

Meeting:	<b>SUMmit</b>
Location:	<b>Council Chamber</b>
Date & Time:	<b>Tuesday 22 April 2025 17:15-19:00</b>

--

**Present:**

NAME	ROLE ON SUMMIT
Jackson Peace	Chair of SUMmit
Jimena Alamo	SU President
Zuber Lakhani	Postgraduate Officer
Amber Snary	Education Officer
Benji Orford Thompson	Community Officer
David Lam	Activities Officer
Oliver Warner	Sports Officer
Huw Ford	Senate Rep
Sam Ellis Hunt	Activities Exec
Angus Gueterbock	Sports Exec
Emily McManus	Sports Exec
Robbie Altham	Academic Exec
Vihan Tripathi	Academic Exec
Eesha Ganesh	Diversity & Support Exec
Ishita Khattar	LGBTQ+ Group
Star Dootson	Disability Action Group
Penn Mackintosh	Peer Mentor
Helen Slater	Open place member and Vice-Chair of SUMmit
Lili Illman	Open place member
Dom Vald	Open place member
Xandi Drysdale	Open place member
Dani Stec	Open place member
William Riddell	Open place member
Jacob Hanley	Open place member

--

**In attendance:**

Charlie Slack	Director of Student Leadership and Support
Nirvan Abedi	Democracy and Change Manager
Samuel Kilgor	Head of Student Voice and Academic Engagement
Emily Attinger	Student Voice Admin Assistant (Minutes)

--

**1. Arrival**

**2. Meeting start and Welcome**

**Welcome from the Chair**

The Chair welcomed members of SUMmit to the final meeting of 2024/25.

**Noting of apologies**

- Isobel Shone
- Josh Freer
- Lauren Wright

- Oliver Piff
- Phoebe Heath
- Yitz Sheinfeld
- Erik Bardenhewer

Community Officer Benji Orford Thompson and Sports Officer Olivia Warner were absent for the first half of the meeting, but arrived in time to engage with and vote in the final Sol discussion.

### **Minutes of the last meeting**

The minutes of the last meeting 4 March 2025 were approved as correct by members of SUMmit.

### **Quoracy**

23 in attendance have met quoracy. Quoracy for a vote to pass is 16 for a Standpoint and actions to pass.

### **Notice of any other business**

Disabled Students Commitment (To be discussed at the end of the meeting)

## **3. Statement of Issue – Study Spaces**

### **Proposer Introduction:**

The proposer explained that having dedicated spaces to study can help improve memory recollection and allow for more clarity and better focus. An anecdote was given about a student who had trouble studying until they used a sensory room and was able to thrive. There has been feedback requesting more sensory friendly study spaces and concerns regarding overcrowding and the reopening of the cafe in the Edge Foyer.

### **Discussion:**

A member commented that the consultation meeting regarding the use of the Edge Cafe seemed leading. The proposer agreed and conveyed that the Arts Development Manager and the Director of Student Life were adamant that the Edge is a social space not a study space. Instead, they suggested lobbying the University for more study spaces. The proposer also commented that the briefing document for this Sol contained a minor error and that it was the Secretary, not the Chair, who attended the consultation meeting.

A member asked for clarification if priority for these new sensory spaces would be given on a needs basis or open for everyone to use. The proposer responded that they should be open, as not everyone is willing to disclose their disability. The member then asked about potential overcrowding. The proposer responded that there is already a problem with overcrowding, and the only response is to just ensure there are multiple different spaces that meet the sensory friendly criteria and can be adapted if necessary.

A member questioned if converting existing spaces to be more sensory friendly would be better than creating new ones. The proposer said that while it is not a long-term solution, this could be a good compromise in the short term because it would be less expensive and there is already limited space on campus.

Following up on the previous question, a member asked how the actions would be possible if the university already has limited space. The proposer responded that there are options, such as rooms that are free between classes. A different member commented that timetabling tries to minimise overbooking rooms and times between classes for accessibility purposes. Another member then commented that gaps in timetables and empty rooms are often utilised by societies

and individual students. The proposer responded that not every single empty room and gap would be booked up, and only certain times or locations could be dedicated to being sensory friendly.

One member asked about the sensory friendly spaces available in the library. The proposer responded that yes, it would be ideal to utilise existing spaces, but they are already overcrowded. A different member agreed that the sensory friendly spaces in the library are inadequate.

The SUMmit chair mentioned the quiet/sensory times in Fresh and asked if this would be an option. The proposer responded yes and stated that this practice is very common in museums and stores. The chair then suggested adding this to the standpoint actions. A member expressed concern that these sensory friendly times are normally very early or late, so this would further limit accessibility. The chair and proposer responded that free rooms during the day could be booked out as sensory friendly spaces.

One member mentioned that booking study spaces can be quite limiting, especially in more accessible locations like the chancellors building. They suggested prioritising bookings in more accessible locations.

A member asked for clarification if this standpoint would work towards more study spaces in general or more sensory friendly study spaces. The proposer stated both.

A member suggested differentiating between study spaces on campus and in the city. However, the proposer and chair said this would not be necessary as the actions are broad and cover both locations.

One member commented on the suggestion of having bookable rooms that are already dedicated to sensory friendly conditions. They mentioned that there is a website that should list the information about each room, but it is out of date. Furthermore, many rooms on the timetabling website are missing sensory information as well. They suggested adding this as an action.

### **Standpoint wording agreed:**

‘The SU believes that there should be adequate sensory friendly workspaces available.’

### **Actions agreed:**

1. Conduct an evaluation of current spaces to determine the stimuli in them
2. Prioritise lobbying for more spaces dedicated for study such that there is greater capacity for low-sensory areas
3. Investigating the possibility of utilising existing study spaces for quiet hours
4. Ensure that room descriptions - including accessibility information – are regularly updated

SUMmit members initially voted on what action should be taken (16 required for a pass)

### **Voting outcome (proceed to vote/call for statements/recommend to BoT for a referendum):**

- |   |    |
|---|----|
| • Proceed to vote on adoption of standpoint and actions by the SU | 23 |
| • Call for statements from the student community                  | 0  |
| • Recommend to the Board of Trustees that a referendum be called  | 0  |
| • Abstain   | 0  |

SUMmit voted to proceed to a vote to adopt/not adopt the Standpoint and actions (16 required for a pass)

### **Voting outcome (SU to adopt/SU to not adopt/Abstain)**

- |  |    |
|--|----|
| • The SU should adopt the Standpoint and actions     | 21 |
| • The Su should not adopt the Standpoint and actions | 2  |

**Therefore, the Standpoint and actions have been voted as being adopted by the SU.**

**A short break was taken by SUMmit members**

#### **4. Statement of Issue – Lecture Recordings**

##### **Proposer Introduction:**

The proposer summarised that this standpoint is about improving the quality of lecture recordings and creating a set of guidance or standards of quality that recordings should follow. The proposer and chair also clarified that this standpoint – if passed- will be merged with a previously passed standpoint on mandatory lecture recordings.

##### **Discussion:**

A member commented that they should improve educating lecturers on how to use the technology and how to make good quality recordings. The proposer agreed and stated that the goal is for lecturers to be able to watch the recordings back and recognise any issues that need to be resolved so students do not have to suffer and chase them down for amendments. The member then summarised that there are 2 main sections of this standpoint: the actual recording of the lecture and then post-production work.

One member shared that a common problem with recordings is lecturers forgetting to wear the microphones.

A member commented that they need to determine what makes a good lecture recording and suggested creating polls/forms to gather student opinion and feedback. A checklist could then be created to guide/remind the lecturers.

One member enquired if feedback has already been collected on this issue. The education officer replied that there has not been an official form sent out. However, feedback has been received through faculty reps and taken to the Education Advisory Board, who then launched an investigation.

A member mentioned that this recording checklist could be merged with an existing checklist for in-person lectures becoming accessible.

A member asked if it would be worth mentioning that lecturers should post the most up-to-date versions of the recordings. The proposer and members stated that this would fall under the action regarding effective recordings.

A member asked if this would include practical sessions (seminars, workshops, etc.), as most of the time these are not recorded. The proposer and other members agreed that these would likely fall under a separate Sol/standpoint because they are more interactive and collaborative compared to lectures.

A member asked for clarification on what 'course' means in the action wording. They amended the wording to 'course/degree' for better clarity.

A member asked about what would happen if there were a problem with a recording. The proposer responded that there are already suggestions and common practises, such as re-recording, editing, utilising past recordings if necessary.

### **Standpoint wording agreed:**

'The SU believes that lecture recordings should be mandatory for all taught content and must meet a consistent and accessible standard, ensuring they are clear, promptly available, and retained throughout the course duration.'

### **Actions agreed:**

1. All lectures should be recorded
2. Make sure all taught content is clearly visible on the recording
3. Through a consultation with students, prepare a checklist of minimum requirements as to what makes an effective recording
4. Make sure lecturers know how to make an effective recording and that they are aware of any limitations (e.g., things not showing up on the recordings)
5. Speed up the release of recordings so students do not have to wait to catch up if they miss a lecture
6. Not delete lecture recordings and make sure they are available to students for the duration of their course/degree

SU summit members initially voted on what action should be taken (16 required for a pass)

### **Voting outcome (proceed to vote/call for statements/recommend to BoT for a referendum):**

- |   |    |
|---|----|
| • Proceed to vote on adoption of standpoint and actions by the SU | 20 |
| • Call for statements from the student community                  | 2  |
| • Recommend to the Board of Trustees that a referendum be called  | 0  |
| • Abstain   | 1  |

SU summit voted to proceed to a vote to adopt/not adopt the Standpoint and actions (16 required for a pass)

### **If proceed to vote, voting outcome (SU to adopt/SU to not adopt/Abstain)**

- |  |    |
|--|----|
| • The SU should adopt the Standpoint and actions     | 18 |
| • The SU should not adopt the Standpoint and actions | 4  |
| • Abstain  | 1  |

**Therefore, the Standpoint and actions have been voted as being adopted by the SU.**

## **5. Statement of Issue – Trans Inclusion in Sports**

### **Proposer Introduction:**

The proposers discussed each of the actions and gave estimated timelines regarding their implementation. They stated that this standpoint will draw a clear line between freedom of belief and discriminatory conduct and is especially important considering the recent Supreme Court ruling. A case study was mentioned, where British Cycling was heavily criticised for banning trans women from competing in the women's category. The proposers emphasised that all students and athletes deserve evidence-based policy and the actions from this standpoint can eventually be extended to other demographics. This standpoint was also developed in consultation with both transgender and cisgender students.

### **Discussion:**

A member asked for more context/info regarding the trans community on campus. One of the proposers responded that there is hesitation at joining sports and participation is low. The member then asked about the expected impact of passing this standpoint (i.e., will it lead to a surge in participation or is this just an underlying problem that needs amending?). The proposers

responded that this standpoint has 2 sides: legislative and social. On the legislative slide, they hope to clarify the eligibility criteria, disciplinary actions, etc. Regarding the social aspect, they do not have exact numbers but believe that removing these definite barriers will encourage participation.

A member asked about the feasibility of the action regarding the trans-inclusion training. They commented that other types of training such as disability training cannot be made mandatory, only 'highly advised'. The proposers responded that the trans-inclusion training would be integrated into existing training for committee members and not a separate or new module.

A member questioned if the goal should just be inclusion in general. However, the proposers responded that trans athletes in particular face unique challenges because sports are so heavily segregated according to gender. Another member agreed and stated that the guidelines and rules for sports and competing are quite binary.

One member wanted more information on what other demographics this standpoint could be expanded to. The proposers responded that this depends on the action. For example, the eligibility document would have information relevant for all students interested in joining sports.

The Director of Student Leadership and Support clarified that the impact of the recent Supreme Court ruling on the SU (which is a charitable organisation) is very unclear. They also stated that many of the standpoint actions will require consultation with and approval from other relevant bodies and channels (EDI committee, boards, etc.). If this standpoint were to be passed, any future delays or obstacles to its implementation would therefore reflect these factors and not a lack of support for trans-inclusion.

A member asked about the mandates mentioned in the actions and how they will be enforced. The proposers responded that this would need to be decided on/figured out.

### **Standpoint wording agreed:**

'The SU believes that sports should be inclusive, equitable, and accessible for all students, regardless of gender identity. Trans and gender-diverse athletes deserve respect, fair participation, and a safe environment. The SU is committed to challenging discrimination, advocating for evidence-based policies, and upholding the dignity of all athletes.'

### **Actions agreed:**

1. Mandate trans-inclusion training for all club committees
2. Require clubs to explicitly embed trans-inclusion into their practises
3. Develop a trans-inclusion charter for SU sport
4. Publicly celebrate trans and gender-diverse athletes
5. Treat transphobia as equally severe in discipline processes compared to existing anti discrimination policies for issues such as misogyny, racism, and xenophobia
6. Create a comprehensive document pertaining to the accessibility and eligibility criterion for participation in SU sports. This document will be publicly accessible to all students and will serve as an easy-to-understand gateway into university sports.
7. Collaborate with other SUs to lobby NGBs to ensure decisions on trans inclusion are based on robust, sport-specific evidence produced by independent, trustworthy researchers – not influenced by political pressure or ideologically motivated groups
8. Consider community consultation after standpoint passage, strongly evaluating any possible risks to marginalised communities that such a process may entail prior to execution. Ensure the process does not put the trans community at any risk.

SUMmit members initially voted on what action should be taken (16 required for a pass)

**Voting outcome (proceed to vote/call for statements/recommend to BoT for a referendum):**

- |   |    |
|---|----|
| • Proceed to vote on adoption of standpoint and actions by the SU | 19 |
| • Call for statements from the student community                  | 3  |
| • Recommend to the Board of Trustees that a referendum be called  | 0  |
| • Abstain   | 2  |

SUmmit voted to proceed to a vote to adopt/not adopt the Standpoint and actions (16 required for a pass)

**If proceed to vote, voting outcome (SU to adopt/SU to not adopt/Abstain)**

- |  |    |
|--|----|
| • The SU should adopt the Standpoint and actions     | 17 |
| • The Su should not adopt the Standpoint and actions | 3  |
| • Abstain  | 4  |

**Therefore, the Standpoint and actions have been voted as being adopted by the SU.**

**6. Updates from Officers****Questions to the Community Officer:**

- One member asked for clarification regarding the AI model mentioned in the officer update. The community officer responded that they are currently working on creating an AI model/tool kit to assist students in submitting complaints to the Bath and Northeast Somerset Council. This would involve suggestions for phrasing, reminders about following up on complaints, etc.
- A member suggested providing students with more information and tips on dealing with mold (identification, removal, prevention, etc.). The community officer responded that there is already information regarding mold provided by the SU and ResLife. However, many students are not receptive to or looking for this information.
- A member asked for details regarding the meeting with First Bus to discuss a U3. The community officer responded that discussions are ongoing and cannot currently be disclosed

**Question to the SU President:**

- One member asked for an update regarding the SULIS club. The SU president responded that the university will likely not repledge the requested amount of money for the renovations. Contingency plans are being developed and the issue will be discussed further with the board.
- In response to a question about outreach and assistance for the student community, the president mentioned they are currently recruiting a part time community officer that will work on projects regarding cost of living.

**7. Any other business and close of meeting**

The members were advised that applications for SUmmit chair are now open and were reminded to fill out the form regarding terms of reference.

The Disability Action Group was approached by the Disabled Student Commitment. It is a scheme through which the University and SU can uphold their commitments to accessibility. Multiple other universities have already signed up, and the action group is interested in hearing the members' opinions on joining. More information will be posted on the teams' channel.

**The SUmmit meeting finished at 19:30**