

Roll Call:  
UCSD  
Ohio State  
UW  
UMichigan  
Pitt  
UC Davis  
UNC  
UT Austin  
Texas A&M

**10:15 AM - 10:30 AM: SAGE Leadership Address/Report**

UM: wants to consider changing membership requirement for SAGE. Right now it is tied to AAU membership, graduate students can't choose whether their school is AAU member.

UW: have schools asked to join but couldn't because they are not AAU

UM: Yes, Oklahoma asked this past year

UNC: why was this restriction put in place in the 1st place?

UM:

Pitt: What is R1?

UM: Carnegie classification system - R1, R2, R3 research based universities, based on how much money is spend on research. T1, T2, T3 are teaching univrsities. Must be in a top section of R1 to be in AAU. Every public school added to AAU also has a private school added.

UCSD: Would argue that it shouldn't be any of the T schools, because we focus a lot on research funding, but we could open up to more R1 schools that are not in AAU

A&M: There are a lot of R1 schools

UCD: We would like more schools in SAGE? Is that what the ask is?

UM: Right now, we have  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the public AAU schools. We are also in talks with. We represent about 200,000 grad students nationally, but it would give us more weight on the hill

UNC: There are A LOT of R1 schools that we could engage with. Have we ever used the AAU for advocacy?

UCSD: No, since I have been involved, we have not. It's not like not having AAU requirement would prevent us from having an AAU representative come to help us out. Sometime, it is valuable for having a smaller group of people so that everyone can have a say. SAGE has benefited from having a more intimate community. I don't think SAGE is in danger of blowing up to 100 schools.

Pitt: What does the process look like to come on board? A letter of interest? How robust do we want SAGE to look/be?

UM: Right now, our invitations are capped to three universities as per our bylaws. Usually they reach out and we issue an invitation. There are 31 institutions that have AAU. This is why some of the Big 10 schools don't always participate as much as the others.

Pitt: If we are going to do the express interest, I think it is important that they do have a formal government in place.

A&M: It would be helpful to decide who this position would sit under. We kind of struggle each year in terms of who to contact at various schools.

UT: Because we have interest from Oklahoma, we should get rid of the rule, especially when there are some that don't really care enough.

Motion on table to get rid of rule requiring that schools have AAU status to be a part of SAGE .

Vote: ASU: yes A&M, yes, UCD, yes, UCSD, yes, UM, yes, UNC, yes, Pitt, yes, UT, yes, UW, yes. Motion passes.

UM: Motion on table to change Brenna's title to Internal Affairs.  
ASU: yes A&M, yes, UCD, yes, UCSD, yes, UM, yes, UNC, yes, Pitt, yes, UT, yes, UW, yes.

UW: Discussion of bylaw change. The problem that we made it into later was that the people who made it to advocacy days but not discussion days. We lost a fierce advocate for that issue. Strong advocate was not there to fill that gap. Context amendment for that bylaw change.

Proposed bylaw change attached below:

2.5.4 Any member institution may attend the meetings prior to the advocacy days of the Spring Day on the Hill conference. However, only institutions that attend the Spring Day on the Hill advocacy days may participate in the vote to decide the advocacy issues and corresponding white papers for the advocacy days and meetings.

Ohio: So this is to prevent people who are less passionate about an issue having to present a topic?

UM: Yes.

UNC: A lot of the groups only ended up discussing 3-4 of the white papers anyway. But I do support this amendment.

UW: This also only pertains to the schools

UCSD: I disagree with this amendment because it prevents schools that don't have the money to travel to the hill. I think it's important that all schools

UNC: How did this come about? I'm not concerned about there being only one institution that is passionate about an issue?

UW: A very compelling argument. It wasn't aware until the next day that she wouldn't be attending the advocacy day.

A&M: That person wasn't involved in the discussion of the white papers prior to the day on the hill? It's not that they don't get a vote, but if institutions aren't involved. Feedback needs to be given during that time. We shouldn't be writing papers or voting on topics at that point.

UM: Two years ago, we ended up re-writing all the papers that went to the hill. To avoid that, we passed a bylaw stating that the papers needed to be written in advance. It wasn't just the one institution. We had talked about how schools had to participate in the process of writing the papers. What about a bylaw change more on this line?

UNC: Makes more sense if people have been involved in the process the whole time, and just can't be involved for that one day.

A&M: Could have been eliminated if it had brought up at that time. I think this can be eliminated.

UCSD: If we get to the point that the majority of the things get voted on. It is on SAGE and SAGE leadership to make sure that everyone is comfortable with the topics. The onus is more on training on the day on the hill. We need to bring in real solid facts and anecdotes, as well as bringing in an expert. This could be the responsibility of the working groups.

UM: Who has seen the website? If you haven't seen it, check it out ([sagecoalition.net](http://sagecoalition.net)) Also need to keep in mind that the white papers aren't just for legislators, but also for disseminating information to member schools. Does someone want to make a motion for the e-board to pass a new bylaw?

UT: We need to define what it means to be working on the white papers.

UCD: Having a say in what is on the white papers depends on the amount of work that you are willing to put in.

UW: In my opinion, to decide level of participation would be risky. Participation level could differ. Even though someone could be quiet during conversation but could participate during research.

UT: Should this fall on the shoulders of the white paper leaders?

A&M: Another issue is figuring out the process. What is the last day that we are able to get feedback? Having that information/who is able to give feedback would help.

UM: There is a clear process in the bylaws. 2 weeks before fall summit. We made very clear last year that this is the process that we are going by. That process is laid out in the bylaws and communicated to the coalition.

UT: So, do we want to change the language around this process?

UT: Motion: New language surrounding voting surrounding the white papers?

Ohio: The motion is around the white papers, but the whole thing/issue is proper representation on the hill. The motion needs to reflect that everyone who will speak on the day on the hill is adequately prepared no matter what the topics are.

UNC: I think that would mean that we don't need to worry about taking away votes if everyone is prepared to speak on whatever topic.

UM: For DOH, overview of what we we do.

UCSD: If I am reading the room, the motion is to task the executive board adding language to bylaws surrounding requirements and the responsibility of the SAGE board to adequately change those going to any offices.

UNC: I am really uncomfortable taking anybody's ability to vote.

UNC: Perhaps we add an additional task that each working group needs to put together a ppt with facts and anecdotes so that everyone is prepared to discuss each topic.

UCSD: We will create two different potential things to vote on. 1) Requirements for voting on white papers to take to the hills 2) Training to make sure that everyone is adequately prepared.

UM: We don't have committee structure in bylaws. That's on me, so I have to look at that.

UCSD: We will get that together within two weeks before the next call.

UM: We need a motion and a second for the committees.

UCSD: We could motion to do it as a slate.

OSU: Motion, and UNC: seconded.

10:30 AM - 11:00 AM: Best practices/ Reports from each school

UCSD: We will go more into legislative issues and how to lobby in the panel tomorrow, and Brenna and I will lead the discussion. The way that we want to start this discussion is by having each institution having a discussion about things that your institution does really well, and things that your institution could do better at. To give guidance, these are some issues that have come up in the past (on board -- healthcare, housing/transportation/off-campus life, campus safety, professional development, student government structure/participation. We will take five minutes now to get into groups and discuss.

UCSD: Let's give each school 3 minutes to talk about the things that you talked about during the discussions.

OSU: One thing that we are trying to do is to spearhead a survey to identify participation in student government . Lack of initiative of delegates. Don't know if this is lack of motivation or if they don't know what to do. Want to make sure that we have more knowledge.

OSU: When we meet every month, we have a different guest speaker. Really struggle with family housing. They decided to take away student housing, and put in a sport complex for undergraduates, and affordability isn't there for families based on the stipends that we do have. Minimum is up to \$15,000. Still trying to get 2-3% raises. Trying to make sure institution doesn't use grad students to make up labor costs when firing others.

UNC: Question about fees. Do you pay these out of pocket?

OSU: Biggest fee is student athletic fee. Our transportation is highest in country, can pay \$500 to get parking pass. \$500 per year.

UM: We have really good healthcare. They recently lowered healthcare significantly which affected masters students. For PhD students, we have great coverage. Now advising students to use healthcare on campus. We want to get this out to grad students. Our transportation is a huge issue. There aren't a lot of spots and its very expensive, and when they do make changes, they talk to undergrads and not graduate students. Our housing isn't an issue in terms of access. Right now, very expensive and they only do a 12-month contract, and we want to ask for a 9-month contract. They can't afford to lower it for us. Our campus safety -- we feel ok generally, but big issues with lighting. Representatives on the Ann Arbor city council. We make sure that students get seats. They are saying that they can't afford it.

UNC: We are really happy with our healthcare. UNC has started to push for similar type wellness. The gradfit run club. UNC does have a small on-campus residence hall. Grad students are especially concerned for allowing concealed-carry on campus. Right now just been a lot of noise, but likely that this will be pushed through. We have had numerous disgruntled undergrads telling grad TAs that we will get you. Certificate programs -- crash course in business fundamentals. So you are prepared with basic accounting skills and management, but funding opportunities has been terrible. Univ. has said that they won't be giving raises, but keep raising fees. As far as student govt, had a revolution last year, and declared independence from undergraduate students. Administration doesn't seem to realize how many students are graduate and professional students. A lot of what we are doing this year is educating boards that we are a different population.

Pitt: From GPSG landscape, good at core resources. We also offer free legal service on staff. Supplemental funding for organizations. Dispersed \$21,000 in travel grants. We have lots of free events. Transportation is great. All students ride the busses for free (Pitt city busses) We are good at partnerships. Professional development and career placement -- all resources as a MBA student is not being spread across campus. Trying to get people who are overlooked career and development help. PittArts teams -- tickets to free symphonies. Moving onto bad things -- communication. We have 17 different grad students and professional students. Hard to communicate with all schools, as they are siloed. We having difficulty in adding additional services. We do have insurance for all students, but it is too high. Possibly adding childcare and study spaces for children who Pitt is going through grad student unionization. Moving past

diversity and inclusion to equity and empowerment. Not only that we are diverse, but we support and empower.

UCD: We have UC-SHIP insurance. Depending on program determines fees you have to pay. We don't inform students that well about all the coverage that is offered. CA is in a huge housing crisis, so we are fighting for our space. They are also keeping grad students out, so we don't have a voice in elections. Grad students have to pay for transportation. Most students end up isolating themselves by living in Sacramento. Safe rides are inconsistent for late night rides. In discussion about talking to Uber/Lyft about filling this gap. We are focused on committees (like legislative action committee), but president has pushed . Working primarily on communication.

UT: We like our healthcare, very responsive healthcare , putting counseling rooms within the general medical center, so that you can go to . Cost of living is skyrocketing in Austin. Busses are irregular because always stuck in traffic or around construction. Grad housing, but can't bring in your own furniture or pets (bc of bed bugs.)

UT: there hasn't been a normalization of what grad students are getting paid. College of natural sciences, there hasn't been an increase in pay with an increase in cost of living. CNS this year instituted a 10% raise that went into effect, but students who are paid on grants, get dropped off of grants, because there isn't enough money on grants.

UT: There has been a push for more safe rides and a lot of police, because we have had two murders over the past two years. The other big issue we are working on is professional development, bc one dept has great opportunities but others are very limited.

UCSD: We will move last three reports until after lunch. We will pick three major topics based the conversation that comes from this.

11:15 AM - 12:00 AM: Keynote: Dr. Nathan Urban, Vice Provost

1:00 PM - 2:00 PM: Best Practices Discussion, continued

UW: Pretty good representation in school policies. Not just about race and ethnicity, but trying to do historical survey on which programs have been more active. UW students get a bus pass (\$84/quarter). At this moment, students are required to purchase whether they will use it or not. Housing is a growing concern as it has become a more expensive place to live. We are concerned that the market is out of control, and school is more concerned about the retention of junior faculty. Graduate students aren't the school's immediate concern. Relatively a safe place to live, but growing small crimes around campus. A guest speaker (Mia Y.) visited and created a controversy -- came to campus the day of inauguration. Students had expressed deep concerns about him coming.

School said we are public school and we can't ask someone not to come. There were gunshots, but the person didn't die. This year, we are expecting another controversial speaker.

UW: For those who have it, healthcare is great. Graduate insurance is expansive and holistic. Graduate students who make \$1000 or more are the only ones who qualify. They have to go through the state ACA market.

A&M: Healthcare -- we don't have maternity leave, trying to push for this. Not a lot of community so not a lot of childcare services. Univ. only has one childcare facility. The mental health system is separate from the other health facilities, and it's free. There is also a healthcare center where people can be international students or not have healthcare insurance, and pay \$5. Housing isn't that big of an issue. Transportation -- busses aren't timely. There aren't a certain number of fees tied to the number of students. In terms of campus safety, we have campus carry. Trying to figure out how we can get students more involved.

UCSD: Another big issue is EDI, love to hear what other schools are involved in in terms of EDI.

OSU: They have outright denied Richard Spenser from speaking three times. In some times, cracking down on the far liberal side of the free speech issue. Would like to hear more about how schools are dealing with the free speech issue.

UCD: Milo Yiannopoulos came to Davis, and the big problem was the immediate need for policing to be on campus for that. We also have Sean King come on campus. Vastly different response to speakers

Split into breakout sessions: [Major Issue areas here.](#)

### **Student Funding Breakout**

UCSD - Just passed HEAAA, allows student researchers to form unions. Have a TA union, don't have to pay member fees. PostDocs also have union.

UM - Just became right-to-work state.

UNC - NC is right to work state. State makes it hard to form unions. Joined Electricians Union.

UM - Depends on who's strong in your area. We are with Teachers Union.

UCSD - What's benefit for union?

UM - More numbers.

UNC - Union tried to organize walk-out. NCState refused to pay stipends for year bc of walk-out, forcing students to leave. Grad students are very cautious about this now.

UM - We can talk about unions but cannot talk during class time. Last year we had bargaining, day before we were going to strike, signed a new contract. If you can get the numbers, numbers force the universities hand.

UNC - Asks are very specific to students in humanities, not successful in recruiting scientists and prof students. Trying to get more interest from these sectors.

UM - Is pay rate the same?

UNC - no.

UM - That's the hard part. Hard to convince them if they're making much more.

UNC - Big discrepancies in base salaries. Prevents collective bargaining.

OSU - Similar problems here.

UNC - With current administration, have you seen any real concerns from admins at your universities?

OSU - Even before current admin we were struggling. Many faculty losing positions bc unable to secure funding. Assoc. Profs do not have tenure. Have to work very hard to ensure my advisor keeps funding and position. (College of Medicine)

UNC - Is this same for humanities and arts?

OSU - No, this is mostly medicine.

UCSD - One of our reps tried to take away funding from sanctuary campuses, didn't pass but can become a concern. Schools afraid of making choice between federal funding and protecting their students.

UM - UM has purposefully not collected information so that this choice doesn't have to be made. When EPA funding was frozen, dean sent email ensuring guaranteed funding for 5 years. (Child Care)

OSU - Handled well at our school. Sliding scale based on income, but looks like it may be taken away.

UM - At least quarter time, you are guaranteed stipend. Main problem is space, huge waiting list for care and profs, employees etc get put at front of the line. It is processed like financial aid, if you hit a ceiling, office will not put the funding through. Huge issue for students, lot of time to go into this.

UNC - Closed down child care access a decade ago, shut down 6 lactation rooms with no explanation in last year. One room that remains open has moved the equipment that allows you to sterilize.

UM - How does access work for you guys? You have to go get a key for us.

UNC - Often building by building. Card swipe is allowed per building. In my building students use a particular faculty's office. There are a few in the student union attached to the women's restroom.

UCSD - We are not good towards student mothers. All their stipend goes to childcare. We do not have designated lactation rooms. Definitely a big problem that has been talked about. Hoping that unionization will improve this.

UNC - Has SAGE worked on this?

UM - No, we have just started to track it but have not presented a paper on it. More of state issue.

UNC - It can be federal, Title 9, etc.

### **Professional development discussion**

UNC - Fabio

UT - Jon

UWash- Matt  
UMich - Pri

UT- do we have centralized university wide prof dev center?

UNC- mini ones; new certificate program for grads and prof students in addition to PhD like a minor

UT-we also have; dept started; ed dept offers a certificate; not publicized

UNC - publicized; grad cert in business fundamentals; any phd can take it; entails taking core courses and workshops; we have networking events, social org TIBS for prof devel. primarily science oriented but not normally focused on science prof dev. like business; would not normally get on science track

UT- is there a specific partnership with TIBS and...?

UNC- with biomedical sciences; not exclusive but focused on biomedical sciences

UT- do you think other fields are aware of the program?

UNC- no, but depts like chem would know

UT- small groups well-established and focused scope, but groups resistant on generalizing.

UM-large broad org for general all-important prof development like management/business-organization level things and small dept level prof development like networking, alumni mentorships, etc.

UNC- dual like one centralized broad org and have small specific depts focusing on prof devel.

UT: some admin staff who focus on this would be good and aware of the disjointed programs and work in concert with the small programs interdisciplinary

structure is so disjoint, but research is so interdisciplinary and prof development is necessary.

UNC-good job of putting phd programs and have larger umbrella of biomedical sciences with smaller depts like biochem, etc.

UT-new dean of grad school talking about getting depts to talk with each other

UW- not as much cross collaborate work; individual program thinks they do it best; business school does development well; campus career center focuses more on undergrads; grad school trying to increase programs; GPSS does not have bandwidth to take that on.

UT- certificate programs within program; texas materials institute in eng college; nano.. in coll of natural sciences both have certificate programs meant to be interdisciplinary

UM-pushback from advisor to do these "extra" things

UNC- cert programs doesn't require that much extra work; use class you've already taken

UT- shouldn't be on us to communicate the importance of this

UNC- new PIs have this kind of mindset; incentive to PI: grant might be easier to get/ look favorably upon if phd students have some prof development

### Housing/Transportation/Off-campus life Discussion

UM- Pri  
OSU- Annaliese  
UNC - Fabio  
UCSD - Kim

-OSU: fees, graduate student housing limited; lead crisis; run-down housing. Affects intl students more because they tend to have families; they relocate; takes away from overall grad student experience

-UCSD: thousands of extra students; lot of green space before, but now it's a concrete jungle; where's the playground? Place for kids to gather and interact no longer available;

-OSU: daycare cost based on sliding scale; waitlist based on whether one kid already went there; waitlist is very long

-UCSD: grad student's wife doesn't work because it's cheaper than working and paying for childcare for 3 children; family living on 30k/yr which is difficult in sandiego

-UNC: Chapel hill getting very expensive to live; no real grad housing; most grads rent; at the moment not bad, but rent is increasing at a higher rate than other places; problems for grad students with families and multiple kids; can't afford to leave kids in daycare all day because of cost

-UCSD: families are forgotten by Universities

-OSU: maternity leave

-USCD: 6 wks unpaid maternity leave, no paternity leave, unpaid after 6 wks; Europe students appalled... they have paternity leave!

-UM- luxury student housing pushing out low-income/grad students from central housing areas

-UCSD: idea: create cap so don't have to pay more than 40% of stipend amount on housing costs; we have 1 grad and 1 undergrad voice on all university housing development committees; lobbied for grad student seat at the table for these committees  
7k grads, 30k undergrads  
Research driven institution, so grad students have to be happy to get them to stay and university to make \$

-UNC- easy to ignore grads because they don't have as much free time to fight for own interests

-UCSD: administration counts on us not caring; other depts making more \$, but admin points to us making more \$ than some other dept.; admin keeping us from being involved.

-OSU: having a survey so we know what is being done at other institutions

-UNC: we have free busses and run on time; bikes used; rural area so it's safer and easier to reach

-UCSD: free busses this year; not on time; light rail being built now

-OSU: free busses city and U; city bus not on time

-UCSD: partnership with lyft→ pay \$190 and get \$200 credit.

**Campus climate Discussion** (lighting, partnerships with city council, local policing, concealed carry, alt-right groups, free speech, EDI, Title IX):

- UT and A&M haven't had too many problems with concealed carry
- Talk about the loosening of rules regarding disabilities/Title IX (Federal gov't has rescinded 72 guidelines on special education, people with disabilities, sexual assault)
  - o For UC system, UNC – they are stating that they will stick with the Obama-era rules; on the campus level, students are making sure that students are aware of the ombuds/EOC office
  - o Office of General Counsel at UM continues to operate like Obama-era rules; problems are sharing the rules with the general community
  - o There is not a clear path on sharing rules with the general community at UM, UT; UCs cover it a little during the orientation (but it's optional, before classes start)
  - o UT-Austin graduate students are mandatory reporters, which makes it tough because people cannot have honest conversations; at UT, the faculty Gender Equity council is working to make reporting easier and the climate better.
  - o UM requires that President gets trained on reporting as a Campus Security Officer
  - o EDI: Bias Reporting System→DOS must release explanation of how they deal with biases
- Bias-sensitive reporting system at UM is recent; at UW, it has been in place for a while, but there are a lot of complaints about it. UW just tried to streamline the reporting system regarding Title IX, try to lower the boundary for people who are afraid to report
  - o President Fenves unrolled a Hate & Bias Sensitive Policy—people can respond to complaints, but the Hate & Bias Policy has been used against protesting. Has been used against protesters
  - o UT's Diversity Action Plan is a “plan that is not full of a lot of action.”
  - o At Pitt, a lot of what happens are conversations without a lot of action
  - o Check out diversity.umich.edu → Michigan committed \$85M to EDI in addition to the \$40M that is annually dedicated to EDI; where does the money go? Some programming, some money to GSSAs, some money to individual students

- Michigan, Washington state cannot consider a student's race, background in considering a student's application. UW is focusing on faculty diversity rather than GAPS diversity
- There is a lot of evidence showing that diversifying the recruitment process itself is going to be the best way to achieve a more diverse acceptance pool
  - "Bring a Professor Home" - selected students take a Professor and a TA back to their home high school to give a talk, greatly increase interest and recruitment from underserved communities at low cost
- Approach in term of Federal/Town/Campus?
- CAMPUS CLIMATE IS SO IMPORTANT; how does one change campus climate before getting students to the campus?

### **Student Government Structure/ Participation Discussion**

UM: Each division gets X reps, plus elected officials

UT: Each dept has a primary rep and an alternate, 56 reps, 10 execs. Elections are maintained by depts

UCSD: Dept reps allocated by Population, about ~110 total but it is hard to get people to show up. No incentives to come to meetings or participate in committees

UCD: Students are incentivized monetarily, but they don't have a lot of engagement. People come because there is free pizza but don't really participate.

UW: Senate has up to 2 reps from each degree granting program. Some depts don't send people. Want to get more programs coming to include all grads. Participation ~40-60%. Lots of communication gaps, try not to rely on senators to disseminate information.

UNC: up to 2 reps for each degree granting program. Committees tasked with different things (planning committee, resolutions committee, standing committees such as appropriations). Incentivized because each dept gets allocations from GPSF depending on participation. You are eligible for more allocations if you participate in committees. Every committee has at least 1 exec board member, at least 5 senators. Some have public members too. Cabinet below elected positions, people sitting on external committees.

A&M: every dept gets at least 1 rep. People show up because their dept is eligible for travel grants if reps show up. Everyone operates within committees, if they want to be eligible for travel funds they must attend AND participate in committee meetings (as determined by committee chair). For committees, everyone works on a project to lead. Role of execs is to help people in committees to grow as leaders. Otherwise, it is hard to empower committees to work hard because they don't have ownership over projects.

UNC: within 6 months we have seen much more engagement because there is stuff to do outside of senate meetings. More ownership.

OSU: within everyone's senates, do senators know their roles or abilities/responsibilities?

UM: More clearly defined in committees (Leg affairs, budget, student affairs, elections, ). Half of all seats go up each term to promote continuity

UT: elections in february, but changeover happens in April so people can learn over a several month period. Only President and VP are elected

UCD: how do people feel about transitions?

Everyone: bad. Not easy to figure out what you have to do.

OSU: came into first senate meeting and had no idea what to do. Slow to start the work.

UCD: this can slow everything down because it takes 6 months to get everything done

UM: Last person in the role did everything himself so it is difficult to understand the scope of the position/ day-to-day.

UNC: first year as a student government, Started a task tracker that is linked on the website for full transparency, and next year people can understand timelines and scope of work.

#### Overall Takeaways:

A&M: all schools seem to have a central healthcare facility. wants more info on healthcare initiatives, money saving

UCSD: In housing meetings, it would be great to send out a survey at the end of this meeting. This information are things I have used to lobby for (transportation -- look at all these schools that aren't paying for buses), (increase of stipends), etc.

UNC: Professional development. A lot of opportunities are "the buck stops with our PI." If your advisor doesn't want you to go, that's often it, regardless of how good the opportunity is for you.

Look at ways to incentivize advisors. If you send students to this professional development program -- something to think about how to make it look good for them.

UM: 5-year document, historical records of student government

UT: Campus climate, issue is not just admitting, but recruiting. The great program I heard about was "bring a professor home" where students can bring a favorite professor/TA back to their home high school. Lots of buy-in

UNC: In funding group, discussed childcare. How do we help each other at the state level and provide each other with anecdotes, on to how student-parents struggle, as well as what we can do at the federal level to help students with parents get through their degrees with less struggle.

#### 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM: Lobbying Training/Panel

- Paul Supowitz, Vice Chancellor of Community & Governmental Relations
  - Bipartisan support - need  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority every year to be funded by the PA Government, so you need to check your personal politics at the door. Must have context but avoid getting into details about other partisan issues besides your own
  - On federal level, has seen broad support for biomedical research on both sides of the aisle. Pitt relies on federal research funds, especially NIH funding. Make sure to look into background of legislators to see what issues will resonate with them.
  - Generated 30,000 emails to legislature in support of university funding in the past couple weeks. Collaboration
  - On high turnover of people in grad student orgs: Have continuity of message even if you can't have continuity of people. Relationship can be more about institution than the people themselves. Staff relationships are key, often you can't

- have a relationship with the elected themselves. Keep relationship positive even if you disagree on a specific issue sometimes.
- Hopefully the first time you meet with someone won't be when you need to ask for something big. It is worth going into offices that are strongly in support of you so they don't feel you are taking them for granted and you might be able to use them in creative ways (talk to their colleagues, take the lead on an issue, convince a decision maker to take up the issue)
- On women making connections in a male-dominated field - try to find alternative areas of overlap with interests, recognizes that the "old boys club" of politics is still alive and it's unfair
- Emails can be helpful, even if they feel ineffective. The more personalized, the better. Offices have to look through these emails, but you probably need to generate big numbers to make it count. If there is a more discrete issue you need to be more detailed on, see if you can get time on the phone with relevant staff so you can make more of an impact.
- Lobbying advice: be on time, have contingency plans if you are running behind schedule. Get organized, get logistics down. Get comfortable with issues instead of reading off the page, relax and be yourself because people can see through it if you don't. You probably know more about the issue than the person you are talking to in many cases, so be confident.
  
- Michael Lamb, City Controller (not present)
  
- Brendan Schubert, Associate of Triad Strategies
  - Bipartisan support - his issues are very client focused. Meetings are all about what he has in common with people.
  - Think - "So, what's the point?" make sure you talk about how it will be relevant to the district/constituents
  - People do business with who they know, like, and trust. People care about what you are saying when they know you care.
  - In Washington, average staffer stays for only 2 years then moves on. It can be hard to build up relationships with specific people. Move on when you have a disagreement, you might need to work with that person later.
  - Don't always go into an office when you need something. Sometimes go to build relationships.
  - Take the time to really listen to people, they will appreciate it. Epidemic in our society that we look at computers and phones instead of each other. Phone will be more effective than an email.
  - Lobbying tips: know your audience. They are probably looking at you as a valuable resource more than you realize. Go online, see which staff you will be meeting with and how you can relate to them. See if congress is in session that day so you know if the staff you meet with will be pulled away at the last minute. Be prepared for things to change.

#### 4:00 PM TAX Discussion

UM: Univ. of michigan did an analysis. If FICA and Section 117d of tax code are removed from tax breaks, our yearly taxes will increase by \$2178 (they will be able to tax our tuition waivers in addition to our stipend). Before 1986, even stipends were not taxable but to fund a tax cut in the 80's, they went after students. Zach will circulate a list of members of Ways & Means Committee, we need to try to  
International students don't like FICA bc they don't get social security. So shouldn't have to pay this.

UCSD: Are you just talking about the republicans on the committee?

UM: yes, dems don't see to be a problem.

UW: Will you circulate full list, or just the republicans?

UM: Full list, including both republicans and democrats.

UM: Watch for any changes to the FICA language and to section 117d of tax code.  
Under FICA, you would be taxed for your tuition remission. Make sure that you get this list to your student bodies and representatives.

UCSD: Move to adjourn until 9am.

Motion passes, with no objections.

#### SAGE FALL SUMMIT, SATURDAY OCTOBER 28th

UM: Today we will focus on DOH. This is where we go to DC and talk about how to meet with legislators, and then actually go to meet legislators. This is about what will happen in the spring.

#### 9:00 AM - 9:40 AM: Current and Future Legislative Landscape

##### 9:00 AM: Research Funding

UCSD: (Include link to slides.) The people we are often trying to convince are republicans, so we often frame this from the standpoint of global competition. We might think about global competition, even predicting out to 2020 (overtaken in the innovation field.) At lot of people think we will maintain our current status in terms of leadership in science/innovation. Every \$1 in NIH funding generates 2.21 in local economic growth. NIH grants alone support ~500,000 jobs. At the time that we went, we were really nervous because Trump administration had released their federal budget, and proposed cuts to almost all federal granting agencies. Asked for opposing limits to intellectual freedom. Will not get the most return on investment if funded by private industry. Many research projects are risky and uncertain in the long term. In defense, you see a lot more applied. Discretionary budget. Would be really detrimental to those not doing late-stage science (because it all comes out of the non-defense discretionary.) It seems like congress is still on-board but still important to talk to government about the research that YOU do, and here's why it's important.

9:10AM: Student Debt: This was painting the picture of the current student debt situation. (Link to slides) SAGE recommendations from last year were the following.

##### 9:10 AM: Immigration

UW: (Link to slides) -- Biggest update was the rescinding of DACA. Opponents of the policy saw this as executive overreach. SAGE recommendations were to reintroduce the STAPLE Act (hasn't even received hearings in committee) -- Supporting the BRIDGE Act -- was reintroduced, there was a petition to discharge the bill

9:20 AM: Campus Safety (Sexual Assault and Mental Health) ○

9:30 AM: Student Loans

A&M: Before we recommend certain types of legislation, good language might be "use this as a model." It could isolate us if we say support this specific bill.

UCSD: Rather than having a hard ask, say that we NEED a legislative fix. Have to be a little more flexible, because not going to get everything that we want.

UCD: Kim used a personal experience with a friend, and this was very successful.

9:40 AM - 10:15 AM: Legislator of the Year Discussion

UW: 3 nominations.

UCSD: Recommended John Garamendi (UC is in his district) Very supportive of student issues and especially grad students. Every year he introduces the student loan refinancing act. This is the only student loan bill that decreases the rates for graduate student loans as well as undergraduates. Regularly gives speeches on the floor about NIH funding, so has put a lot of work into maintaining basic science funding. All of his issues align with the issues that SAGE represents, and he is really good advocate for graduate students.

A&M: Endorsed Senator Bob Casey. Sorted through data on govtrack (who brings the most legislation on the floor. Who is the most bipartisan. He hasn't authored bills directly supporting graduate students.

UW: Representative Suzan DelBenne. Very friendly relationship with our office, and helpful. Has coauthored and sponsored bills that relate to higher education. HR3870, which seeks to lower costs by offering access to . HR1656 which allows employers to contribute to

UW: The benefit is to get in better graces with legislators, and the benefit to our office is gain more notoriety. Active in seeing who is paying attention to us, so hopefully more legislators will pay attention to our issues.

UM: Of the three that are nominated, which of the three would we most want to build a better relationship with.

UNC: Senator Casey -- real advantage with him. Plus having Pitt with SAGE would make sense. He has great relationships across the aisle.

UM: Has SAGE given these awards before.

UW: No, this would be the first time.

UT: What is the price range?

UW: Minimum \$50

UM: Get together with your institutions and discuss.

UCSD: Anyone want to debate anymore as a group?

UM: Point of information -- Midhat's idea

UM: Is there a way that we could do a best senator and a best representative?

UCSD: We could talk about it. It's

UM: This would mean a likely increase in fees for DOH.

UCD: Why did you want to go with two?

UM: Because we can't choose! Casey would be great to improve our relationship with him. Garamendi, we don't want to take him for granted, because he has been doing the work for graduate students. So, could we do a legislator and a senator.

UM: And in this way we could have our name in both the senate and the house.

UCD: Is there any reason Susan wasn't considered?

UCSD: We were talking about leaning towards Casey that we might want to use it to forge new connections. But giving them that first award, if this is the "gold standard" for what we want. We could do one this year and one next year.

UNC: I will support only giving one award -- and I think it should be for John Garamendi. I also think its worthwhile to charge our friends at Pitt to keep bugging Senator Casey.

A&M: SOMething that we should do throughout the year is a general letter to thank them. There are people that we should be recognizing for their work. Write a letter, but don't tell him about the plaque.

UM: What is the purpose of an award? To recognize. SO as a coalition, Should we use an award to recognize or to build a relationship, and I think it should be the former.

UCSD: Any other debate on this? Does anyone want to make a motion about having two awards on this? Ok -- we will move into a ballot/secret vote.

UW: SO by a vote of 7-1-1, it's Garamendi. The second thing that we need to discuss is how much we are allocating to this.

UCSD: The floor is open for debate.

UCD: A glass plaque with white letter writing on it. \$30.

UNC: How much is shipping?

UT: I don't know but you can buy with packs of 12.

UNC: \$50, that way there is wiggle room.

A&M: I make a motion to spend \$50. UCD seconded.

UNC: Luca said that maybe we should deliver it on DOH. Would be weird if SAGE got a random box. Maybe a good idea to bring it to DC, so that we can present it.

UM: Then we could do a photo opp and have a press release.

UNC: Make it so that it is a little more of a ceremony.

UT: Would be mutually beneficial.

UT: \$82.

UNC: I think we should aim for a \$40 plaque.

UM: I was just saying \$100 is too much.

A&M: \$75 max.

UW: I want to clarify I will look for something cost effective. I don't know that I won't encounter it with 50 or 75 but no matter what we decide, cost-effective is the priority.

UCSD: Any other motions?

UM: It is an allocation, so we will call a roll. The motion on the floor is for \$75. OSU - yes, A&M - yes, UCSD - yes, UNC - yes, Pitt - yes, UT - yes, UM - yes, UW - UCD - yes. The motion passes by unanimous vote.

(<https://www.thingsremembered.com/round-glass-award/product/627441> - suggested plaque found by UT)

10:15 AM - 10:45 AM: Keynote: Christopher Staten, Pitt GPSC

(See if can attach slides) University of Pittsburgh GPSGC. Brief overview of what we do. Comprised of e-board, graduate student governments, and cultural graduate student organizations. Foster a sense of community not only within the university, but within the local community. A moment of transparency -- I recently had to remind our executive board of our mission. We don't necessarily see the different obstacles that we might confront. A lot of us forgot our mission. This is what we signed up to do. We offer free legal services, advocate for graduate and professional students, plan social events, and provide travel events. There are a range of legal services that are offered.

UNC: Will they help students right wills or work with leases?

UPitt: yes, but we have to keep in mind that different legal professionals have different areas of expertise. We pay him \$300/week.

UW: At UW, we provide free legal services for similar things.

UM: The legal services come from graduate student fees?

Pitt: Half of grad and professional student fees go to us, and half go to your respective student government.

UNC: What is your operating budget?

Pitt: We will get to that.

Pitt: We all have discretionary funds, of course the programming fund is a little bit larger. We all receive stipends. Anything other than the stipend is the whole year. The administrative assistant has to dedicate 20 hrs/week. She gets her tuition paid for and she gets a stipend as well. Most times we don't go over our allotment, but sometimes we do. As far as more information for that, we cover flight, lodging, poster costs. We don't cover drinks. We don't cover food either. They can only apply to one travel grant/yr and the cap to that is \$500.

UCD: How many apply to the travel grants per year?

Pitt: 63 so far, and it's september -- we haven't done october yet. They have a 10-day window to submit their request.

UW: So your travel grant funding can be retroactive?

Pitt: Yes, always retroactive.

UCD: Do you also fund people that want to go to a professional development conference. Are there any stipulations?

Pitt: You actually have to PRESENT at an academic conference. Present a body of work that you have been working on. We need proof (a letter from advisor, a JPEG of poster, etc)

Pitt: I personally think that we should amend this bylaw, to make it more robust, so that they can apply more than once. Some respective schools have additional travel grants.

UW: What is the ratio of applicants that you get versus applicants that get funding?

Pitt: Most get some type of help. Most if not all get something to offset expenses.

UCD: Why not professional development? What is stopping you from helping people who want to go for networking or want to go to presentations? I think networking is a big piece of it all.

Pltt: I think you bring up a good point. It can be problematic. I have to look into that.

UT: Only allowed to go to one conference per year, and my advisor will only fund me to go to conferences where I will present my work.

UT: We give out a smaller number of awards for early PhDs to go to conferences where they won't be presenting their work. Doesn't do a lot, but allows people to go to a local one and network.

UW: How do you leverage the demand?

Pitt: We do see surges in attendance depending on the months. I'm guessing most of academic conferences are in spring or summer.

UCD: Who makes decision on who gets travel grant or not?

Pitt: Most if not all get some type of money. If and only if you present at a conference. There is no set process, but the general process is sent to email. If things are not legit, we have to pull them in. Our partners are the Office of Provost (Graduate studies), Office of INTERNATIONAL studies (50% of our students are international), Office of Student Affairs (we're partnering with them), Department of athletics etc....

UNC: What is your relationship with the undergraduate student board?

Pitt: It is as cordial as it can be. There will be times when we will need them, and when they will need us. I make sure that our relationship is collaborative. The undergraduate teams have a team that is second to none.

- (1) Professional Development and Career Readiness. We are trying to streamline our efforts. How can we spread all these resources across the whole 10,000 GPS landscape? We want to have targeted and tailored programs. If I'm an MBA, I don't want to see the same messaging as We're trying to figure out what the best way is to communicate these efforts.
- (2) We want to move beyond diversity and inclusion to equity and empowerment. We are partnered with the Office of D&I, College of Urban Education, College of Arts & Sciences Graduate Student Government, and The Alliance. We are working on these programs -- Black Male Summit (least amount of degrees attained, 38% graduate in 6 years. Not only for black males but also latino males. The numbers are around 68%. There are a minimal number of them on campus, lack of support and community on campus. Around 2.2% on georgia. If you're not represented, it's easier for you to fall off the map.
- (3) Gender equity

(3) Enhancing communication efforts.

UM: how did you conduct the survey?

Pitt: They didn't know about us before the survey.

UM: What was the response rate?

Pitt: About 12% response rate. The majority did not know what we did, or they didn't know who we were. We send out one email per semester. Show video. We played this video at all 30 orientations: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KGZMKFdZUIY>

UNC: Did you all produce this video yourself?

Pitt: We partnered with the student affairs team. Getting people to watch the video is a different story. Better to have a short video. Any more questions?

UCD: What is your social media presence like?

Pitt: Terrible. We have a facebook page. Our instagram is struggling. How is social media at all your respective schools?

UW: How do other people use social media?

UM: Our FB is decent enough. Had questions about -- do you post your events on FB? Our newsletter has a really great open rate.

UCD: How many grad students go to twitter? I use FB more in grad school than i did in undergrad.

UNC: Graduate students are still on FB and instagram not twitter.

OSU: How frequently are you posting on your social media pages? And what are you posting?

UNC: What we're finding is that it's not showing up in people's newsfeeds. We can only reach so many. We have a designated social media manager. What is content that you are posting. Call to volunteers. Photos of grad or professional student doing work.

Pitt: For us, we are trying to make sure our FB and instagram are less transactional and more ENGAGING. Trying to launch "reach your exec board."

UM: We mainly just publish our events. I think its good for us to publish our political decisions and our resolutions. A lot of grad students think that we should be neutral. I push for us to post what we push through our board. This is not always well-received.

UCSD: We are 40 minutes behind schedule, and 15 minutes behind schedule on this . You can motion to extend time.

OSU: Motion to extend time. Seconded. In terms of social media, you personally sign up to things that add value to your day. There needs to be a conversation about what our voice should be, and what the value added is.

UCSD: There is one agenda item that we skipped over. I would like to move to table this until our next call.

UT/OSU -- seconded.

### **10:45 AM - 12:00 PM: SAGE Focus Areas/ Working Group**

UCSD: Okay, we will talk about this at our next call. We would like to open it up to a discussion about what we would like our working groups to be.

UM: In the past, we have found it helpful to allow institutions to get together and discuss what is the most important to you as an institution.

UCSD: We will do that for five minutes, come back together at 1138.

UCSD: Reconvening.

A&M: I think immigration and international student issues are very important. Not a lot of groups talk to them about this. And I think we got good feedback from offices that we talked to. I think student debt is also really important as well. And research funding as well.

OSU: Ohio State will second all three of those.

UCD: The three that are important -- student debt, the reality of being a graduate student and having a family, -- research funding, and also campus climate. I know I left immigration out. Being in DC, I'm unsure how things will change. People just don't know what's going to happen.

UT: UTAustin will be research funding (staple) and campus climate. Put it up for debate by separating into sexual assault and EDI. Might be challenge to put it together but if we split it into two.

UM: There is an unlimited number of bylaws. On DOH, historically only 3 white papers. This has changed with the committee structure. These papers have an afterlife and get read. This is a source of information. How much time do you want to devote and how much information do you want to put out there. Also how much time do you want to spend debating.

UNC: We talked about dropping the campus wellness piece, because there isn't really legislation tied to these pieces. We think it would be more effective to target. We also talked about a fourth piece.

UM: Some offices prefer that we don't come in and talk to them about pending legislation. Some of our offices have said that they wish more people would come in and talk about We are also a voice for our constituents and have a responsibility.

UNC: Want to clarify that all things are important.

UM: Right now we are deciding what we are willing to put in.

UT: Have to be very careful to talk about free speech, not using wording like "climate change"

A&M: I don't think we should be worried about what specific piece of legislation we are tying our papers too. Last year we spent all year voting on these issues but didn't even get to prepare. We put people in situations where we put in papers that we decide to take away later. I would rather not have an abundance of white papers but

UCSD: We could re-think the working group as a group that is charge of tracking an issue. It doesn't mean that something might not come up. Immigration might not even be on a table, or the group might decide that . We have to think ahead that we don't even know what the issues will be. We could also add working groups this year as things come up.

AM: When did the working group leaders start working on papers.

UCSD: By end of November, had to had a roster, had to have one meeting by January coalition call, by Feb coalition call had to present a draft. Feb call was all groups presenting their papers.

A&M: I'm wondering if we change the structure and identify point people, and after the call. It doesn't take that long to write. Feedback takes time, but we can't get feedback from every single person. We need to send to federal offices and get their feedback. I think there are ways we could more productively use our time.

UM: Right now, I see four different groups. Campus climate, finance, free speech, and immigration.

UM: It might be important to increase the student debt to more generally student finance.

UM: We also discussed in a different way free speech -- what happens to protestors. Folks can be expelled from the institution. It's a hot topic, and I think it's important that we talk about. These papers live outside what we bring to the hill. I think this is something that we should

UNC: There is three strike rule. We don't have expulsion for students for hate crimes.

UM: there is a bill?

UNC: The current way that its written. The biggest concern is that the language is very vague. Right now, if cause significant disruption or cause people to be preventing from moving from point a to point b. THINK it will be targeted specifically to groups that protest.

UNC: We did lead the charge on the bathroom bill, so NC is clearly the paradigm for shitty legislation.

UCD: Campus wellness falls under mental health. But campus climate is free speech and Title IX. Also keep in mind that when you speak to representatives, its only 30 minutes. Even if it's only three of those things, it's a lot to talk about.

UM: We are not set up to do traditional lobbying. Free speech is about state legislation. Will be fought out much more effectively in the judiciary. If we do go down that road, we should be careful.

A&M: Do we want to vote on these issues? The amount of volunteers might dictate the number of topics.

UCSD: Anyone can make a motion about bringing on x number. Best way forward.

UNC: I would like to make motion that we reconsider how a working group is defined, so that a working group is not specifically assigned to write a white paper, but is tasked with monitoring policy.

UM: Should that motion include a time?

UNC: Makes sense to follow the same timeline. Have students to track legislation. In Jan, group will say, yes its worth writing a white paper or no, its not worth writing a white paper.

AM: Seconds motion

UCD: I would like to amend the motion to include a selection of topics.

UCSD: Point of information, this wouldn't preclude us from also motioning to preclude these groups. It might not be necessary for a working group to have a white paper at the end of it.

UNC: IF we have all agreed that these are important, it would be good to get more information.

UT: i do think campus wellness should be limited to mental health and campus climate should include the other topics.

UCSD: Now we are open to other motions at this time.

UT: Motion to form working groups on these five topics.

UCSD: I would like to amend the motion to include healthcare in campus wellness.

UT: And family healthcare

UCSD: The motion right now is to adopt five working groups.

UNC: seconded.

UM: Is it assumed that sexual assault falls under campus climate?

UCSD: Yes it falls under title ix.

UT: Do we assume that someone will be conscripted in the job, or do we need to make sure that there is a volunteer for each working group?

UM: Would the leaders still be the leaders once the working group becomes the white paper group.

UCSD: yes.

UCSD: We will do this by a roll-call vote.

UCSD - yes  
Ohio State - yes  
UW - yes  
UMichigan - yes  
Pitt - yes  
UC Davis - yes  
UNC - yes  
UT Austin - yes  
Texas A&M - yes

Motion passed unanimously.

UCSD: Are there any motions to nominate?

UNC: The motion is to open nominations for the working groups.

AM: seconded.

UCSD: that motion carries.

UNC: I would like to make a motion to nominate Madelyn Percy (UNC) for the research funding/intellectual freedom group.

UT: I would like to nominate Sam Fuchs (UT) for campus climate. Accepted.

UT: I would appreciate a co-chair.

UM: Nominated Alex Vazsonyi (UM) for immigration. Accepted.

UM: Nominated Lucca Henrion (UM) for finance. Accepted.

UT: I nominate Jon Bender (UT) for campus wellness. Accepted.

UCSD: IF the coalition so decides, we can do an elections process.

UNC: I move to close nominations for chairs.

UNC: Motion to make a slate. Seconded.

Motion made by OSU, seconded by UW.

UCSD: The last year the way we thought of this was in terms of coalition calls. We were required to have these set by the date before DOH. We have five meetings before the DOH.

11/12 - Create online group to share information. Advertise groups on coalition call

12/10 - Roster of working group

1/14 - Go/No go on white paper

2/11 - Draft of white paper presented on coalition call

3/11 - Final white paper, last chance for feedback from the coalition

UNC: By november, have created online system, by jan have a go/no go decision, and then whenever white papers are due.

UM: How do we go about creating a roster?

AM:

UM: It runs through matt's office. If you are interested, email matt. And he puts you on the roster. We also have a slack channel to keep this all in one place. WE also have the google drive.

AM: Anyone providing feedback has to provide feedback before that time, otherwise they don't get to give feedback.

UM: The papers have to be closed before DOH (except for grammatical changes)

UT: When does that have to be in by, because otherwise the march call could go on forever.

UM: WE can do comments on google drive.

UM: Do we have dates for DOH?

UCSD: We will get to it next, but its after 3/11.

### **12:00 PM - 1:00 PM: Day on Hill Discussion**

UM -- motion to approve dates, seconded by UCD.

UW: Ellyn is at UT, and she is our advisor. We have to plan DOH around her availability. She is either available March 18th-21st or April 1nd-4th.

UM: SUndays and Mondays are business meetings, and hill meetings are on tuesday. We could also vote to move days.

UM: We also floated the idea from 4/8-4/11. ABA may be in town. Last year we ran up against APAC.

UM: Would you recommend a later date?

UM: Once you get out of April, you get into May, and schools are out of session. Keep in mind there is no perfect date, there are just better dates.

UM: Can we see if all of the group leaders are open?

UM: I would also like that there are people you can task to explain the paper.

UNC: I would to vote against the April 1-4th date.

UM: Conflict with 18-21st?

UCD: Final examinations.

UM: Ellyn doesn't have to be there, so we could have an additional call where Ellyn briefs us.

UM: What about 3/25-3/28?

\*\*\*There are a lot of other offices that we can use as resources\*\*\*

UM: Do we have a motion?

UNC: Motion to vote on date from 3/25-3/28.

UM: Roll vote.

UCSD - yes

Ohio State - yes

UW - yes

UMichigan - yes

Pitt - yes

UC Davis - yes

UNC - yes

UT Austin - yes

Texas A&M - yes

Decided unanimously.

UW: Start planning about a month in advance. Don't set any times or dates.

UW: We can also send out a link to the form letter as the day gets closer.

AM: Reach out to introduce who you are. Closer to the date have a list of representatives that you want to meet with.

UW: State day is wednesday, SAGE day is tuesday.

UCSD: If you have to leave early, its up to your schedule.

UW: One SAGE day, we will likely be done by 5pm. Any more questions about DOH?

UM: Campus carry. It is an issue on our campuses, but the moment we have that conversation, it's a nonstarter. With that knowledge, just be ware.

UW: For the working group chairs, if you decide that a white paper is necessary, make sure that that white paper is only on that issue. Be careful of rabbit holes. Make sure that everything stays on message.

UT: And keep it on the national level.

UT: What about interactions between white papers?

UCSD: If people feel like there is overlap, they can have joint calls. Is there anything that people specifically want on DOH? Is there anything that people think will be valuable to them?

UT: I have some suggestions. I met an advisor in the geosciences division of NSF, and she said that I can reach out to her. She spends time arguing about why you should care (climate change) and I have some contacts.

UCSD: Would be great to get a speaker.

UM: Do you meet with lawyers who work with senators? One of my mentors is the direct lawyer to senator warren. She could meet with us and go over strategies. We could throw out connections.

UCSD: If you could reach out, or we could, that would be wonderful.

UNC: Maybe on Monday, we could have some breakout sessions. So if you are really passionate, you could talk with different people. 1 hr each of meeting people, but not everyone has to meet with them.

UM: Getting a briefing on past experiences with certain lawmakers. IT would be good to start storing this information. It helps to initiate conversation.

UM: Your state offices will do this for you. If you don't and need help, reach out to schools that do have an office. AS part of SAGE day, we do keep records of meetings. We know that we need to have some sort of briefing. People should be aware of certain things while going into those meetings.

UM: I do this with a different group to advocate for physics. SHort google form. Here are the highlights. If we implemented that, it would be nice to keep a record.

AM: I think the operations of the day of are important. Typically everyone has a different area that they start specializing in. Team dynamics and transitioning are really important. Strategies - - some people only get 10 minutes. It is important to know how to internally communicate with each other.

UW: THose of you who have been on calls, I am working on legislator database. If anyone is willing to help with that, please come talk to me.

UCSD: We could think about using SQL or something if it gets too unwieldy.

UCSD: I will put as much of these suggestions in. That ends the discussion for DOH, and our last agenda item. At this time, we will entertain a motion to adjourn.

OSU -- motion to adjourn.

No objections.

**Meeting adjourned at 1245PM.**