

old
new

Urban Concerns Workshops Inc.

Project 120

January 24, 1977 - March 18, 1977

Dave O'Connell - Executive Director, Urban Concerns Workshops Inc.
Bruce King - Project Director, Program Associate, Urban Concerns Workshops Inc.
Kate Hanlon - Secretary
Kaylee N. Davis - Scheduler
Paul Moe - Group Leader from the Government Learning Center

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE 1977 PROGRAM.	1
PROJECT 120 DAILY SCHEDULES	11
SPEAKERS.	19
INDIVIDUAL APPOINTMENTS WITH LEGISLATORS.	21
BUDGET.	23
POLITICAL ATTITUDE SURVEY OF PARTICIPANTS	24
PROGRAM EVALUATION BY THE PARTICIPANTS.	29

REPORT ON THE 1977 PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION:

Included in this report will be a description of what actually took place during PROJECT 120: promotion of the program, selection of the participants, physical arrangements, scheduling, activities, and the general attitude and response of the students. Some observations will be made on each of these aspects, with some suggestions as to what we can do differently next year. An evaluation of the project will conclude the report.

PROMOTION:

In mid-September, materials were sent out to all high school principals in the state of both public and private schools that had an enrollment over 25 students. The materials included letters to the high school principals and to Government/Political Science teachers along with PROJECT 120 application forms which described the program. The original deadline for the applications was November 15, 1976. Press releases, describing the project, were also sent out to many local papers.

By mid-October, there were very few applications sent in. It was decided to send out letters to the Chairman of the Social Studies Departments to urge them to promote the project.

Applications continued to come in very slowly. At the end of October, certain schools were targeted and called. This seemed to help some since applications came in at a quicker rate after these calls. The deadline was extended to accommodate late applications.

The majority of applications were in by mid-December. We accepted a few more into January. Most of these were special requests from legislators who had heard about the project and wanted some of their constituents to participate.

The reason we accepted the late applications was due to the fact that we did not receive the large number of them that we had originally expected. The total number of applications was 178.

Comments: It is obvious from the low number of applications that PROJECT 120 was not promoted very well in the high schools. Talking with the students when they arrived bore this out. Many students felt that their principals and social studies teachers just left the materials on their desks or mentioned it once and then forgot about it.

To improve this situation for next year, we might go directly to the students through the student government in the schools, while still sending the materials to social studies teachers. When the students find out about it from their student government, hopefully they will press their teachers to inform them better. We might also ask the Social Studies Consultant to push the program in high schools. More publicity through the Minnesota Education Association and the Minnesota Federation of Teachers might also be helpful.

SELECTION:

Because we had such a small number of applications, our selection process was made very easy. In fact, we were going to accept all the students who applied. One school, however, who sent us 20 applicants would only allow three of these to participate. Juniors were ruled out immediately since they could apply again next year. We also ruled out those who had participated in other government-learning programs and those who asked to be excused for part of the project due to extra-curricular activities. Of the few remaining, we chose the three on the basis of their essays included in the applications.

We accepted a total of 161 students. Six students dropped out prior to the start of the programs due to other activities. Two students from the fourth

congressional district came only one day to the project. One dropped out because, as she said, the program was not as she expected. One other student was asked to leave the program because he was obviously using it to get out of school.

So, a total of 153 students participated in the project. The breakdown by congressional district is as follows:

First Congressional District:	13 students
Second Congressional District:	15 students
Third Congressional District:	18 students
Fourth Congressional District:	26 students
Fifth Congressional District:	18 students
Sixth Congressional District:	23 students
Seventh Congressional District:	23 students
Eighth Congressional District:	17 students

Comments: Hopefully we will receive more applications next year and can choose exactly 20 students from each congressional district and choose only one student from a school. We should continue to have the students include essays with their applications, and also urge the teachers to include some comments about the students when they send in the applications. Not many teachers did this for this year, but it would certainly help us in selecting the participants.

We should also make it clear in the materials we send out that we expect certain things from the students who participate. In particular, it should be mentioned that the students will be together as a group for the whole week and no one will be excused to participate in school activities or attend a state basketball tournament, or go shopping. We might also include a sample schedule of activities to give the students a better idea of what they will be doing. These things should help weed out any students who did not intend to take the project seriously.

PHYSICAL ARRANGEMENTS:

Transportation to St. Paul to participate in the program was the students' responsibility. This worked out well with only a few exceptions: such as late arrivals. Most students were brought in by their parents and picking up those students who came by bus was no problem. We must make it clear, however, that the project starts at a specific time and if a student is not willing to come by then, he or she should stay home. Last minute problems may come up for a few students, and I think we can be flexible enough to deal with them.

The first and second districts stayed at the St. Paul Travelodge, two blocks from the Capitol. Although the location was very convenient, this motel had no place for the students to relax or get some exercise. Because of this, we decided to move to the Midway Motor Inn for the sixth, seventh, and eighth districts. This motel had a swimming pool, sauna, and game room. It was about two miles from the Capitol and we took the bus back and forth each day. This worked out very well. The only problem at this motel was the students who were there for the state tournaments, which were going on all three weeks. This probably would have been a problem at any motel in St. Paul.

The majority of the students behaved very well while at the motel. There was a curfew imposed on only one group, the seventh, who got a bit rowdy late one night. There was no further trouble. The other groups were generally conscientious about keeping quiet and going to bed each night.

If it is feasible, I think we should have two staff members staying with the students at the motel: one of them being exclusively responsible for supervision of the students while at the motel. It is difficult for one person to be both instructor and baby-sitter.

The third, fourth, and fifth districts commuted to and from the Capitol each day. This worked out alright, but I think it detracted some from the program. Being part of the program for the entire time they were there,

helped the first, second, sixth, seventh, and eighth district students concentrate more on what they were doing. Some of the city students, however, were more concerned about what they were going to do when they got home than the project.

We can solve this problem by mixing up the groups and housing all eight in a motel. The only advantage we had in going by congressional district was for them to meet with their Congressmen. But I don't think too many students would mind meeting any Congressman that is willing to come. The advantages of mixing the groups are: all students would be part of the program for the entire week, we would have groups made up of both inner-city, suburbs, and out-state students, and, also, this would give us a bit more flexibility assigning students to a particular group — keeping close to an even number in each group. The students should have the opportunity to state their preference of weeks in which they would like to come.

As to meals, breakfasts and lunches were taken at the Centennial Building Cafeteria and dinners at the Grammophone Restaurant about three blocks from the Capitol. These arrangements worked out very well and the majority of the students enjoyed the food at these places.

For the out-state groups, Wednesday nights were set aside for attending a play. Four groups went to Dudley Rigg's Brave New Workshop and one to the Guthrie. This night out each week served as a good break for the students and should be continued next year for all the groups. (There were no evening sessions for the city groups.)

PROJECT 120 was fortunate to be given an office in the Capitol by the Speaker of the House, Martin Sabo. This served as our meeting room for some speakers and a rallying place for the students each day. We very definitely need space at the Capitol and appreciated the thoughtfulness of the Speaker and his staff.

SCHEDULING:

The schedules were drawn up one week prior to the arrival of each group. We had great success in getting speakers and in setting up appointments for the students to meet with their legislators. Speakers included many Representatives and Senators, Constitutional Officers, Supreme Court Justices, legislative staff persons, members of the press, U.S. Congressmen, representatives from the DFL and IR, and lobbyists. After the first few weeks, certain speakers knew we would be calling them and began to set aside time for us each week. This was extremely helpful and made the scheduling much easier towards the end of the program. We are deeply indebted to all those speakers who gave so willfully of their time and talents.

The students were busy from 9 a.m. to about 4:30 each afternoon. The out-state groups also had an hour and a half session in the evenings. The pace was very quick which helped to keep up the students' interest. There was, however, very little time for the students to discuss what they had just been exposed to. Next year, we should probably provide one or two breaks during each day's activities so they can do this.

A few conflicts came up each week which resulted in changing the original schedule. We were flexible enough to accommodate most of these and rescheduled them for another time.

A few participants each week had people they wished to see or something they wanted to do at the Capitol that the group as a whole did not. The staff urged the students to make any of these requests known to them, and we were very successful in setting up appointments or giving them the opportunity to do these things.

Everyone, of course, wants to see the Governor and we were only able to arrange for the Second District to see him. Perhaps in the future, we can put more emphasis on arranging a time when he will be available.

It is obvious from the schedules that there was very little free time for the students and many of them suggested that there be more. I do feel, however, that the participants get more out of the program with a more structured schedule. The three or four hours of free time that the students had each week is really enough.

ACTIVITIES:

The following is a list of the activities in which the students participated during the program and some comments about each activity.

1. Speakers: The students certainly got a good understanding of each individual speaker's involvement in state government by meeting with them. They also got a great deal of information regarding many aspects of government and politics.

For next year, we might change the format for some of the speakers: e.g. have a few panel discussions on important issues facing the legislature with two or three representatives and senators. We might also add to the types of speakers we have by inviting a department head each week.

2. Appointments with legislators: This was probably the most valuable part of each week. The students had the opportunity to meet and talk with their legislators. They all got a good idea on how they were being represented in the state government. So many of the students said that this was the best part of the week, and for next year, we should increase the amount of time the students could spend with their Senator or Representative: perhaps a half-day to be with them to learn in more detail what their legislators are like and what their primary concerns are.
3. Attending House and Senate Sessions, Supreme Court Sessions, and Committee Meetings: This gave the students a good feel for how the legislative process works and what goes on in the Supreme Court. It was interesting to watch how the students followed all week a particular issue that they were exposed to in a committee meeting on Monday.
4. Issues Discussions: We focused on a few issues to be covered during the program: Capital Punishment, Criminal Justice, and the Environment. Some of these were discussed each week. We did not hope to reach any great conclusions on these issues, but wanted to help the students get a better understanding of them in order that they could draw their own conclusions. I think we did accomplish this to a good extent.

5. Mock Precinct Caucus: This was held each week. In it, all the students could actively participate. It was valuable in that the students now have a good understanding of the first step in the political process. It was also a good activity because the students were not passive learners but were actively involved. If time allows next year, we should have more sessions like this.
6. Session on Youth Involvement: This involved a discussion of a hand-out we prepared which gave the students some ideas on how and where they could get involved in the political process in Minnesota. This helped many of them a great deal.

Through all these activities, we were able to accomplish very much. The students definitely got a good understanding of the many aspects of state government and politics. We had a good variety of activities which kept the students' interest up.

ATTITUDE OF THE STUDENTS:

The general attitude of the students who participated in PROJECT 120 was very positive. How much the students got out of the program was very definitely dependent on how much they put into it, and the vast majority of the students did put a lot of effort into it. They were attentive, enthusiastic, asked good questions of speakers, and followed up on things which they did not fully understand. There were also a few students each week that put an extraordinary amount of effort into the program. This was reflected when they sought out more detailed information than provided by the group's activities. For example, many students got copies of bills, others received information from different departments and agencies, and some students met with female legislators to learn more about women in politics.

On the other hand, there were some students who did not take the program seriously. They put a minimal amount of effort into it, and as a result, got less out of it. Fortunately, there was not a large number of these, and their effect on the program was very slight.

It was really very interesting to see how much each group as a whole put into the program. The Second District, Fifth District, and Eighth District students were the most serious about the program and tried to get all that they could out of it. The Third, Sixth, and Seventh District participants also put a lot of effort into the program, but not quite as much as the former three. The First and Fourth District groups did what the program expected of them and not much more. In these groups were those students who did not take the program seriously. We were also able to accomplish more with the out-state students who were here for the entire time. The city students, from the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Districts, were often thinking about and discussing what they were going to do when they got home that evening. It was very apparent that the out-state groups could concentrate more on what they were doing since they were part of the program for the entire time.

Overall, the 1977 PROJECT 120 was a success. We had hoped to accomplish two things: to give the participating students a better understanding of Minnesota state government and politics, and to get them interested enough to become actively involved in the political process. The students certainly learned a great deal during their week at the Capitol and almost all of them commented on the evaluation form that they did plan to get actively involved in the political process in some way or another. We will be sending out questionnaires to the participants some time in the future to find out if they actually did get involved. We already know of a few cases where the students did actually become involved on a volunteer level for political parties.

Looking back on each week, we did accomplish more in some weeks than in others. The first and second week of the program did not come off as well as we had wanted. This is probably due to the fact that it was the beginning of the program and we were all new at the program. Even though this is the second

year of the program, not one of the current staff was around a year ago. So, we were actually starting from scratch in many cases. This will not be the case in 1978. By the end we had improved this situation and the last three weeks went really very well.

We had also hoped that the students who participated in PROJECT 120 would be used by their social studies teachers as a resource for their lessons on government. We will try to find out whether they did or not through a questionnaire that will be going out in late April or May. Perhaps next year we could invite the teachers to St. Paul to spend a day with their students. This would give them a better understanding of what the program entails and might encourage them to spend more time on state government and politics in their classes. In this way, we would be reaching more than the 160 students who actually participated in the program.

In conclusion: it was a good year for PROJECT 120. We were able to accomplish a great deal and the reaction of the participants was positive. There were mistakes and oversights, however, but if we keep these in mind, we can make PROJECT 120 even better in 1978.

Bruce King
Project Director

PROJECT 120 DAILY SCHEDULES

Session One - January 23 through January 28

Sunday, January 23rd

7:00 - Evening Orientation

Monday, January 24th

9:00 - Capitol Tour
10:00 - House Committee Meeting on Criminal Justice
11:00 - House Sergeant at Arms Larry Bothwell
12:00 - Harlan Christianson, Educational Services
2:00 - Film: There Oughta Be A Law
3:00 - House Session
3:45 - Speaker of the House Martin O. Sabo
4:30 - Representative Richard Lemke
6:00 - Gene Mammenga, Lobbyist for Minnesota Education Assn.
7:00 - Issues Discussion

Tuesday, January 25th

9:00 - Secretary of the Senate, Pat Flahaven
10:00 - Senate Committee Meeting on Energy and Housing
12:00 - Televised Governor's Budget Address
2:00 - Individual Appointments with Senators and Representatives
6:00 - Political Parties with Chuck Slocum (IR) and Rick Scott (DFL)
9:00 - Third Parties, Dave Cummings

Wednesday, January 26th

9:15 - Supreme Court Session and Briefing on Protocol
10:30 - Attorney General Warren Spannaus
1:00 - State Treasurer Jim Lord
2:00 - Secretary of State Joan A. Grove
3:00 - Supreme Court Justice Todd
4:00 - Issues Discussion
8:00 - Play: Games People Cheat At, Dudley Riggs Brave New Workshop

Thursday, January 27th

9:00 - Capitol Press Corps, Bruce Nelson of St. Paul Dispatch and Pioneer Press
10:00 - Issues Discussion
11:00 - Senate Session
12:00 - Senator Nancy Brataas
1:00 - Lt. Governor Alec Olson
2:00 - Larry Harris, Lobbyist from Minneapolis Public Schools
Bob Plaster, Lobbyist from MPIRG
5:00 - Youth Involvement in Politics, Randy Zats
7:00 - Mock Caucus with Judy Silverman

Friday, January 28th

9:00 - Representative Don Friedrich, City/County Government
12:00 - Program Evaluation

PROJECT 120 DAILY SCHEDULES

Session Two - January 30 through February 4

Sunday, January 30th

7:00 - Evening Orientation

Monday, January 31st

10:00 - Hennepin County Senators and Hennepin County Board
11:30 - Hennepin County Commissioner John Derus
1:30 - Hennepin County Government Center Tour
3:30 - Harlan Christianson, Educational Services
5:30 - Gene Mammenga, Lobbyist from the Minnesota Education Assn.
7:00 - Issues Discussion

Tuesday, February 1st

9:00 - Capitol Tour
10:00 - Senate Committee Meeting on Energy and Housing
12:00 - Senator Tim Penny
1:00 - Speaker of the House Martin O. Sabo
2:00 - House Session
3:30 - Representative Don Moe
6:00 - Political Parties with Chuck Slocum (IR) and Rick Scott (DFL)
8:00 - Third Parties with Dave Cummings

Wednesday, February 2nd

9:15 - Supreme Court Session
10:00 - Issues Discussion
11:00 - Attorney General Warren Spannaus
1:00 - State Treasurer Jim Lord
2:00 - Individual Appointments with Legislators
3:00 - Secretary of State Joan Growe
4:00 - Issues Discussion
8:00 - The National Health at the Guthrie Theater

Thursday, February 3rd

9:00 - Capitol Press Corps, Blair Charnley, Minneapolis Star
10:00 - Senate Session
11:00 - Individual Appointments with Legislators
1:00 - Individual Appointments with Legislators
2:00 - Lobbyists: Don Waage, Northwest Bancorporation & Mike Flanagan, Minnesota Bar Association
4:30 - Governor Perpich
5:00 - Youth Involvement
7:00 - Judy Silverman & Cindy Anker, Mock Precinct Caucus

Friday, February 4th

9:00 - Representative Orville Birnstihl
12:00 - Program Evaluation

PROJECT 120 DAILY SCHEDULES

Session Three - February 7 through 11

Monday, February 7th

8:30 - Orientation
9:00 - Capitol Tour
10:00 - House Committee Meeting on Criminal Justice
11:00 - House Sergeant at Arms Larry Bothwell
12:30 - Speaker of the House Martin O. Sabo
1:00 - Harlan Christianson, Educational Services
2:00 - House Session
3:00 - Film: There Oughta Be A Law
4:00 - Representative Mary Forsythe

Tuesday, February 8th

9:00 - Third Parties with Dave Cummings
10:00 - Senate Committee Meeting on Energy and Housing
11:00 - Political Parties with Chuck Slocum (IR) and Ruth Cain (DFL)
1:00 - Secretary of the Senate, Pat Flahaven
2:00 - Individual Appointments with Representatives and Senators

Wednesday, February 9th

9:15 - Supreme Court Session and Briefing on Protocol
10:00 - Issues Discussion
10:30 - Attorney General Warren Spannaus
11:30 - State Treasurer Jim Lord
2:00 - Supreme Court Justice George M. Scott
3:00 - Secretary of State Joan A. Growe
4:00 - Issues Discussion

Thursday, February 10th

9:00 - Capitol Press Corps, Bruce Nelson, St. Paul Dispatch and Pioneer Press
10:00 - Senate Session
1:30 - Lobbyist Gene Mammenga, Minnesota Education Assn.
2:30 - Mock Precinct Caucus
3:30 - Issues Discussion

Friday, February 11th

9:00 - County Commissioner Sam Sivanich
10:30 - U.S. Congressman Bill Frenzel
2:00 - Program Evaluation

PROJECT 120 Daily Schedules

Session Four - February 14 through 18

Monday, February 14th

- 9:00 - Orientation
- 10:00 - Harlan Christianson, Educational Services
- 11:00 - Lobbyist Gene Mammenga, Minnesota Education Assn.
- 1:00 - Fourth District Congressman Bruce Vento
- 2:30 - St. Paul Mayor George Latimer
- 3:00 - Issues Discussion

Tuesday, February 15th

- 9:15 - Supreme Court Session and briefing on protocol
- 10:00 - Senate Committee Meeting on Energy & Housing
- 11:00 - Political Parties with Rick Evans (IR)
- 1:00 - Secretary of the Senate, Pat Flahaven
- 2:00 - House Session
- 3:00 - Supreme Court Justice Todd
- 4:00 - Film: There Oughta Be A Law

Wednesday, February 16th

- 9:30 - Senate Majority Leader Nick Coleman
- 10:30 - Attorney General Warren Spannaus
- 11:30 - Issues Discussion
- 1:00 - State Treasurer Jim Lord
- 2:00 - Senate Majority Leader Robert Ashbach
- 3:00 - Issues Discussion
- 4:00 - House Sergeant at Arms Larry Bothwell

Thursday, February 17th

- 9:00 - Third Parties with Dave Cummings
- 10:00 - Senate Session
- 11:00 - Individual Appointments with Senators and Representatives
- 1:00 - Individual Appointments with Senators and Representatives
- 2:00 - Mock Precinct Caucus, Bruce King
- 3:00 - Youth Involvement in Politics, Randy Zats
- 4:00 - Issues Discussion

Friday, February 18th

- 9:00 - Secretary of State Joan A. Growe
- 10:00 - Representative John Rose
- 11:00 - Speaker of the House Martin O. Sabo
- 2:00 - Program Evaluation

PROJECT 120 Daily Schedules

Session Five - February 21 through 25

Monday, February 21st

- 8:30 - Orientation
- 9:00 - House Session
- 10:00 - Capitol Tour
- 11:00 - House Sergeant at Arms Larry Bothwell
- 12:00 - Harlan Christianson, Educational Services
- 2:00 - Film: There Oughta Be A Law
- 3:00 - Issues Discussion
- 4:00 - Congressman Don Fraser

Tuesday, February 22nd

- 9:00 - Third Parties with Dave Cummings
- 10:00 - Speaker of the House Martin O. Sabo
- 11:00 - Political Parties with Rick Evans (IR) and Rick Scott (DFL)
- 1:00 - Secretary of the Senate Pat Flahaven
- 2:00 - Individual Appointments with Representatives and Senators

Wednesday, February 23rd

- 9:15 - Supreme Court Justice George Scott
- 10:30 - Youth Involvement in Politics
- 11:30 - Lt. Governor Alec Olson
- 1:00 - President of the Senate Ed Gearty
- 3:00 - Secretary of State Joan Grove
- 4:00 - Senator Robert Tenneson

Thursday, February 24th

- 9:00 - Capitol Press Corps, Bruce Nelson, St. Paul Dispatch and Pioneer Press
- 10:00 - Senate Session
- 11:00 - House Minority Leader Henry Savelkoul
- 1:00 - Lobbyist Gene Mammenga, Minnesota Education Assn.
- 2:00 - Attorney General Warren Spannaus
- 3:00 - Harry Davis, Minneapolis School Board
- 4:00 - Mock Precinct Caucus with Ruth Cain

Friday, February 25th

- 9:00 - Senate Committee Meeting on Employment
- 10:00 - Lobbyist Larry Harris, Minneapolis Public Schools
- 11:00 - Issues Discussion
- 1:00 - Senator Peter Stumpf
- 2:00 - Program Evaluation

PROJECT 120 DAILY SCHEDULES

Session Six - February 28 - March 4

Sunday, February 27th

7:00 - Evening Orientation

Monday, February 28th

9:00 - Capitol Tour
10:00 - House Committee Meeting on Criminal Justice
11:00 - House Sergeant at Arms Larry Bothwell
12:00 - Harlan Christianson, Educational Services
2:00 - House Session
3:00 - Film: There Oughta Be A Law
4:00 - Lobbyist Gene Mammenga, Minnesota Education Assn.
7:00 - Issues Discussion

Tuesday, March 1st

9:00 - Third Parties with Dave Cummings
10:00 - Senate Committee Meeting on Energy and Housing
12:00 - Speaker of the House Martin O. Sabo
1:30 - Senate Sergeant at Arms Gene Daly
2:00 - Individual Appointments with Representatives and Senators
7:00 - Political Parties with Rick Scott (DFL)

Wednesday, March 2nd

9:00 - John Kaul, Administrative Asst. to Senator Coleman
10:00 - Issues Discussion
11:00 - Attorney General Warren Spannaus
1:00 - Senate Page Brad Campbell
2:00 - Phil Boone, Supreme Court Marshall
3:00 - Representative Adolph Kvam
4:00 - Representative A. J. "Tony" Eckstein
7:30 - Play: Rich Dope, Poor Dope - Dudley Riggs Brave New Workshop

Thursday, March 3rd

9:00 - Capitol Press Corps, Bruce Nelson from St. Paul Dispatch and Pioneer Press
10:00 - Senate Session
11:00 - Larry Harris, Lobbyist from Minneapolis Public Schools
1:00 - Issues Discussion
2:00 - Lobbyist: Rick Teske, Minn. Assn. of Commerce and Industry
3:00 - Secretary of State Joan Growe
4:00 - Youth Involvement in Politics
7:00 - Mock Precinct Caucus

Friday, March 4th

9:00 - Senator Ed Gearty
12:00 - Program Evaluation

PROJECT 120 DAILY SCHEDULES

Session Seven - March 7th through 11th

Sunday, March 6th

7:00 - Evening Orientation

Monday, March 7th

9:00 - Capitol Tour
10:00 - Senate Committee Meeting on Educational Organization
11:00 - House Sergeant at Arms Larry Bothwell
1:00 - Issues Discussion
2:00 - House Session
4:00 - Representative Bruce Nelson
7:00 - Issues Discussion

Tuesday, March 8th

9:00 - Third Parties with Dave Cummings
10:00 - House Committee Meeting
11:00 - Assistant Secretary of Senate Janine Mattson
12:00 - Harlan Christianson, Educational Services
2:00 - Individual Appointments with Representatives and Senators
7:00 - Political Parties with Rick Evans (IR) and Ruth Cain (DFL)

Wednesday, March 9th

9:15 - Supreme Court Session and Briefing on Protocol
10:00 - Lobbyist: Larry Harris, Minneapolis Public Schools
11:00 - Senator Roger D. Moe
1:00 - State Treasure Jim Lord
2:00 - Supreme Court Marshall Phil Boone
3:00 - Secretary of State Joan A. Growe
4:00 - Attorney General Warren Spannaus
7:30 - Play: Rich Dope, Poor Dope, Dudley Riggs Brave New Workshop

Thursday, March 10th

10:00 - Senate Session
11:00 - Speaker of the House Martin O. Sabo
1:00 - Representative Carl Johnson
2:00 - Lobbyist Gene Mammenga, Minnesota Education Assn.
3:00 - Senator Doug Sillers
4:00 - Issues Discussion
7:00 - Mock Precinct Caucus with Judy Silverman

Friday, March 11th

9:00 - President of the Senate Ed Gearty
10:00 - Youth Involvement
12:00 - Program Evaluation

PROJECT 120 DAILY SCHEDULES

Session Eight - March 13 through March 18

Sunday, March 13th

7:00 - Evening Orientation

Monday, March 14th

9:00 - Capitol Tour
10:00 - House Committee Meeting on Criminal Justice
12:00 - House Sergeant at Arms Larry Bothwell
2:00 - House Session
4:00 - Issues Discussion
7:00 - Senator James Ulland

Tuesday, March 15th

9:00 - Third Parties with Dave Cummings
10:00 - Senate Committee Meeting on Energy and Housing
11:00 - Senate Sergeant at Arms Gene Daly
12:00 - Harlan Christianson, Educational Services
2:00 - Individual Appointments with Representatives and Senators
7:00 - Political Parties with Arne Carlson (IR) and Jane Lansing (DFL)

Wednesday, March 16th

9:00 - Supreme Court Session
10:00 - Gene Mammenga, Lobbyist, Minnesota Education Assn.
1:00 - State Treasurer Jim Lord
2:00 - Secretary of State Joan A. Grove
3:00 - Supreme Court Marshall Phil Boone
4:00 - Attorney General Warren Spannaus
7:00 - Play: Rich Dope, Poor Dope, Dudley Riggs Brave New Workshop

Thursday, March 17th

9:00 - Capitol Press Corps, Bruce Nelson from St. Paul Dispatch and Pioneer Press
10:00 - House Committee Meeting on Health, Welfare and Corrections
11:00 - Speaker of the House Martin O. Sabo
1:00 - Senator Jerald Anderson
2:00 - House Session
3:00 - Rick Teske, Lobbyist, Minnesota Assn. of Commerce and Industry
4:00 - Issues Discussion
7:00 - Mock Precinct Caucus with Cynthia Anker

Friday, March 18th

9:00 - President of the Senate Ed Gearty
10:00 - Ed Schultz, Lobbyist, F & M Savings Bank
11:00 - Program Evaluation
12:00 - PROJECT 120 Special Luncheon

SPEAKERS WHO TALKED TO THE
PROJECT 120 GROUP AS A WHOLE

LEGISLATORS:

Representatives

Martin Sabo
Richard Lemke
Don Friedrich
Don Moe
John Rose
Henry Savelkoul
Adolph Kvam
Tony Eckstein
Bruce Nelson
Carl Johnson
Arne Carlson
Orville Birnstihl
Mary Forsythe

Senators

Nancy Brataas
Tim Penny
Nick Coleman
Robert Ashbach
Ed Gearty
Robert Tennesen
Peter Stumpf
Roger Moe
Doug Sillers
James Ulland
Jerry Anderson

EXECUTIVE BRANCH:

Governor Rudy Perpich
Attorney General Warren Spannaus
State Treasurer Jim Lord
Secretary of State Joan Growe
Lt. Governor Alec Olson

LEGISLATIVE STAFF:

Pat Flahaven, Secretary of the
Senate
Harlan Christianson, Director
of Educational Services
Larry Bothwell, House Sergeant
at Arms
Gene Daly, Senate Sergeant at
Arms
John Kaul, Administrative Asst.
to Senator Coleman
Janine Mattson - Asst. Secre-
tary of the Senate
Brad Campbell, Senate Page

U. S. CONGRESSMEN:

Bill Frenzel
Bruce Vento
Don Fraser

CAPITOL PRESS CORPS:

Bruce Nelson, St. Paul Dispatch
and Pioneer Press
Blair Charnley, Minneapolis Star

SPEAKERS FOR PROJECT 120, CONT.

SUPREME COURT:

Associate Justice Todd
Associate Justice Scott
Court Marshall Phil Boone

POLITICAL PARTY REPRESENTATIVES:

Chuck Slocum
Rick Evans
Rick Scott
Ruth Cain
Jane Lansing

LOBBYISTS:

Gene Mammenga, Minnesota Education
Assn.
Larry Harris, Minneapolis Public
Schools
Don Waage, Northwest Bancorporation
Bob Plaster, MPIRG
Mike Flanagan, Minnesota Bar
Assn.
Rick Teske, Minnesota Assn. of
Commerce & Industry
Ed Schultz, F & M Bank

OTHERS:

Dave Cummings, Pillsbury
Jon Schroeder, Citizen's League
John Derus, Hennepin County
Commissioner
Sam Sivanich, Hennepin County
Commissioner
George Lattimer, St. Paul mayor
Harry Davis, Minneapolis School
Board
Bill Lynch, Johnson High School
in St. Paul
Anne Lewis, Urban Concerns Work-
shops
Judy Silverman, mock precinct
caucus
Cindy Ankor, mock precinct caucus
Randy Zats, volunteer for Minne-
apolis Alderperson Charlee
Hoyt and former PROJECT 120
participant.

INDIVIDUALLY ARRANGED APPOINTMENTS BETWEEN
LEGISLATORS AND THEIR PROJECT 120 CONSTITUENTS

SENATORS:

Roger Moe
Robert Lessard
Gerald Willet
Douglas Johnson
James Ulland
Douglas Sillers
Collin Peterson
Wayne Olhoft
Myrton Wegener
Winston Borden
Roger Strand
Robert Dunn
A. O. H. Setzepfandt
John Bernhagen
Earl Renneke
Clarence Purfeerst
Steve Engler
Marion Menning
Howard Olson
Carl Jensen
Arnulf Ueland, Jr.
Tom Nelson
Mel Frederick
Nancy Brataas
Robert Laufenburger
Robert Schmitz
Robert Benedict
Otto Bang, Jr.
B. Robert Lewis
George Pillsbury
Emily Anne Staples
Hubert H. Humphrey, III
William Luther
David Schaaf
Gene Merriam
Jerome Hughes
Gerald Silkorski
Conrad Vega
Howard Knutson
Edward Gearty
Gene Stokowski
Robert Tennessen
Allan Spear
Harmon T. Ogdahl
Steve Keefe
Jack Davis
Neil Dieterich
Nicholas Coleman
Bill McCutcheon

REPRESENTATIVES:

William Kelly
Willis Eken
Norman Prahl
Douglas St. Onge
Glen Sherwood
Joseph Begich
David Bataglia
Arlene Lehto
Keith Langseth
Jim Evans
Gene Wenstrom
Bruce Nelson
M. B. (Doc) Nelsen
Glen Anderson
Al Patton
Dick Welch
Bob McEachern
John Clawson
C. L. (Shorty) Gunter
Adolph Kvam
Harold Dahl
Raymond Albrecht
Robert Vanasek
Orville Birnstihl
Jim White
Victor Schulz
Buzz Anderson
Wendell Erickson
Darrell Peterson
Tony Eckstein
Richard Wigley
Henry Savelkoul
John Biersdorf
Don Friedrich
Ken Zubay
Richard Lemke
Kenneth McDonald
Bruce Williamson
Lyle Abeln
Mary Forsythe
John Arlandson
Pete Petrafeso
Tad Jude
Dwayne King
Lyndon Carlson
Linda Scheid
Wayne Simoneau
Gordon Voss
Howard Neisen

INDIVIDUAL APPTS. WITH LEGISLATORS, CONT.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Maurice McCollar
Mike Sieben
Ray Kempe
Jim Rice
Stanley Fudro
John Sarna
Jim Casserly
Tom Berg
Phyllis Kahn
Bill Dean
Arne Carlson
Ken Nelson
Stanley Enebo
John Brandl
Walter Hanson
Ray Faricy
Richard Cohen
Fred Norton
Eugene Waldorf
Arnold Kempe
John Tomlinson
Harry Sieben

BUDGET

RECEIPTS

Government Learning Center (Historical Society)	7,000.00
Fees from Participants (\$100 per student)	9,100.00
Funds Contributed by Urban Concerns Workshops Inc.	3,136.95
	<hr/>
	19,236.95

DISBURSEMENTS

Project Director (5 months @ \$700)	3,500.00
Secretarial	650.00
Office Space	250.00
Telephone	98.76
Travel, Project Director	-0-
Scheduler (4 months @ \$132, 3 months @ \$480)	1,968.00
Volunteer Staff Mileage	-0-
Lodging	4,145.22
Food	3,173.00
Transportation for Participants	266.61
Accident and Health Insurance	176.65
Entertainment	319.15
Equipment	106.59
Participant Kits	353.03
Promotion, Evaluation	764.94
Scholarships (44 students)	3,465.00
	<hr/>
	19,236.95

PROJECT 120 PARTICIPANT POLITICAL ATTITUDE SURVEY

(Pre-Program and Post-Program)

1. Is state government truly representative of the people or is it primarily influenced by private interest groups?

	Before	After
Representative of the people	69	120
Influenced by private interest groups	37	24
Not sure	33	11

2. Do you feel that state government is responsive to the people's needs?

	Before	After
Yes	107	142
No	13	3
Not sure	17	4

3. Do you feel that state government interferes too often into people's lives?

	Before	After
Yes	17	23
No	97	106
Not sure	22	16

4. Do you think that the state legislature is well organized?

	Before	After
Yes	61	121
No	17	21
Not sure	61	8

5. Is the state legislature too big to be effective?

	Before	After
Yes	14	10
No	83	134
Not sure	41	6

6. Do you think legislators are overworked?

	Before	After
Yes	11	52
No	78	79
Not sure	49	18

7. Do you believe that legislators are adequately compensated? Is their salary

	Before	After
Too high	30	8
Too low	17	68
All right	86	74

8. Do you think legislators have enough staff?

	Before	After
Yes	66	111
No	11	18
Not sure	60	16

9. Do you believe that the political parties control their legislators?

	Before	After
Yes	76	66
No	33	58
Not sure	27	18

10. Would you feel comfortable meeting and talking with a legislator?

	Before	After
Yes	113	148
No	3	0
Not sure	22	1

11. Circle as many alternatives as you think apply:

The legislative process is. . .

	Before	After
Fast	8	18
Controlled by only a few powerful legislators	23	24
Open to public scrutiny	60	116
Greatly influenced by lobbyists	66	92
Well organized	50	84
Responsive to problems rather than anticipate them.	56	75
Slow	74	78
Too bureaucratic	50	32
Chaotic	17	47
Mostly done in smoked-filled backrooms	5	16
Slanted toward big business	36	14

12. Circle as many alternatives as you think apply:

Government officials are:

	Before	After
Hard working	73	127
Hard to talk to	24	8
Primarily concerned about their constituents	38	94
Friendly	70	135
Easily accessible	22	56
Mostly influenced by the people they represent	57	91
Generally average citizens	66	109
Mostly influenced by private interest groups	35	19

13. If a person becomes involved in the political system, do you think he or she can have an effect on public policy?

	Before	After
Yes	118	145
No	3	3
Not sure	18	2

14. Do you believe that the political system welcomes all persons interested in getting involved and is responsive to them?

	Before	After
Yes	74	121
No	48	18
Not sure	16	11

15. Do you feel it is everyone's duty to vote?

	Before	After
Yes	134	136
No	5	13
Not sure	1	1

16. Is voting all that is necessary to fulfill a person's political rights and responsibilities?

	Before	After
Yes	18	20
No	117	125
Not sure	6	4

17. Do you feel that more people should get actively involved in the political process (beyond voting)?

	Before	After
Yes	125	143
No	0	3
Not sure	10	4

18. Do you think the two party system should be preserved?

	Before	After
Yes	83	116
No	21	17
Not sure	34	17

19. Do you feel that the political parties are the most important and effective part of the political system?

	Before	After
Yes	48	59
No	58	77
Not sure	38	16

20. Do you believe that getting involved in a political party is a necessary part of exercising a person's political rights and responsibilities?

	Before	After
Yes	64	90
No	58	46
Not sure	16	14

21. Do you think that being an independent makes a person more effective in the political process?

	Before	After
Yes	20	16
No	81	119
Not sure	39	15

22. Do you think that there are no differences between the two major parties?

	Before	After
Yes	11	17
No	114	122
Not sure	13	9

23. Do you feel that all DFLers are liberal?

	Before	After
Yes	13	16
No	112	128
Not sure	13	4

24. Do you feel that all Independent Republicans are conservative?

	Before	After
Yes	10	14
No	115	131
Not sure	13	4

25. Do you think that Minnesota should keep the precinct caucus system as opposed to the primary system?

	Before	After
Yes	51	123
No	14	8
Not sure	68	19

26. Do you think lobbyists contribute to the political process in a positive way?

	Before	After
Yes	76	132
No	16	8
Not sure	43	9

27. Do you plan to get actively involved in the political process (beyond voting)?

	Before	After
Yes	94	130
No	7	5
Not sure	32	15

28. Are you now or do you anticipate becoming a member of a political party?

	Before	After
Yes	81	118
No	20	14
Not sure	37	18

29. Do you think that you might consider running for political office?

	Before	After
Yes	55	83
No	28	25
Not sure	58	41

PROJECT 120 PROGRAM EVALUATION

1. How clear was your understanding of the objectives of PROJECT 120 before the program began?

Very clear	25
Pretty clear	69
Not very clear	40
Not clear at all	14

2. How closely did the content and emphasis of the program coincide with your expectations?

Very closely	59
Somewhat closely	70
Not too closely	9
Not at all	9

3. Which of the following alternatives best describes your reaction to the total program?

It was stimulating and interesting throughout.	67
It was usually stimulating and interesting.	71
It was only occasionally stimulating and interesting.	1
It was never stimulating and interesting.	0

4. How would you describe the growth in your understanding of how government and politics operate as a result of the 120 Program?

I learned quite a bit.	127
I learned some new things.	22
I learned very little.	0
I did not learn anything new.	0

5. For each item below, circle the alternative which you find best characterizes the program.

- a. The climate or atmosphere of the program was:

Poor	0
Average	40
Very good	108

- b. The overall design of the program was:

Ineffective	0
Sometimes effective	29
Very effective	118

- c. The activities of the program were:

Coherent and understandable	127
Sometimes coherent, sometimes understandable	23
Incoherent and confusing	0

d. As a participant, I felt that I:

Shared actively in influencing what went on	52
Had some say about what went on	81
Had no influence or say about what went on	11

e. Project resources, such as speakers, films, etc. were used:

Poorly	0
Adequately	30
Very well	111

6. Circle the number which best characterizes the program:

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	
a. Professional -----	80	65	4 -----	Unprofessional
b. Routine -----	18	56	71 -----	Diverse or varying
c. Fast -----	79	62	6 -----	Slow
d. Much free time -----	4	90	52 -----	No free time
e. Enjoyable, fun -----	120	23	0 -----	Dull, unenjoyable
f. Very useful -----	139	9	0 -----	A waste of time

7. What is your opinion of the schedule and work load of the program?

Too heavy	33
About right	110
Too light	3

8. What is your opinion of the amount of free time?

Too much	1
About right	68
Too little	79

9. What is your opinion of the rate at which the program moved?

Too fast	16
About right	125
Too slow	6

10. Overall, I would say that PROJECT 120 was:

One of the best ways to learn about government and politics	127
A good way to learn about government and politics	20
A poor way to learn about government and politics	1
One of the worst ways to learn about government and politics	0