Fall Summit Saturday Minutes, 10/19/19

Attendance:
[X] MSU - Megan Abel
[] The Ohio State
[X] Rutgers - Nate Flores
[X] Texas A&M - Anna David
[X] Arizona - Marie Teemant, Dylan Barton
[X] UC Davis - Gwen Chodur
[X] UC Irvine - Connor Strobel, Eric Hernandez Barraza
[X] UC San Diego - Quynh Nguyen
[X] U Maryland - Annie Rappeort, Rachel Lamb, and Ashley Clark (virtual)
[X] UNC - Manny Hernandez, Cody Love, Yael, Carlos, Chastan Swain, Hallee Haygood
[X] U Pittsburgh, Yashar Aucie, Stephanie Rose, Amanda Leifson
[X] UT Austin - Samantha Fuchs, Christina Baze, Kathryn Abercrombie
[X] U Washington - Abbie Shew, Matt McKeown, Maggie Dunham Jordahl
UC Santa Cruz - Rebecca Ora
Ellyn Perrone, SAGE Advisor
Mark Derdinski, CPAGE

Schedule:
Saturday morning: (https://unc.zoom.us/j/719165758)
9:00-9:30am: Breakfast
9:30-10:45am: Review of prior year/Plans for Day on the Hill, Abbie Shew, Political Director
10:45-11:00am: Break
11:00-12:00pm: Session 2: "How to Be an Effective Advocate" Michelle Sogge, Senior Coordinator of Assessment for Thrive Center; Dr. Emily Earl, GPSC Institute Director
12:00-1:00: Lunch (Saguaro National Park Trip Planning)

Saturday afternoon: (https://unc.zoom.us/j/157574633)
1:00-1:30pm: CPAGE, Mark Derdinski, CPAGE-SAGE Liaison
1:30-3:00pm: Working group discussion and topic selection
3:00-3:30pm: Working group chair elections
3:30-4:00pm: Working group expectations and timelines
4:00 - Open Forum

Meeting opened at 9:30am.
Review of Press release regarding the passing of Congressman Elijah Cumins.
Motion to approve press release by UC Davis, Irvine seconds.
Roll Call vote:
MSU - Aye
Rutgers - Aye
Texas A&M - Aye
Arizona - Aye
UC Davis - Aye
UC Irvine - Aye
UC San Diego - Aye
U Maryland - Aye
U Michigan - Aye
Legislative Review
Political Director: More information is available in the drive with detail on the bills and links to the bill text. First, we will go over our legislation from last year’s day on the hill.
Student Finance focused on employer Participation in Repayment Act (HR 1043) and Supporting America’s Young Entrepreneurs Act (HR 231). Not a lot has changed since Day on the Hill. Neither of them have moved forward.
Campus Sexual Misconduct: Combating Sexual Harassment in Science Act (HR 36). This directs NSF funding to research into sexual and gender harassment. This did pass the house on 7/23/1029. There is a senate version coming, supposedly, but it has not been introduced to the floor soon. The CAMPUS HATE Crimes Act amends HEA to strengthen prevention and response measures for hate crimes that occur on campuses. It updated definitions. It also had a provision to restrict federal funding for campus who do not adequately address hate crimes. This bill has not seen any movement. However, much of this language is incorporated into the House HEA reauthorization this year.
Student Immigration Reform. American Dream and Promise Act (HR6). Streamlines DACA to provide a permanent residents. Passes the House in June, expected to come up for a vote in the Senate soon. We opposed Fairness for High-skilled Immigrants Act (HR1044). Placed country caps on skilled worker visas. The EB visas are not for students, but for post-graduate students. It applies to STEM students who hope to stay in the US. This passed the house with overwhelming support and is expected to pass the Senate via a roll call vote. It initially failed a passing by unanimous consent.
UC Davis: Why did we oppose?
Political: We thought some of the language was unnecessarily restrictive. It placed a cap on India and China. We have gotten feedback from some members who still want us to oppose this ahead of the Senate vote. It does seem quite popular, so this may not be the best decision for SAGE. We will talk about it later in this presentation. Any questions?
Higher Education covers virtually everything. Sets rules for department of education administration federal programs, including financial aid. FAFSA, Plus Loans, Pell grants. It includes oversight provisions, accreditation of public universities, best practices. It is supposed to be reauthorized every 5 years, was last reauthorized in 2008. It has been discussed in numerous committees. It is overdue. Recent reauthorization attempts: PROSPER Act of 2018, was wildly unpopular. Republican-supported bill that passed through committee but never received enough support for a floor vote. Was a comprehensive overhaul including financial aid and Title IX, but went over everything in the wrong way. The Aim Higher Act 2018 was also proposed, the Democrat’s answer to PROSPER, but did not make it out of committee. SAGE has addressed reauthorization in passed working groups. Student Finance Reform and Gender Equity 2019 working group asked for a full reauthorization.
Current reauthorization Acts: Bills exists as of this Tuesday in both house and senate. House bill came out on Tuesday, is 1200 pages long. We’ll have a brief overview.
Senate: Student Aid improvement Act by Senator Alexander Chair of HELP committee. It is NOT a full reauthorization, only addresses FAFSA and Pell Grants, though it is being marketed as a reauthorization bill. It allocates $225 million of permanent and mandatory annual funding to HBCUs and MSIs
Ellyn: They are funded that way now, but it’s not permanent.
Pol: It’s not a change in amount, just making it permanent. This bill also simplifies the FAFSA - reduces total number of questions, allows for integration with IRS tax data (both House and Senate bills do this. You have to manually add data for the past year, and this would greatly simplify this.

MSU: How is this different? I was able to import data from previous years.

Irvine: This was a development ???

Ellyn: This provision is not going to go anywhere because Ways and Means are concerned about the firewalls. There is a concern about cybersecurity.

Pol: Is this about the College Transparency act?

Ellyn: No, this is about the Department of Ed. Data has been breached a lot. Congress is very concerned. Department of Ed will have to step up and convince Ways and Means, which is where this bill will end up.

Pol: There is another provision for data security. The last thing this Senate bill does is for simplifying aid notification letters, a single letter for amount of aid and how to access it.

(slide) Pell Grants expanded by increasing maximum amount (add dependents), increasing total eligibility pool to 250,000, with 1.3 million total qualifying. Both Senate and House allow for prisoners who are eligible for parole to use Pell grants from prison education. It also allows income-based repayment plans to ensure that all individuals and paying full 10% of discretionary funding. Both Senate and House funding allow for Pell grants to be used for short term technical programs and community college.

House version: Has not officially been introduced to the floor, has no number. College Affordability Act. Is a full reauthorization. Increases and permanently reauthorizes funding for HBCUs, MSIs, and TCUs. (historically black) (minority serving) (tribal). TCUs were not in senate bill. Addresses rising tuition costs by creating federal-state partnerships to incentivize states to invest in public colleges and make community colleges free. Fed can start to restrict funding if states aren’t investing enough.

Santa Cruz: What state would fall under that threshold?

Pol: Don’t know that yet. There’s a dollar percentage that has to be included.

Ellyn: Congress has tried this in the past, ‘maintenance of effort’ because states say ‘you can’t tell us what to do’. Alos 94 million for community colleges only.

Pol: Second way to address tuition increasing early access from high schools to get early credit programs. Also increase Pell grant funding. Student loans: making them cheaper and easier to understand by simplifying FAFSA, lowering interest rates, and eliminating hidden loan fees. Also simplifies income-based repayment. Student loan relief: expanding public service loan forgiveness. Senate bill has an appendix recommending eliminating PSLF, not actually in the bill. Income-based loan repayment to lower loan rates. Loan forgiveness after 15 years (maybe 10?) still have tax based problem of yesterday. Enforces crackdowns on for-profit institutions, especially on recruitment of GI benefit recipients. Accreditation: includes new and specific provisions for new colleges and universities, and makes them happen more regularly from 10 years to every 8. Blocks federal funding to schools who spend too much (percentage) on marketing and lobbying.

Pitt, Stephanie: The GI benefits, talking about predatory recruiting?

Pol: Yes, the for-profits recruit and then eventually don’t get degrees to GI bill recipients. Campu climate: blocks the new Title IX rules from the Ed. Back to victim-focused system, not accused-focused system proposed by DeVos. New tracking and accountability measures to work with the Clery Act to enforce crime reporting. New sections on types of crimes and sexual and gender based harassment that have to be reported under clery. This is most similar to CAMPUS HATE crimes act. What counts as discriminatory crime. This is very similar to what we supported last year. Pell grant access: expanded similarly to senate bill. House bill talks specifically for certification for in-demand technical programs - such as short term nursing programs. Also allows use of Pell Grants for technical schools.
UCSD: There’s a bill for carrying over of pell grants to post-bacs?
Pol: I do not know. There is not one in the senate version, for sure.
Similarities of house and Senate: Simplification of FAFSA, Senate is more specific and functionally describes. House is more general. Pell grant access is more specific in House for programs eligible and recommended. Both include provisions for standardizing income-based repayment. Senate has accountability. Senate stabilizes funding for HBCUs, House increases funding for HBCUs.
Differences: Senate is not a reauthorization. It is only FAFSA and Pell Grants.
Ellyn: It is a reauthorization of a part of HEA. Obstacles in the Senate preclude this. He is looking at doing it piecemeal, so he doesn’t have to do a comprehensive bill.
Pol: It is not a FULL reauthorization, I should say. House version is full reauthorization, including title ix, accreditation, and enforcement of for-profit.
Pitt: Neither address first-gen students?
Pol: Not specifically, no.
UCSD: It seems like House bill does have the provisions for carry-over of pell grant to post-bac student.
Pol: Thanks. Now, I don’t want to get into the weeds, but here are a few specific policy differences. House version offers specific scheduled funding for HBCUs and MSIs, offer more funding on a permanent basis and includes TCUs. Senate is very specific on new FAFSA and what the form and it’s questions would include. House version specifically implements income-based repayment, senate does not, only includes enforcement methods for not paying loans back on time.
Questions and comments?
UT Austin: Because HEA hasn’t been reauthorized, what’s at stake if it’s not reauthorized until late 2020?
Ellyn: Nothing. Provisions stay in place until it’s reauthorized. It took 10 years last time.
Pol: Nothing will happen to the current HEA, but tuition restrictions are very important.
Increasing funding available through FAFSA and Pell grants. As tuition rises, state and federal partnerships can help. Yes, nothing happens, but a lot will improve if it does.
UT Austin: Nothing happens, as in the status quo remains.
Pol: Title IX is a big part of it, for House version to block new rules. If house version passes as is (unlikely) that would streamline process of review for higher education.
MSU: Does any of this specifically address graduate education, with the exception of graduate use of fafsfa and pell grants.
Arizona: I’ve heard Sen Alexander is opposed to graduate students?
Pol: Yeah, something like that. Now, pell grants can be exhausted, so continuing past undergraduate years. But yes, both versions default to undergraduate education.
MSU: That hasn’t passed?
Pol: None of this has passed. That is a part of the house bill.
UT Austin (Christina): I am baffled by Sen Alexander’s office is passing theirs piecemeal. I feel like there’s childish reasons I’m missing.
Pol: Yes, Patty Murray’s office if vehemently opposed to Title IX. That’s the sticking point. Sen Alexander’s office is supportive. That’s why they’re at a standstill.
Chair: This is a lot of great material to use in our white papers to push policy to benefit us.
Pol: I am going to push for HEA reauthorization to be the major focus of student finance and gender equity groups. This is something we can really have an impact on to include graduate student focus. Many of these provisions do not mention grad education as a part of higher education at all.
Ellyn: They don’t mention undergrad as a part of higher ed at all.
Pol: In conversations on the hill, the thought is of undergraduate students. Many see graduate school as elitist or unnecessary, or that we’ll be getting highly paid after we graduate.
Ellyn: One reason it’s not on their radar is because their constituents are not talking about it. They need to have their constituents make it a priority. The people who elect them have to say that graduate education is important for their district and their state. That’s why K-12 is important, because those parents are the most vocal. You need to start getting traction in your communities, or it’s not going to gain traction for people who get elected every 2 years.

Arizona: That is a big role of ours, to let them know from their constituents need these degrees. Showing statistic of what jobs require advanced degrees. It’s not that we ‘want’ to do it, it’s that we ‘have’ to do it for certain jobs.

Chair: We can do letter writing campaigns, or templates, to get attention outside day on the hill for advocacy.

Pol: This is an advocacy problem, for inclusion, but also for awareness problem. People don’t know that graduate students are concerned.

UNC: Our federal affairs team felt confident that LAmar would put forward a full HEA as part of his legacy.

Ellyn: It will get done in this session of Congress. It may not be until November, but it will happen. Lamar is one of the only who has been governor, president of a university, all of those credentials. Industry are recruiting graduate students. Think of a strategy to integrate with industry in community to make communities successful. Need that mass of public expectation to make graduate education important.

Santa Cruz: In California we have to deal with obstacle of engagement, that lawmakers know constituents are not sympathetic to grad students. Still come across as a privileged, subgroup, afterthought. It’s ‘indulgent’ to get more money for graduate education. Maybe graduate students need PR management.

Pol: There is very much a perception of that, that it’s not necessary. That you can get whatever job you want right out of undergraduate.

Pitt: I’d like to propose a dissenting opinion for Ellyn. I’ve heard a joke that the bachelor’s degree is what a highschool degree was 30 years ago. I think there is an understanding that graduate school is more and more necessary.

Ellyn: That’s a message that industry needs to be saying, that the world requires advanced degrees for those skills. I don’t think they see it as unnecessary, but that they see it as an option, that you chose that expense. I know when we go in and talk about paying. The message is exactly what you say, that it’s going to incur a lot of debt, but they’ll make salaries to pay it back. You have to change the dialogue. Industry plays a big role. In california, silicon valley needs to step up. Contributions to candidates who have that graduate focus. Need to get chamber of commerce to have graduate education be a priority, of what community would be like without graduate educated workers and skills. Try to focus on your state’s main industry. It would be great if someone who go to DC for Chamber of commerce to show graduate education is important and part of the program. If we don’t change perception, this won’t work.

Pol: In the interest of time, this will be a great discussion for advocacy panel. Next section is immigration response. The bill is HR 1044, included on our white paper last year as something we opposed because of restrictions on immigrants from india and china. It passed house with overwhelming support. It is expected to pass senate with larger support. We have had SAGE members ask to continue to write against this bill. We have not done this so far because the bill is not controversial, which is surprising, and it’s a bipartisan supported bill. It doesn’t seem good for SAGE to oppose such a supported bill. Second, this bill is not about graduate students or anything about education visas. It also is not entirely consistent with the mission of SAGE for us to stake our claim on. We have a couple of options - write a letter of opposition, do nothing, or write a letter like NAGPS that had an amendment request. HOWEVER, there is now Keep STEM Talent Act, S 1744 - staple a green card your diploma act. Links permanent citizenship status to some STEM higher education degrees attained at US institutions. This is what we’ve been waiting for. Rep Foster’s office is planning on introducing this bill in the house, and she
asked for SAGE’s opinion two weeks ago. I think we should support it. This is very much in line with the conversations we’ve been having about high-skilled immigration. It is specific to graduate students, does not include country caps, allows students with master’s or PhD to stay in US with permanent residency.

UCSD: It was introduced.

UNC: What are the visas being impacted in the high skilled immigration status (HR 1044)
Pol: It’s the Eb visas - one is stem specific, one is high skilled (various terms) and one is for finance. It is and is not stem specific.

Pitt (Yashar): High skilled green card can be applied for from anywhere. They say that when they remove caps-
Pol: 1044 Places caps on India and China.

UMich: It increases caps for all other countries.
Pitt: What I’m hearing is that it is preventing them from coming to the country?
Pol: It is preventing one country from getting 85% of any one type of visa. Less than 100 visas per year.
Pitt (Steph): one issue we are having is doctoral students not able to come back to finish their degrees.
Pol: That is not a part of either of these bills. I don't know if that’s a larger conversation for an immigration working group.

Internal: that’s an executive order?

Irvine: It wasn’t executive order. Students not allowing reentry was about reasons not being explained. The only alternative route was that they had to reapply for the visa process. We have had some universities working through this. There’s still not an explanation for why they were denied.

Pol: These two bills are unrelated. Very separate.

Irvine: If they are separate, they won’t be lumped together for a bill.

Pol: The reason I brought them up, the Keep Stem talent act, was because NAGPS wrote a letter of support for 1044 with an amendment specific to graduate students that was unrelated to the content of that bill. But that amendment they proposed is pretty much the keep STEM Talent act, to keep graduate students with research should be allowed to stay here post graduation.

MSU: I’d like to make a motion to support Keep STEM Talent.

Michigan seconds.
Pitt: Oppose because of India and China caps -

MSU: Separate from that bill, that’s 1044.

Pol: 1044 is about the caps. Keep STEM Talent Act is separate.

Arizona: Oppose. I don’t think we have enough time to look at it.

Pol: This was sent out on a previous coalition call.

UT Austin: I would love to see if we can table until after working group discussion.

Pol: We have been delaying the vote on 1044 for months, so we should at least decide our position there. It will likely pass in a couple of weeks.

UT Austin: I’m talking about 1744.

MSU: My motion is still open. I will rescind my motion.

UC SD motions to take no action on 1044, second by Arizona.

Michigan: 85% is a pretty high number, so how much has this actually impacted?

Pol: Not much. That’s why it’s not controversial. We will take a roll call vote.

Roll Call vote:

MSU - Aye
Rutgers - Aye
Texas A&M - Aye
Arizona - Aye
UC Davis - Aye
UC Irvine - Abs
UC San Diego - Aye
U Maryland - Aye
U Michigan - Aye
UNC - Aye
U Pittsburgh - Abs
UT Austin - Aye
U Washington - Aye
11 ayes, 2 abstentions. Motion passes. We will take no action on HR 1044/SB386 in the Senate.

Pol: Supporting or opposing STEM Talent act does not require a letter of support, we just have an email to respond to.
MSU: Should I call for a yes or not?
Arizona: I would still like more time.
Ellyn: If it helps, AAU mostly does support these kinds of bills. I do not know exactly how similar this bill is. Sen Cornyn, Sen McCaul of Texas were interested. A lot of the talk around immigration is toxic, so we have to be very careful with language. STEM Jobs talent act of 2012. ‘Any university’ is too broad, because any school could give the degree. It has to be an accredited university. Congress would repeal if green cards go to unqualified information. We have to consider the end-goal.
Pol: I will recommend we vote on this on November coalition call.
(general agreement)
Pitt: Can we respond that we’re researching our response?
Pol: Yes, I will also respond that we have no opinion on 1044.
IA: ‘Institute of higher education’ is defined as same accreditation as HEA does. Cites it.
Ellyn: You’re going to have offices emailing you to get letters, in order to get leverage. Be careful what you lend your name to.
Arizona: I recommend against roll call votes, they psychologically induce conformity. A vote at which everyone at once is better.
Pol: There are provisions in our constitution about when we need roll call vote.

10 min break

11:00-12:00 - How to be an Effective Advocate Panel - with a focus on usage of data
Arizona, Dylan: Welcome! We are still waiting on one panelist but we will start now and introduce her when she gets here. First is Dr. Emily Earl, who earned advanced degrees in ed psych where she focused on research methods and play. Currently serves as Second panelist Tom Rhodes is director of Graduate Research at Arizona. Senior Institutional Researcher for more than two decades. Leads internal study, working with state legislature. Please join me in welcoming them both.
Our third is Michelle Sogge is the Senior Coordinator for Assessment at the Thrive Center for minority and first gen students. Past work includes assessment and data collection at Arizona food bank.
Dylan: What are your surface level thoughts on advocacy?
Dr. Earl: Get your data in order. No one cares about your feelings. Need to have information to back up what you are saying. Numbers speak loud.
Dr. Sogge: Understand your topic and how it relates to your audience.
Rhodes: I come from a quantitative background, and that's important, but a compelling story trumps data every time. You can have sophisticated models and great data, but a story is the key to moving the ball forward.

Arizona: We had a wide variety of questions in the initial questionnaire. We invite you to ask questions now.

UNC (Yael): I do a lot of advocacy on behalf of science policy and use my research to inform this advocacy, but I know it is important to make that story. I struggle to make that story when it is not personal. How do you overcome this?

Rhodes: You have to understand your audience. Different frames will resonate differently with different audiences. You might want to talk about social justice and equity. To a lot of people, that's not an argument. It has to be efficiency, and the costs of doing it or not doing it. Craft your argument.

Who are you focusing your issues towards?

UNC: Health - Focus on tobacco companies. Other researchers use their family histories regarding e-cigs. Stories are relatable. How do you relate your research?

Dr. Sogge: Sounds like you are dealing with legislators. How does your specific topic relate to the bottom line? Suggest how they relate to their bottom line and their constituents and get them re-elected

Look towards grant funding. Use that information and create your own spin on them and drive your own points.

UT (Sam): Environmental Engineering focus -- Concern on issues that lead to rejection of facts. Understand the framing of the topic but when there is a rejection of facts, how do you shape your argument?

Dr. Sogge: It is a hard question, in my work within social justice, I have to tell a story and avoid words that they will find hard to accept. Example: Climate change -- find clever ways to say your overall messaging without those words, 'extreme weather'.

Dr. Earl: You can be right or you can win. I work a lot with refugees, community members talk about how they can get involved. Strive to find a common ground and spin your messaging to get some buy-in.

Rhodes: Do you tell people the truth or what they want to hear. Effective lobbying is telling them what they want to hear. Legislators are used to getting criticism, complaints multiple times a day. Find something about that person what they have done that you appreciate and tell them. See how that changes the dynamic and pivot to what you want to say. Try to share the information that connects with them.

Rutgers: Many people who you want to advocate to but have no record where their priorities are. How do you reach these individuals?

Rhodes: Whatever you are advocating for, if an ask is tied to some allocation or budget resource, that is a hard sell. If you have a position that doesn’t involve some budget neutral, it is important to develop networks across campus. That allows you to have a better understanding of their perspective.

Dr. Earl: Collaborating with other folks at your level can amass more information. You will probably have to try many different things to understand what their priorities are. Take risks which is hard.

Dr. Sogge: As graduate students, we have an incredible power with our voice. Because we are graduate students, we can reach out to different demographics (ex: im in business but can connect with environmental science). It’s really about networking.

UM: How important is it to include a representative numbers that you are advocating for? Including them, basically

Dr. Sogge: Yes, that's important to include numbers and types of groups. There’s a lot of information about methodology nowadays. The groups gathered the knowledge are a backbone of designing a survey.
Dr. Earl: Co-collaborators to design the appropriate questions are essential. I study refugees, but I am not a refugee. So I have to understand where the information needs to go in order to ask the questions. It needs to start from ‘I know nothing’ and going from there.

UW: We have had trouble with state advocacy of being asked for data that doesn’t exist, and won’t be moved without data. How do we ask for things without good data support.

Rhodes: I think that’s a real challenge for story-telling jobs. We have areas that we can’t get hard-quantitative data, but that won’t stop you from telling a story. We all love our grandmothers. Are you going to get our a spreadsheet and make a model? It’s more about the persuasive story.

Dr. Sogge: What other data can you get? Photos? Specific story from a real person? Video, recording. Those can be effective. IS something similar going on in another place that does have data? Other counties, other data. Peers for Tucson or University of Arizona.

Dr. Earl: You can also make it. You can make your own data from national figures, but you can’t wait and you have to go after your own data. It’s fun. Then you can publish on it.

Dr. Sogge: Sometimes you can you proxies. Questions you ask where you can’t measure it. How do you measure happiness on someone in university? Campus climate surveys can get towards it. It’s somewhere, you’re getting there.

Arizona, Dylan: When we’re thinking about advocacy and persuading people, for facts with percentages and statistics. You have been talking about what surrounds those numbers, how you interpret them, how you make that hook. My questions - how much do you really need that quantitative data.

Dr. Earl: It’s really important we have that data - I’ve been trained to think that. But I love qualitative more, it’s about that balance. And knowing your audience. If they’re the numbers people who want long-term grant goals, you need the numbers. If they’re feel-good, they just need a statistic and they’re there for the people.

Dr. Sogge: Rarely do I give numbers without qualitative data behind it. Numbers are great, when they’re used well they’re powerful, but they need context. With too many numbers, they get mixed up and lose power.

Rhodes: I want to tell a brief story about what’s important to me. Considering another groups perspective. I was brought in to lead a survey on compensation. The data was so compelling and so clear. We were 50th in the nation. We put together this presentation for the state legislature. I couldn’t imagine a presentation going any better. Chair of the committee, said ‘that was the best, we’re not getting complaints about low service. Next item on the agenda.’ So someone might see the world from a different perspective from you.

Arizona (Torbet): Presenting this information to legislators who don’t have statistics of information backgrounds. What are strategies to communicate this rigorous analysis?

Dr. Sogge: I tend to simply, regression of back end data analysis. Before I even do it, I think of how I’m going to explain this to someone for whom it’s not a priority. I think of graphics, picto-chart. I simplify my terminology be ~50%. I am precise with language so I can explain further, but visuals are the way.

Dr. Earl: KISS it, Keep It Simple Stupid. You have to use the most simplistic way of displaying information, since most people don’t have statistics training. Knowing your audience is key, and make it as simple as possible. Drive home your point, but don’t lose your audience in the data.

Rhodes: If you are writing a journal article, then pack in as much information as possible, but for the lay person, statistical details are not as important. You will just lose them. One of the teachers I worked with in quantitative methods, and he suggested the “grandma rule;” if you can explain it to your grandma, you’re on the right track.

UW: How do you advocate for issues that only affect a minority of students?

Rhodes: Ask yourself: why should they care? And develop your argument around that. Sogge: Again, know your audience.
Earl: We can also offer projections for the future, and encourage your audience to be a leader. Logic can also help. Like, women of this age tend to have children. That’s logic.

Sogge: We need to think about the identities people have within the identities people are looking at. If you can find groups represented within the groups for which your are advocating, you can build coalitions.

MSU: Regarding marginalized populations within the university, I have a lot of powerful negative stories. How do I ethically utilize these stories? Even without revealing the person, details might slip through the narrative. Particularly when I’m not a member of that group. Have you run into these issues? How do you as a leader advocate while protecting your constituency, and without appropriating their experiences?

Earl: Research ethics helps a lot, especially when working with children. When I do research with underrepresented groups, consent (and repeated consent) is key. Creating a community while doing the research is important so that you can fact check, collaborate, and receive consent.

Sogge: This pops up a lot in my job. WE serve a lot of students of color and collect data within that community. We do not share that data publically, but turn it over to them for their use. It is difficult if the community does not feel comfortable for self-advocacy, but consent is key. I recommend reading Decolonizing Methodologies. It is very helpful and famous.

Arizona: This question is specific to Tom Rhodes. We all have campus partners to use. We can afford an institute director at UofA, but even if you can’t, we have worked with the university on a lot. What has made student/admin partnerships work in terms of information sharing and using data?

Rhodes: I know a lot of things that didn’t work. A collaborative consulting relationship is critical, because different people will know certain aspects of the institution better than others. Have a sense of the advocacy history of your group at your university. You will make mistakes, but it is better if those are original rather than repeated. Be realistic and focused. Don’t just show up with a list of data items. Ask your expert consultants on the most effective means of accomplishing your goals.

Sogge: I come from a privileged position of always having a big title behind me. Without that, I have found it effective to be clear about what I want, and to build trust within your institution. Reciprocity builds this trust. There is a lot of politics going on in the country and within universities. Some of the frustrations I had as a student have changed with perspective of coming into an administrative role, and seeing how regulations preclude doing things the way students want to do them.

Earl: Trust is the key to getting anywhere. As grad students, we generally have power that we do not harness. We have the powerful to be teachable, which forces the admin into a mentor role and guiding us towards our goal.

UCSD: A lot of advocacy now takes place on social media. Whether that’s Twitter or the weird TikTok stuff. Do you have effective strategies for engaging in advocacy on social media? How much is too much?

Rhodes: Pass. My twitter has been suspended seven times.

Everyone: WHY?!

Rhodes: It is not an affiliated university account.

Sogge: Social media is useful for two purposes. The first is that you want an answer, which is difficult because often your target’s staff is running their Twitter. The second is to raise awareness, which is much more effective. Pictures help with that.

Earl: I will also pass due to lack of expertise on social media. If you are representing the university, be sure that your social media will not get the institution into trouble. Focus on information over powerful rhetoric or complaints. Advocacy sometimes mean advocating for things you do not believe in. you want to look professional.
VC: Regarding intermediaries for communication. We are often talking to staffers for legislators rather than directly to our target. Sometimes it is better to start with auxiliaries, especially within our institutions. But how do we ensure that our message is passed up the chain of command?
Rhodes: Trust is key. This is a challenge because you are in a sort of transactional situation. I am amazed at how many advocates come off as adversaries rather than partners. Engage with that person in terms of forming a partnership, rather than being combative. That is how trust develops. Once you lay the foundation, you can transmit the policy information.
Sogge: I also use visuals. I tend to use a one-page informational sheet. It needs to be simple and directed. This ensures that the message is digested. Sometimes a simple email can get you into the door. People are eager to collaborate and talk. If you don't have people like that in your university, start looking for research papers and contact the authors (go through the faculty rather than the admin).
Earl: Sometimes the school newspaper can also be an avenue into the admin. Elevator pitches need to be prepared. With admin, you have to get in good with their assistant, because they have all the power over meetings with them. I have even volunteered to help with office tasks to build a rapport with the assistants. Encouraging reciprocity can encourage participation.
Arizona: That concludes our panel. Please help thank the panel.

LUNCH BREAK: 1 hour

CPAGE 1:30PM
Council for the Promotion of American Graduate Education, Mark Derdinksy
CPAGE: I am here to speak on CPAGE. Who has heard of CPAGE? (hands raised). I'll about who am I. Bachelor’s at UC Berkeley. Went on to do graduate research at UC San Diego on particle physics and heavily involved in student advocacy. I was involved with SAGE for several years. I am also working for a data company and I am the policy advisor for CPAGE. I am showing here a public perception graph of those who think higher education is going in the right (38%)/wrong (61%) direction. It's in scope for organizations like ours to try and talk about the importance of graduate education, particularly economics as alumni. You, as students, are uniquely positioned to share first hand perspective. You are strategically advantaged to be the students experiencing it now.
CPAGE is a 501(c)3 non profit composed of current and former graduate students seeking to support advocacy. We used to be SAGEers. Our 6 member board are former SAGEners who have or are finishing their graduate degrees. This is all new, but we are fully staffed from a board of directors point of view. Still don't have a general counsel, and don't have funding for one.
Anyone want to work pro bono?
Relationship between SAGE and CPAGE: A lot of initiatives to work together, such as the travel grant program earlier. This is outlined in a Memorandum of Understanding, MOU. The MOU should be renewed before June 2020. We have already been discussing what updates need to be made with the SAGE executive board. We're updating procedures and language, but functionally there won't be changed between the organization. I'm not going into the full text right now, but I would be happy to answer questions. I can share that with you.
Chair: It’s on the drive as well.
CPAGE: In short, it supports the efforts of SAGE in a fiduciary capacity and an advisory capacity without any decision or impacts on the actions of SAGE. CPAGE will continue to support graduate students as SAGE board comes and goes. There was a financial transaction early on, but not that is complete. Current financial actions are described in boilerplate in the MOU. Any questions? (none). I'll talk a bit more about our revenue models. Currently, revenue sources if membership dues at $50/yr collected semi-annually, collected by the treasurer and membership officer. Addition revenue collected through ad hoc contributions via small donations, and an Amazon smile account. That gets 0.5% of sales to a charity of choice, and
CPAGE is an option. Plans for the future are membership growth and recruitment. 5 years includes donor solicitation and grant application. As folks age out SAGE, we really want to keep in touch, keep you a part of the community.

Arizona (Marie): Airline miles?

CPAGE: One of the disbursement programs is a registered traveler program. When you buy airline tickets with a registered traveler code for our org, then our org can build up those miles and distribute them back. There’s an FAQ on how to use it.

Santa Cruz: Membership growth and recruitment - what do the alumni have access to? Donors and such from the top down?

CPAGE: Great question. There is not a centralized pipeline for automatically scooping up lists for a recruitment tool. We would have to have a conversation about privacy, legal risks to ensure we are meeting and disclosing. That is something we are working up as we build up our list serves. Right now all membership is through direct contact as established by previous relationships, or people coming back to us. You can opt in to listserv today to keep in mind.

Disbursement programs: Few things so far: offset of operation costs (website housing), reimbursement for legislation action operations (printing, hotel room reservation), grant applications for travel. Grant program is a pilot program to see how it goes as CPAGE builds up infrastructure. Thank you for applying and giving back feedback. Before we scale up, we need to build up. Roadmap for this year does include more grant money.

General Event fund: Open now! It will be open to all GSA for advocacy and education policy event funding. Applications within the slides. DOH Travel Grants, opening February 2020 with a similar application process to Fall Summit.

VC: Thrilled for a general event fund. We can't use our budget for advocacy. How small is too small?

CPAGE: There's no limit or cap at the moment. We want to hear from you about what you need.

Recent Updates: collecting feedback on first travel grants, Amazon Smile launch, CPAGE-SAGE MOU Revisions are complete and ready for ratification, website in development, currently adding about 2 members/month - looking to accelerate growth. Internal structural development is good for now, now we are developing public outreach to grow membership. We are doing that through growing our social media presence, pushing our Purpose Statement, completing a support form, and growing our membership base. Thanks for your time. Questions?

Arizona: Are you aiming for alumni and MOUs with other ad to vocacy institutions?

CPAGE: Not at the moment, or within the 5-10 year plan. Decision-making is primarily in the hands of the student advocacy groups. MOU stresses a unified message in case of joint statements.

UNC: Who else do you represent?

CPAGE: None at the moment, but we are looking at other state/federal level advocacy groups. Depends a lot on legal status of organizations. We are just looking to support financially and strategically.

Working group topic selection:

Pol: Our proceedings may not follow the schedule exactly.

Pol: Introduction to Day on the Hill. It is not scheduled yet, but first few weeks of March. Actually a four day program. First two days allows us to finalize our white papers (last minute copy edits, etc.). WE also do a lot of internal discussions and SAGE best practices. Day two is practice with lobbying. We showcase scenarios good & bad, bring in experts, choose topics, and coordinate with your advocacy groups. Group size is around 4, made up of reps from different institutions.
Day 2 lets you guys get to know each other, practice speeches. Day 3 will (hopefully) be completely packed with meetings. Almost none of us will be meeting with actual reps, but with staff. Meetings are short: 15 minutes. You want to get as much across as possible, but also want to provide a strong, succinct message. Needs to be very rehearsed. Day 4 is State Day, in which each institution goes to lobby their own state reps. State Day is NOT organized by SAGE, but rather the responsibility of your own institution. Many of you have legislative liaisons in D.C. for your resource.

Pol: A few other things we do: we practice lobbying (a lot), bring in experts, do internal research/discussions on best practices. We also conduct Eboard elections. We also give out the Legislator of the Year Award. A large group of SAGE members will go to present the plaque.

C: We can also vote on bylaw changes there, or any other changes.

Pol: Will likely update MOU.

VC: And we can vote on invitations for new membership.

UCSD: Do we also decide on next Fall Summit location?

Pol: Yes. You can be prepared to pitch your school as host.

UT Austin: Comfortable shoes are important.

Pol: Yes.

Pol. Working Groups: We have topic-centered groups on relevant topics for advocacy. The final product for these groups is often a white paper. These are useful to bring into congressional meetings. They contain facts, recommendations for legislation or voting. Presents data for advocacy. Not required; could also write letters in support of legislation. Meetings are only 15 minutes, so it is next to impossible to present more than 3. So as we begin to discuss working groups, remember that if we make more than 5, most will not be published in our packet that we will present at DOH. Joining a group is not mandatory, but HIGHLY recommended. These groups drive our advocacy. Our bylaws state that we can only push what has been developed in a working group. You are not allowed to go off script, so being involved can ensure that you are advocating for something you are passionate for, and be involved in the decision-making about which bills to support, which data to present, etc.

Pol: Last year we had five groups that produced white papers. Only three had pieces of legislation tied to them. This is not essential, but our federal ask is extremely important. Without legislation to support/oppose, the ask becomes extremely difficult. Think about topics that are not just important, but have a direct tie/ask of the federal gov’t.

Pol: Possible topics: HEA Reauthorization is THE topic. Two competing bills came out this week and will be a focus of discussion. I recommend that this becomes two working groups: one focused on finance, and the other on campus climate. Other suggested topics, based on your responses to the questionnaire: student loan debt/tuition affordability (10/10 responses), immigration visa issues (8/10), Sexual Misconduct & Title IX (6/10), Research Funding (2/10), Labor conditions (2/10), Student eligibility for gov’t programs (2/10).

Pol: Decision making time. REMEMBER: We cannot take more than 5 white papers. We can have more than 5 working groups, but that opens the possibility that someone will not have their paper presented. Also, think about what can be presented on a federal level. We should frame our discussion around concrete asks.

C: It would be best if we follow the same framework from last year. Any member institution can propose a topic. After we have a list of topics, we can pull out themes. Afterwards, we’ll break for a fifteen minute caucus before we make final decisions.

Arizona: Maybe some of the themes for best practices could transition into a working group?

Pol: That list was focused on the institutional level. Today we are focused on federal advocacy.

UC DAvis: I would recommend tying in smaller, specific needs into the ump category of student finance.

MSU: Sexual Misconduct is very relevant given DOE guidelines and rulings from the courts, so I think we should definitely focus on that.
VC: What did you mean by connecting research and policy, to whoever wrote that in the questionnaire? That seems broad, and we should remove it from the list.
Arizona moves to remove, UT Austin seconds.
Motion passes by voice vote.

UT Austin: could federal benefits also fall into student finance?
C: Yes.

UT Austin: I suggest we consider combining sexual misconduct and mental health, leaving Title IX separate, but focusing on resources for students on campuses (maybe call it Student Wellness).
Pol: Similar tack last year.

UT Austin: I’m suggesting we separate Title IX group from sexual misconduct and student wellness.
Arizona: Maybe combining labor conditions with grad experience? Trying to separate Title IX from sexual misconduct doesn’t make sense to me, since they are so intertwined.

UT Austin: Sometimes we lose support resources for people who don’t go through Title IX claims, so lumping in specific asks for sexual misconduct resources with student wellness.
Arizona: There is also other types of trauma (vets, PTSD, etc.), so it seems unnecessary to call out sexual misconduct specifically.

C: The new research coming out should help inform this as well.
UC Davis: Thematically it makes since, but logistically it seems unreasonable.
UNC: I don’t understand why sexual misconduct can’t go into student wellness and be its own paper.
Arizona: What would the ask be for a sexual misconduct paper?
UT Austin: Having a required ratio of counselors who are trained in trauma informed care.

Ellyn: The key focus is: where does this tie in to policy and appropriations. For example, labor policy usually comes from Department of Labor and has no place in legislation. You will get huge pushback from your campus if Congress would impose a specific ration for universities (due to budgetary concerns).

UC Irvine: I think that UT Austin’s suggestion is worth at least looking into. I also don’t think university response should inform our decision making.
Pitt: Is attrition still on the table? Can we roll predatory practices w/ GI Bill into that?
Pol: We can, but that feels like a financial ask.
Pitt: Wherever it fits best.
Pitt: What research funding are we focusing on?
C: That is up to the working groups.

VC: Research funding asks are important since we can target appropriation problems.
Pol: Reminder, we are not deciding the direction of the working groups are yet, but rather focus on umbrella topics. The working groups have a lot of leeway to determine the direction in which they take this.

UC IRvine: UCI moves to remove research funding from the table. MSU seconds.
C: Discussion?

Ellyn: Have you considered how a lack of funding will affect you and your program?
MCU: Will it be relevant in the Spring, though?
Pol: It isn’t bad if the legislation you are working on goes through before DOH. We can regroup and move on to other issues.

Arizona: Increasing research funding is ALWAYS relevant and is an easy sell. It is bipartisan and is a good sell to the constituency.
Motion fails by voice vote.
UMich moves to remove labor conditions since it is not relevant to legislation. Arizona seconds.
C: Discussion?
Rutgers: Clarification: we have talked about expanding our advocacy outside of legislation. Is our working group ONLY targeting Congress?
Pol: If a working group decides to focus on an exec department, their paper will not go to Congress.
Ellyn: We could have one group go to the exec department to advocate.
UNC: Reminder that we do get spread thin on working groups.
C: More groups means more chairs, less members per group.
Pol: Our problems surrounding our immigration advocacy stemmed from how thinly we were stressed.
UMich: Labor/attrition could be wrapped into other working groups.
Arizona: It does overlap with a lot.
UT Austin: Maybe this isn’t the place to do this work.
MCU: A lot of this does have to do with state-level policies and could maybe be better handled among individual institutions.
Motion passes by voice vote. Rutgers abstains.
C: Other additions?
Pol: Hold off removing until after caucus.
MSU: Should student finance be divided up? It seems to large and broad.
C: Historically, the working group has decided.
UCSD moves to close discussion and open caucus. Irvine seconds.
Motion passes by voice vote.
Caucus for 10 minutes.
Resume group discussion for priorities of the institutions.

MSU - sexual misconduct/title IX, Immigration, Research Funding
Rutgers - sexual misconduct/Title IX, Mental health, Immigration, Research Funding
Texas A&M - Sexual misconduct, student finance
Arizona - sexual misconduct (title IX and other discrimination), finance, research funding
UC Davis - student finance, sexual misconduct, immigration
UC Irvine - access to federal benefits
UC San Diego - sexual misconduct (title IX and other discrimination), finance, research funding
U Maryland - student finance, immigration, research funding
U Michigan - sexual misconduct, immigration, research funding, student finance, mental health
UNC - Student finance, Mental health, Sexual misconduct
U Pittsburgh - sexual misconduct, immigration, research funding, student finance, mental health
UT Austin - sexual misconduct, immigration, research funding, student finance, mental health
U Washington - finance, sexual misconduct, research funding

Tally:
Student Finance: ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb = 11
Title IX/Sexual Misconduct: ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb = 11
Immigration: ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb = 7
Research Funding: ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb = 9
Mental Health: ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb = 5
Federal Benefits: ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb ⌂️ indeb = 2

UC Davis moves to roll in benefits into student finance. Irvine seconds.
C: Discussion?
Motion passes by voice vote. UC Davis moves to approve the remaining five as working groups. Irvine seconds. Arizona: Mental health, to me, is a locally driven issue by the institution. I don't know what the federal ask is there. In terms of immigration, we certainly address what comes out, but it's a moving target. I think we would benefit for less groups and more people on those topics. UMich: To address your point, we have a unique perspective on mental health, it's a time to raise awareness. To the second point, because immigration is a moving target, it's necessary to have a group to adapt to bills as it comes out. Example, the STEM talent Act would be one bill that our organization could support. Pol: If there is not a chair elected today, that working group with not exist. Last year we had trouble with chairs and the working groups struggles. There needs to be a champion for each of these issues today. Arizona (Dylan): I think that we need chairs first. The population should drive. Pitt: To address mental health, maybe there's not federal action, but it's something that we need to have in best practices, in internal affairs. Rutgers: I want to mention that we would have more people here if we could afford it, so there are more populations. MSU: We second that. UMich: We have someone who wants to chair mental health, here on phone. Irvine: We do a lot of bill tracking, and there are mental health bills that are very interesting. I am sympathetic to paring it down, but there is stuff on the docket. MSU: Would it be more prudent to consider the Council for Graduate Schools and Sloan foundation - should we wait on recommendations under they've invested the time and money? Chair: We have that network, but we don't know how much data they will release, or how much policy they will push for their agenda only. Arizona: I want to make a suggestion on mental health - is that graduate students are under stressors that can be addressed until Title IX, or Student finance, or graduate funding. UNC (Carlos): I think it's important to consider the near future, and the long-term. Mental health in the senate had a bill supporting studies on mental health, coming from private institutions and other data collectors. We need to start those discussions now. UNC (Chastan): Mental health is always stigmatized, and I don't think congressmen will respond unless we make a statement. Rutgers: If a group finds nothing productive, can they disband? Pol: Yes. Chair: And that's something Abbie will work with folks on. UNC: Mental health can be accentuated by things it's under, but it is it's own struggle. We need to treat it as its own separate entity, separate issue. IA: Talking about mental health also involves it's solutions, which are not covered on something else.

Roll Call vote:
MSU - Yes
Rutgers - Yes
Texas A&M - Yes
Arizona - Nay
UC Davis - Aye
UC Irvine - Aye
UC San Diego - Aye
U Maryland - Aye
U Michigan - Aye
UNC - Aye
U Pittsburgh - Aye
UT Austin - Aye
U Washington - Nay
The Ayes have it, 11 to 2. We will have 5 working groups: Sexual Misconduct, Student Finance, Graduate Funding, Mental Health, Immigration

Short break.

Reconvene.
POI: Duties of the working group chair involve organizing the working group. Coordinate all calls. We recommend monthly, or more often early on when you're developing your plans. That is up to the discretion of the Chair. Chairs all report back to me (Political Director) on what your group is doing and how your group is doing. You are coordinating the research and writing. That can mean doing a chunk of the work, but also pushing the folks to do the work they promised.
Here is the timeline for when we want to get things done. The immediate thing to do is get contact information, figure out how you're going to meet. November is to figure out what you're doing. Logistical things, brainstorming the possibilities for projects and asks. If you have a large group and decide to do multiple projects, what are they? How do you want to differentiate them? It's figuring things out. December need to have an aim: white paper, letter, white paper to the department of labor, some other project with a clear goal. What are you asking for, what legislation you are looking for, what bills you want to track. You should also have a sense of current congressional movement. Hopefully today has been a lot of grounding in that movement, particularly for HEA. January, we should have rough drafts. This is earlier than last year, but the idea to have the background research, the ask, and the legislation tracking. The rest of the time is spent honing those, editing to add or take away depending on what is relevant. We should have, Day on the Hill, solid 5 ish white papers that hopefully need no more than light copyediting.
VC: Our bylaws stress that we vote on white papers BEFORE we get to Day on the Hill. No substantive changes can be made in DC.
VC: Also, the Exec Board is here to help you, working group chairs!!
Pol: You'll never be alone as a member of SAGE.

Sexual misconduct chair:
UT Austin: I, Kathryn Abercrombie, nominate myself.
Arizona: Seconds.
Mich: motions to close
Maryland seconds
Vote, the ayes have it.

Immigration chair:
Pitt Yashar Aucie: I nominate myself.
Irvine: seconds.
UT Austin motions to close
Maryland seconds:
Vote, the ayes have it.

Research Funding:
Internal Affairs nominates Annie Rappaport.
Maryland, Annie: I accept
MSU: second
UC San Diego motion, UT Austin seconds.
The Ayes have it.

**Student Finance:**
Davis, Gwen Chodur, self-nominates and co-chair Davis
Irvine, Eric, seconds.
UT Austin: Christina Baze, I nominate myself. I am open to a co chair...
UMich seconds.

Pol: You can also have Vice Chairs. Can decide that internally to a working group.
Gwen: I am interested in this position holistically, for benefits and student loan debt.
Eric: I am legislative affairs director for irvine. I am most interested in student finances.
VC: Are you considering two white papers? One to dep of labor?
Gwen: We could.
POI: How do you plan to work together as co-chairs?
Gwen: UC’s meet together once a month, so we can divide up work.
Eric: YEah, we have strong relationships.
Dylan: What years are you in your program, how much time will you have?
Eric: 2nd of masters.
Gwen: I am in my 2nd to last year, I am spreading my last year out into two. I’m in a good spot.

UT Austin, Christina Baze: Graduate in May 2021. My interest in this stems from my interest in funding issues. I have a unique perspective on state funding. I am very interested in HEA reauthorization and how that affects state funding. I am interested in have a subcommittee/VC to present a second white paper to department of labor. Possibly to create a template for state distribution, but federal level is more important.
Arizona: I don’t think either vote is negative, but I want to support you. You are a student parent, and I would like that unique stressor to be included in that perspective.
Votes taken by secret ballot.
Co-Chairs are Gwen and Eric

Annie rappaport, Maryland: motions to reopen research funding
Ut Austin seconds.
Vote - ayes have it to reopen.
Irvine moves, UC Diego sconds nominates Rachel Lamb as co-chair.
UCSD close, UW Seconds to close debate

**Mental Health Chair:**
University of Michigan: Nominates Sarah Bork
MSU seconds
UNC: nominates Carlos Patino.
Davis seconds.
Rutgers, Nathaniel Flores: I self-nominate
MSU: seconds
UW motions to close nominates.
UCSD seconds.
UMich: Written statement by Sarah Bork. Her work focuses on mental health, particularly graduate engineering mental health. She is also working on health mind dataset that focuses on graduate and professional students. Her current coursework focuses on US mental health policy. Her professional goals involve being active in the Rackham student government to address student needs. She hopes to increase program and financial support for mental health in graduate students from the administration. Policy and stigma improvements. She co-lead the research working paper last year with Madelyn Percy.

UNC Carlos: I am open to co-chairing.

UNC, Carlos: Mental health has been a big best practices focus for UNC. I think it’s important to put this issue at the forefront of federal funding and awareness of this issue for graduate students. I think our services at UNC are very effective. There are lot of people in the public health department that could contribute from UNC who would be on the working group.

UMich: Have you worked with Sarah

VC: What year are you in your program?

UNC, Carlos: I am in my 5th year, two years to go.

UNC, Chastan: What is your experience in working groups?

Carlos: I worked in the data and espionage group, we did not find an ask and so did not create a white paper. I did participate in Day on the Hill.

Rutgers, Nate Flores: I’m a member of my university’s team working on a strategic vision for mental health. We’re working with a consulting firm on a six year plan. I have made mental health a promotion within our GSA, with 30 people participating. I’m a 6th year PhD and have struggled in my mental health and I know how it can affect people.

Arizona: And your position in student council?

Nate Flores: President.

Pitt: What do you think your federal ask would be?

Nate: I do not know yet. There is more research out there, and I would want to speak to those policy experts.

Pol: We will now have each institution rank the candidates from 1, 2, and 3. Please write legibly.

Pol: Votes are in. The cochairs are Sarah, Michigan, and Nathaniel, from Rutgers.

UT Austin: I would like to reopen nominations

UW seconds.

All in favor: ayes have it.

UT Austin: I nominate Matt from UW to be co-chair.

Arizona seconds.

Pitt motions to close, UNC seconds.

All in favor: Ayes have it.

UNC: Motions to open immigration working chair

UT Austin seconds;

Ayes have it

UNC: motion to nominate Carlos as co-chair

Pitt seconds it.

UNC motions to close.

UT Austin seconds.

All in favor, Ayes have it
Pitt moves to close working group chair discussion
UT Austin seconds
All in favor.

Pol: Now chat with each other to have contact information. I need contact information from all chairs.
Chair: We will have a google form to invite folks to join working groups.

Open Forum:
U Michigan: One of our issues is diversity, equity, and inclusion so that we are accounting for all graduate students on a federal level. We’ve sent some time discussing issues that are not unique to R1 public universities. This is something that we should expand. There is a misalignment between our mission statement and our value statements - one on R1, one on graduate students broadly. We aren’t representing everyone. This isn’t an actionable item today. We feel like there are people out there who are not members of R1 universities who could collaborate on best practices.
Irvine: What is AAU requirement? Point of Order?
VC: Our bylaws state R1 requirement. AAU requirement on the website is a leftover.
UMich: When they classify R1, it's about how much money they get. If you are to advocate, it should be for everything. Classification changes from year to year, so would people get kicked out?
Arizona: We are talking about R1 issues with some specific. They still affect others, but every organization can't do everything. NAGPS addresses and includes everyone. We prefer this.
Arizona, Dylan: R1 is arbitrary. The types of issues are not very different. I don't think what we've done today means advocating separately for different entities. If we wanted to critique the work we've done here as a different from NAGPS, that's something else.
MSU: If you are at an R1, you are at a research focused, scholarly focused program. Other programs have other focus, teaching focus. We chose SAGE, not NAGPS to reactivate with because it's different comparisons. Not saying that's there's different value, but there's different models for how the graduate education is.
UMich, Carolina: There is not one issue here today that doesn't also apply to R2 universities. There are a number of HBCUs and MSIs that are not represented here today. Opening up would be more welcoming, showing what those programs could be. Excluding them comes across as elitist.
UNC: The effectiveness of Advocacy is getting something done, and SAGE is small and focused and succeeded where NAGPS is flopping. They're too broad of a pool.
UC Davis: I agree that there is a disconnect between our mission and our bylaws, and that there's nothing we've done today that doesn't apply to others. UC Davis does both NAGPS and SAGE, and if SAGE was the same, it would be essentially the same.
Rutgers: I don't know the exact numbers of R1. our advocacy power relates to the numbers of our constituency. If we represent a smaller number of people eligible, what is our credibility.
IA: If people are concerned to overlapping too much with NAGPS, we are still public only and NAGPS is public, private, and for-profit.
VC: Our joining process is still invite-only.
UMich: There are 300 R1s, so there's not much of them that we represent
UT Austin: SAGE currently leans on classifying as R1 because these are the graduate students we put in front of legislators, and that's the 'elite' we should put in front. Opening up to R2 is pushing more. There's something we have to consider of playing into the status quo, or of pushing expectations of congresspeople.
UNC: Looking at R2 list, there’s another UC Merced. What do UCs think of that R2 in theirs?
Irvine: Thank you everyone for the work done here today.
Santa Cruz: I’m from Santa Cruz, and we’re R1 but not AAU. We keep hearing to ‘artificially grow our population to keep that R1 status. The pushing is arbitrary and doesn’t matter to our quality of R1. UC Merced is the most diverse. I hear the argument that being specific gives a specific angle, dividing gives more logos on a letter. I do second the comment that 0 things we talk about don’t apply to all schools.

VC: The original history was AAU, R1, that SAGE was the public side representation of the AAU.

Meeting closed at 4:04pm.