

Meeting:	SUMmit
Location:	Council Chamber / Teams
Date & Time:	Monday 20th February 2023 17:00-20:00

Present:

Luca Volentir	Chair of SUMmit
Ada Sadowska	Vice-Chair of Summit
Alexander Robinson	SU President
Julia Kildyushova	Education Officer
Blake Walker	Community Officer
Jura Neveraускаite	Postgraduate Officer
Elizabeth Stacey	Sport Officer
Viktor Toshev	Activities Officer
Britt Flanderjin	Senate Rep
Titus Hiller	NUS Conference Delegate
Mahikha Raman	NUS Liberation Conference Delegate
Charlotte Foster	Activities Exec member
Jamie Cubitt	Sports Exec member
Zisis Tzifas Kratiras	Academic Exec member
Refilwe Badubi	Academic Exec member
Andre Jek	Diversity & Support Exec member
Pradhyumna Abhijit Lunkad	PGT Exec member
Tudhgeet Kaur	PGT Exec member
Hitansha Baranwal	International Exec member
Peter Irvine	Media Exec member
Youssef Assad	Senior Hall Rep
Bayu Patten	Senior Hall Rep
Luke Ackerley	Peer Support member
Jordan Sweeny	LGBT+ group rep
Eesha Ganesh	Feminism & Gender Equality Group member
Beatrice Clementel	Open Place
Jack Wilson	Open Place
Andrei Linguraru	Open Place

In attendance:

Charlie Slack	Head of Student Voice and Engagement/Interim Deputy Chief Exec
Amy Young	Insight and Engagement Manager/Interim Head of Student Voice & Engagement
Melissa Oram	Student Voice Coordinator (Change & Inclusion)
Konrad Rynski	Student Voice Admin Assistant

Item	
1.	<p>Welcome from the Chair</p> <p>The Chair of SUMmit welcomed members to the second meeting of SUMmit for 2022/23.</p>

2.	<p>Apologies</p> <p>Apologies were noted from: Isobel Shone Emma Aldred Mandy Wilson-Garner Lucy Ancheson Esther Jennings-Kirk Harry Wynne Shourya Gupta</p>
3.	<p>Minutes of the last meeting</p> <p>The minutes from the last meeting were approved by the members.</p>
4.	<p>Actions from November 2022 Meeting</p> <p>4.1 Standpoint : Exam questions should be aimed at testing the understanding of content rather than memorization. Outcome: This Standpoint, as agreed by members of SUMmit went to vote. Member of SUMmit approved this Standpoint and therefore it has been adopted by The SU and included in the Standpoints document.</p> <p>4.2 Standpoint : The University should offer appropriate revision materials for different exam formats. At the November meeting members of SUMmit agreed to put a call out for statements from the wider student community and discuss at the February meeting.</p> <p>The Chair presented the outcome from the call for statements, two statements were sent by students, with a suggestion to change the wording of the Standpoint to ‘The University <i>must</i> offer appropriate revision materials...’.</p> <p>The Chair invited members to the discussion, clarifying that appropriate in this context means accommodating to different exam formats, such as online or in-person.</p> <p>A member of SUMmit questioned whether the wording of the Standpoint is specific enough. Another member agreed, stating that the Standpoint is unclear, and that the University can self-classify anything they already provide to be ‘appropriate’.</p> <p>Furthermore, a member of SUMmit questioned if this Standpoint will actually cause the University to change anything. The Chair argued that the Standpoint would allow The SU to advocate on this issue in the future.</p> <p>Members of SUMmit discussed changing the wording of the Standpoint, potentially footnoting ‘appropriate’ as relating to materials relevant to the format of the exam. Members also asked whether it is appropriate to vote on the standpoint if the wording is not yet clear or agreed on. A member of SUMmit further questioned the practical outcome of the Standpoint, as it currently seems generic and as a result may not be able to achieve much in practice.</p> <p>A member of SUMmit stated that this standpoint would be especially useful for new or revised units where past exam material is limited, while another member of SUMmit pointed out that at times how drastic curriculum changes are taking place, such as currently, it is important to have such a Standpoint in place especially for 1st year students. A member of SUMmit also raised that Master’s students who switch directions</p>

from their Bachelors would also benefit greatly from extra support that the Standpoint could guarantee.

Nevertheless, a member of SUMmit suggested that this Standpoint needs to be revised and developed further so that it is clearer and not as vague. Another SUMmit member agreed, and proposed to discuss this Standpoint outside of the SUMmit and bring it up again at the next meeting.

ACTION: Members of SUMmit to further discuss this Standpoint proposal in light of the outcome from the call for statements and discussion and advise the proposer of revised wording for submission at a future meeting.

Standpoint: The University should make a more active effort to invite students to discuss relevant matters that directly impact the assessment and learning of students. At the last meeting of SUMmit, members decided to refer this Standpoint proposal to the Head of Student Voice and Engagement to provide a briefing to the February meeting.

4.3 The Head of Student Voice and Engagement provided an update regarding the standpoint. A paper had been circulated with members in advance of the meeting that provides a brief overview of what the University currently does with regards to the Standpoint, and the reasoning and purpose of representative democracy at the University. Furthermore, the Head of Student Voice and Engagement clarified that this Standpoint goes against guidelines for what is a Standpoint as it covers potentially changing the operation and management of The SU. Therefore, the Standpoint cannot be progressed. However, it was agreed that having a conversation around academic representation is important to have, and The SU is always looking to make a positive change for students in this regard. The Head of Student Voice and Engagement invited members to send emails with their thoughts on this. Furthermore, work around the 3 Year Strategy for The SU will be starting soon and members interested in participating are encouraged to reach out.

Update on UCU Strikes & Referendum

4.4 The SU President updated members that an SU referendum regarding the UCU strikes took place to agree The SU's position on the strikes following concern from SUMmit at the last meeting regarding how the previous position had been decided upon. The referendum reached a quorum, and the result was very close. In the end, students voted not to support UCU action for the remainder of the 2022/23 academic year <https://www.thesubath.com/news/article/thesu/UCU-Strike-Referendum-Result/> Since then, notice has been given nationally by UCU that the strikes have been paused for a short period of time with a number of days cancelled, strikes will resume in March. Members expressed that it was good to see students engaging with the referendum, and for The SU to have a stance. The Head of Student Voice and Engagement agreed, stating that although the issue is divisive across the student body it was good to see a strong turnout.

The Chair brought up a case of lecturers stating that they will not be releasing lecture material from sessions cancelled due to the strikes, but still examining on the missing material. The SU President clarified that the University has said that it will not allow strikes to detrimentally affect the student's academic experience. Furthermore, the Head

of Student Voice and Engagement assured members that although lecturers can withhold material, each University department is responsible for meeting any learning outcomes within student's course units, otherwise they would be liable for legal action. Therefore, it is unlikely that the students will be negatively affected in this way. The Chair pointed out that potentially many students may not be aware of this.

A member of SUMmit asked about the nature of an academic complaint related to missed content due to strikes, and who would potentially receive a refund if successful. The Head of Student Voice and Engagement clarified that this would depend on who submitted the complaint, such as if it was an individual or cohort complaint. [Secretary's note: information regarding how students can make a complaint either individually or collectively as a cohort can be found at <https://www.thesubath.com/voice/campaigns/staff-strikes/#toolkit>] A member of SUMmit wanted to clarify what is meant by learning outcomes, with the Head of Student Voice and Engagement explaining that they should be found in the unit catalogue.

Members also asked how the University should account for any emails that lecturers and especially dissertation supervisors have missed and not replied to due to striking. The Education Officer and the Head of Student Voice and Engagement stated that this depends on the department and unit. Nevertheless, students should approach the University and complain that they are letting this happen. On this point, a member of the SUMmit explained that there may be a belief amongst students that complaining to the University is often ineffective and achieves very little. Therefore, it is important to raise the fact that students should complain to the University and that it does matter. The Head of Student Voice and Engagement agreed, and as such will ensure information is clearly communicated on how students can effectively complain about strikes.

A member of the SUMmit asked about the intellectual property rights regarding recordings from previous years, and whether they could be released to help with revision in the case of missed content due to strikes. The Head of Student Voice and Engagement stated that many teaching staff feel that by releasing past lecture recordings, the strike action will be made less effective. The Education Officer pointed out that they will be looking at where this has happened, and whether the students have deemed it to be appropriate. Additionally, a survey will be going out to Academic Representatives to get feedback on mitigations departments have put in place due to strike action.

The SU President continued, notifying members of SUMmit that the UCU will ballot again, however The SU will stand against any additional period of strikes, as per the referendum result. A member of SUMmit asked how The SU will use the referendum result to lobby the University. The SU President clarified that any action or campaign is led by students, and The SU usually do not campaign on their own around this issue. The Head of Student Voice and Engagement added that the referendum is significant politically, and The SU will always lobby the University to ensure no student is negatively affected, whilst simultaneously talking to senior management and trade unions to ensure strikes are resolved quickly.

5. **Standpoints discussion**

5.1 **Standpoint 1: The SU believes menstrual product dispensers must be available in washrooms.**

Proposer Mahikha Murali Sundar, NUS Liberation Conference Delegate

The Chair opened the discussion with the proposal that the wording could be potentially changed to say 'every washroom'. Members agreed, discussing how dispensers should be in every bathroom, not only in the accessible ones. Members further discussed how having dispensers across every group of toilets is needed. Additionally, a member of SUMmit suggested that they should not only be inside of bathrooms, but also outside of them in public spaces to prevent their vandalization or abuse. Some members raised the worry however that if they are in public spaces, people might be self-conscious about using them and it might put people off. Instead, it was generally agreed that ideally most menstrual products dispensers should be available inside bathrooms, but some can be offered outside of them.

A member of SUMmit suggested to change the wording of the standpoint to include 'free menstrual products...', with members quickly agreeing. The Community Officer spoke out to agree to the principle of Standpoint, and told members that they have been working with the University on the Period Dignity Campaign. As a result, boxes of free menstrual products have been placed across various locations and toilet clusters on campus. The Vice-Chair wanted to clarify what kind of menstrual products the Standpoints is considering, with the Community Officer replying that the term usually refers to both main types, tampons and pads.

A member of SUMmit asked the Community Officer where these boxes of menstrual products are currently placed (as part of the Period Dignity Campaign), as they have not seen them. The Community Officer replied that this is only a recent development, however they can be found across a range of toilets across campus.

A member of SUMmit suggested to add '*sustainable, environmentally-friendly* menstrual products...' to the wording of the Standpoint, with other members agreeing to the suggestion.

Member of SUMmit were invited to poll on the next steps regarding this Standpoint.

Decision: This Standpoint will be sent to an online vote by SUMmit Members

5.2

Standpoint 2: The SU believes the curriculum for certain courses need to be revised to accommodate students under 18.

Proposer Mahikha Murali Sundar, NUS Liberation Conference Delegate

The Vice-Chair introduced the Standpoint, stating that students who are under 18, which often happens to be international students, cannot access all opportunities or course content in some of their courses. It was recommended from initial discussions by SUMmit members prior to the meeting to conduct a call to statement from the student body.

A member of SUMmit asked for an example of when this has happened, with other members explaining that in some courses such as Psychology, students are required to participate in dissertations, most of which are only available for over 18s. As a result, many under-18 students have received worse marks for participating in other dissertation projects. Another member of the SUMmit wanted to know what legal element is stopping the participation of under 18s in these projects. It was clarified that

some ethics approvals will be on the agreement that participants are over 18, and that an Ethics Committee decides this centrally.

The Head of Student Voice and Engagement clarified that the call to statement would normally be circulated to all students. With this in mind, a member of the SUMmit argued that the Standpoint is not clear as it stands, and students will not know what it is referring to. A member of SUMmit disagreed, saying that as long as there is a specific reference to under-18s, the wording should be clear enough to gather opinion from relevant students.

A member of the SUMmit suggested changing the wording of the Standpoint, arguing that curriculum is very broad term. A changed wording was proposed as follows: "Students under 18 should have the same access to learning opportunities as those over 18". A member of SUMmit suggested a different point of view in that providing alternatives for students under 18 which are the same or equal should be sufficient, rather than changing the rules around dissertation participation.

Member of SUMmit were invited to poll on the next steps regarding this Standpoint

Decision: SUMmit agreed to proceed with the Standpoint by requesting a Call for Statements with context from the student body.

Due to timing, no further Standpoints were discussed.

The following Standpoint proposals will therefore roll over to the March meeting of SUMmit:

- The SU believes Impacts on studies due to financial circumstances should be considered for IMC claims and coursework extensions.
- The SU believes The University should lobby the UK government to offer more financial support to students during the cost-of-living crisis.
- The SU believes The University should offer inclusive and comprehensive education about sexual health, consent, and sexual harassment.
- The SU believes The University should have meaningful consult with the Students' Union on rent levels for all halls of residence.

6. Officer updates Q&A

The reports were submitted and read by members prior to the meeting, with the floor opened for questions.

- 6.1 A member of SUMmit raised the issue of engagement monitoring, and whether students would be monitored when attending lectures. It was discussed how this has been proposed, and had gone to Senate for approval. The SU Officers expressed concerns that some students may not wish to have their attendance monitored in lectures, believing that if the plans go further a student consultation would need to happen. A member of SUMmit also questioned as to who would have access to this data, with SU Officers replying that they have asked the University for clarification on this and are waiting for a response.

6.2	<p>The issue of recording of lectures was brought up by a member of the SUMmit, and the fact that recordings may not happen if a lecture includes sensitive topics. It was questioned as to what is 'sensitive', and why can't they be recorded. The Education Officer spoke about how students may not want recordings of sharing their personal experiences or sensitive issues. The Head of Student Voice and Engagement also stated that lectures may contain criticism of certain companies, and the dangers this may pose to the University if this was lifted out of the recording and shared. It was argued that this all concerns a bigger issue around lecture recordings, how they work and why they are happening. A member of SUMmit reminded members that there currently exists a Standpoint regarding the recording of lectures. A suggestion was raised that lectures can be recorded and then sensitive content, questions, or statements can be edited out. However, this would be a big undertaking and a lot of work for staff. The Community Officer confirmed that staff have to provide materials such as lecture recordings for students as part of DAPs (Disability Action Plans) and as such all lecturers should be doing this.</p> <p>A member of SUMmit reinforced the need to be clearer about why lectures are not recorded, especially in the School of Management due to company sensitivity, etc. Another suggestion was the introduction of software that stops content being lifted from recordings. Generally, members argued that the sensitivity issue should not stop recordings from happening.</p>
6.3	<p>The Postgraduate Officer highlighted that in their report they had mentioned current working on an emotional support animal policy with the University and asked for feedback from SUMmit members. A member of the SUMmit replied that the policy is good for mental health, and perhaps it could be extended so that when students apply for accommodation this can be an option in the accommodation request.</p> <p>A member of the SUMmit also asked if this is offered in any other University. The Postgraduate Officer stated that there is a policy at King's College London which the University is looking at. It was clarified that this is about an emotional support animal and that they would stay in their room, and as such not be allowed in lecture rooms.</p> <p>The type of pets was discussed, with the Postgraduate Officer stating that the policy does not specify the size of the animal. The draft policy allows for any animal that the accommodation of the student is suitable in size for. This suggests that the policy will most likely lean towards smaller animals. However, a concern was raised that small animals may be worse for mental health support.</p>
7.	<p>Any Other business</p> <p>None.</p>
<p>The meeting ended at 19:15.</p>	
<p>Item number</p>	<p>Action</p>
4.2	<p>Members of SUMmit to further discuss this Standpoint proposal in light of the outcome from the call for statements and discussion and advise the proposer of revised wording for submission at a future meeting.</p>