Applied Government Name\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  
**Education Committee Hearings 2021**Mr. Faulhaber Class Period: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**"Should the Montana Legislature pass a bill outlawing Native American Nicknames, Mascots, or Caricatures in any Public School outside a Reservation?"**

***Procedure and Purpose:***

* The following simulations will be quasi-state legislative committee hearings. The procedures we will be following are modified from what one would see if at the state legislature in Helena and attending a state senate committee hearing.
* The purpose of these specific state senate committee hearing will be to solicit public comment about issues that permeate the public square and often divide the public.

***Task:***

* Provide public comment on what to do regarding controversial issues on the public agenda (keep as is, modify, or eliminate) or ask clarifying questions to determine what action is to be taken.
* Demonstrate an educated opinion regarding either public policy agenda issues chosen by you and/or your classmates regarding a current controversy by asking clarifying questions or by providing public comment as a stakeholder representing an interested population or questions to determine what action is to be taken and articulating the course you believe ought to be pursued.

***Participants:***

* **Education Committee Member**
* Krystan Jasin, Committee Chair
* Ali Merritt, (R-Member)
* Daniel Schneider, (D-Member)
* **Pro-Stakeholders Testifying**
* Hadley Garsjo, Sponsor
* Sean Earle, Representing:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Hudson Severson, Representing:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* **Con-Stakeholders Testifying**
* Seth Dodds, Representing:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Brianna Brost, Representing:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**How the hearing will work:**

1. You will be sign up to represent a “stakeholder” (interest group, public interest institute, etc,) or to play the role of a state senator.

2. The hearing will be opened by the committee chair (**each Senator must have a placard announcing who they are and what political party they represent**) who will announce an introduction such as:

**“Welcome. The Montana Senate Education Committee will come to order. Today we will hear public comment on the proposed bill to outlawing Native American Nicknames, Mascots, or Caricatures in any Public School outside a Reservation.**

3. The chair will then introduce the bill’s sponsor who will give a brief overview and description of the proposed law **and** outlining its necessity.

4. After the bill is discussed the chair will open the floor for testimony and explain the time constraints each witness will be obligated to follow:

**“Each person testifying will have a maximum of seven minutes for a statement followed by questions from this committee. Please introduce yourself, first and last name for the minutes, who you represent and what your organization does, and whether you are a proponent or opponent of the proposed policy.**

**Anyone that wishes to speak on this policy please make a line behind the podium or go to the podium when it is open  
  
You may begin... ”**

5. Statements/Testimony from proponents and opponents will ensure. Each testifier will be a “stakeholder” that is vested in the outcome of the proposed law.

* Each speaker will need to introduce themselves and a brief description of the interest group, public interest institute, etc they represent
* Each speaker will have up to 7 minutes to deliver a statement. The statement should work to convince the U.S. Senators to vote keep as is, modify, or eliminate the school policy by stating reasons for or against the current policy, using personal experience or factual evidence pertaining to United States.
* The first 4 minutes will be under a civility rule (uninterrupted talk)

**caveat: If speech is done prior to the 4-minute rule; the speaker can announce:**

**“that concludes my prepared statements, I welcome any questions regarding my testimony**

* After the 4 minutes of uninterrupted talk or whatever remaining of that time is not utilized during the statement period, committee members will pepper the speakers with questions clarifying statements and getting the requisite information to make an informed vote.

**caveat: If state senators do not have questions or they end before the 6 minutes is completed the chair may thank the speaker and call for the next stakeholder.**

6. After the first stakeholder presents his/her statement and is questioned, all other stakeholders will present.

7. After all interest group lobbyists from the class have presented, the committee will open up to the **audience** to make statements themselves regarding their feelings concerning the policy.

8. The chairperson calls discussion of the members to express their opinion for and/or against the testimony presented to encourage fellow members to vote a specific way. After five minutes (maximum) the chair should call for a motion to adopt, eliminate or alter the proposed policy. The committee votes on recommendations and decides the fate of the policy by passing the policy out of committee to the full board with the aforementioned recommendation and for final approval or to keep the policy in committee for further discussion/work.

**Whole Group Preparation**

* Decide as a group an outline of the proposed law (the sponsor will fill in the blanks) so all members know what they will be debating/testifying in regards to.

**Individual Preparation**

* Before you research, determine what you know, would like to know, and need to know to be successful in the Harkness. In your note sheet, write down the following categories and answer the questions:
* What I know includes…
* What I think I know includes…
* What I want to know includes…
* What I need to know to answer this question include…

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**U.S. Senator Group Preparation:**

* Read the proposal carefully and discuss it amongst yourselves.
* Choose the party and state each Senator will represent.
* Choose a committee chairperson from the majority party who will run the hearing
* Research the policy. Be fluent in its merits and criticism. Recognize other alternatives to the policy proposal. In essence, gain some understanding of what the various positions on the policy proposal might be.
* Look to what the courts have said regarding the law or cases that regard issues that would pertain to the law
* Contact officials that are intimately familiar with this issue (i.e. school officials and school board members)
* Discuss with your parents and community members their thoughts
* Create questions for the stakeholders and other speakers through questions that are: purely informative, designed to point out strengths and weakness in the arguments presented, or to show support for or against a particular position.
* ***Remember, your job should not to be adversarial but to ask clarifying and hypothetical questions to make an informed decision and justifying it to your constituents***

**Stakeholders Preparation:**

* Consider the following when researching on what to present regarding the proposed law:
* Who the members of your interest group are, what experience your members might have with healthcare, and how they might feel about the Medicare for all proposal.
* Discuss the policy proposal from the group’s perspective- how do they think and feel about this policy?
* Does the group have any concerns about the policy proposal-whether it’s strong enough, or overreaching, or effective, or unconstitutional?
* Contact officials from the organization you are representing and/or people around the community/state/etc that share similar concerns and how they would argue for/against the proposal.
* Discuss with your parents and community members their thoughts
* Perform the following
* Decide what your interest group, public interest institute, etc wants the U.S. Senators to do-pass the policy proposal, reject the proposal, or rewrite the proposal. First, you should list the primary arguments in favor of their position and draft a short statement and list key points to be made during this time.
* State reasons for or against the current policy, using personal experience or factual evidence pertaining to United States.
* Generate a list of questions the senators might ask, and consider responses to those questions.

**Montana Senate Education Committee Legislative Hearing Grading Rubric**

**DIRECTIONS: Read through each category and its criteria***. Complete either or both columns to give yourself an accurate grade.*   
  
In the LEFT column: Place a check plus next to those you completed in an exceptional manner, a check plus/check mark if it was only completed well, a check mark next to the criteria in which you completed okay, a check mark/check minus if it was completed okay but not great, a and a check minus that you completed but not very well, and place an X next to the criteria not completed at all.   
  
In the RIGHT column: Place the appropriate grade in the space to the immediate left of EACH criteria required by determining those areas you performed or were lacking and based upon the point value listed. Place a N/A or “not applicable next to any criterion not required for your specific role. Average the points together in place that score in the “your estimate” blank.   
 ***\*\*\*Remember, a perfect grade should reflect perfect work and only be used when the work done had no deficiencies & could not have been performed any better***.\*\*

**YOUR GRADE**

* **PREPARATION AND RESEARCH**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/20**

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Fulfilled role as outlined in “preparation” section

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Talked with parent(s), guardian(s), and/or adult(s) in your life to gain a better understanding of the varying facets of the issue  
\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Watched an example of a committee hearing on MPAN or the state legislative website to familiarize yourself with your responsibilities   
\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Put a good faith effort into contacting officials(governmental), Native American Groups, etc directly related to this issue  
\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_**Conducted research on your own based upon the questions you still have to be effective in the simulation**

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Gathered necessary information to be knowledgeable and successful in assigned role

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Properly used class time to complete project

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Put in multiple hours outside of class

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Spent necessary time on project to be effective in assigned role

* **CONTENT COVERED: PERSUASIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE** **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/10**

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Explained the bill’s background and/or effect of bill as you/your interest group sees it

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_Clearly outlined why this bill is necessary/unnecessary & what problem it purports to solve/problems it causes

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Included criticism and attributes of proposal with arguments generated employed insight of the issue

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Cited verifiable facts and included citation of where they came from

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Got material across in a way that was informative and easily understood with Clear arguments and position   
 \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Presentation was dynamic and had interesting elements to draw attention and wasn’t boring, dull, or blah

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Arguments Utilized Logos, Pathos and-if necessary-Anecdotes but AVOIDED *ad hominem* Attacks

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Performed to the best of your abilities

* **RESPONSIBLE DRESS, POISE AND PRESENTATION** **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/05**\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Professional, and Attentively followed proceedings (taking notes if a commissioner)  
  \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Looked and Acted like a Commissioner, Lobbyist, or person testifying in front of the this commission   
  \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Giggling kept to a minimum and did not use inappropriate language  
  \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Was Respectful to Peers  
  \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Dressed up for a business presentation or interview not for a night on the town   
  \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Wore a tie and colored socks if a guy/Dress pants or a business type dress or skirt if female   
  \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Made eye contact

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Loud enough for everyone to hear, even the old lady in the back of the room  
 \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Used inflection of voice during presentation/questioning

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Had pleasant and audible tone of voice and Avoided reading as much as possible

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Used time effectively/**NO** **DEAD TIME**   
 \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Had a positive Attitude during Simulation and Played Well with Others  
 \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Was an attribute, not detriment to this Simulation; People had positive comments about my performance

* **ASKING/ANSWERING QUESTIONS** **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/10**

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Showed ability to think on feet by using questions to your advantage and weaving questions into arguments \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Cited history, discussed facts or data, and used that knowledge to your advantage

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Had clear main arguments that showed a strong grasp of principles involved

***OR***

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Questions demonstrated a strong grasp of the issue/policy, its history and its significance

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Questions concerned the meaning and application of the issue/policy

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Utilized ***clarification*** questions to gain information decide the case and **hypotheticals** for long-term effect of policy

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Was a Frequent Participant and Didn’t simply echo the thoughts of others or make irrelevant comments   
 **TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/50 or \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_%**

* **REFLECTION (1-10):**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/10

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Provided Honest and Helpful Feedback to peers both in this and other simulation  
\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Read and followed direction: Placed the appropriate mark next to EACH category

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Did not just give yourself 100% in **each** section; used ½ points

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Answered each question with deep thought and in as much detail as possible

\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Reflected thoroughly and deeply, provided rich detail, specific examples  
\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_Answered reflection questions with MINIMALLY three sentences for each question

**TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/60**

**REFLECTION QUESTIONS:** Learning involves some permanency. The discussion needs legs. After the simulation and completing your self-evaluation, re-cap the conversation with your parent(s), guardian(s), adult(s) in your life about what you heard and reflect deeply on what was discussed. **Answer each question on the back of this sheet and return with your rubric.**   
**QUESTION #1.** What were the best arguments made on both sides. Who made these arguments? Why did you find those arguments persuasive?

QUESTION #2. What were your (and, if time, your loved one’s) initial thoughts on the subject and question? How has that opinion evolved and/or become more nuanced?

**QUESTION #3.** List and describe the most meaningful ideas, concepts, and/or principles learned through this project.

QUESTION #4. Explain what you did well on the project. Explain what could you could have done differently and would change if you were to complete this project again?   
  
QUESTION #5. **OVERALL PERFORMANCE:** How would you rate your project (1-10) based upon your preparation, knowledge and understanding of the issue, and performance in regards to your prior projects and your peers? Justify the ranking. Did the rubric give you the correct grade? Explain. If the overall score determined through the rubric is different from the grade you believe you deserve explain why and the grade you believe is warranted.