Call started:

**Attendance:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Attending</th>
<th>Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Danielle Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td>INACTIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Tam., Nathaniel Flores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Stony Brook</td>
<td>INACTIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Anna David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Berkeley</td>
<td>INACTIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Davis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Gwen Chodur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Irvine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Eric Barraza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Los Angeles</td>
<td>INACTIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-San Diego</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Victor Wang, Quynh Nguyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign</td>
<td>INACTIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland, College Park</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Annie Rappeport, Rachel Lamb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Ashley Melnick, Sarah Bork, Marshall Case, RJ Batas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>INACTIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Manny Hernandez, Karson Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Dana Duncombe, Yashar Aucie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas-Austin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Samantha Fuchs, Kathryn Abercrombie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>INACTIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Abbie Shew, Maggie Dunham Jordahl, Ambrose Zhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in Attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approval of Minutes:**

1. **December Coalition Call**
   a. December Coalition Call minutes can be found [here](https://unc.zoom.us/j/719143743)

C: We are at quorum, so we need to approve our minutes.
Executive Board Reports

1. Chair- Manny Hernandez (chair.sage@gmail.com)
   a. Ad Hoc Membership Committee Work
      C: Really quickly, just for myself. The Ad Hoc Membership committee met on the 19th of December. For those of you not on the Dec coalition call, we went ahead and formed a committee to look at membership, membership requirements. Committee has been doing great work thinking about advocacy, finance, and general data gathering. Meeting again this week. Then getting ready to send data to the coalition.
   b. Day on the Hill Hotel
      C: We are trying to hammer out prices. We are looking at a range of prices, since there's a festival going on that weekend. We’re hoping to get the block reserved within the next day or so, so that everyone can get their hotel reserved as soon as possible. The pricing right now is $269/night, two queen beds per room at the Kimpton Palomar DC. It’s a bit farther from the Capitol than last year, but transportation is very reliable. If you have issues, contact the exec board. Any questions?

2. Vice Chair- Samantha Fuchs (vicechair.sage@gmail.com)
   a. CPAGE Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for 2020-2022
      i. SAGE-CPAGE MOU 2018-2020
      ii. SAGE-CPAGE for review
         VC: Last meeting introduced MOU, good for 2 years. Went through to simplify language. Had original MOU in PDF, and google doc to make comments. There has only been minimal changes. If no concern will be sent to CPAGE by the end of week so they can approve and we can all vote at DoH. This must be done in person.
   b. President’s Call 3 - Mental Health
      VC: Next president’s call on mental health. Will be sending out when-to-meet, for last week of Feb since no other calls scheduled at that time and gives people time to plan ahead. I am not going to get an outside speaker after talking to mental health co-chairs, seeing if they could be on the call to facilitate discussion.
      UCSD: I agree with the idea because having union people come in on last call got in the way of the time we had to discuss best practices.
      VC: I agree and have heard that from many other people.

3. Political Director- Abbie Shew (policy.sage@gmail.com)
   PD: I am in the process of figuring out our SAGE Day meetings. I will be reaching out to people in the next couple of weeks about who wants to meet with reps on State day. The rest of my updates are concerned with LEgislator of the Year and Working groups, which are later.

4. Communications- Ashley Melnick (communications.sage@gmail.com)
   a. New “Conferences” tab on website
      i. http://www.sagecoalition.net/
      Com: I wanted to have a quick place for people to find easily information about conferences. Right now there’s just a date, but as information becomes available, I will be posting to that page regularly.
   b. SAGE Shop-Coming soon!
      Com: We’ve been working with CPAGE to get some apparel out to you guys, available to you guys, that after a few weeks, will be able to purchase. This idea comes from last year, when people wanted t-shirts and things to show off SAGE pride.
      VC: If there’s other items you want the SAGE logo on, you can send us requests. I’m buying stickers.
Chair: And you can change the colors!

5. **Internal Affairs**- Cody Love ([internalaffairs.sage@gmail.com](mailto:internalaffairs.sage@gmail.com))
   a. Internal Research - Student Finances and Benefits Questionnaire

Chair: Cody was not able to join us, but he wanted to let you know that there will be a questionnaire going out next week for student finances information. That will contribute to our collected institutional knowledge available to everyone.

**Old Business**

1. Legislator of the Year Vote
   a. Rep. Scott Peters (D-CA)
   c. Sen. Patty Murray (D-WA)
   d. Rep. Mark Pocan (D-WI)

PD: I would love to vote on this today so that we can schedule to meet and give the award directly to the Legislator, rather than interns. Last year, we gave the award to Bobby Scott, Chair of the House Education committee, who worked on great bills for graduate education. If each of the nominators could shortly describe their folks. Anyone for Scott Peters?

UCSD: Scott Peters - he has been a fantastic rep for meeting with students, particularly graduate students from our campus. Have a great relationship in his office in DC and in the district. Last year he authored HR 1043 - Employer participation in student loans act. Would have allowed employers to contribute to student loans. He’s a fantastic person to work with and listen to. His office has amazing staffers, reach out to us on higher education bills to ask our opinions.

VC: How long has he been in Congress?

UCSD: 2010 or 2012, have to check. 2013.

PD: Would anyone like to speak for Rep Gomez?

UCD, Gwen: I know that my school (Connor) recommended him. He has put forth a bill for SNAP benefits and work requirements - since graduate students research doesn’t count towards the work requirements.

PD: Sen Murray?

UW: She is the ranking Democratic member on the Senator Education committee. She has been working on HEA, and in opposition to Sen Lamar Alexander’s conservative versions of HEA. She is trying to make it inclusive of all areas, not piecemeal. She is widely regarded in the senate. She has continuously voted for graduate and professional students.

VC: She has historically talked about imbalance in the Senate. Also strongly counters things that have been detrimental like the Prosper Act coming out of the House last year, Senator Alexander already agreed wouldn’t be proper bill because against principle. She has been successful at getting work done.

UCD, Gwen: My nominee. He has a very progressive platform, sponsored student loan refinancing, sponsor HR 2747, WORK act, National Poverty Center Authorization Act, Respect Student Workers acts, many other. His work directly speaks to graduate student worker experience. Very fond of his principles and platforms.

VC: How long in office?

UCD: Voted in in 2012. Had a great meeting with his office last year and it was great.

PD: Not taking any more nominations, only a vote. We will take a roll call vote.

Michigan State: Mark Pocan

Rutgers: Sen Murray

A&M: Mark Pocan

UC Davis: Pocan

Irvine: Gomez

San Diego: Peters
Maryland: Pocan
Michigan: Peters
UNC: Peters
Pitt: Sen Murray
UT: Murray
UW: Murray
Peters: 4, Pocan: 5, Murray: 4, 1 Gomez
PD: Can we do a second?
Irvine: Peters
PD: Now Peters or Pocan. Roll Call Vote
Michigan: Pocan
Rutgers: Peters
A&M: Pocan
Davis: Pocan
Irvine: Peters
San Diego: Peters
Maryland: Pocan
Michigan: Peters
UNC: Peters
Pitt: Pocan
Austin: Pocan
UW: Pocan
Peters: 5, Pocan: 7
PD: Congratulations to Rep Pocan and all that voted for him.
VC: Remember there’s always next year and a longer congressional record.
UMich, Sarah: Can we do two?
C: We just do one.
UT: Is it financial, or just status quo?
C: It’s not fully financial.
VC: It’s THE legislator of the year, we dilute its power if there are multiple people.
C: But nothing in the bylaws states that we have to stick with one.
PD: Financially, we get them a trophy/plaque, but it’s not a huge investment.
UT: I don’t have strong feelings, but it is a very close vote. If there’s someone with strong
feelings, that would be for them.
UMich, Sarah: I think it would be great to do two.
C: If the coalition felt strong enough that they want to vote on giving two awards, that’s the
coalition’s choice. Nothing in the bylaws about it.
UCSD: I would motion to vote on giving two.
VC: Need a second.
UCD: Seconds.
PD: All in favor: (ayes) (3 nays)
C: Let’s do a quick roll call vote
Michigan State: Nay
Rutgers: Nay
A&M: Nay
UCD: Aye
Irvine: Aye
UCSD: Aye
Maryland: Nay
Mich: Aye
UNC: Aye
Pitt: Aye
Austin: Aye
UW: Nay
Ayes 7, Nay 5
C: The ayes have it. We will have two legislators of the year award. Just a quick confirmation, all in favor of Peters having the second award?
Ayes all around.
VC: We will have to figure out how to phrase that.
C: Which we will do on our end.

New Business
1. Working Group Advocacy Goals/White Paper Drafts
PD: Here are the initial drafts. Very early, nothing final. Focusing on the general asks for what we want on Day on the Hill and how they will phrase each ask. Keep it to 3 minutes for a short summary with time for questions.
a. Immigration
Pitt, Yashar (and Carlos, out of country): If you have questions, you can always ask. I will be brief. We still have lots of work to do. The format of the paper is not very different compared to last year. The background section is very similar, with showing international people in the country are important and impacting our country. We will have a figure showing international people and students are growing the economy/possibly another figure made shows graduate completion rate in US vs. China and the jobs needed to be filled. Then, we have two sections - Visa reform (Attracting and Retaining the best thinkers for the economy) - H1B visas being time consuming, delayed, backlogged. Saying should support S2091 to reduce backlog. Also support S1744 and HR4623, the Keep STEM talent act. Possible third issue on OPT issues for visa, still requires research. Dreamers is second second, similar to last year.
VC: Devil’s Advocate time...Why do we need the dreamers section? Are there a lot of dreamers seeking grad degrees? Are there other groups to include that we can make this more targeted and strongest possible case.
Pitt, Dana: DACA is sitting in the Supreme court, seeing how that may affect our situation in the future. More broadly, the Dream Act and the other bill we support (HR 1298) is a tuition equity bill, that remains very important. It’s more broadly for undocumented students.
VC: Something you may consider instead of naming it dreamers, bec of lingo and polarizing, you can use _____ or _____ depending on the politician. Try to avoid phrases that freak people out. We can talk about ‘equality of opportunities’ issue.
PD: And we can work on phrasing in the future. Trying to move us along.
Pitt, Yashar: And the document is open to everyone for comments.
Pitt Dana: and we’re still in limbo with the Supreme Court case.
PD: Last year, intro only had men in tech, so if you can find other options, that would be beneficial.
b. Research Funding
PD: Annie and Rachel?
Maryland, Annie: Yes, we’re both here. Building on the first group, we have all of our documents online. We also have a call to action - there are some excel sheets that we would like to bring human stories to - success and failure. Something that’s informational, but human for bringing to meetings. We had a great first meeting. We have 5 institutions represented. We have two main points of our focus areas: diversity, inclusion, and equity in research funding. Showing a lot of research funding is happening, but where it happens varies. Looking across disciplines, outside of STEM, as well as international. Then our second issue is highlighting what is cut. There are fellowships being cut from certain fields. We want to look at what legislation will be under consideration. Those are the main takeaways.
Maryland, Rachel: At the end of this last calendar year, there has been some view for higher ed and sci looking at appropriations. Many of the major agencies and regranters are getting an increase. We previously asked for 5% in white papers, and most of them have reached that 5%. So two big bullet points are ‘hey this is great’ for increasing the budget. Focusing on the pipeline - does agency funding actually reach students, and second is ‘who is eligible’ across disciplines. Two points are a bit more specific than previous asks, but that’s because we are seeing increases.

VC: As long as we aren’t taking for granted the increase because only reason we had the first bullet point be match Higher Education Price Index inflation, is because it always goes up. If it could still be a component in background saying how funding has gone down in the past few years.

Maryland, Rachel: Yes.

C: So those excel charts - you want examples focusing from those two main bullet points?

Maryland, Annie: The excel sheets are more to have human stories. We don’t have a large number of people, so we want some successes and struggles. Supportive networks.

Maryland, Rachel: One of our members has the fellowships disappearing issues. Those stories.

c. Mental Health

PD: Nate and Sarah.

Mich, Sarah: We’ve had 4 meetings, which is great. Combining interests and putting things together. Draft is rough, needs citations. Intro - showing mental health problems, needs not being met currently, and it matters in the workforce - so that’s what the congress folks want to hear. Two groups of asks - first is to increase resources. Legislation - mental health data collection isn’t mandated. So I want graduate students to be specified in those metrics. Second is access concerns. Associated with legislation for insurance, student finance support. A lot of data also doesn’t fit in this white paper, so we are also making a Best Practices document for the institutions.

VC: Awesome.

Mich, Sarah: Nate, did I miss anything?

Rutgers, Nate: Nope.

d. Sexual Misconduct

UT Austin, Kathryn: Matt is in the background, so I’ll do most of the talking. Background is similar to last year. Not a lot has changed, legislatively. We won’t reinvent the wheel. We will update statistics in the background. Our group has only met once over the phone with lots of other emails, but we are meeting again this week to take our raw materials and put them together. We are tracking 20 bills, including some HEA bills that include Title IX changes. It’s mixed together, so we will be categorizing into opposing Title IX changes and then seeing the movement on other bills that we’re tracking. We’ll hit the most important bills that are a hot topic at the time. The two themes - ending the rape kit backlog and providing legal protections and pathways for employer-employee relationship issues. We want to be relevant and timely, so we have a lot of irons in the fire, ready for as we get closer to DoH.

PD: Any questions?

UW, Matt: We might also make a best practices document because of the high interest and information.

e. Student Finance

UCI, Eric: We divided the committee into subgroups. We assigned people to student loans, housing, HEA, and food insecurity. There’s been a lot of gridlock on HEA, mostly on Title IX issues. Senate is going with a piecemeal approach, with smaller bills - such as streamlining FAFSA. Want to support House 4674 College Affordability Act. - creating a federal loan program that would help undergrad and grad students. More information on the document I won’t read, for sake of time. Senate bill 2225, Basic Act - 500 million grant programs for basic needs - food, housing, transportation, childcare. Better networks to connect students to sources.
UCD, Gwen: We have some interesting side projects going on, but for time sake, will leave to next time.
UCSD, Quyhn: we are also trying to pass some of the bills mentioned here. We have faced issues with conservatives about the fiscal costs. Need to frame it in a way to show benefits outweigh the costs, or that it’s not that high a cost.
UCD, Gwen: Would love to chat with you off-call about this.
Maryland: Our student government supported the College Affordability Act, pulled out the graduate student parts that are most important. But, since congress fast tracked HBCU and MSI funding by Alexander in the Senate, there’s a lack of push for the rest. Need to show that the remaining components, the most important ones for graduate students, haven’t been touched yet.
UW, Matt: Yes, that document would be very helpful. This bill is unlikely to gain traction in the senate, get stuck in republican control.
Pd: In the interest of time, we will cut off here. We will have updates at the next calls. The chairs would love to hear your questions/comments via email.

Announcements/Open Forum
C: Thank you to all working group chairs and members. Y’all are doing a fantastic job. Anything for open forum?

Events
1. Next Coalition call: February 10th, 9pm EST
2. Next Presidents call: February TBD

UC Davis motion to adjourn, UCSD seconds. Unanimous approval.
Adjourn 10:10pm EST.