

Meeting:	SUMmit
Location:	4W 1.2
Date & Time:	04/03/2025 17:15 -19:15

Present:	
Jackson Peace	Chair of SUMmit
Helen Slater	Vice-Chair of SUMmit and Open Place Member
Jimena Alamo	SU President
Zuber Lakhani	Postgraduate Officer
Amber Snary	Education Officer
Benji Orford Thompson	Community Officer
David Lam	Activities Officer
Olivia 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
Isobel Shone	Diversity and Support Exec
Eesha Ganesh	Diversity and Support Exec
Christopher Wahlen	Media Exec
Lauren Wright	Feminism and Gender Equality Group
Star Dootson	Disability Action Group
Penn Mackintosh	Peer Mentor
Oliver Piff	Peer Assisted Learning Leader
Josh Freer	Hall Rep
Jacob Hanley	Hall Rep
Sharon Herath	Open Place Member
Jojo Darling	Open Place Member
Dom Vald	Open Place Member
Xandi Drysdale	Open Place Member
Jian Xin Lim	Open Place Member
Pheobe Heath	Open Place Member
Erik Bardenhewer	Open Place Member
Dani Stec	Open Place Member
William Riddell	Open Place Member
Manya Gupta	Open Place Member
Sarah Hafner	Open Place Member
In attendance:	
Amy Young	Data Research and Insight Manager
Polly Hawker	Director of Student Life

Niamh Grundy	Student Voice Admin Assistant
Henry Steele	Student Voice Admin Assistant
Apologies:	
Rama Alassaf	Open Place Member
Yitz Sheinfeld	Open Place Member
Hanan Banda	Race Equality Group
Ella Rathgeber	Bath Exchange Network
Olivia Warner	Sport Officer

Item	
1.	<p>Introduction and Quoracy</p> <p>The Chair welcomed members to the third SUMmit meeting of this 2024/25 academic year.</p> <p>At the beginning of the meeting, 33 members were present (this became 34 with the arrival of Sarah Hafner at 18:00), making this meeting quorate.</p> <p>Minutes from the December meeting: The SU President asked for a correction to the minutes, the local councillors meeting was not well attended due to traffic issues rather than weather as minuted.</p> <p>Regarding any other business, a member raised a request for time to ask a few questions on behalf of the Peer Support staff. By the end of the meeting there was no time to discuss this business.</p>
2.	<p>Updates from Officers</p> <p>Nightline:</p> <p>The Community Officer (henceforth CO) updated SUMmit that he would send out questions to gather feedback about Nightline as the national organisation overseeing Nightline is closing down by the summer. This is not a decision by the University or The SU, rather the charity as a whole which has taken the decision to close down.</p> <p>There were a number of a questions from members asking whether the SU could create its own Nightline equivalent service, the CO responded by saying that the University has had ideas of utilising a similar service to Nightline, but it may not have the same format as a telephone service as Nightline currently has.</p> <p>The Education Officer (EO henceforth) asked for the difference between this proposed new system and the Be Well Talk Now system that already exists at the University. The CO responded by saying that Be Well Talk Now is not student run, whereas a new service would be, or would at least rely heavily on student feedback in its creation.</p> <p>A member asked if the existing University security team and structure could be used to provide this service. The response from the CO was that Nightline is a listening service rather than providing practical in the moment support which is what security provides.</p>

Disability Access Plans (DAPs):

The Chair asked the EO about DAPs, particularly in reference to the Skills Centre being unable to access DAPs, for example if a student were to miss a session that their DAP can explain, the Skills Centre does not have access to these DAPs.

The EO responded by saying that the answer or explanation by the University with anything regarding DAPs is GDPR, a member added to this saying that there are different access levels for DoSs, Academic Advisors, Unit Convenors, and Lecturers.

A member said that lecturers also do not fully understand DAPs, the EO responded by saying that the DAP does not itself provide a way of showing lecturers how to meet accessibility, for example it will say 'provide lecture slides' but does not say in what format or the like.

Pronoun database:

The Chair asked for updates on the pronoun database discussed at a previous meeting of SUMmit, the CO said good progress has been made by DDAT (the University's Digital, Data and Technology department) with regard to inputting pronouns, e.g. it is no longer a list but rather you can enter in any pronouns you choose. DDAT itself deals with around 95% of all student facing activity.

Campus space

A member asked the CO for information regarding sensory rooms or the new R7 project (new accommodation project), with the CO responding saying with R7 and many rooms around campus, lighting has been changed to be more accessible, as well as the University looks to have more sensory areas across campus.

A member asked for information on R7, the CO responded by saying that is a new planned 1000 room student accommodation to be built on campus, where 25% of the rooms will be 'affordable' according to the National Union of Students guidance.

A member asked for any information on the proposed 0% interest loans for bus passes and how these will work and be repaid, the CO responded saying this will be paid by students as frequently as possible to make it small regular payments and the pilot will be available to those students on bursaries initially.

A member asked if there are plans to expand this to students on the two highest maintenance loan bands due to the struggles many non-bursary students face, as there is only a certain amount of annual bursaries. The CO responded saying that the University itself does not know the maintenance loan bands for all students and therefore would not be able to promote directly to these students.

3.

Statement of issue discussion #1 – IMCs and Extensions

The potential Standpoint presented to SUMmit by those proposing it read as follows – “The SU believes that the University should improve its IMC and extension policies and processes and standardise these across departments.”

A member asked for clarification on receiving extensions after the deadline has passed, the EO responded by saying that this often happens when a student does not submit their coursework and then can provide a reason for a retrospective extension, at the minute there is no consistent firm guidance as to how this should work in practice.

The CO asked how IMCs at Bath compare across the sector, the EO said that if this Statement of Issue (SOI henceforth) becomes a Standpoint and action taken, the IMC process, in terms of its inclusivity, will be far ahead of others in the sector. The Chair did point out, however, that the extension process is still fairly strict in comparison to other universities.

A member asked if being forced to give reasoning for an IMC has stopped individuals from applying for IMCs, the Chair said that recent information provided by the SU for the briefing document accompanying the Statement of Issue has said that some students have not applied for an IMC as they believe the reasoning could impact their ability to stay at the University, the University has recently made a commitment to the principles in the Compassionate Communication statement to mitigate against this.

A member raised anecdotal evidence of how off-putting the IMC form can be, the difficulty or triggering nature of having to explain one’s problems or issues has led to students struggling to fill in the form within the current deadline.

A member furthered this, suggesting an increased the window of when students are required to provide the reasoning for applying for an IMC, being able to submit an IMC without reason in a certain amount of time then having the ability to fill in the form at a later date.

Another member raised issues with when the panels meet after exams regarding IMCs, IMC applications close the Wednesday after exam season ends, and then meet on the Friday.

The EO responded to all of the above points, saying that the University are currently assessing the timeframe of the exam season, looking to expand the deadline to apply for IMCs from 3 days after an exam to 5, also being able to apply at the end of exam season for a single IMC to cover multiple assessments. In terms of the panel timing, this is out of necessity, there are so many steps after exams that moving it back would then move results releases back.

A member asked if it is worth incorporating this with an earlier Standpoint passed at SUMmit, regarding marking and capping marks with late submissions, arguing that both concepts could be aligned, as they address similar concerns at heart.

The SU President proposed to change the Standpoint wording itself, suggesting that instead of using “improve,” the term “amend” might be more appropriate.

Another member proposed that “simplify” could be used to make the Standpoint more actionable and to define the action clearly.

A member suggested an amendment to the wording to say, “to align with the university’s obligations to EDI,” suggesting that this would add clarity to the intent of the Standpoint.

Another member commented that the focus should be on IMCs and not extensions, as they are very different issues. The member emphasised that retrospective extensions should not be implemented until the extension system itself is reformed and clarified. Another member agreed that IMCs and extensions should be treated separately due to their differences.

Another member spoke of the possibility of splitting the Standpoint into two: one focused on IMCs and one focused on extensions. The SU President responded that only one Standpoint could be voted on at this meeting of SUMmit, with the other being put forward for a future SUMmit.

A member pointed out that both IMCs and extensions affect each other in some ways, and therefore the decision was made to first combine the two issues into one Standpoint.

A member was opposed to splitting them up, stating that this had been attempted before at SUMmit with less similar systems and it did not save time. Another member argued that despite their differences, the systems do go hand in hand, and SUMmit has limited meetings and time to consider lots of Standpoints.

The decision was made to keep the two issues together in one Standpoint. The finalised wording was agreed to be:

The SU believes that the University should amend its IMC and extension policies and processes and standardise these across departments in accordance with its EDI commitments.

A member put forward an additional action to make the process across departments standardised and flexible. There was some opposition to the term “flexible,” with some members concerned about its ambiguity. The individual who proposed the action

explained that “flexible” could involve offering different methods of submitting applications.

The SU President suggested an action for Officers to issue a call for actions for members who wish to be included in the work on this Standpoint to allow for further discussion.

A member suggested an action to address self-certification for IMCs.

A member raised concerns about IMCs being rejected, and another member responded that Student Support is available for assistance. They also mentioned that rejected IMCs can be viewed through SAMIS.

The finalised actions were as follows:

- Advocate for an increase to the deadline for IMC applications
- Push for explicit acceptance/rejection emails with detailed reasoning when an IMC is rejected
- Seek the option to receive extensions after a deadline has passed.
- Represent the student views through the inclusive education steering group.
- Continue work on the standpoint on allowing students with IMCs the option to resit affected exams (even if they do not fail)
- Standardise processes across departments.
- Summit members must have the option of being consulted through the review process.
- Lobby for a reduction in evidence requirements and self-certification.

Members of SUMmit were first asked to vote on the next steps, a super majority (66% + 1) was required for a vote to pass:

31 members present voted to proceed to vote on the adoption of the Standpoint

0 members present voted to call for statements

0 members present voted to recommend for referendum

2 members present voted to abstain.

Members of SUMmit were therefore asked to vote on the adoption of the Standpoint and actions as agreed above.

31 members present voted to adopt the Standpoint and actions

2 members present voted to not adopt the Standpoint and actions

1 member present voted to abstain.

The Standpoint and actions were approved and will therefore be added to the SU's Standpoint document.

	<p>Number of members of SUMmit present increased to 34 following the vote.</p>
4.	<p>Statement of issue discussion #2 – Sexual harassment training:</p> <p>The proposed Standpoint wording presented to SUMmit by the proposers read as follows – “The SU believes that the University’s sexual assault and harassment should be mandatory, regularly updated based on student and professional consultation, and include clear guidance on support services.”</p> <p>A member of SUMmit asked how the training could be made mandatory while ensuring that students can opt out if they wish due to triggering content. One of the Standpoint proposers responded by saying that actions should include a detailed review of how students can complete the training in the most effective way possible. There was also a proposal to make the refresher courses more effective and optional for students.</p> <p>A member of SUMmit proposed an amendment to the wording, to remove the word ‘mandatory’ from the Standpoint. However, another member objected, arguing that the training should be mandatory as it is in workplaces and, in a university setting, it is essential for students to complete. They acknowledged that the training might be triggering for some, but emphasized that it is a necessity.</p> <p>A member of SUMmit asked if it would be possible to create a less explicit version of the current training for those who might want to “opt out.”</p> <p>Another member agreed that the training should remain mandatory, stating that some topics, such as sexual assault awareness, should be covered for all students, but with clear warnings for particularly sensitive content.</p> <p>The EO responded to the discussion happening regarding whether the training should be mandatory or not. Completion of training or a test cannot be made mandatory unless it relates directly to a student’s degree. The Activities Officer agreed, mentioning that making something mandatory at the university level is a challenging task. The EO also added that previous ‘mandatory’ training had been dropped due to concerns with triggering content.</p> <p>A SUMmit member asked if it would be possible to make the training mandatory for anyone joining an SU committee or society. They argued that, similar to the corporate world, such training should be required in any role within these organisations.</p> <p>A SUMmit member also suggested that this requirement should extend to sports, saying that mandatory education in this area is crucial for protecting individuals in those settings.</p>

It was noted that in the briefing document it had given figures regarding the increase in completion rates due to a name change, but highlighted that this was also likely due to reminders sent out by Student Support services to non-completers.

A SUmmit member questioned the exact goal of the Standpoint, noting that it was unclear if it was bringing anything new forward, as the University already reviews the training and sends follow-up emails, with options for opt-outs and similar mechanisms in place.

A SUmmit member spoke of how some students do not take the training seriously, simply clicking through it to register their completion, rather than engaging with the content meaningfully.

A SUmmit member raised the issue of triggers in training and how to support students in those cases, emphasising that accountability for this lies not just with the University but also with the SU. The SU should ensure that the training is carried out effectively and responsibly.

It was noted that emails from Student Support already label the training as mandatory, prompting further questioning about the actual need for the Standpoint. It was noted that there are already two related Standpoints in existence.

A SUmmit member commented that this issue ties into the SU's broader policy of ensuring all students feel safe at the University, especially those who have experienced sexual assault.

A suggestion was made that The SU makes the training mandatory for students 'joining the SU'.

The SU President acknowledged that while the SU cannot make this a mandatory factor for students becoming a member of The SU due to its charity status whereby all students are automatically made a member upon registration with the University.

A SUmmit member suggested that the logical next step would be to make it mandatory within the SU, especially for sports teams and societies.

The CO agreed with this point but emphasized that the message needs to be more focused and concise, targeting specific areas rather than applying a blanket approach.

It was noted that the Bridge, a service providing advice and support related to the content of the training, is not well known to students, leading to a suggestion to review the proposed Standpoint to request a full review of the training and strategy around support provided to students.

Following amendments in the meeting, the final Standpoint wording was:

The SU believes that the University's sexual assault and harassment training should be regularly updated based on student and professional consultation and include clear guidance on support services.

The actions, updated within the meeting, were:

- Train security staff and other support staff in awareness of external support services, e.g. The Bridge.
- Training module to be regularly updated and reviewed according to the results of professional and student consultation, with the first update to be on what to do if you experience, witness or want to support a victim of sexual assault.
- SU and University to actively promote #NeverOk and show zero tolerance towards incidences of sexual harassment and/or violence.

Members of SUMmit were first asked to vote on the next steps, a super majority (66% + 1) was required for a vote to pass:

22 members present voted to proceed to vote on the adoption of the Standpoint

2 members present voted to call for statements

0 members present voted to recommend for referendum

9 members present voted to abstain.

Members of SUMmit were therefore asked to vote on the adoption of the Standpoint and actions as agreed above.

8 members present voted to adopt the Standpoint and actions

18 members present voted to not adopt the Standpoint and actions

7 members present voted to abstain.

The Standpoint and actions were not approved and will therefore not be added to the SU's Standpoint document.

5. **Statement of issue discussion #3 – Fossil Free Careers (2)**

The proposers of the Standpoint provided members of SUMmit with a short presentation providing context and explaining the rationale for the actions proposed. A similar proposal had been presented to the previous meeting of SUMmit and did not pass for adoption, the proposers had therefore reviewed and amended their asks.

The proposed wording for the Standpoint was: The SU believes that the University careers services should implement an ethical careers policy to ensure that it is not complicit in platforming the companies most responsible for the climate crisis.

The proposers explained that their Standpoint now focused on the CU200. BP, ExxonMobil, and two or three other companies working with the University of Bath feature on the CU200. The proposers had initially considered using the CU500 but decided to take smaller, more incremental steps.

One of the proposed actions from the proposers was the creation of the FFC Think Tank which would serve as a link between the Careers Service and students, deciding which relationships to end based on reports and discussions. The Standpoint proposers proposed that for every lost opportunity, two better opportunities would be introduced in its place to ensure choice and opportunities were not limited.

A SUMmit member reminded SUMmit that at the previous meeting concerns were expressed on the risk of impact on University research funding and the Gold Scholarship programme when turning down these companies. An action was suggested for this to be reviewed.

The Standpoint proposer responded by saying that the report they have recommended as part of their actions would include this consideration.

A SUMmit member raised concerns that this might make students suffer or prevent potential career changers from joining these companies. The Standpoint proposer countered, stating that this belief contradicts the idea of sustainability, emphasizing that these companies themselves will not change.

A SUMmit member asked for clarification, confirming that the proposal does not prevent students from pursuing careers in these companies but rather stops the University from advertising them. Another member sought clarification on the process of discussions, to which the Standpoint proposer explained that the report would be released, reviewed by the think tank, and further steps would follow.

The Standpoint proposer stressed that they are not trying to eliminate these opportunities altogether but simply to stop the University from advertising them. A member supported the idea of the think tank but raised concerns that the refusal to work with certain companies could go too far.

The Standpoint proposer clarified that the decisions to remove companies from recruitment relationships will be based on the think tank's findings.

It was clarified that nothing in the Standpoint is an action until the think tank reports back. The questions raised need to be answered before moving forward, and some members suggested that a call for student input might be necessary.

For the Standpoint proposers, SUMmit represents the student voice. The proposers had organised a recent event on this topic to provide more information, they advertised to SUMmit members, but only one member outside of the three who proposed the Standpoint attended, and only five responses were received to a previous feedback

form they had circulated to SUMmit members. They stressed that SUMmit is the space for student voice.

The SU President highlighted that the whole purpose of SUMmit is to steer the SU, and that there is nothing wrong with trusting those who know what they are talking about. The Standpoint proposers took feedback into account from the last meeting and returned with their current proposal.

A SUMmit member asked how the Standpoint would address concerns regarding the removal of opportunities for students. The Standpoint proposers responded by explaining that while these opportunities would not be advertised by the University, students could still find them independently, though they acknowledged that this could be an issue for some individuals.

The wording of the Standpoint had remained unchanged:

The SU believes that the University careers services should implement an ethical careers policy to ensure that it is not complicit in platforming the companies most responsible for the climate crisis.

The finalised actions were as follows:

Assess existing relationships with fossil fuel companies:

- Conduct a full review of all recruitment-related agreements between the university and oil, gas and mining companies.
- Publish a report detailing these relationships that is made available to students and staff of the university.

Lobby the University:

- To refuse all new relationships with oil, gas and mining companies in the CU200.
- To decline to renew any current relationships with these companies once the contractually obligated periods end.
- For every fossil fuel company removed from recruitment partnerships, the careers team should aim to establish at least two new relationships with companies in the renewable energy or sustainability sector. Policy should be implemented on a trial basis, where it is under continuous scrutiny and review.

Listen to students:

- Student feedback on the policy changes and specific company exclusions should be continuously collected and policy altered accordingly
- Differential impacts between student groups, e.g. students with low household income, should be particularly considered here.

Members of SUMmit were first asked to vote on the next steps, a super majority (66% + 1) was required for a vote to pass:

27 members present voted to proceed to vote on the adoption of the Standpoint

	<p>1 member present voted to call for statements</p> <p>3 members present voted to recommend for referendum</p> <p>3 members present voted to abstain.</p> <p>Members of SUMmit were therefore asked to vote on the adoption of the Standpoint and actions as agreed above.</p> <p>26 members present voted to adopt the Standpoint and actions</p> <p>5 members present voted to not adopt the Standpoint and actions</p> <p>3 member present voted to abstain.</p> <p>The Standpoint and actions were approved and will therefore be added to the SU's Standpoint document.</p> <p>The meeting concluded.</p>
--	--

Owner	Actions from Meeting