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OVERVIEW

1. Welcome Soldiers

The purpose of *The High Ground* is to give Army leaders, especially those who are new to positions of leadership, practice in developing the crucial moral/ethical skills that are the foundation of their professional ethic. The audience for *The High Ground* includes United States Army Squad Leaders (E5/E6), Platoon Sergeants (E7), Platoon Leaders (O1/O2), and Company Commanders (O3). Soldiers who will be placed in new positions of authority may also benefit from this interactive video.

Success in deployed operations requires being able to consistently apply the Army professional ethic in morally/ethically complex or ambiguous situations. Often, these situations involve rules, outcomes and/or values that are in conflict. How does a Sergeant balance the obligation to protect Soldiers against the obligation to report when they have done something wrong? How does a young Lieutenant weigh the value of a Soldier’s life against that of an innocent noncombatant? What if they haven’t had the life experience to deal with such dilemmas, and yet they’re facing life-or-death decisions?

In *The High Ground*, either of two characters can be played to experience what it’s like to make ethical decisions when such conflicts are involved. The players make decisions as that character and then see the consequences of those decisions play out. *The High Ground* helps them think through and practice making ethical decisions in a safe environment so that they can apply what they learn here later to critical real-life situations.

*The High Ground* serves three goals:

- Strengthen the moral/ethical capabilities of the individual learner.
- Provide information that may, through post analysis, provide insights into the moral/ethical reasoning capabilities of new Army leaders.
- Provide experiences in the moral/ethical domain.

As the characters of either 2LT Fowler or SSG Moultrie are presented, the players are urged to look at problems through different “ethical lenses,” to develop the ability to make reasoned, balanced decisions that reflect the professional ethic. Those ethical lenses represent three ways of evaluating the options for action in terms of:

- Rules-based reasoning: What are the rules that govern this situation and my choices?
- Outcomes-based reasoning: What are the benefits and costs of the outcomes of my different choices?
- Values-based reasoning: How do my choices align with my personal values, the values of my organization, my oath, my country, etc.?
The narrative of *The High Ground* is divided into three sections: pre-deployment, deployment, and re-deployment.

**2. Opening Video**

Play the introduction video. It should start automatically when you call up the program. If the introduction does not automatically start, select “NEXT.”

The short opening video makes the following points to the audience:

- You’ve either been deployed or are about to be deployed.
- Your morals and values will be challenged while you’re making life-and-death decisions.
- Have you ever made a choice that you wish you could go back and change? This program will let you do that. It will make you think about your decisions.

After the introductory video, players are asked if they have played *The High Ground* before. If not, the program takes them to a tutorial that demonstrates how to use *The High Ground* interface. Players can return to this sequence at any point by choosing “Play the Tutorial” from the main menu.

**3. Using the Interface**

Here’s how to navigate the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTROL</th>
<th>WHAT IT DOES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEXT</td>
<td>Moves to the next screen You have to click NEXT to leave text screens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACK</td>
<td>Moves to the previous screen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Starting the Character Modules

After the tutorial, the Main Menu will appear. Choose a character to play first: 2LT Paul Fowler or SSG Glen Moultrie. Click on that character to begin. To prepare for facilitating the junior leaders’ experience with *The High Ground*, read about the characters and review the decision maps. These tools are for the facilitator’s use only.
5. Using Decision Maps

Each Character Navigation Path below has a decision map. It lays out each decision along with the available choices. Each course of action is identified by its “ethical lens,” (i.e., rules-based, outcome-based, or values-based.) If a player chooses inaction, then one of three reasons are given as to why that choice may have been made:

- Lack of capability — “I have no power to change the situation.”
- Lack of courage — “The consequences are more than I want to deal with.”
- Lack of ownership — “It’s not my problem.”

Short-term or long-term consequences related to a decision are also noted. Key content points and discussion questions follow many of the decision points.

In discussing the decision points, you may find that players complain about scenarios with seemingly no right answers. Sometimes the mentor character, Platoon Sergeant Gudrie, offers critical feedback no matter which action is chosen. Emphasize that the aim of *The High Ground* is to encourage junior leaders to consider all options and different approaches so that they make balanced decisions. There will often be another way of handling the situation or something else to consider—that does not mean their decision was wrong.

The decision maps and related information can assist you in teaching and are easy to understand and follow.

**Note**

Players can see the decision map for a particular character by clicking on “View Decision Map” from the main menu. Clicking on a particular decision will take them to that point in *The High Ground.*
1. SSG Glen Moultrie

SSG Glen Moultrie is a veteran of deployments to Afghanistan and Iraq. He started out in the infantry then reclassed as part of a reenlistment option. He has been a SSG for a year. Married with a son, Moultrie is helping prepare his Company for its next deployment, which begins in 30 days. On his last deployment, he saw two Soldiers wounded while trying to protect a local citizen, and he saw an innocent civilian killed because of a mistaken identity.

Decision Map

The decision map below shows the various choices and the lenses that they represent. As time allows, encourage participants to explore other choices and their consequences. The map also describes consequences and includes some discussion questions and key content points.

Pre-deployment Decisions

Vehicle Repair vs. Family Time – What do you want to do?

Tell your wife you can’t control the situation—the job needs to be done. (Lack of capability)

Tell her that you have to stay until the vehicle is repaired and will get home as soon as possible. (Rules)

Tell her you’ll be there, then trust your NCOs and delegate. (Outcome)

Tell her that you’re coming home because this is important. (Values)

For Discussion

Where does loyalty to your family fit in with loyalty to your Soldiers and to the mission?

Why do you imagine that some people think they can’t control the outcome? Is that often a valid concern or an excuse to avoid acting?
Takeaway

Balance is hard to find, whether you’re talking about decision making, delegating, or the demands of work and family.

False Report on Vehicle Repair – What do you want to do?

Report the vehicle as green. (Lack of courage)

Tell the mechanic to fix the vehicle ASAP. (Outcome)

Tell him that you can’t let an inaccurate report stand. (Values)

Tell him to fix it or it will be reported as deadlined and he will be toast. (Rules)

*If players choose to fix it ASAP, that decision has long-term consequences. During deployment, maintenance starts to slip, as everyone adopts that “I’ll get to it as soon as I can” attitude. The sliding maintenance deadlines begin to affect the mission.*

Takeaway

In this situation, using outcome-based reasoning led to tunnel vision and an inability to see what the unintended consequences might be.

Soldier Penciled in as Qualified – What do you want to do?

Say nothing. (Lack of ownership)

Have Davidson set the record straight and tell SFC Gudrie that you have two Soldiers who need qualification. (Rules)

Discuss with SFC Gudrie to see if you can give the two Soldiers a break. Don’t mention false records since no harm has been done. (Outcome)

Report false records to the Platoon SGT and send Soldiers to the range for qualification. (Values/rules)

Setting the Tone for Deployment – What do you want to do?

Let it go. (Lack of courage)

Give clear guidance about mission. (Rules)
It’s about looking out for each other. (Values)

Tell them to hold on to that good morale. (Outcome)

*If Moultrie fails to give clear guidance, then there are long-term consequences. During deployment, members of the squad treat the local civilians badly.*

**For Discussion**

Is it wrong to tell them to look out for each other?

How do you balance loyalty to your Soldiers with loyalty to the mission, to the Army, and to this nation’s ideals?

**Takeaway**

In this situation, both an outcome-based decision and a values-based decision ended up being too narrow, bringing unintended consequences.

**Deployment Decisions**

**Negligent Discharge – What do you want to do?**

Let it go. (Lack of capability)

No one gets fried with an Article 15. Grey does extra duty to make sure it doesn’t happen again. Let’s keep it within the squad. (Outcome)

Drive on. (Outcome)

We have to take care of each other. There will be no Article 15, and let’s keep it within the squad. (Values)

Report it. (Rules)

*If players choose not to report the discharge, then Moultrie is blackmailed later when he catches a PFC stealing money from a local civilian. Moultrie turns the Soldier in and confesses to SFC Gudrie. The Soldier gets a company grade Article 15 while Moultrie is under a commander’s inquiry.*

**For Discussion**

What kind of actions can safely be kept within the squad?

How do you balance the obligation to protect your Soldiers against your obligation to uphold the rules and regulations of the Army?
**Takeaway**

You never know what decisions will come back to haunt you later.

**Detainee and Local Police – What do you want to do?**

Let the cops take him; he’s not your responsibility. (Lack of ownership)

Letting him go may result in more attacks on Soldiers. Let the cops take him. (Outcome)

Since the man could be harmed, get him away from the cops. (Values)

*If players decide to let the cops take him, then an unknown man is later found dead, severely beaten, along the road. Moultrie wonders if it’s the same man. If players choose to take him away, they face another decision when no one wants to hold him.*

**What do you want to do with the detainee?**

Nothing you can do—let him go. (Lack of capability)

Challenge the guidance given by higher up. (Outcome)

*If players choose to let him go, then two days later, there is another IED attack that leaves one person dead and another severely injured. Moultrie wonders if the bomber is the man he released.*

**For Discussion**

Where does your loyalty lie here? To your Soldiers, to the mission, to a higher set of values? Where do you draw the line?

**Takeaway**

You may never know ultimately the consequences of your decisions. However, even if you never know what happened, you still have to be able to live with yourself.

**SSG Possible Fraternization – What do you want to do?**

You’re not his boss. Forget about it. (Lack of ownership)

Remind him about the policy on fraternization. (Rules)

Look out for him; tell him he should be setting an example. (Values)

Tell Riggs that he should play it safe. (Outcome)
For Discussion

Given Riggs’ personality, which approach outlined above do you think would work the best? Why?

Takeaway

Although you may hesitate to initiate a discussion here, particularly when you don’t know if anything is really happening or not, the obligation to protect fellow Soldiers means that you have to get involved.

SG Jackson Destroying Civilian Property – What do you want to do?

Keep it within the squad. It will be a mess to report, and I’ll be reprimanded. (Lack of courage)

Handle his hot-headed mistake within the squad. (Outcome)

Give the civilian a collateral damage certificate and minimize what happened to the chain. (Outcome)

Report what happened accurately. (Rules/values)

*If players choose not to give an accurate report, then Jackson later commits assault after he returns home. He needed treatment for combat stress, but no one knew it.*

Takeaway

Loyalty to Jackson turned out to be the worst thing for him.

Back-flipping Soldier – What do you want to do?

Walk away. SFC Carlin will bury you. (Lack of courage)

Confront Carlin. (Rules/values)

Win Carlin over. (Outcome)

*If players do not choose to confront Carlin immediately, then the Soldier tries his flip anyway and breaks his leg badly. If he does break his leg, then players are faced with the decision below about whether to reveal Carlin’s role in this.*

Tell 1SG What Really Happened – What do you want to do?
Tell him. You owe the unit and the mission. (Rules/values)

The damage is done — keep it to yourself. (Outcome)

You can’t let a lie stand. Tell Carlin to tell the truth or you will. (Values)

**For Discussion**

What happens when you try to reconcile all the conflicting values?

**Takeaway**

In a situation like this, the safety of your Soldier comes first.

**Re-deployment Decisions**

**SG Riggs and Sexual Conduct – What do you want to do?**

Don’t tell him. (Lack of ownership)

Tell him what you saw and suspect. (Rules/values)

Report truthfully what you know. (Outcome)

**SSP Richards’ Medical Secret – What do you want to do?**

It’s his business — forget about it. (Lack of ownership)

It won’t help the Army if they lose a good NCO. Keep it to yourself. (Outcome)

Richards deserves your loyalty. Keep it to yourself. (Values)

Talk Richards into doing the right thing. (Rules/values)

Tell Richards that you are going to talk to the 1st Sergeant. (Rules)

*If players opt to talk to Richards, then he refuses to reveal his condition, and they are faced with the following options:*

It’s his business — forget about it. (Lack of ownership)

It won’t help the Army if they lose a good NCO. Keep it to yourself. (Outcome)
Richards deserves your loyalty. Keep it to yourself. (Values)

Tell Richards that you are going to talk to the 1st Sergeant. (Rules)

*If players fail to act, then Richards has his knee operated on. Because he is without his medication for the first time in years, he attacks a nurse.*

**For Discussion**

Should Richards’ discipline in managing his meds over all those years count for anything? How about his competence?

Where does your loyalty lie? What about Richards’ loyalty to you, given the position he has put you in?

**Takeaway**

His condition puts others at risk. Don’t you owe them something?
2. 2LT Paul Fowler

2LT Paul Fowler has completed the first month of his first duty assignment. He was commissioned through ROTC at Florida State University and is the only non-West Point officer in his Company. LT Fowler is single and feels that he has to prove himself professionally.

Decision Map

The decision map below shows the various choices and the lenses that they represent. As time allows, encourage participants to explore other choices and their consequences. The map also describes consequences and includes some discussion questions and key content points.

Pre-deployment Decisions

Movie Night – What do you want to do?

Leave it to the NCOs. (Lack of ownership)

Treating Soldiers like adults is good for morale. Let them choose their own movies. (Outcome)

Tell Riggs that all Soldiers deserve to be respected. (Values)

Tell Riggs that you don’t like their choice and it will cause problems for the unit. Fix it. (Outcome)

Sexually explicit material creates an inappropriate environment for female Soldiers. Have them choose a less risqué movie. (Rules)

*If players choose to deal with the problem, it sets a good example for another Soldier, who intervenes and acts later when he sees something wrong. If they choose not to act, then the female Soldier later complains about harassment from another Soldier and a hostile environment, using Movie Night as an example.*
For Discussion

Are there ways to avoid singling out the female Soldiers, to avoid creating an “us vs. them” mentality on this subject?

Takeaway

You need to act to ensure that you are not part of creating a hostile environment. If you are not part of the solution, then you’re part of the problem.

Perception of Favoritism – What do you want to do?

He’s not in your platoon. Forget it. (Lack of ownership)

Talk to Carlin yourself. (Rules)

Ask Specialist Carter for the facts. (Outcome)

Respect NCO ranks. Ask SFC Gudrie to raise issue with Carter. (Values)

Protect the integrity of the command leadership team. Discuss with your commander. (Values)

*If players fail to act, then Carter lands in a lot of trouble later, possibly due to Carlin’s influence on him.*

SSG Jensen’s Pre-Deployment Attitude – What do you want to do?

Don’t say anything. You can’t change his mind. (Lack of capability)

Balance Jensen’s comments with the mission and rules of engagement. (Rules)

Balance Jensen’s comments with a focus on achieving the best outcome. (Outcome)

Balance Jensen’s comments with a focus on respect for human life. (Values)

You don’t agree but don’t discuss in front of his Soldiers. (Outcome)

*This decision has serious tactical consequences down the road during deployment. If players do not communicate their expectations about respect for human life, then civilians, including children, pay the price later on. And a Soldier, seeing the children dead, suffers long-term consequences as well.*
For Discussion

Are any of the options for action wrong? Why or why not?

How do you balance the worth of a Soldier’s life against that of a non-combatant?

Takeaway

Failing to have these serious discussions with your Soldiers can have serious consequences.

Deployment Decisions

Conflicting Accounts About 15-6 Investigation – What do you want to do?

Nothing — the 15-6 officer is responsible for the determination. (Lack of ownership)

Advise the 15-6 officer that he may have missed important information. (Rules)

Leave it alone. The officer drew the correct conclusion. (Outcome)

Speak with SFC Gudrie about PFC Mathers’ report. (Outcome)

*If players decide to speak with SFC Gudrie, then they again face these choices about what to do:*

Nothing — the 15-6 officer is responsible for the determination. (Lack of ownership)

Advise the 15-6 officer that he may have missed important information. (Rules)

Leave it alone. The officer drew the correct conclusion. (Outcome)

*If players choose to do nothing, then Mathers becomes cynical about investigations. If players advise the 15-6 officer, he investigates and comes to the same conclusion, but the NCOs feel as if they are on trial.*

For Discussion

How do you balance loyalty to enlisted leaders against loyalty to the Army and the idea of accountability when things go wrong?

Brave Soldier and Stolen Equipment – What do you want to do?

Specialist Grey needs to fix this himself. (Ownership)

Recommend him for an Article 15 for the theft, pull the Bronze Star, and reassign him. (Values)
Recommend him for an Article 15 for the theft, support the Bronze Star, and reassign him. (Rules)

Recommend him for an Article 15 for the theft, pull the Bronze Star, and keep him in the platoon. (Values/outcome)

*At first glance, none of these actions have positive consequences. However, the critical decision is to keep Grey in the platoon. If he is reassigned, then he commits suicide after the deployment.*

**For Discussion**

How do you balance the needs of the unit against Grey’s needs as an individual? Are those values necessarily in conflict?

**Rumor From the Homefront – What do you want to do?**

It’s NCO business. Let it go. (Lack of ownership)

Rumors kill morale. Tell PFC Hall to keep it to himself. (Rules)

He can’t do anything from here, and no one benefits if he’s upset, so keep it quiet. (Outcome)

Talk to SFC Gudrie to decide how to best support him.

*If players decide to talk to SFC Gudrie, then they face the following set of options about what to do:*

You can’t help him. Drop it. (Lack of capability)

Repeating the rumor won’t help the unit. Drop it. (Outcome)

You owe it to him to let him know. (Values)

Ask Captain Rainey for guidance. (Lack of ownership)

*If players choose not to tell him, then his estranged wife cleans out their savings account and runs up the credit cards before leaving.*

**For Discussion**

How does this square with guidance to never discuss rumors? And to let NCO issues stay in NCO lane?
How do you balance loyalty to a particular soldier against the damage that rumors can do to a unit?

**Clan Leader and Torture Victim – What do you want to do?**

You can’t change the local culture. Get the list and go. (Lack of capability)

The mission is to get the target list. (Rules)

Get the list, then try to persuade him not to torture suspects. (Outcome)

Stop the torture now. (Values)

*Later on, if players fail to stop the torture, then local clan leaders and civilians talk about how Americans just stood by and watched someone killed. They stop cooperating. However, if the players choose to stop the torture, then 2LT Fowler doesn’t accomplish his immediate mission. However, he discovers later that the locals, having heard what happened, are cooperating and offering more intelligence.*

**For Discussion**

Does knowing the positive outcome (that people cooperate more) affect your decision about whether to stop the torture? Should it?

**Tactical Decision – What do you want to do?**

Minimize collateral damage. Suppress shooter with well-aimed fire. Direct SSG Jensen to hold position while you call for QRF. (Rules)

Minimize Soldiers’ exposure. Suppress shooter with AT4s and machine gun fire. (Outcome)

Protect innocent non-combatants. Suppress shooter and direct SSG Jensen to take the house. (Values/outcome)

Call company commander for guidance. (Lack of ownership/courage)

*If players hesitate and call for guidance, then Jensen acts “on his own.” If previously, respect for human life was stressed, then the hostiles escape, one soldier is wounded, one civilian is dead, and the other three civilians are safe. If players decide to minimize casualties, then one soldier dies, they capture the insurgents, and the civilians are okay. If players choose to minimize exposure, then one soldier is slightly wounded. The two hostiles and one civilian are dead, and one civilian is wounded. If players decide to minimize collateral damage, then the hostiles escape. One soldier and one civilian are dead, while the wife is injured, and the children*
are okay. If players failed earlier to insist on a respect for life, then four civilians and two hostiles are dead. If the children die, then SSG Jensen suffers long-term consequences.

**For Discussion**

Are any of these choices of action wrong? Why or why not?

Are there circumstances in which asking for guidance first would be the most ethical thing to do?

**Takeaway**

This is one of those situations where some of the consequences will be negative, no matter what you choose to do. You cannot reconcile all of the conflicting values. In the end, what can you live with doing?

**Re-deployment Decisions**

**A Friend Who Might Need Help – What do you want to do?**

Respect his privacy. Let it go, but keep tabs on him. (Values)

Ask what you can do to help. (Outcome)

Let it go. You can’t fix it. (Lack of capability)

Offer to go with him to Behavioral Health. (Rules)

**For Discussion**

When is it a viable option to respect a peer’s privacy?

**Bring Buddy to your Captain? – What do you want to do?**

No. Talk to your friend again first. (Rules)

Tell Captain about your suspicions. (Outcome)

Respect his privacy. (Values)

**Takeaway**

Other stressors could be driving your peers and Soldiers. Try to get the whole story before acting.
6. Using the After Action Reports

Each lesson ends with a viewable, printable after action report (AAR). It summarizes the principle choices made by the participant and notes any patterns in decision making. The AAR can be used by the individual learner for self-development. New leaders can also take their AARs to a mentor, who can discuss the results with them.
LESSON DELIVERY

The lessons are designed to be stand-alone, but may also be used in facilitated discussions. Junior leaders may do either one or both of them. They may experience *The High Ground* individually or as part of a group. If you are facilitating a group, choose a separate “decision,” sequence of events or play one character’s story all the way through. You can poll group members on what they want to do, or pick volunteers to make the individual decisions. After the group has completed the lesson, use the sample lesson plans below and decision maps to discuss the decision points in more detail.

Below are learning objectives for the program.

Terminal Learning Objectives

- Within the context of *The High Ground* interactive video depicting conditions of stress, fatigue, fear, and cultural challenges, leaders will make choices that demonstrate their ability to recognize the moral/ethical implications inherent in military operations.

- Within the context of *The High Ground* interactive video depicting conditions of stress, fatigue, fear, and cultural challenges, leaders will make choices that demonstrate their ability to form a moral/ethical judgment concerning ethical issues in military operations.

- Within the context of *The High Ground* interactive video depicting conditions of stress, fatigue, fear, and cultural challenges, leaders will make choices that demonstrate their intent to assert moral/ethical correction with military operations.

- Within the context of *The High Ground* interactive video depicting conditions of stress, fatigue, fear, and cultural challenges, leaders will make choices that demonstrate appropriate behaviors to effect moral/ethical correction with military operations.

- Within the context of *The High Ground* interactive video depicting conditions of stress, fatigue, fear, and cultural challenges, leaders will make choices that demonstrate awareness of multiple dimensions of ethical military operations.

- Within the context of *The High Ground* interactive video depicting conditions of stress, fatigue, fear, and cultural challenges, leaders will make choices that demonstrate capability to use three distinct lenses for evaluating the ethical content of military situations: rules-based, outcome-based, and values-based.

- Within the context of *The High Ground* interactive video depicting conditions of stress, fatigue, fear, and cultural challenges, leaders will make choices that demonstrate capability to negotiate situations across a spectrum of moral/ethical intensity.

Materials and Equipment:

- *The High Ground* DVD
1. **SSG Moultrie Lesson Plan**

**Delivery Time: 1 hour, 40 minutes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 0:00 – 10:00 | Start up the program. Click the pause button.  
                   Explain to group members that they will have an opportunity to practice making ethical decisions during pre-deployment, deployment, and re-deployment. They will be able to make decisions as SSG Moultrie and then see the consequences of those decisions play out.  
                   Describe *The High Ground* as an interactive methodology that allows them to see what happens as the result of the decisions they make.  
                   Play the Introduction Video and the tutorial. |
| 10:00 – 40:00 | Explore the pre-deployment section, which focuses on the following decisions:  
                   • Vehicle Repairs Vs. Family Time  
                   • False Report on Vehicle Repair  
                   • Soldier Penciled in as Qualified  
                   • Setting the Tone for Deployment |
| 40:00 – 75:00 | Explore the deployment section, which focuses on the following decisions:  
                   • Negligent Discharge  
                   • Detainee and Local Police  
                   • SSG Possible Fraternization  
                   • SG Jackson Destroying Civilian Property |

Explain that you will lead the group members through the SSG Moultrie module. Use the decision map to explore the choices. Remember that it is important that players also explore alternative outcomes. Be sure to answer questions and encourage discussion.

---

1 Please see the section on Technical Solutions and Suggestions in this guide.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Back-flipping Soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75:00 – 95:00</td>
<td>Explore the re-deployment section, which focuses on the following decisions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SG Riggs and Sexual Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SSP Richards’ Medical Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95:00 – 100:00</td>
<td>Wrap Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explain that this interactive simulation helped them to practice making ethical decisions by weighing a number of different perspectives for a balanced approach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. 2LT Paul Fowler Lesson Plan

#### Delivery Time: 1 hour, 35 minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00 – 5:00</td>
<td>Start up the program. Click the pause button. (Note: if players have already completed the Moultrie module, then skip the introduction and tutorial. If not, then refer to the Moultrie lesson plan for details about the Introduction Video and tutorial.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explain that you will lead the group members through the 2LT Fowler module. Use the decision maps to explore the choices. Remember that it is important that players also explore alternative outcomes. Be sure to answer questions and encourage discussion.**

<p>| 5:00 – 35:00 | Explore the pre-deployment section, which focuses on the following decisions:               |
|              |   • Movie Night                                                                            |
|              |   • Perception of Favoritism                                                                |
|              |   • SSG Jensen’s Pre-Deployment Attitude                                                    |
| 35:00 – 75:00 | Explore the deployment section, which focuses on the following                            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decisions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conflicting Accounts About 15-6 Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Brave Soldier and Stolen Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rumor From the Homefront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clan Leader and Torture Victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tactical Decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 75:00 – 90:00 | Explore the re-deployment section, which focuses on the following decisions: |
|               | • A Friend Who Might Need Help                             |
|               | • Bring Buddy to Captain?                                  |

| 95:00 – 100:00 | Wrap Up                                                   |
|               | Explain that this interactive simulation helped them to practice making ethical decisions by weighing a number of different perspectives for a balanced approach. |
TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This section answers technical questions, helps to trouble-shoot problems, and offers suggestions to create a technically better presentation of *The High Ground*. Included are subheadings on System Requirements, Projecting the Simulation for a Large Audience, and Playback Problems.

A. System Requirements:

- Windows XP, Vista, or 7 / Mac OS 10.3 ("Panther") or higher
- Adobe Flash Player 10+ (included)
- 1Ghz or faster processor (2GHz recommended for full-screen playback at high resolutions)
- 256MB of RAM (512MB recommended)
- DVD-ROM Drive
- Video Card & Display (1024 by 768 minimum resolution)
- Sound Card & Speakers / Headphones

B. Projecting for a Large Audience

*The High Ground* can be projected onto a screen for large audiences, given the right equipment, if the classroom/auditorium is already set up to project multimedia.

If the classroom auditorium is only set up to use or project TV/VCR images, and you want to project the simulation, then you have two options.

A. Large Computer Monitor (21” or more) for a small group.

B. Computer Projection System with LCD projector for large groups.

C. Graphics/Color Issues

*The High Ground* is designed to work best in a screen resolution of at least 1024 by 768, with at least High Color (16 bit) color palette/depth.

D. Playback Problems

Video Skips and Hesitations

*The High Ground* is not made for older computers. Skips and hesitations in the video indicate that part of your computer is not processing quickly enough. This is generally caused by a lack of either CPU processor speed, amount of physical memory (RAM) or both.
If you have the minimum system requirements, you may be able to improve performance by closing all other applications and/or decreasing your desktop resolution.

**No Sound**

Double-check the wires — be certain that the speakers have electricity, that all the connections are in the right places, and that the speakers are turned on and the volume is up.

If you still do not have sound, contact your computer support folks and tell them you may have a problem with your sound card or speak.