lectures and teaching demonstrations in an attempt to introduce participants to the best practices in teaching terrorism-related courses. While high-level government officials and noted academics updated us on the latest developments and research in the counter-terrorism and homeland security fields, the hands-on teaching exercises were creative and thought provoking. One particular exercise, in which groups were asked to plan a terrorist attack using common household materials, remains fresh in my memory to this day. The objective was to design a scenario that would disrupt the greatest number of lives in the United States on any given day. The

---

1. The simulation was held from 9:00 a.m. until 12:00 p.m. on Oct. 23, 2009 in four separate classrooms and the atrium of Inlow Hall, the home of the Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law – Indianapolis. A second simulation was held in October 2011 expanded the participation to medical school students.

2. SWOTT is a one-week crash course offered to graduate students and faculty that is designed to develop best teaching practices in the field of terrorism. *See* Gregory Miller, Teaching about Terrorism: Lessons Learned at SWOTT, 42 PS: Pol. Sci. & Pols. 773 (2009) (describing the challenges in teaching terrorism related courses and the SWOTT program).

exercise quickly forced participants to adopt a terrorist's operational mindset.[3] Most importantly, the session demonstrated to me how active student engagement in a creative problem-solving exercise could challenge student performance, capture student attention, and develop critical thinking skills.[4]

As I began my own academic career, I was determined to supplement the traditional Socratic Method with a variety of exercises that forced students to approach the law not as law students, but as legal practitioners. My own experience as a prosecutor in the State of New Mexico, as well as my research on the impact that organizational culture plays in shaping legal decision-making in government service, spurred my search for teaching exercises that would highlight the constraints and challenges facing lawyers in government service. I firmly believed that practice of law posed a number of challenges not taught in traditional law school classrooms.

Many of these challenges were brought to the forefront in the wake of the 9/11 terrorist attacks. In particular, national and international criticism of the Bush Administration's policies regarding torture, the use of force, and the rendition and detention of enemy combatants highlight the tension that lawyers employed in government service may confront in finding legal support for policies that may violate national and international law.[5] In the most recent decade of American history, there has been no shortage of examples of failures by lawyers to render objective and independent advice to public officials. Whether one points to the infamous "torture memos" drafted by Bush Administration lawyers that allowed waterboarding of suspected terrorists[6] or the government's illegal targeting of immigrants and the use of racial profiling to target persons of particular descent in the wake of 9/11,[7] the fingerprints of government lawyers are adhered to some of the most questionable government practices of the past decade. Indeed, as Peter Margulies has written, government lawyers functioning as advisors and litigators in the war on terror have been responsible for a full spectrum of abuses.[8]

---

3 I recognize that our own biases and experiences still affected our decision-making processes.

4. William W. Newmann & Judyth L. Twigg, Active Engagement of the Intro IR Student: A Simulation Approach. 33 PS: Pol. Sci. and Pol. 835 (2000).

5. *See, e.g.*, Editorial, The Torturer's Manifesto, N.Y.Times, Apr. 18, 2009, at WK9 (calling for the impeachment of federal judge Jay Bybee for his role in drafting the so-called torture memos); Eric Lichtblau & James Risen, Officials Say U.S. Wiretaps Exceeded Law, N.Y. Times, Apr. 16, 2009, at A1 (alleging that the National Security Agency's domestic surveillance program violated US law); and Editorial, It's Torture; It's Illegal; The Attorney General's Evasions on Waterboarding Are Repugnant, and Set a Dangerous Global Precedent, L.A.Times, Feb. 2, 2008 at A20 (criticizing waterboarding of detainees).

6. There has been much debate concerning whether the legal advice set forth in the memos authored by John Yoo and Jay Bybee violated professional guidelines. An initial draft report prepared at the end of the Bush Administration recommended that the Justice Department refer the case to the appropriate disciplinary authorities. The final report issued by the Obama Administration concluded that Yoo had "violated his duty to exercise independent legal judgment and render thorough, objective and candid legal advice" and Bybee had "acted in reckless disregard" of ethical obligations. The report concluded that these actions did not justify a disciplinary referral. *See* U.S. Dep't of Justice, Office of Professional Responsibility, Investigation into the Office of Legal Counsel's Memoranda Concerning Issues Related to the Central Intelligence Agency's Use of "Enhanced" Investigation Techniques on Suspected Terrorists 11, 256 (2009), *available at* http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/pdf/OPRFinalReport090729.pdf.

7. Peter Margulies, Uncertain Arrivals: Immigration, Terror, and Democracy After September 11, Utah L. Rev. 481, 495-99 (2002).

8. According to Margulies, since 9/11 government lawyers have committed four types of professional abuse. These include:

(1) the requirement that the government show a particularized need for coercion or restraint; (2) the obligation to share exculpatory evidence with the defense; (3) the obligation to refrain from

While it is easier now, more than a decade after 9/11, to second guess decisions made in the aftermath of those attacks, my goal in teaching the seminar was not to take a stand on those decisions but rather to bring to life for the students the challenges of preserving allegiance to the rule of law while protecting national security. Although traditional law school courses in professional responsibility may touch on the ethical dilemmas confronting lawyers in public service, the volume of material that must be covered in that course invariably means that brief attention is given to the topic. Thus, as I prepared my syllabus for a new seminar in comparative national security law, I sought to find a teaching exercise that would specifically highlight the tension that government lawyers face as they advise government leaders in times of crisis. To get my students to appreciate the contextual pressures of making decisions in a crisis management mode, I wanted to find a way to recreate a crisis environment and then ask them to make decisions in that environment. However, it was not immediately apparent to me how I was going to incorporate this into my syllabus and, further, how I was going to justify the time and expense.

Using Simulations to Enhance the Law School Curriculum

Criticism leveled against the traditional law school curriculum, which has been principally based on the Langdellian appellate case method, has been on the rise during the past two decades.[9] My initial vague goal of introducing students to an atmosphere of crisis decision-making resonated with the need to provide students with several of the fundamental lawyering skills and values identified in the MacCrate Report.[10] In particular, my goal of teaching crisis decision-making by stepping beyond the four corners of appellate opinions, from the start coincided with two key skills identified by the report, namely, problem solving and recognizing and resolving ethical dilemmas. Depending on the crisis and potential decision-making scenarios that I incorporated into the exercise, the simulation had the potential to improve students' factual investigation, communication, and negotiation skills as well.

Planning the Counter-Terrorism Simulation

As I began planning my counterterrorism course, I stumbled upon a description and some short videos describing a series of counter-terrorism simulations that Amos Guiora had run at Utah Law School.[11] I contacted Professor Guiora and he graciously gave me a "short-course" in simulation preparation over the phone and subsequent lessons through phone and email conversations. While I embraced many of the Utah model's core components, I decided to break from the model and include students from the Indiana University's School of Public and Environmental Administration (SPEA).[12]

---

prejudicial public comments about defendants pending or during trial; and (4) the mandate to avoid interference with the attorney-client relationships of persons targeted by the government.
See Peter Margulies, Foreward: Risk, Deliberation, and Professional Responsibility, 1 J. Nat'l Sec. L. & Pol'y 357, 360 (2005).

9. Am. Bar Ass'n Section of Legal Educ. & Admissions to the Bar, Legal Educ & Prof'l Dev., An Educational Continuum: Report of the Task Force on Law Schools and the Profession: Narrowing the Gap 106 (Am. Bar Ass'n 1992) [hereinafter MacCrate Report] (stating that many practicing lawyers believe that their law school education "left them deficient in skills"). *See also* William M. Sullivan, Anne Colby, Judith Welch Wegner, Lloyd Bond & Lee S. Shulman, Educating Lawyers: Preparation for the Profession of Law 6 (Jossey-Bass 2007) [hereinafter Carnegie Report]*.*

10. MacCrate Report, *supra* note 9, at 107.

11. The Utah Law School's Counter-Terrorism Website, *available at*: http://simulation.law.utah.edu/.

12. Indiana University's SPEA program offers an undergraduate concentration in Public Safety Management as well as certificate programs in public safety management and civic leadership.

With dreams of matching the sophistication and excitement of the Utah simulation, I approached two members of the SPEA faculty whose knowledge and prior experience in the fields of public safety and counterterrorism far exceeded the length of my college and graduate school education.[13]

As with many multi-disciplinary projects, our initial planning meetings were marked by tentative commitments and skepticism. Although I wanted to place ethical decision-making at the center of the simulation, my partners were initially more operationally focused. No doubt this difference reflected the fact that they had participated in tactically based simulations with federal and state level Homeland Security personnel. While I was envisioning decision-making dilemmas based on issues of constitutional law, my partners questioned how law students would be able to make operational decisions. The differences in disciplines at times translated into difficulties of understanding. One of my partners had a tendency to speak in military acronyms. Although I could guess what a SIMCELL[14] was, I was left in the dust trying to decipher full strings of acronyms rolled into one sentence ("Are we going to integrate a JTTF[15], AARs,[16] and ICP[17] into the exercise?") My meeting notes from our early planning sessions contain lists of acronyms and question marks—each of which seemed like a minefield that could overcomplicate what I sought to accomplish. As time progressed, I became comfortable enough to tell my colleagues to please speak English and they felt comfortable enough to point out gaps in my event planning.[18] Our initial order of business was to come up with a script of news broadcasts that would serve as the core storyline and engage students assigned to roles at different levels of government.[19]

Preparations

Two key goals were involved in the structuring of the script. One was to create enough action to involve approximately 50 students who would play roles at different levels of government. The second goal was to create a decision-making dilemma that would force students to wrestle with the core concepts of the class. I began with an initial rough idea of a scenario--a dirty bomb attack in Indianapolis with possible international implications. That idea would engage students assigned to teams involving the Mayor's Office in Indianapolis, the Office of the Governor of Indiana, and federal officials with the Department of Homeland Security. As the idea evolved, I decided that I needed more action to engage the decision-makers at the White House and to challenge students to set priorities. To accomplish this goal, I added a series of embassy bombings in Washington D.C. In the midst of the bombings, I threw students a curve ball involving international politics by having the Iranian Ambassador to the United Nations visiting the Pakistani Embassy to the U.S. as a bomb exploded outside the embassy. This allowed me to add a statement by the Iranian President that blamed Israel for the Embassy attack as well as a threat from

---

13. Prior to beginning his academic career, Dr. William Foley served as Director of Strategic Leadership at the United States Army War College and Chief of Operations for Homeland Security for United States Forces Command. Jim White is a retired member of the Indiana State Police with over twenty years of service. His extensive public safety background includes over 37 years of military experience and service as a security planner for the 1993 World University Games, the 1994 World Cup Championships, the 1995 World Rowing Championships, and the 1996 Atlanta Centennial Olympics.

14. Simulation Cell.

15. Joint Terrorism Task Force.

16. After Action Reports.

17. Incident Command Post.

18. Benefit of acronyms.

19. The news broadcasts are available at http://indylaw.indiana.edu/programs/simulation/news.cfm.

Israel to attack the Iranian nuclear facilities. This action sequence naturally lent itself to the inclusion of an American embassy in Israel.

With the script for the news broadcasts written and sent to the "studio" for filming, we set about planning the sets and roles for the simulation. We ended up with five main sets:

1.   White House National Security Council

2.   White House National Security Council Support Room

3.   Office of the Governor of Indiana

4.   Office of the Mayor of Indianapolis

5.   U.S. Embassy, Israel

In addition, we had a generic press conference room that could be used by any of the officials who wanted to give a press briefing.

A key piece of the pre-event planning involved the technical preparations. The key technological pieces of the simulation included installing a videoconferencing capability in each room, designing a web dashboard that the students could use to view the media reports and through which the public could watch the action taking place in each of the rooms. As the simulation exercise was taking place, members of the public could access the dashboard and view the action live as well as access the media reports. The dashboard also performed a coordination function as it enabled our control room staff to monitor the action in each of the rooms and to be on the lookout for any unanticipated problems. Much of the legwork on the media web link was performed by the law school's fantastic web development and IT personnel. For the design work of the simulation dashboard and integration of the live camera feeds we called on the IT resources of Indiana University. The behind-the-scenes work completed by all of these individuals resulted in a near seamless functioning of the technical portion of the simulation.

One final wrinkle occurred three weeks prior to the simulation's scheduled date when I found out that the law school's media relations and development office had reached an agreement with our local public television station, WFYI, to film a documentary on the day of the simulation. While this was great news, it sent me scrambling to find props that would enable the documentary audience to follow the edited clips of the action more easily. We created office logos as well as maps of cities and countries and placed them in each room. It turned out that these props not only helped the audience to follow the action, but they also helped the students determine where events had taken place.[10]

Each student received his or her assigned role two weeks before the simulation. I met with all of the law students who were participating in the simulation individually and discussed with them how they should gather background information on the position they would play in the simulation. At minimum, students were expected to research the function and responsibilities of the position, the function of that position within the larger institutional structure, as well as current possible threats that an individual in that position might be expected to confront. Most of the students reviewed the course materials and read recent media reports related to terrorist attacks prior to the simulation as well as a plethora of articles and information my research assistant had compiled in an intelligence database. The information in the database included organizational charts, diagrams that showed the chain of command and relationships between government agencies, as well as a variety of maps and background information on key countries and terrorist groups. Just like government officials in real life, the students had little time to sort through volumes of material and determine what was relevant to their role.

---

[10] The documentary, which was entitled "Tough Decisions: Defending the Homeland," won WFYI an Emmy® Award in the Great Lakes Region in the category of Public/Current/Community Affairs on June 18, 2011. Information on the documentary can be found at: http://www.wfyi.org/toughDecisions.asp

Simulation Day

As the simulation day began, students checked in at a registration table and were directed to an assigned room where they met their other student colleagues. The students had approximately 30 minutes to get settled and organized before the simulation began. As the simulation began, the simulation dashboard lit up with reports of a bombing at the Pakistani Embassy in Washington, D.C. and the explosion of a dirty bomb near Lucas Oil Stadium in Indianapolis. The students in the D.C. and Indianapolis locations were quickly involved in trying to verify the information reported by the media, determine casualties and response needs, and to assess the likelihood of further attacks. In order to facilitate information gathering, I had a handful of students, faculty members, and members of the community playing the roles of actors in the field including a police sergeant playing the role of the commanding officer at the scene of the explosion at Lucas stadium. All of these sources were available by cell phone. When the Indianapolis mayor wanted to find out the latest developments at the explosion site, for example, one of his staff members could call the officer at the scene to get an update. The majority of these sources were physically located in the simulation control room. This allowed us to control the outgoing flow of information to the students and to scale down or intensify the decision-making choices confronting students .

In addition to cell phone communication, the student teams could communicate with each other through videoconferencing capability provided in each room.[20] Intel "injects" were the final piece in our information management strategy. At various points in the simulation, we sent envelopes into the room directed at certain participants with special instructions for that participant. The injects contained new information from the "field" as well as instructions to key participants that were designed to move the decision-making processes forward or to add additional uncertainty to the scenario. Sample injects included: 1. an instruction to hold a press conference in ten minutes to answer questions from the press corps;[11] 2. the revelation that a member of the press was about to post inaccurate and potentially panic-inciting information on a newspaper blog; and 3. top secret information that one country was going to take advantage of the situation by bombing another country.

As the simulation began, it was fascinating to watch the students quickly get down to work and to take the simulation and their roles seriously. The performance of each team ranged from good group decision-making with effective leadership to a less inclusive leadership style that left some students on the periphery of the decision-making processes. In general, the undergraduate public policy students interacted well with the law students. There was one problem involving the interactions between students and professionals involved in the simulation. I had elected to place a real public safety person on the Indianapolis mayor's team. Perhaps reflecting his leadership role in real life, he attempted to dominate the student team using his operational expertise as a basis to attempt to usurp the mayor's control of the group. In the future, to avoid this sort of conflict, I intend to restrict professionals to a phone consultation role to ensure that the decision-making processes are completely student driven.

Goals and Outcomes

A.   Enhance Critical Thinking Skills

---

20. There were unplanned technical difficulties. Students with phones from a certain carrier found themselves without cell phone coverage within the law school. Although each student was provided with a list of phone numbers for all of the contacts, some of those numbers were inadvertently transposed incorrectly. This left at least one faculty "CIA agent" lost in the field.

[11] In our 2011 simulation, we recruited actual members of Indianapolis' press corps to pose questions to the student role players.

The primary goal of hosting the simulation exercise was to improve students' critical thinking skills through teaching methods that go beyond the Socratic Method. Law school students are typically taught to uncover the facts of a case simply by reading the excerpted opinion in their casebook. The facts may be subject to interpretation, but they are essentially given. By contrast, in the simulation format, media reports provide students with a mere starting slate of facts that may or may not be accurate.[21] As students read or listened to the news reports, they had to decide how the government should best respond to the events. But as the response planning efforts commenced, the key decision-makers also had to determine what further information was needed to guide the planning efforts and direct their staff to obtain that information. In response to the initial reports of a bomb explosion in Indianapolis, the mayor of Indianapolis pressured the front-line responders to identify the type of bomb, the initial injuries, and the bomb's potential fallout. The conflicting answers to those questions dribbled out from sources on the imaginary front lines.[22]

Because many events appeared to be happening simultaneously, it was important for students to prioritize the information coming in the field, which varied in terms of its reliability. Some of the field intelligence agents provided only vague information at first and students learned quickly that the mere relaying of information from the field would not satisfy the information needs of the key decision-makers. As a case in point, the key decision facing the White House was whether or not to give Israeli fighter planes permission to fly over Iraqi airspace on the way to Iran. In the middle of a meeting of the National Security Council, an undercover operative stationed at an Israeli airfield erroneously reported that the fighter planes had taken off for Iran. Before the information was verified, the decision-making momentum in the National Security Council shifted towards giving Israel the green light.

The simulation format forces students to take steps to determine and weigh sifting facts on the ground and reach decisions that will have consequences for the security and civil rights of other players in the game. By creating a series of decision scenarios that forced students to think through the consequences of action or inaction, the exercise challenged students' critical thinking skills beyond the typical class room format. Moreover, the decision scenarios had multiple ripple effects on the actions of other teams. In response to a recommendation from the American Embassy in Israel and input from military and intelligence personnel, the National Security Council initially worked to discourage Israel from attacking Iran. While the President was making a decision on whether to support an Israeli attack, the White House staff was busy interacting with the staff of the Mayor of D.C., the Mayor of Indianapolis, and several federal agencies. From the President on down to the embassy officials stationed in Israel, students grappled with decisions that impacted other players, agencies, and governments. The key decisions the students encountered included:

1.	Whether to grant Israel permission to fly over Iraqi airspace on the way to bombing targets in Iran.

2.	Whether to call up the National Guard in Washington, D.C. and Indianapolis to assist with the damage and chaos caused by the bombings.

3.	Whether federal or state law enforcement officials would interrogate terrorism suspects arrested in Indiana.

---

21. The initial media reports were intentionally brief and provided few details to the students. For example, the very first news report stated: "Pakistani Embassy Bombed in Washington D.C.-Less than thirty minutes ago a suicide bomber attacked the gates of the Pakistani embassy in Washington D.C. Fire fighters and police are on the scene as the Embassy is on fire. More details will follow as they become available (INN News)."

22. In response to one inaccurate report, the Mayor initially and erroneously instructed residents to boil water before drinking it.

4.   When to hold press conferences to inform the public about the government's response as well as to issue instructions to the public.

5.   How to handle a massive traffic jam in Indianapolis as residents fled the city in the aftermath of the dirty bomb explosion.

6.   Whether to request an emergency injunction against a TV news reporter who was threatening to broadcast sensitive information associated with the terrorist attacks.

B.   Introduce students to the Challenges of Teamwork

The second pedagogical goal was to introduce students to the challenge of working with individuals from different disciplinary backgrounds. Not only did the student teams mix law students with undergraduates in the public policy school, but we injected law enforcement and public safety personnel into the simulation as well. The individuals who relayed what was happening at the scenes of the terrorist attacks were police officers with the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department. While the use of front line experts available by phone worked very well, when we physically stationed an expert from the Fire Department in the Mayor's Office to work with the students, he attempted to assume command. After the exercise, the law students reported that it was an interesting challenge to work with the embedded experts as well as the public policy students and that everyone was not always on the same page. There were interdisciplinary challenges between the law students as well. The students appeared to quickly adopt the mindset of their respective agencies as the individuals assigned to defense and intelligence roles essentially ignored any recommendations produced by the State Department. In the heat of the simulated crisis environment, the student decision-makers in the White House roles were more likely to turn to the tools of warfare rather than diplomacy even as embassy personnel in the Middle East recommended diplomacy. There were also interesting power battles between the federal and state level officials as the state level officials refused to turn terrorism suspects over to the federal officials without a promise that the federal officials would eschew using torture. There were also disagreements between the federal officials based at the state level and their superiors in the nation's capital. In one instance the U.S. Attorney based in Indianapolis arrested a television news reporter without clearing the action with the Justice Department leadership in Washington.

C.   Model Professionalism

One of the key themes of the Carnegie Report is its call for law schools to teach professionalism. Our simulation project aimed to embrace the concept of professionalism on two levels. First, regardless of their role within the simulation, students were encouraged to act as a professional and to communicate with each other respectfully. Second, the instructions to the law student participants asked them to reflect upon their identity as a future member of the legal profession and to act with good judgment during the simulation. To this end, it was evident that students took their assigned roles seriously. That was particularly true on the National Security Council set, students reported they were committed to working as a team. When I placed an undergraduate public policy student in charge of one room, appointing her Mayor of Washington, D.C, the law students treated her and the other undergraduates with respect. Still, one of the Indianapolis sets descended into mass confusion for almost an hour as the flow of information into the Governor's Office seemed to overwhelm the office and poor acoustics in the room made relaying information between departments difficult.

In hindsight, teaching professionalism involves more than simply getting the students to treat each other in a professional manner. In future exercises, I hope to enhance the professionalism component of the simulation by incorporating a reflective writing exercise and selected readings on professionalism in the course syllabus.

Conclusion

The Counter-Terrorism Simulation we conducted at Indiana University Law School-Indianapolis in October 2009 introduced students to the decision-making challenges that leaders face in times of crisis. By adapting a model used extensively in the military and public safety environments to achieve pedagogical goals aligned with the law school curriculum, the simulation project tested students' ability to apply the law in a unique professional setting. By using a team centered decision-making model, the simulation encouraged students to share information, discuss possible courses of actions, and to reflect on the short-term outcomes of their decisions. By targeting students' abilities to solve problems, communicate effectively, and work in a multidisciplinary team, the project targeted key skills critical to the successful practice of law.

The ability to demonstrate leadership in a time of crisis is one of the key skills missing in the management of public sector organizations today. In the field of public sector management, many governments have turned to simulation exercises to improve leaders' ability to respond to a crisis.[23] During the past fifteen years, natural and man-made crises have posed unprecedented challenges to political leaders and public servants. Facilitated by globalized social, economic, and technological progress, new threats such as the rise of terrorism, pose increasingly complex challenges to political leaders and front line decision-makers. The impact of challenging crises such as epidemics, terrorist attacks, natural disasters, and civil unrest are often not constrained by national boundaries. As Perrow forecast in 1999, local disruptions now trigger regional and international crises.[24] Yet, as the bungled response to Hurricane Katrina demonstrated, many public leaders and front line responders are often unprepared to handle the communication and decision-making challenges posed by a crisis. For these reasons, educational institutions that hope to prepare their students to assume positions of leadership, cannot afford to ignore the fact that the complexity of the modern decision-making environment requires the use of new pedagogies to prepare students. Our proposed counter-terrorism simulation will help to fill that need.

Whether we examine the nation's early response to the war on terror, the inaction of multiple layers of government to Hurricane Katrina, or the lack of public confidence in a municipal police department, the individuals in key management positions lack a decision-making road map. Absent such a road map, individuals may take steps that cross legal and ethical boundaries, undermine organizational confidence, and at worst fail to protect the public. Given that lawyers occupy pivotal positions in government, it behooves us to educate law students and public policy students who are prepared to assume leadership positions.

---

23. *See e.g.*, Amos N. Guiora, Teaching Morality in Armed Conflict—The Israel Defence Forces Model, Case Legal Studies Research Paper no. 05-24, (2005) *available at* http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=783985 (describing the Israeli military's use of simulated exercises to expose soldiers to international law); Eric Stern & Bengt Sundelius, Crisis Management Europe: An Integrated Regional Research and Training Program, 3 Int'l Stud. Persp. 71 (2002).

24. Arjen Boin & Patrick Lagadec, Preparing for the Future: Critical Challenges in Crisis Management, 8 J. Contingencies and Crisis Mgmt. 185 (2000) (arguing that transboundary learning processes facilitate a better understanding of current and future crises).