Meeting:	**SUmmit**
Location:	**Council Chamber**
Date & Time:	**Monday 27 November 2023 17.15-19.00**

Present:

Peter Irvine	Chair of Summit
Jimena Alamo	SU President
David Lam	Activities Officer
Hanna Hajzer	Community Officer
Amber Snary	Education Officer
Aaron Horwood	Hall Rep Member
Akansha Matta	Peer Support Member
Anny Li	International Exec Member
Caitlin Grainger – Spivey	Academic Exec Member
Daniel Paul	Open Place Member
Dhanishtha Upadhyay	Diversity & Support Exec Member
Eesha Ganesh	Race Equality Chair
Jess Smith	Disability Action Group Chair
Jesse Dipple	LGBT+ Group Member
Kiara Singh	Peer Support Member
Lisa Shaw	Sports Exec Member
Mahima Yadav	Hall Rep Member
Titus Hiller	Senate Rep
Valerie Tsang	Activities & Diversity & Support Exec Member
Elliot Rose	Media Exec Member
Lauren Wright	Feminism & Gender Equality Group Member

In attendance:

Charlie Slack	Head of Student Voice and Engagement
Amy Young	Insight and Engagement Manager
Ryan Bird	Chief Executive
Scott Raven	Change & Inclusion Manager
Melissa Oram	Student Voice Co-ordinator (Change & Inclusion)

Item	
1.	**Welcome from the Chair** The Chair of SUmmit welcomed members to the first meeting of SUmmit for 2023/4. Daniel Paul was the sole nomination for the position of Vice Chair, which he won through a unanimous member vote.

| Chair: | P. Irvine |
| Date: | 27/11/23 |

2.	**Apologies** Apologies were noted from: • Mandy Wilson-Garner • Abbie Watkin • Joyeeta Kar • Steven Kockaya
3.	**Proposed Standpoints discussion:**
3.1.	**Standpoint 1: The SU believes that all students, regardless of their year of study should have access to high quality, affordable accommodation at an accessible distance from campus.** Discussion: The proposer outlined the reasoning behind this standpoint which is connected to the Top 10 item encouraging the university to guarantee affordable and quality accommodation to students even beyond first year. There is particular concern if numbers of students coming to University each year continues to grow. Over recruitment issues have also aided the lack of housing. 489 students who did not get university accommodation. Other cities/universities were used as precedent for the Standpoint. DAG students were consulted, who said it was hard for them to find appropriate accommodation. Students should have more choice on where they live, regardless of their accessibility needs. Some concerns were raised about how we define affordable and accessible. It was highlighted that being too specific about definitions in the Standpoint wording may limit the SU's ability to negotiate / advocate for this, but this was an important point. There were many expressions of support for this Standpoint proposal, so the options for proceeding were read by the Chair. SUmmit members were polled on next steps. 17 members voted that this Standpoint should proceed to an online vote. **Decision:** The Standpoint proposal will progress to an online vote of SUmmit members.
3.2.	**Standpoint 2: The SU believes that every student in the University, at all levels of study, should have access to personal tutors or equivalent.** Discussion: The proposer outlined the reasoning behind this standpoint which has been proposed after student feedback from PGT/PGR students who would like a personal tutor as well as a dissertation supervisor. A member requested clarification on the difference between a personal tutor and a supervisor. The proposer clarified that personal tutors provide references on graduation and can advise and signpost on queries relating to not work related items. It is more of a pastoral role.

The Chair was interested to know how the Standpoint would tackle the lack of support from current personal tutors. Various members voiced their experience with their personal tutors and thought the Standpoint was reasonable. Many members had not had the opportunity to meet with their personal tutor much but expressed that it was a good experience when they could. They were also understanding that not everyone would have a positive experience with their personal tutor.

A member voiced the importance for having more pastoral support. The wellbeing team can be intimidating to some, and the process can take a long time. Personal tutors might offer a quicker and easier approach.

A member raised a question on how this would work in practice and questioned whether staff would be equipped to provide this support. The proposer stated that this is just the first step in working to secure the service, and that the training and skills would come later through collaboration with the University.

Some members expressed the benefits of familiarity with their personal tutors. Others did not use the service and were aware not all get a good service. Some didn't understand the role of the personal tutor.

SUmmit members were polled on next steps. 17 members voted that this Standpoint should proceed to an online vote.

Decision: The Standpoint proposal will progress to an online vote of SUmmit members.

| 3.3. | **Standpoint 3: The SU believes that student's Disability Access Plans should be acknowledged and delivered in full by teaching staff.** |

Discussion:

The proposer gave some further background information about this Standpoint, it being a top priority for DAG this year. The proposer gave detailed information about what DAPs contain and the current issues with them which were reported in the 2022 accessibility survey – lack of consistency, hostility around self-recording, not being given extra time etc.

A member asked whose responsibility it was to share / implement DAPs. The answer given by the proposer was that it is the responsibility of the teaching staff.

A member asked when staff get DAPs. The proposer answered that they get them in advance of lessons. They are placed on a system which can be accessed by the staff. Students do not have to do anything to share them.

A member stated they heard a tutor say they don't believe in DAPs as it does not prepare students for the workplace. Some also suggested some tutors who have issues with DAPs do so because of their own personal beliefs regarding their usage, so there needs to be better oversight.

A member asked whether staff receive training for DAPs. A member stated that some staff have mandatory training but not academic staff, however, this is being assessed.

The proposer said they will chase all points raised in this discussion with academic

Chair:	P. Irvine
Date:	27/11/23

services.

A member added that some departments are better than others at using DAPs.

SUmmit members were polled on next steps. 18 members voted that this Standpoint should proceed to an online vote.

Decision: The Standpoint proposal will progress to an online vote of SUmmit members.

3.4.	**Standpoint 4: The SU believes that the University must require that all recordings of lectures are accessible offline (e.g., downloadable).**

Discussion:

The proposer gave some further background information about the standpoint which has been proposed considering feedback given to them as an academic rep and its link to the current Top Ten item.

A member stated that tutors were worried about the intellectual property aspect of this. Job security was a major concern.

The Chair asked members from management what their experiences were. Some said lectures were only available for a few days, but this is hard when you are sick or away. Sometimes recordings are only available for a week, or for Reading Week only. Some declared it was unfair they must buy a book for class when the recordings would be more help. Students have been told to buy books rather than watch recordings. The books are often unavailable in the library.

A member stated it is important to be aspirational with the platform of SUmmit. Although it might be difficult to achieve this, it is important to try.

A member said they were happy with the wording of the proposal as it says 'all recordings of lectures', which doesn't necessarily include lectures that have not been recorded. It would be a good first step to at least achieve this.

Some members stated that it would be good to have recordings in case of strike action.

A member added that it is important to consider equity within the solution. Working conditions and pay are important to safeguard for staff. Another member added that there must be a software solution to ensure staff are protected.

A member added that tutors should be included in this discussion.

SUmmit members were polled on next steps. 8 members voted that this Standpoint should proceed to an online vote and 8 members voted to refer this Standpoint to the Head of Student Voice to provide a briefing. The Chair broke the deadlock by deciding that the Standpoint should proceed to an online vote.

Decision: The Standpoint proposal will progress to an online vote of SUmmit members. |
| **3.5.** | **Standpoint 5: The SU believes that all students at every level of study should** |

Chair:	P. Irvine
Date:	27/11/23

have Wednesday afternoons off to partake in sports.

Discussion:

The proposer gave some further information about this standpoint and how having Wednesday afternoons off will help PGT/PGR students with their sense of belonging at Bath. The Director of Education and Student Services in the University has informed the proposer that availability of teaching spaces would make it very difficult to allow PG students have Wednesday afternoons off. The university is currently at 97% of timetabled space.

A member stated that PGs cannot always compete competitively as BUCS competitions happen on a Wednesday afternoon.

Members also raised the issue of students having to catch up on work due to missing Wednesday afternoon lectures.

Work currently underway by the university re. audit of spaces and how spaces are used to maximise the spaces on campus.

Some members expressed that students are having to choose between dissertation support sessions on Wednesday afternoons or playing sport. Over 6000 students involved in sport, only 1200 involved in BUCS (Wednesday afternoons). A member asked whether PG students are not involved in BUCS because it's on a Wednesday afternoon or because they just want to do recreational.

A member stated that the University need to be asked about how they are using teaching spaces on campus and is this at its most effective. Another member specified that there is a space utilisation project happening at the moment to help with this work re. capacity of rooms and whether this is effective. One member asked whether workshops on a Wednesday could be offered on different days throughout the week rather than only on a Wednesday.

One member expressed that at secondary school education physical activity is compulsory but then when you get to higher education it's an extra. Those in charge of timetables don't seem to appreciate that PGs might like to do sport at this time in their life.

A member also stated that there is no provision for disabled students to do something during that period on a Wednesday afternoon. Even though UG disabled students have Wednesday afternoons free it would be great if there could be some provision for disabled students e.g., free access to the gym on a Wednesday afternoon.

SUmmit members were polled on next steps. 11 members voted that this Standpoint should proceed to an online vote. 6 voted for a call for statements from the wider student community.

Decision: The Standpoint proposal will progress to an online vote of SUmmit members.

Members of SUmmit took a 10-minute break

Chair:	P. Irvine
Date:	27/11/23

8.	**Officer Question and Answer:** Q to Community Officer: How are you looking into expanding power outlets? A: Pragmatic approaches such as extension cords. Cheap and short-term changes currently. Working with the University to find cost effective measures. Q to SU President: Some accommodation options are being taken away in favour of 1st years and postgrads. Years 2,3, and 4 cannot remain in their accommodation sometimes. International students are being displaced. There has currently been no discussion or support on this. Can these residents be given support? A: President promised to look into this and follow up with member privately. Q to Education Officer: What are you currently doing on feedback? A: We performed poorly on surveys on this. Collaboration with University ongoing. Currently working on ensuring feedback is specific. Recommendations on good and bad practice is helpful. Q to Education Officer: What is being done to ensure the library accessibility is being advertised? A: DAG have been contacted and information about the room will be sent to students. Q to SU President: What is the contingency plan for snow this winter? A: President to check with campus services and feedback.
9	**Any Outstanding Business** No additional business was raised.
	The meeting ended at 19:00.

Chair:	P. Irvine
Date:	27/11/23