Overall, a nicely done simulation. I wish some parents, peers, etc. would have come to watch. It was nice having Mr. Shaw’s class and Representative Krautter there. They are on the opposite political spectrums from one another but friends, once again demonstrating that friends do not have to think alike and those that do are not your enemies. Please find below some of my thoughts and those of your classmates. 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 good 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.

Good: the speakers were loud for the most part and they responded to the questions confidently.

Bad: the senators were quiet and the notecards were used a little too much

Good questions/Good answers to questions when asked/Everyone looked very professional/Good arguments were made for both sides

Bad: At first no one asked Joel any questions which was embarrassing I thought/Some read monotone off notecards/Some senators asked more questions than others

Ugly: Speak loud and clear; question had to be repeated 3x/Speak more professional like Joel did/This isn’t a debate; don’t attack each other

The Good- Everyone was well informed on the issues, and argued their points well with good research.

The Bad- Senators should’ve spoken up louder, or stood as they were speaking as it was incredibly hard to hear. Constituents also needed to speak louder and slower while speaking.

The Ugly- Senators had a lot of dead time with some pro/opponents, and some questions were hard to understand. Pro/opponents had awkward pauses within their sentences and said “um” a lot.

Senators

Good - thoughtful questions, good attack and softball questions, final opinions were clear

Bad - some could speak a little louder and maybe a little more eye contact

Ugly - dead time

Opponents

Good - spoke loud and clear, brought up relevant examples that helped get points across, nice little stories and quotes

Bad - Q and A was a little slow at first, but got better as it went on

Ugly - some stumbling and pauses

Proponents

Good - spoke loudly, defined points clearly, brought up relevant cases

Bad - stumbled a little bit and could enunciate more

Ugly - speaking time

Senators

Good- good questions about other states’ laws and good questions about the Bible and religion

Bad- could ask more questions and some questions were absurd

Ugly- could talk louder and there are reasons laws are laws

Constituents

Good- I like the sword/ shield comment and good precedent scenarios

Bad- some people mumbled and some pauses in prepared statements were too long/Speakers should talk with more voice fluctuation so people are in tune with speaker  
  
Ugly- some people didn’t get the name of the bill right and some kind of perjured themselves/Some speakers forget to say if they are proponents or opponents

James: Good voice. Loud/ James stumbled though questions. A little unclear

Hannah spoke clearly with good points/Hannah filled time perfectly/ Hannah had good rebuttals

Will had good clear questions that were biased at the right time

Shea got points across effectively/

Cooper had good points and answered questions effectively for the most part Cooper needs to sound more enthusiastic

Ximena spoke clearly and confidently/She had good points that were easy to follow/Ximena stuttered a little

Ashlynn should ask more questions/Ashlyn needs to be louder