*Overview*

Texas v. JohnsonApplied to Taking a Knee at a High School Football Game

This activity is based on the landmark Supreme Court case *Texas v. Johnson*, 491 U.S. 397 (1989), which deals with First Amendment protection of flag burning as symbolic speech.

**How to Use These Resources**

1. **Start Here**. The Activity Download is the place to find the web resources formatted as courtroom- and classroom-ready handouts.
2. **Read**. Have students read the facts and case summary and the fictional scenario about the kicker on a high school football team who risks her future to exercise her First Amendment rights.
3. **Analyze**. Assign student attorneys to the two sides of the case and the issues listed in the talking points.
4. **Deliberate**. All other students are jurors who deliberate in a courtroom fishbowl activity. The judge, volunteer attorneys, and student attorneys observe as the jurors deliberate in a large group or smaller groups. Due to time constraints, the verdict doesn’t have to be unanimous.
5. **Reflect**. Students can respond to the discussion questions verbally or in writing.

**What Happened After Texas v. Johnson**

United States v. Eichman, 496 U.S. 310 (1990) The Johnson decision only affected a Texas state law. In the wake of the decision, the federal government enacted a law that also prohibited flag burning. In order to try to get around constitutional challenges, the law prohibited all types of flag desecration, with the exception of burning and burying a worn-out flag, regardless of whether the action upset others. The Supreme Court held that this did not cure the constitutional defect and the same 5-4 majority from Johnson held that the law still impermissibly discriminated upon viewpoint and struck it down.

*Agenda*

Texas v. Johnson  
Applied to Taking a Knee: Is Protest Worth the Price?

**Courtroom Roles**

1. The facilitator manages the program and facilitates jury deliberations.
2. The judge presides over the hearing and asks questions of the student attorneys after each presents arguments.
3. Eight student attorneys – four on each side – argue before the judge and student jury.
4. Two attorney coaches prepare the student attorneys in two nearby rooms using the Opening Protocol and Talking Points handouts.
5. Two attorney volunteers/law clerks help the student jurors prepare for the jury deliberations in the courtroom, using the Arguments Worksheet/Answer Key.
6. All participants, except student attorneys, are jurors seated in the gallery.

**Introductions*****(10 minutes)***

* Facilitator welcomes the group and explains program
* Attorney coaches/law clerks introduce themselves: *Why I Chose the Law*

**Presentations *(10 minutes)***

Two Attorney Volunteers or Law Clerks Set the Stage

1. One presents the facts and case summary of *Texas v. Johnson*
2. One presents the fictional teen scenario.

**Preparation** ***(30 minutes)***

Attorney Coaches Prepare Student Attorneys  
Four students are attorneys – two on each sideare selected by the teacher(s) at the event (not in advance). Ask the teachers to keep in mind gender and racial balance when choosing participants. Once selected, the student attorneys work with their respective attorney coaches in two nearby roomsgoing over the Opening Protocol and Talking Points.

**Attorney Volunteers Prepare Student Jurors**All other participants are jurors. They stay in the courtroom and work with the volunteer attorney(s). Small Group Work. If there are more than 20 jurors, they organize into two groups – one attorney for each group – jurors discuss and fill out the Arguments Worksheet. The attorneys guide them through a discussion of the arguments, helping them identify the issues, using the Worksheet Answer Key. If there is time, jurors fill out the Juror Questionnaire.  
  
**Oral Arguments to the Judge and Jury** *(60 minutes)*

Judge Takes the Bench, Opens the Hearing

Opening Protocol Script: The Judge and student attorneys follow the Opening Script.

* + Talking Points: The student attorneys argue the case using the Talking Points and their own arguments. After each attorney presents, the judge asks spontaneous questions of that attorney.
  + Optional: To keep the students in the gallery involved, the judge also may ask them a question after each student attorney speaks.

**Active Jury Deliberations/Voting with Your Feet** *(30 minutes)*  
The facilitator asks the student jurors to form two groups and sit in the gallery behind the party they initially favor – the Government or Tiana Johnson. Guided by the facilitator, student jurors make their arguments, directing their comments only to the jurors on the other side of the issues, seated on the other side of the gallery.

As their opinions change, student jurors move to the side of the gallery behind the party they support. The facilitator proactively invites them to move several times during the deliberations. Due to time constraints, there is no need for a unanimous verdict. When the deliberations wind down, the facilitator returns the program to the judge.

**Jury Verdict**  
The judge asks the jury for a show-of-hands vote to determine the verdict. The judge may ask several participants to explain their decision.

**Q&A with the Judge** *(20 minutes)*  
The judge opens the floor to questions from participants. At this time, the students also fill out the feedback forms. (The forms are their ticket out of the courtroom and must be collected from each student.)

* Q&A is followed by photos taken with the judge.
* Students have the opportunity to talk informally with the judge, law clerks, and attorney coaches.

**Adjournment**

*Facts and Case Summary*

Texas v. Johnson  
491 U.S. 397 (1989)

**FACTS**

Gregory Lee Johnson burned an American flag outside of the convention center where the 1984 Republican National Convention was being held in Dallas, Texas. Johnson burned the flag to protest the policies of President Ronald Reagan. He was arrested and charged with violating a Texas statute that prevented the desecration of a venerated object, including the American flag, if such action were likely to incite anger in others. A Texas court tried and convicted Johnson. He appealed, arguing that his actions were "symbolic speech" protected by the First Amendment. The Supreme Court agreed to hear his case.

**ISSUE BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**Whether flag burning constitutes "symbolic speech" protected by the First Amendment.

**RULING**Yes.

**REASONING (5-4)**The majority of the Court, according to Justice William Brennan, agreed with Johnson and held that flag burning constitutes a form of "symbolic speech" that is protected by the First Amendment. The majority noted that freedom of speech protects actions that society may find very offensive, but society's outrage alone is not justification for suppressing free speech.

In particular, the majority noted that the Texas law discriminated upon viewpoint, i.e., although the law punished actions, such as flag burning, that might arouse anger in others, it specifically exempted from prosecution actions that were respectful of venerated objects, e.g., burning and burying a worn-out flag. The majority said that the government could not discriminate in this manner based solely upon viewpoint.

**DISSENT**Justice Stevens

Writing for the dissent, Justice Stevens argued that the flag's unique status as a symbol of national unity outweighed "symbolic speech" concerns, and thus, the government could lawfully prohibit flag burning.

*Fictional Scenario*
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Tiana Johnson is an 18-year-old high school student at Oakwood Public High School in Dayton, Ohio. As a junior, she is the starting kicker on the varsity football team, with hopes of entering the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, MD on a full-ride athletic and academic scholarship.

She has the grades and an impressive record of extracurricular leadership in ROTC that make her a strong candidate for a scholarship. As the editor of the student section of the school’s website, Tiana writes a blog on a variety of topics. Her recent piece on race and police-involved shootings got some media attention in Dayton.

Like many student athletes, Tiana is frustrated that the media attention given to this issue has been waning since former NFL quarterback Colin Kaepernick’s career faltered. She says he wasn’t hired because of his take-a-knee protest at games during the national anthem. Tiana wants to keep attention on the police issue. To do that, she wears Kaepernick’s number taped on her jersey and takes a knee at the first football game of her junior season.

While most of the students at Oakwood don’t care, or they respond positively, those from military families are offended by her action. They write an open letter to the football team that they want posted on the school’s website. As editor of the student section, Tiana invites interested students to an editorial meeting about the letter, which they, ultimately, decide to post. When Tiana is asked why she insults the military, she says she is in ROTC, and wants to go to the Naval Academy.

In the meantime, the Ohio Legislature passes House Bill 999, which makes it unlawful for an adult to take a knee, be disruptive, or distract or detract from the national anthem in a way that could be interpreted as disrespecting the American flag. The penalty for violating the law is a $5,000 fine for every incident. Tiana knows that a misdemeanor conviction will stay on her record and will have an impact on college admissions and future job prospects.

Nevertheless, the issue is so important to Tiana that she takes a knee, again, after the Governor signs the bill into law. Tiana thinks the U.S. Senator, who is nominating her for Annapolis, will be impressed by her courage and the Academy will reward her leadership – even if she is convicted. Tiana thinks her ROTC and academic records are strong enough to protect her scholarship prospects.

At the game, Tiana is caught on video by a military mom using her cell phone to document the protest. She turns her phone over to the local police at halftime. After reviewing the video, the State of Ohio charges Tiana with a misdemeanor that could cost her not only the financial penalty, but admission and scholarships to any college. While her conduct falls within the scope of House Bill 999, her public defender argues that the Ohio law is unconstitutional, because it violates the First Amendment’s guarantee of free speech. The defender cites the precedent set by the Supreme Court in *Texas v. Johnson.*

*Worksheet to Be Filled Out Individually*

United States District Court

Juror Qualification Questionnaire

Dear Prospective Juror:

Your name has been drawn by random selection, and you are being considered for jury service in the United States District Court. Jury service is a privilege and it is a legal obligation of every American. In order for us to obtain some information about you from which we can objectively determine whether you are qualified to serve pursuant to federal law, please complete this questionnaire. You must answer every question, sign, date, and return the form in the enclosed envelope within ten days.

1. Are you a citizen of the United States?

2. Are you 18 years of age or older?

Date of Birth: Month \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Day \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Give your age \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3. Have you lived in Maryland or D.C. for the past year?

4. Do you speak the English language?

Do you read, write, and understand English well enough to answer the rest of the questions?

5. Are you currently charged with a crime?

6. Have you ever been convicted of a crime that had a penalty of one year or more in prison?

1. Do you have any physical or mental disability that would interfere or prevent you from serving as a juror?

8. Are you a full-time paid employee as a: Government official? Police or Fire? Military?

9. Are you Hispanic or Latino?

10. Federal law requires you to indicate your race to avoid discrimination in jury selection.

Black/African American \_\_\_ Asian \_\_\_ American Indian/Alaska Native \_\_\_

White \_\_\_ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander \_\_\_Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

11. Male \_\_\_ Female \_\_\_

12. Are you now employed?

13. Are you an employee of the U.S. government?

14. What is your usual occupation, trade, or business? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Print Your Name\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*Jury Preparation Exercise – Arguments Worksheet*
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**Directions:** Put TJ next to arguments for Student Tiana Johnson and SO for arguments for the State of Ohio.

1. Political symbols and statements are protected under the First Amendment. Taking a knee is a political statement and is protected under the First Amendment.
2. The First Amendment gives a higher level of protection to speech than it grants to conduct. Not all conduct is considered a form of speech. Kneeling is an action and, therefore, is not protected.
3. The American flag is a symbol of national unity and the American way of life. Taking a knee is an attack on American values and the military fighting to protect them.
4. Taking a knee during the national anthem is symbolic speech. It is a peaceful form of symbolic speech that does not threaten the safety or property of others.
5. Conduct that involves, or is directed toward, the American flag is often expressive, but that doesn’t automatically make it political speech.
6. The context of the conduct must be considered. Kneeling during the national anthem might be a tool of commercial interests, like selling a certain brand of shoes worn by the protesters. For example, Colin Kaepernick is a spokesperson for Nike.
7. If taking a knee during the national anthem is prohibited, other forms of political expression are put at risk.
8. Saying that the political protest of taking a knee undermines the values of the flag is a not logical. Such a statement undermines the very values the flag represents.
9. The protection of the flag and what it stands for is a compelling governmental interest that justifies legal consequences for disrespecting the flag by taking a knee during the anthem.
10. The American flag is a political symbol. Kneeling during the national anthem is political symbolism that is protected under the First Amendment.

*Jury Preparation Exercise: Arguments Worksheet – Answer Key*

Texas v. Johnson

Applied to Taking a Knee: Is Protest Worth the Price?

**Directions:** Put TJ next to arguments for Student Tiana Johnson and SO for arguments for the State of Ohio.

1. Political symbols and statements are protected under the First Amendment. Taking a knee is a political statement and is protected under the First Amendment. **TJ**
2. The First Amendment gives a higher level of protection to speech than it grants to conduct. Not all conduct is considered a form of speech. Kneeling is an action and, therefore, is not protected. **SO**
3. The American flag is a symbol of national unity and the American way of life. Taking a knee is an attack on American values and the military fighting to protect them. **SO**
4. Taking a knee during the national anthem is symbolic speech. It is a peaceful form of symbolic speech that does not threaten the safety or property of others. **TJ**
5. Conduct that involves, or is directed toward, the American flag is often expressive, but that doesn’t automatically make it political speech. **SO**
6. The context of the conduct must be considered. Kneeling during the national anthem might be a tool of commercial interests, like selling a certain brand of shoes worn by the protesters. For example, Colin Kaepernick is a spokesperson for Nike. **SO**
7. If taking a knee during the national anthem is prohibited, other forms of political expression are put at risk. **TJ**
8. Saying that the political protest of taking a knee undermines the values of the flag is a not logical. Such a statement undermines the very values the flag represents. **TJ**
9. The protection of the flag and what it stands for is a compelling governmental interest that justifies legal consequences for disrespecting the flag by taking a knee during the anthem. **SO**
10. The American flag is a political symbol. Kneeling during the national anthem is political symbolism that is protected under the First Amendment. **TJ**

*Scripted Opening Protocol for the Presiding Judge and Student Attorneys*
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**Note to Student Attorneys:**

* When talking to the Judge always stand. Address the Judge as “Your Honor.”
* The first time each attorney addresses the Judge, say: *“May it please the court.”*

**The Judge is announced, takes the bench, and welcomes the group.**

**Judge:** Are Counsel for the students ready?

**Counsel for the Students**

(Attorney #1 stands at counsel table) Yes, Your Honor.

**Judge:**  Are Counsel for the State ready?

**Counsel for the State of Ohio**

(Attorney #1 stands at podium) Yes, Your Honor.

**Judge:**  Please go ahead and introduce yourselves. We’ll start with the attorneys for the students.

**Attorneys for the Student**

Student Attorney #1 for Ms. Johnson *(Stands at the podium)*

Good afternoon and may it please the Court. My name is \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ *(first and last names).* I am from \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ *(your city and state).* My colleagues and I are counsel for student athlete Tiana Johnson.

I will be handling Issue #1, asking if taking a knee during the national anthem is a violation of the First Amendment. My colleagues will be handling Issues #2 and #3. They will come to the podium and introduce themselves, then our Attorney Coach will introduce himself/herself. *(Sits down)*

**Student Attorney #2 for Ms. Johnson** *(Stands at the podium)*

I am \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (*first and last names)* from\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ *(your city and state.* I will be handling Issue #2, asking if any action taken in response the American flag is worthy of protection under the First Amendment.

**Student Attorney #3 for Ms. Johnson** *(Stands at the podium)*

I am \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (*first and last names)* from\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ *(your city and state).* I will be handling Issue #3, asking if taking a knee during the national anthem should be protected as symbolic speech under the First Amendment.

**Attorney Coach introduces himself/herself.** *(Stands at the counsel table)*

*More Scripted Opening Protocol for the Presiding Judge and Student Attorneys*
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**Note to Student Attorneys:**

* When talking to the Judge always stand. Address the Judge as “Your Honor.”
* The first time each attorney addresses the Judge, say: *“May it please the court.”*

**Counsel for the State**

Student Attorney #1 for the State *(Stands at the podium)*

May it please the Court.

My name is \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ *(first and last names).*

I am from *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (your city and state).* My colleagues and I represent the State of Ohio.

I will be handling Issue #1, asking if taking a knee during the national anthem is a violation of the First Amendment. My colleagues will be handling issues #2 and #3. At this time, my colleagues will come to the podium and introduce themselves. Our Attorney Coach also will introduce himself/herself.

**Student Attorney #2 for the State** (Stands at the podium)

I am \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ *(first and last names).*  I am from \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ *(your city and state).*

I will be arguing Issue #2, asking if any action taken in response to the American flag is worthy of protection under the First Amendment. *(Sits down)*

**Student Attorney #3 for the State** (Stands at the podium)

I am \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ *(first and last names).*

I am from \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ *(your city and state).* I will be handling Issue #3, asking if taking a knee during the national anthem should be protected as symbolic speech under the First Amendment.

**A****ttorney Coach introduces himself/herself**. *(Stands at the counsel table)*

*Talking Points*

Texas v. JohnsonApplied to Taking a Knee: Is Protest Worth the Price?

Suggested points that the student attorneys can use and/or modify for their oral arguments.

**Judge:** Here is the issue before us today. Is a state law that prohibits taking a knee or otherwise protesting during the national anthem a violation of the First Amendment?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Judge:** We will start with Issue #1. Because the students are bringing this appeal, their attorney will go first.  Is a state law that prohibits taking a knee or otherwise protesting during the national anthem a violation of the First Amendment?  Counsel for the students, please proceed. | **Judge:** Now we will hear from the counsel for the State of Ohio on Issue #1.  Is a state law that prohibits taking a knee or otherwise protesting during the national anthem a violation of the First Amendment?  Counsel for the State of Ohio may proceed. |
| **Student’s Attorney #1** | **State of Ohio’s Attorney #1** |
| YES   * The Supreme Court has recognized that the First Amendment protects certain forms of symbolic speech. * Taking a knee during the national anthem is symbolic speech. It is a peaceful form of symbolic speech that does not threaten the safety or property of others. * The government cannot prohibit this action without infringing upon free speech rights.   **The Judge has the option of asking questions before moving on.** | NO   * The Supreme Court has interpreted the First Amendment to grant a higher level of protection to speech than it grants to conduct. Not all conduct is considered a form of speech. Kneeling is an action. It is conduct. * The First Amendment does protect symbolic speech, but some actions do not always rise to the level of symbolic speech that warrants First Amendment protection. Kneeling during the national anthem is not symbolic speech protected by the Constitution. * The American flag is a symbol of national unity and the American way of life. Taking a knee can be considered an attack on American values and the military fighting to protect them. * The government has a legitimate interest in regulating the protection of the flag because the flag is an embodiment of the nation.   **The Judge has the option of asking a question before moving on.** |
| **Judge:** We turn our attention now to  Issue #2  Is any action taken in response to the American flag considered expression worthy of protection under the First Amendment?  Counsel for the students, please proceed. | **Judge:** Issue #2 for the State of Ohio is the same:  Is any action taken in response to the American flag considered expression worthy of protection under the First Amendment?  Counsel for the State of Ohio, please go ahead. |
| **Student’s Attorney #2** | **State of Ohio’s Attorney #2** |
| YES   * Political symbols and statements are protected under the First Amendment. It follows that actions taken to comment on the political symbol of the American flag, such as kneeling during the national anthem, should be considered freedom of expression protected under the First Amendment. * The American flag is a political symbol. Kneeling during the national anthem is political symbolism that is protected under the First Amendment. * Because the flag represents political ideas and ideals, conduct that is a commentary on those political ideals – and how the nation is living them out – is nothing more than a political viewpoint, protected under the First Amendment.   **The Judge has the option of asking questions before moving on.** | NO   * Conduct that involves, or is directed toward, the American flag is often expressive, but that doesn’t automatically make it political speech. * The context of the conduct must be considered. Kneeling during the national anthem might be a political statement, but it might not be. The statement may be a tool of commercial interests, like selling a certain brand of shoes worn by the protesters. * The broader context of such expression must be considered before declaring that Tiana’s conduct warrants First Amendment protection   **The Judge has the option of asking questions before moving on.** |
| **Judge**: We now will look at Issue #3  Should taking a knee be protected as symbolic speech under the First Amendment?  Counsel for the students may proceed. | **Judge:** Issue #3 for the State of Ohio is the same:  Should taking a knee be protected as symbolic speech under the First Amendment?  Counsel for the State of Ohio may proceed. |
| **Student’s Attorney #3** | **State of Ohio’s Attorney #3** |
| YES   * The First Amendment protects even speech that some find abhorrent. That protection applies to speech even when it is regarded by some as disrespectful to the American flag and what it represents. * When Tiana Johnson took a knee, she was making a political statement about her opposition to racism. She took a knee, which is a respectful posture, to honor the values represented by the flag, including the right to protest and to call attention to America’s problems. * Political speech has always had the highest level of protection. If taking a knee during the national anthem is prohibited, other forms of political expression are put at risk. That would undermine the very values for which the flag is raised.   **The Judge has the option of asking questions before moving on.** | NO   * Even though the First Amendment protects symbolic speech, an exception should be made to prohibit taking a knee during the national anthem. * The flag is a symbol of national unity that represents the ideals for which the United States stands. Taking a knee undermines that unity and dishonors military personnel who fought and died for the flag and what it represents. * Taking a knee is an insult to the troops that threatens morale and unit cohesion in the military. * The protection of the concepts embodied in the flag are a compelling governmental interest that justifies legal consequences for disrespecting the flag by taking a knee during the anthem.   **The Judge has the option of asking questions, then he/she turns the program over to the facilitator to guide the jury deliberations.** |

*Discussion Questions*

Texas v. JohnsonApplied to Taking a Knee: Is Protest Worth the Price?

Use the discussion questions to improve understanding of the case and how it was decided by the Supreme Court.

1. If you were an Associate Justice serving on the Supreme Court, what legal arguments would you take into account in deciding Texas v. Johnson?
2. If you were writing an amicus brief on behalf of the student, what arguments would you make?
3. Can you think of other examples of symbolic political speech that might be offensive to some but that would be protected by the First Amendment?

*Student Feedback*

Texas v. Johnson  
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Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(first) (last)

School \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Year You’ll Graduate \_\_\_\_\_\_

Career Aspirations \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Setting. What was it like having the program in a real courtroom?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

2. Judge. What was it like having a judge preside?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3. Adult Attorneys. What were the differences between the real attorneys and those on TV?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

4. Jury Deliberations: What were the deliberations like for you? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

5. Future Jury Service: How do you feel about serving on a real jury after this event?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

6. What did you learn today that you can apply in your life?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

7. How would you rate your civil discourse skills during the program?

Poor Good Very Good Excellent

8. What civility skill will you practice after today’s experience?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

9. What did you learn from the host judge during the Q/A session?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

10. What will you tell your friends about this experience? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_