

Meeting:	<b>SUMmit</b>	
Location:	<b>CB 3.09 and Teams</b>	
Date & Time:	<b>Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> March 2023 17.15-19.30</b>	
<b>Present:</b>		
Luca Volentir	Chair of SUMmit	
Ada Sadowska	Vice-Chair of SUMmit	
Alex Robinson	SU President	
Elizabeth Stacey	Sports Officer	
Blake Walker	Community Officer	
Julia Kildyushova	Education Officer	
Jura Neverauskaite	Postgraduate Officer	
Titus Hiller	NUS Conference Delegate	
Zizis Tzifas Kratiras	Academic Exec member	
Refilwe Badubi	Academic Exec member (joined remotely)	
Eesha Ganesh	Feminism & Gender Equality Group member	
Amber Snary	Disability Action Group member	
Andrei Linguraru	Open Place	
Jack Wilson	Open Place	
<b>In attendance:</b>		
Charlie Slack	Head of Student Voice and Engagement/Interim Deputy Chief Exec	
Amy Young	Insight and Engagement Manager/Interim Head of Student Voice & Engagement	
Mandy Wilson-Garner	Chief Executive	
Scott Raven	Change & Inclusion Manager	
Melissa Oram	Student Voice Co-ordinator (Change & Inclusion)	
Konrad Rynski	Student Voice Admin Assistant (Minutes)	
Item		
1.	<b>Welcome from the Chair</b>  The Chair of SUMmit welcomed members to the third meeting of SUMmit for 2022/3.  The Chair informed members that this SUMmit meeting would be trialling a timing system to ensure that all of the agenda items are addressed in good time.	
2.	<b>Apologies</b>  Apologies were noted from:  Viktor Toshev Peter Irvine Emma Aldred Britt Flanderijn Andre Jek Jamie Cubitt Luke Ackerley Shourya Gupta	

	Charlotte Foster Mahikha Murali Sundar
3.	<b>Minutes of the last meeting</b>  The minutes from the last meeting were approved by the members.
4.	<b>Actions and outcomes from previous meeting:</b>  4.1 <b>Standpoint:</b> The SU believes that free sustainable, environmentally friendly menstrual products must be available in every washroom. Following the decision at SUMmit this Standpoint proposals went to an online vote of SUMmit members. <b>Outcome:</b> 10 votes were cast, quoracy was 18. Therefore, it did not meet quoracy and the Standpoint was not adopted.  4.2 <b>Standpoint:</b> The SU believes the curriculum for certain courses need to be revised to accommodate students under 18. Following the decision at SUMmit this Standpoint proposal was shared with the student body as part of a call for statements. <b>Outcome:</b> A call for statements went out to all students on 17.03.23, as well as a news story on The SU website, but no statements were received by the deadline.  The Chair reiterated the minutes from the previous meeting regarding this Standpoint, summarising the arguments and discussion.  The Standpoint was presented to a poll of present members via Menti. As a result, this standpoint will now proceed to an online vote of SUMmit members.
5.	<b>Standpoints discussion</b>  5.1 <b>Standpoint 1: The SU believes The University should lobby the UK government to offer more financial support to students during the cost-of-living crisis</b>  The Standpoint was proposed and presented by the Community Officer. While acknowledging the limit to how much the University can do regarding financial support for students as they are already in a difficult financial position, it is important to encourage the University, and especially senior members, to advocate for measurable improvements to government provisions for students.  The Community Officer discussed how the maintenance loan given to students by the government is not increasing along with inflation. Furthermore, there is disproportionately less support for international students. The University should be advocating for its students. There has already been a letter sent to the University Finance committee which has led to more proactive engagement with government bodies. This standpoint will solidify the expectation that the University is talking to the government.  Members questioned what the word 'lobby' implies in this sense, and whether that means paying the government. The Community Officer clarified that this would only mean representing students on the national stage on issues such as the cost-

5.2	<p>of-living crisis, being present in cost-of-living parliamentary group as well as asking for measures such as the maintenance loan to be increased. The Community Officer agreed that the Standpoint is appropriately broad, as it allows plenty of room for action.</p> <p>Another member expressed support with the Standpoint, but asked how The SU would ensure that the University is held accountable to this motion. The Community Officer responded that this addresses a broader question of how The SU tracks Standpoints, however with this Standpoint it is foreseen that it will be done through the University's Cost-of-Living Task and Finish group.</p> <p>The Chair stated that the cost-of-living crisis is likely not here to stay and therefore the Standpoint is potentially too specific, suggesting a rewording. The Community Officer believed that the Standpoint is topical, relevant, and contains appropriate wording, but was happy to take on board changes.</p> <p>A member argued that this is a good example of a temporary Standpoint, and while it is good to keep the Standpoint as it is, in a future SUMmit meeting it can be reconsidered and changed or withdrawn.</p> <p>The Change &amp; Inclusion Manager explained that it is possible to add a review or expiry date to a Standpoint. With this in mind, the Chair suggested adding a review date to the Standpoint in one year's time, agreeing that it will still be an important conversation to have as Bath remains an expensive place to live. The Community Officer agreed to add the review date into the Standpoint.</p> <p>Members of SUMmit were polled for the next steps for this Standpoint.</p> <p><b>Decision: This Standpoint will be sent to an online vote by SUMmit members, and if passed would have a review date included of one calendar year.</b></p> <p><b>Standpoint 2: The SU believes The University should meaningfully consult with the Students' Union on rent levels for all halls of residence.</b></p> <p>The Standpoint was proposed and presented by the Community Officer. The SU Officers, and particularly the President and Community Officer, are often involved in discussions around rent prices for University owned halls of residence. However, it has felt like there is no real consultation by the University, which is not acceptable.</p> <p>The Community Officer argued how important it is that student welfare is considered, and while The SU will not be able to set the rent prices, it is crucial that the Officers have a real voice on the issue. The Community Officer also clarified that 'meaningful' was specifically added to strongly state proper engagement. Nevertheless, the Standpoint is open to wording suggestions.</p> <p>Members discussed how they see the importance of Standpoint, with the only amendment being to remove 'meaningful'. A member also suggested that while The SU will not likely be able to influence rent amount, The SU could be required to give an official position or agreement on rent prices, and not just be ignored by</p>
-----	---

5.3	<p>the University. The Community Officer argued that it is beneficial to have the word 'meaningful', and while the suggestion from the SUMmit member is valuable, the viability needs to be considered. The Community Officer also argued that including consultation in this Standpoint might end up having use for other Standpoints.</p> <p>The Education Officer proposed to define the word consult in the Standpoint, while another member suggested adding '...with intent to act on their feedback' to the wording. The Community Officer considered that the Standpoint does not need further clarification.</p> <p>A member agreed to leave 'meaningful' in the Standpoint, as not all consultation is meaningful and so the statement of intent is useful. The President agreed, further stating that the Standpoint is appropriately vague Standpoint as it allows The SU to act broadly.</p> <p>Members of SUMmit were polled for the next steps for this Standpoint.</p> <p><b>Decision: This Standpoint wording will remain unchanged and will be sent to an online vote by SUMmit Members.</b></p> <p><b>Standpoint 3: The SU believes The University should offer inclusive and comprehensive education about sexual health, consent, and sexual harassment.</b></p> <p>The Standpoint was proposed and presented by the Community Officer. It is very important that the University takes responsibility for the health and wellbeing of its students, and there is a huge difference and variance in education that people have over these issues before coming to university. Schools have limitations around teaching these topics and so it is crucial that the University has a strong presence in this area. The Community Officer said that while the University offers consent training, it lacks provisions around teaching about sexual health. Furthermore, while progress is being made and there is momentum building for resources in this area, it is still significant to have a strong stance from The SU.</p> <p>The Community Officer updated members that the completion data for consent training had been requested but was not yet available to present to SUMmit.</p> <p>A member discussed how in their first year of study, part of their Psychology course they had participated in bystander training, however the course featured sensitive and potentially triggering material without proper notice. As such, the member asked who will be involved in discussing issues such as these so that people have informed decisions to take part. The Community Officer stated that it is unlikely to affect the involvement or running of bystander training and agreed that while it is unfortunately hard to encompass all of these important issues in this Standpoint, it is crucial to consider in the future.</p> <p>Another member agreed that it is important to acknowledge in the Standpoint that while there is already training in place, the problem remains, and The SU are building on existing attempts to solve them. The Community Officer clarified that training or campaigning around these issues changes regularly, and there is a</p>
-----	---

5.4	<p>connection between existing training, and so the Standpoint is fine to remain as it is.</p> <p>More generally, it was discussed as to whether there should be a paragraph included giving context to every Standpoint, with members saying it would be a good addition</p> <p>Members of SUMmit were polled for the next steps for this Standpoint.</p> <p><b>Decision: This Standpoint wording will remain unchanged and will be sent to an online vote by SUMmit Members.</b></p> <p><b>Standpoint 4: The SU believes impacts on studies due to financial circumstances should be considered for IMC claims and coursework extensions.</b></p> <p>The Standpoint was proposed and presented by the Community Officer. Recently, the guidance on IMCs (Individual Mitigating Circumstances) has recently been updated and now explicitly includes unexpected financial crises which essentially covers the Standpoint. Although this does discount the urgency of the Standpoint, the Community Officer still believes it is an important stance to take. Effectively, it is useful and powerful to have this Standpoint to show that difficult financial circumstances negatively affect studies – not just during the cost-of-living crisis.</p> <p>Members discussed how they do see the standpoint's importance and appreciate the fact that the University is taking it into account. However, members believe there needs to be improvements to the general logic behind IMCs. They should provide a fair service to include everything they are currently missing, and as such the Standpoint should include all missing aspects which may impact a student's performance, not just this specific one.</p> <p>A member suggested that the Standpoint should relate more to the process of IMCs rather than the value or not be considered at all, as it is a small part of the bigger issue and it is interdependent with other claims. The Community Officer responded, arguing it would be very difficult and not appropriate to have an exhaustive list of all IMC reasons. It is fair to consider one problem at a time and reasonable to still have this.</p> <p>A member stated how students that are from poorer background have different university experiences and are much worse off. This means The SU needs to have an explicit point for the University to know this.</p> <p>Another member agreed that the point is good, but wondered how financial circumstances can be isolated so that it remains in the IMC list as it could technically also qualify under other claims such as mental health issues. The Community Officer responded by saying that it does not need to qualify individually, as these issues are often interlinked. The hope is that they are considered in context.</p> <p>The Chair stated that the Standpoint may be too specific and was concerned that it does not consider other issues. The Community Officer replied that if there is</p>
-----	---

5.5	<p>another circumstance, another Standpoint could be proposed. As this one stands alone well, it should remain. The Education Officer agreed, saying that it is important to acknowledge the issue and it does not diminish other circumstances for IMCs. Making the Standpoint broader will only diminish its value.</p> <p>Members of SUMmit were polled for the next steps for this Standpoint.</p> <p><b>Decision: This Standpoint wording will remain unchanged and will be sent to an online vote by SUMmit Members.</b></p> <p><b>Standpoint 5: The SU believes a healthy, membership-led, representational democracy should be transparent to its membership in its decision-making processes. There should be opportunities to hold representatives to account, and directly change the priorities and functions of the organisation.</b></p> <p>The Standpoint was proposed and presented by the Community Officer. It was clarified that the Standpoint meant The SU reflecting on organisations we interact with, and about what democracy actually means to us as a body. It aims to empower students who are dealing with organisations to make sure they are representing students properly. Furthermore, it can help steer expectations when interacting with these bodies.</p> <p>A member questioned whether this affects the Terms of Reference of SUMmit which states that Standpoints <i>must not propose the creation of new SU policies, procedures, or practices that influence the operation, administration, or management of The SU</i>. The Community Officer reiterated that the Standpoint is not about The SU, but generally about approach towards other organisations. There was a mention of a conversation on the SUMmit members Teams group about the Articles of Governance and reflecting on them in the Terms of Reference meeting.</p> <p>A member asked whether this is something which should be pursued with NUS. The Community Officer believed that this should happen, but this Standpoint concerns a broader part of student life. The Community Officer stated again that it is clear in the description that it does follow the terms of reference for Standpoint proposals. The Head of Student Voice and Engagement/Deputy Chief Exec Interim agreed, as the Standpoint is not about The SU, but rather about affiliations with external bodies and a knock-on effect to ensure others follow these values.</p> <p>The Sports Officer asked whether it would be possible to take time to look at this with regard to other organisations The SU works with such as BUCS (British Universities &amp; Colleges Sport), NUS and Student Minds, and whether this Standpoint would affect them. The Sports Officer expressed that they would like the Standpoint to come back to the next meeting so that this could be explored. The Community Officer argued that it should not have any implications on current affiliations and that the Standpoint does not mean direct action will be taken.</p> <p>The Sports Officer stated that organisations such as BUCS are structured differently and this may lead The SU to question functions of other organisations which may not be appropriate. The Community Officer said that as the Standpoint</p>
-----	--

	<p>is specifically about democratic organisations, it should not have impact on BUCS.</p> <p>Members suggested changing the wording of the Standpoint to say ‘The SU believes a healthy, membership-led, <b>representational democratic organisation</b> should be transparent...’. The Community Officer (Standpoint proposer) agreed to the change.</p> <p><b>New Standpoint proposal wording agreed: ‘The SU believes a healthy, membership-led, representational Democratic organisation should be transparent to its membership in its decision-making processes. There should be opportunities to hold representatives to account, and directly change the priorities and functions of the organisation.’</b></p> <p>Members of SUMmit were polled for the next steps for this Standpoint.</p> <p><b>Decision: This Standpoint, with the amended wording, will be sent to an online vote by SUMmit members.</b></p>
5.6	<p><b>Standpoint 6: The SU believes that Art students need space, dressing rooms and costumes storage to do their activities.</b></p> <p>The Standpoint was proposed by the Activities Officer, in their absence it was presented by the SU President instead. The Standpoint argues that Arts groups need appropriate space to do their activities. There had been problems with not enough storage being available and students have been worried about where belongings and society equipment are kept. The President stated that more space should be asked for from the University.</p> <p>The Community Officer supported the proposed Standpoint and believed that this is an important issue. They highlighted that a lot of students in Arts societies have a lot of equipment and costumes that cannot be easily transported, carried or replaced. It therefore makes sense to have a clear stance so that our groups are provided with proper facilities.</p> <p>A member agreed with the Standpoint, but questioned whether this should be exclusive to ‘Art students’ as Bath does not have these. Instead, a change in wording was proposed so the Standpoint speaks of ‘students participating in ‘arts’ or ‘arts groups’’. The Change &amp; Inclusion Manager stated that this is a reasonable change, as it does not change the nature of the Standpoint. The wording change will go back to the proposer, the Activities Officer, after the in meeting poll but before the online vote.</p> <p><b>New Standpoint wording proposed (and later confirmed): ‘The SU believes that art groups need space, dressing rooms and costumes storage to do their activities.’</b></p> <p>A member asked whether the Standpoint should include non-Art groups, as it is often also hard for other societies to store their belongings. The President responded that this would materially change the Standpoint. Another member stated that it is not a good idea to broaden the Standpoint, and instead it is important to emphasise on Arts specifically in space allocation.</p>

5.7

The Sports Officer argued that the Edge is a dedicated building with storage for Arts groups, and yet the standpoint brings up that more space is needed. Furthermore, there is an ongoing internal review and audit of storage space, and the Standpoint may be too specific to stand. The President clarified that the Standpoint argues that facilities should be kept and are important, not necessarily stating that there are none.

The Chair pointed out a Standpoint proposed last year about University of Bath radio was rejected as it was too specific, arguing that this one is similar. The Community Officer stated that other Standpoints can be proposed and considered individually to consider other areas and needs such as sports.

Members of SUMmit were polled for the next steps for this Standpoint (pending the proposer's approval of the proposed alternative wording).

Update (12/04/23): the wording change has been agreed by the proposer.

**Decision: This Standpoint, with its amended wording, will be sent to an online vote by SUMmit members.**

**Standpoint 7: The SU believes students deserve autonomy in deciding the structure of their studies in accordance with their circumstances and supports that students know what is best for their welfare and progression.**

This Standpoint was proposed by the Feminism & Gender Equality Group member of SUMmit. The Standpoint considers the wider relationship between the University and students and the lack of consideration for part time students from the Academic Registry. Students often find it hard to get approval for part-time study and they are not listened to properly by academic departments. The Standpoint argues that the autonomy of students should be an essential right.

A member stated that following a conversation on Teams, the Standpoint makes sense with the added context. However, the initial part is too broad and should be more specific when referring to autonomy. The Proposer agreed to change wording to 'The SU believes that autonomy of the students in decision making that affects their personal welfare is an essential right....'

**New Standpoint wording approved: 'The SU believes that autonomy of the students in decision making that affects their personal welfare is an essential right...'**

The Chair proposed that the Standpoint should not be passed to an online vote of SUMmit members as it could extend to the wider student body. A call for student statements would be more suitable, as well as referring to the Head of Student Voice and Engagement to provide a briefing so that members have more information.



	<p>A member argued that this leaves the door open to any request being made by students where the University has to say yes to this. The Proposer responded that they believe that the University is currently not listening to students at all.</p> <p>The Community Officer added that this is an ambitious standpoint that is essentially important, but wonders if it offers too much flexibility. The Community Officer agreed with the Chair that this Standpoint should come back with reconsidered wording and more information.</p> <p>A member highlighted that course structures have certain standards which are set by a regulatory body which the University will be bound to which may restrict student choice in how they take their course.</p> <p>The Education Officer stated that this is an important Standpoint, as the University does not have a lot of focus on part time provision. While the wording does need to change, the reasoning is important. The Proposer argued that it is abstract on purpose, but agreed it does need to be reworded.</p> <p>The Chair proposed that members ask the Head of Student Voice and Engagement to take a look and bring back more information as a briefing. The Head of Student Voice and Engagement/Deputy Chief Exec (interim) agreed, stating that they can look at issues such as credit bearing structures, restrictions around this, as well as if other universities have any flexibility, and more generally other issues for part time students.</p> <p>Members of SUMmit were polled for the next steps for this Standpoint.</p> <p><b>Decision: Refer to the Head of Student Voice and Engagement to provide a briefing and bring back to the next meeting.</b></p>
6.	<p><b>Officer Updates Q&amp;A</b></p> <p>The President informed members that Officer Updates presentations were circulated prior to the meeting. The President briefly summarised these reports highlighting key items of note.</p> <p>The Education Officer updated members that a lecture recordings campaign will be launched soon from The SU as it is valuable to see how many students do not currently have their lectures recorded, why this is the case and to ultimately push towards a University opt out lecture recording policy.</p> <p>Members asked about the President's meeting with Dan Norris regarding buses in the area and what was the outcome of the meeting. The President clarified that they met with the Mayor as he is pushing bus companies to recruit students as bus drivers. The President did ask the Mayor about issues such as annual bus pass prices and the U1 provisions not running in the early morning. While the meeting was useful, there was no specific outcome, however the Mayor is eager to work with the SU on alleviating bus issues.</p> <p>The Chair asked the Community Officer about the Standpoint around sexual health and harassment, what work has been done so far and its direction. The Community Officer responded by mentioning the BeTheChange training being</p>

	<p>compulsory for staff members, but it would be challenging to make it mandatory for students. Incentivising people to engage meaningfully is difficult and forcing people to do it will not work. Instead, the Community Officer argued that there needs to be a focus on rollout to the local community in local bar and nightclub venues. The BeTheChange campaign needs to ensure it is much broader, that it changes dialogue around it and involves everyone. As the NeverOK campaign is no longer around, its impact in the local community has been lost. In its place, BeTheChange needs to be present in clubs and bars in the same way that previous campaigns were.</p> <p>The Community Officer highlighted the need for consistency in signposting and guidance. Furthermore, the Community Officer received a number of concerns and reports around some venues by students of colour. The Sports Officer informed members that the Lacrosse Club is currently trailing awareness training with the University, testing with small group of students and having discussions with clubs in town to get them involved.</p> <p>A member asked the Postgraduate Officer about PG committee members in societies and what the feedback has been from current committees. The Postgraduate Officer responded that they have had a low response from committees, but societies seem to be open to introducing such a position in committees and that introducing such position would help engagement.</p> <p>A member asked if societies consider that PG communities are represented. The Postgraduate Officer stated that they have not asked about this, but it would be good to find out.</p> <p>Another member stated that inclusivity positions in committees can be challenging and asked how a PG role in committees would be supported so they did not face similar challenges. The Postgraduate Officer if they would need different support than other committee members, to which the member responded that they would need more support.</p>
7.	<p><b>Review of SUMmit</b></p> <p>The Change &amp; Inclusion Manager clarified that meetings will be scheduled to specifically review the SUMmit Terms of Reference in advance of the final meeting of the year to ensure appropriate time is given to discussion. SUMmit members will be contacted with dates and times of the meetings.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Meetings to discuss Terms of Reference to be scheduled and communicated to members of SUMmit.</b> Update: meetings scheduled for 17<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> April 15:15 – 16:15</p>
8.	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p>The Chair discussed the trial of the timing structure trialled at this meeting and welcomed feedback. For future meetings a proposal had been made to have a discussion meeting ahead of a SUMmit meeting to discuss a Standpoint for members interested (in addition to the Teams channel discussions). This will allow more conversation around individual Standpoints and ensure that decisions made are the right ones and to look at how SUMmit is then used. This will be trialled if</p>

	possible before the final meeting of SUMmit if timings allow. The Community Officer agreed that this is a good idea.
<b>The meeting ended at [19.27].</b>	
<b>Item number</b>	<b>Action</b>
7	ACTION: Meetings to discuss Terms of Reference to be scheduled and communicated to members of SUMmit. [COMPLETE]