Reponses to student questions for the Science Expert Briefing

1. Are we meant to pick a specific position that corresponds with our role/perspective?

   Yes, your voice/perspective should represent that of your stakeholder.

2. With each of our perspectives, do we have to say how one is impacted from the law and how to change that with a certain recommendation? Or are we just speaking from that perspective on an overall issue?

   Recommendations should represent the interests of the stakeholder.

3. In terms of our recommendations, must they be solely based on a governmental aspect or may they extend to environmental measures as well? Do our recommendations have to be targeted towards certain aspects? Or are we free to have our recommendations go with any category (i.e. government or environmental or social).

   Recommendations from the science stakeholders on the team should best represent the perspectives of the stakeholders. These may be pure science suggestions and/or administrative in nature; all recommendations should be supported as to why the stakeholder is making them. Remember you are speaking to federal lawmakers, so while your recommendations may span categories, make sure they are recommendations that Congress can implement.

4. Would we be able to include our team recommendations in one of our individual reports if it aligns? Or should be just keep it in one or the other?

   Team recommendations should represent consensus among all of the stakeholders. Some of the team recommendations may be similar to individual recommendations but it is unrealistic that they would be exactly the same.

5. Is the law considered as one of our citations or is it separate?

   It does not count toward citation count but should be cited where appropriate.

6. When structuring our essay, does it have to follow a format where we begin with an overview of our field and its importance, and then transition into the impact of the law? Is that a viable format?

   No, an overview is not necessary. However, you should reference your field and the interests of your field where appropriate.

7. What is the ultimate goal of our recommendations? Is it to change the bill to make it passable or to appease the base of local interest?

   The goal of the recommendations it to represent the interests of the stakeholder. Recommendations can be to maintain, alter, add, or remove components. Each recommendation must be a properly supported argument. If you think this is a good bill that should pass, you should be trying to get it
passed (possibly with needed improvements). If you think it’s a bad bill that needs significant reform even to be considered, that’s the message you should convey.

8. Is it okay to use a figure that we have adapted in our written testimony?

Yes, please cite it accordingly.

9. How will we show the visual aids when presenting the policy brief orally?

The judges will have a copy of your written testimony so presenting the visual during the oral session is not necessary. If it is essential to your team’s consensus abstract, you can request to share your screen before timing begins.

10. For the policy briefing, do we have to read directly off our written testimony?

Only the team consensus abstract will be read during the oral session and should be, more or less, read verbatim. The remainder of the oral session is Q&A.

11. Can you explain how the conferring between teammates in question asking will work in the virtual setting?

Conferring will occur across the screen. Judges will remain quiet while students confer.

12. Do in text citations count towards word count?

No.