Reflection: Good-Bad-Ugly of “Abolishing the Death Penalty” Legislative Simulation

Overall, a very good simulation. I was pleased. That said, there is much room for improvement. Please find below some thoughts of your classmates. Some of these I discussed yesterday and are general observations. Understand that everyone views success differently and these reflections represent those different viewpoints. Read through them and look fort themes. If two people bring up the same pint but one says it was goo and another says it was bad, then you can’t make much out of those comments. However, if everyone is pointing out the same concept in their good or bad, those need to be taken seriously. Please talk with me if you have any concerns.

The Good:

Everyone that did dress up for the occasion looked very professional for their presentations and positions. I really liked how smooth Noah made the beginning of the hearing go. He was calm and collective, and the hearing flowed

smoothly. Hudson’s speech went really well using great biblical references and acting as if he was really representing a catholic church. Ecy did a great job with her speech, and I love how she brought up the Native Americans mostly because they pertain to Montana. Seth used anecdotes in his speech. Daniel was very confident in relaying the

information from his speech. Ali was as well very confident when speaking.

I liked how the audience got up and spoke their own opinion on the matter. It made the simulation feel more realistic. Good Use of Stats

I think each stakeholder spoke loud and clear, they seemed to be very educated. I really enjoyed how Hudson really portrayed the character for the group he was representing. Many had good arguments and used good facts and statistics. Daniel and Ecy did a good job looking up from their papers and making eye contact with the Senators. I think the Senators did a good job of asking questions. I also liked that Noah would interrupt the stakeholder if they went over the four minutes, a bit harsh but I liked it. I think Ali did a good job being the only opponent to the proposal and included good facts that I agreed with. It was also nice to hear from Sarah, Brianna and Alexa as audience members.

Senators very clear at opening. Hudson was very clear and spoke nicely, didn't show any nervousness, knew stats pretty good. Ecy spoke nicely, info was good. Her answering to questions was really good. Seth speech was good. Dan spoke very clearly and loudly and passionately. Ali speech was informative. Questions were answered well. Senators did well speaking clearly and loudly, but Sean definitely asked good questions that helped the bill rather than hurt and were always well thought out. The other senators had ok questions.

The Bad:

The Senate was a little choppy with most of their questions, either not being quite clear or stumbling over their own words. Serenity didn’t ask very many questions, and when she did they seemed to just confuse the speaker.(I thought she would’ve been a little more active in this hearing). Seth delivered his information very well, but when being asked questions it almost seemed like he could recall the information that he had in front of him.(Maybe wrote more than he could remember?) Daniel, although he was confident, also had a little trouble with using the facts from his speech to answer his questions. Ali did great with her speech, but couldn’t seem to directly answer questions and got pretty flustered.

I really did not like how there were four proponents and only one opponent, I wish there could have been more people to argue the other side. Some of the stakeholders did well in their speeches but got rather flustered when they were asked questions. I also think that is on part of the Senators, some of the questions that were asked didn’t quite make sense and seemed more to be arguments as to why the stakeholder is wrong rather than clarifying questions. I didn’t like the ending of the simulation, Noah seemed to be lost in what he was supposed to be doing and it seemed rather unprofessional. I also felt like the three Senators came into this with their opinions on which way it should go and weren’t going to be swayed, it was Sean’s job to be the sponsor for the bill but the other two seemed biased when they shouldn’t have.

Hudson was a little monotone and his answers to questions were hesitant. Ecy stuttered a lot. Seth spoke very quietly. Got flustered on questions. Alis speech was very choppy and had no flow. Senators noah and serenity's questions were ok but didn't seem to have a direction. The ending of it all was kinda confusing noah didn't end it well.

The Ugly:

No one had their nameplate, which was a big no no. (even though no one did the day before either... whoops). Daniel didn’t dress up for his part which docked a couple points visually. At the end the decision made by the Senate was alright, but it almost seemed forced and more awkward than anything.(Would’ve liked to see more

confidence and thought process).

The committee lacked a sense of parly procedure as no motion or vote was directly stated.

Overall

I think overall the simulation went pretty well, I think the ending could’ve been better. My favorite speech was Hudson because he really played his character and spoke slow and loud for everyone to understand. The stakeholders should have split up to have another opponent to the proposal. I would like to give a shout out to three that got up and spoke as audience members but especially Brianna because she had not done research on the topic, she felt that since there was only one opponent she should go and share her thoughts on it and she was unfairly hammered with questions, she may have gotten more questions from the Senators than a single stakeholder did, so good job to her. I think as a class we have improved but we still have a ways to go.

speakers spoke well, senators too. Participation in the audience was good. Questions toward audience speakers were not very good.