Meeting:	**SUmmit Minutes**
Location:	**Chancellors Building 3.5**
Date & Time:	**Tuesday 22 November 2022 17:30-19:40**

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 Neverauskaite	Postgraduate Officer
Elizabeth Stacey	Sport Officer
Viktor Toshev	Activities Officer
Titus Hiller	NUS Conference Delegate
Mahikha Raman	NUS Liberation Conference Delegate
Harry Wynne	Activities Exec member
Charlotte Foster	Activities Exec member
Emma Aldred	Sports Exec member
Jamie Cubitt	Sports Exec member
Zisis Tzifas Kratiras	Academic Exec member
Refilwe Badubi	Academic Exec member
Andre Jek	Diversity & Support Exec member
Shourya Gupta	Diversity & Support Exec member and Race Equality Group Rep
Lucy Ancheson	Media Exec member
Youssef Asaad	Senior Hall Rep
Bayu Patten	Senior Hall Rep
Antej Colic	Peer Support Member
Luke Ackerley	Peer Support Member
Jordan Sweeny	LGBT+ group Rep
Beatrice Clementel	Open Place
Jack Wilson	Open Place
Britt Flanderjin	Senate Rep

In attendance:

Mandy Wilson Garner	Chief Exec
Charlie Slack	Head of Student Voice and Engagement
Ben Palmer	Change and Inclusion Manager
Amy Young	Insight and Engagement Manager
Beki Self	Senior Administrator (Governance)
Ming Lee	Student Voice Admin Assistant

Item	
1.	**Welcome & Introductions from Chair** The Chair of SUmmit welcomed members to the first meeting of SUmmit for 2022/23. Members and staff present introduced themselves. Members were notified that the meeting will be recorded and that a photographer is present to take pictures of the SUmmit
2.	**Apologies** Apologies were noted from: Esther Jennings-Kirk

Chair:	
Date:	

		Pradhyummna Abhijit Lunkad Tudhgeet Kaur Hitansha Baranwal Peter Irvine Jasmine Jilma Isobel Shone
3.		**Minutes from previous meeting (Date of last meeting)** Due to technical difficulties at the last meeting full minutes are not available.
4.		**Actions from the last meeting(s)** No actions were recorded from the previous meeting
5.		**Standpoints** The Change and Inclusion Manager gave a reminder to members of the SUmmit of the process within the meeting and options given for each Standpoint. Prior to the meeting, SUmmit members have been provided with the Standpoints submitted and have been given the opportunity to comment and discuss each Standpoint in advance of the meeting via Teams. SUmmit members in the meeting would consider and debate for each Standpoint and make the following decision, using an in-meeting vote: Send to online vote (voting by SUmmit members) Determine the standpoint doesn't sufficiently impact members of a community to become a standpoint Refer to Head of student voice and engagement to provide a briefing Call for statements from the wider student community and discuss at next meeting Recommend to Board of Trustees that a referendum is held.
	5.1	Proposed Standpoint: Exam questions should be aimed at testing the understanding of content rather than memorization Proposer described that pre-pandemic in-person exams tested students based on their ability to memorise content. The structure of online assessments instead assessed students based on understanding of the content and would like to propose that moving forward, in-person exams should be similar to that of the online exams set in response to the pandemic. There was a consensus between the members of SUmmit that exams should test students based on understanding as it would have more real-world impact. However, there was also an acknowledgement that memorisation questions are needed to test for basic concepts. One Member of SUmmit proposed that should exams be heavily-based on testing of understanding cross-courses, it would be beneficial that crib sheets are allowed for exams university wide as this means that exams can be set out to be application-based rather than memorization Due to the consensus for supporting exams based on testing understanding and the need for memorization-based questions in some situations, a Member of SUmmit proposed that the wording of the standpoint should be changed rather than discuss whether understanding-based exams should be supported.

Chair:	L.Volentir
Date:	29/11/2022

Another Member of SUmmit proposed that the wording of the Standpoint should be expanded to include the ability to bring in crib sheets and having open-book exams as these will facilitate the use of exams testing understanding. They also alluded that durations of exams should also be visited as they acknowledges that timed exams put people under stress which may implicate exam performance.

SUmmit Members did not reword the Standpoint in the meeting, only the discussion that the Standpoint should be re-worded took place.

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

Finalisation of the wording will take place outside of the meeting with the Standpoint's Proposer and the final wording will be available when the Standpoint goes to vote.

5.2	Proposed Standpoint: The University should offer appropriate revision materials for different exam formats

Proposer highlighted that students are often not made aware of how exams will be structured until the end of term. This is concerning especially with the switch from online assessments to in-person exams. Proposer commented that not all past papers are released in the library and that they are only released by their lecturers during the end of term/ reading week. This Standpoint is important because students have experienced two format changes in recent years, as such clarity is much needed with exams this year.

A member of SUmmit questioned the Proposer as to what would be considered as appropriate revision materials. Proposer explained that exam questions pre-2019 were similar while post-2019, the exam questions are more creative and about expanding on concepts. The Proposer suggested that a guidance on what works well with this type of exam/question format for students should be drawn up.

Another Member of SUmmit suggested that the Standpoint needs to be more explicit about what different formats and what would be appropriate revision materials.

There was further discussion about what appropriate materials meant. A Member of SUmmit highlighted that 'appropriateness' is subjective to different people, and it would be difficult to satisfy the requirements of different exam types and students learning styles. Another Member acknowledged the position that the Proposer is coming from but felt that the revision materials provided through the Library is sufficient. They also highlighted that the need for past exam questions as revision material is in direct conflict of the previous Standpoint (Exam questions should be aimed at testing the understanding of content rather than memorization) because if questions are aimed at testing understanding, the questions each year on testing application would be different, making the past exam questions irrelevant.

Other concerns relating to revision materials that were brought up by Members of SUmmit including lecture recordings not being made available to students which may be a disadvantage especially students with disabilities; The University should amend current policy of not providing model answers alongside the past exam paper to providing at least one set of ideal answers as this may encapsulate all the different revision styles.

Chair:	L.Volentir
Date:	29/11/2022

Clarification of the Standpoint was requested as the question of why 'appropriateness' was used was posed by a SUmmit Member. The Proposer clarified that the use of 'appropriateness' is stemmed from the format of exams not being the same as before as such there should be the appropriate set of revision materials supporting the current format of exams.

A Members of SUmmit suggested that past papers might not be the best revision materials as courses have been tweaked and improved over the years, making past papers less relevant to how courses are structured now. They also felt that different exam formats might not be the right term for the Standpoint.

Decision: Call for statements from the wider student community and discuss at next meeting.

5.3 | Proposed 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

Proposer introduced the Standpoint by highlighting that the existing effort from the University is through SSLCs (Staff Student Liaison Committees). Instead, more should be done including asking students from wider student body for opinions/debate. Proposer feels that this input should not be relied on the Academic Reps/ Faculty Reps.

A Member of SUmmit agrees that students should be more involved but the Standpoint should be worded to be more specific. For example, making the Standpoint course specific.

However, a Member of SUmmit from the Peer Support area highlighted that given the support provided to first years, there has been no feedback on what tailored support is needed by the cohort and there is no opportunity to share their views. They often receive feedback from students as a Peer Mentor but do not have a mechanism to feed this back other than emailing the individual lecturer.

There was also a question of how to draw the line between the responsibilities of Academic Reps and students. Proposer felt that the line should not be drawn and that everyone should equally participate in providing input in course-related decisions.

A SUmmit Member questioned what this Standpoint is going to change as there are many opportunities for students to provide feedback such as through Unit Evaluations and course surveys. Rather, they feel that it is a problem of increasing engagement in terms of the existing options.

The Education Officer gave some wider context with this issue and highlighted that there is difficulty in getting student engagement because there are areas where student voices are welcomed but there are instances where it is discouraged, for example some courses discourage students from becoming an Academic Rep. There is also a concern where on some matters, student voice is taken into consideration but there are some instances where student voice has been bypassed but it is unclear how changing of wording will change anything. A Member of SUmmit highlighted that the relationship between Academic Reps and students is lacking compared to pre-

pandemic. If the rapport is built again, this may allow for a more representative student voice through the existing Academic Rep system.

The SU President gave further context and highlighted that the SU is aware of the problem with engagement between Academic Reps and students, they invited the Head of Student Voice and Engagement to update SUmmit relating to recent developments in this area.The Head of Student Voice and Engagement updated that the SU Leadership Committee has recently agreed to invest in a tool, Unitu, which allows elected Reps to reach out to the student community about problems that need to be discussed, this will be used initially with Academic Reps but has the option to be rolled out to other representative roles. However, this tool will only be brought in the next academic year. Additionally., the University will be recruiting a new position of Assistant Pro-Vice Chancellor Student Voice whose role will be specifically looking at the gap between student voice and the University.

Problems of transparency within the chain of communication was also brought up which makes students unaware of what is being done with feedback.

Decision: Refer to Head of Student Voice and Engagement to provide a briefing and bring back to the next meeting.

| 6. | **Break** |
| 7. | **UCU Strike Action Update** |

SUmmit Members were welcomed back to the meeting by the Chair.

The SU President provided an update about the UCU Strike Action. In response to UCU (Universities and Colleges Union) announcing strike action to take place this month, the SU Officer team reached out to their Executive Committees and SUmmit members to gauge opinion on the strike action and whether the SU should take a stance to support the UCU strike action or not. This course of action was taken rather than through a referendum due to the timing required to enact a referendum which would have meant the result would have been after the action. A Member of SUmmit challenged how the decision was made regarding who was consulted, as they had concerns that the responses from SUmmit members alone may not be representative. The SU President responded that SUmmit members and SU Executive Committees were asked to share their opinions before the Officer team decided upon a stance. The SUmmit Member further asked who would be taking part in the strike action.

The SU President clarified that some lecturers are UCU members, and they have the choice of participating in this Strike Action (or not). The SU President also informed that the SU Officers will briefly join the picket line in support of PGR Students who are affiliated with the UCU.

The Community Officer also reported that there are concerns of longer period of strike action if the current strike is not successful. There has been news of more impactful actions to come in the following year such as marking boycotts. They clarified that the rationale behind supporting this strike is to hope that action will be taken to prevent further impactful actions on the student body. The current stance to support the strike action only applies to the three dates of strike action happening this November.

| Chair: | L.Volentir |
| Date: | 29/11/2022 |

	A SUmmit Member was curious about financial compensation because they felt that the University is financially benefitting from the strikes as the lecturers that go on strike would not be paid for those days.

The Head of Student Voice and Engagement clarified that staff who strike are not paid and this money deducted from staff pay goes into a central pot, in the past the University has agreed with the SU that this money would go into the Student Hardship Fund or a mental health fund for staff and students. It was further clarified after a question from a SUmmit Member that this pot of money is not used to pay for any refunds awarded to students following a successful complaint submission related to the impact of strikes.

The process and concerns around the submission of a complaint by students who feel they have been adversely impact by strike actions was also discussed. The Change and Inclusion Manager responded that there is a FAQ page on the Student Voice webpage on the SU website addressing how students can make a complaint and when financial compensation may/may not be offered as a result of a complaint. [NOTE: for information the webpage is https://www.thesubath.com/voice/campaigns/staff-strikes/] |
| 8. | **Officer Reports**

The Chair invited Officers present to elaborate their work so far to the SUmmit members based on their circulated reports.

SU Postgraduate Officer
The Postgraudate Officer introduced the key meetings she is a member of and the current issues she is addressing. This includes improving PGT Dissertation Supervision as the PGT Dissertation Survey revealed some low satisfaction rates. There is also effort in looking into cost of living and mental health specifically for doctoral students, research integrity and postgraduate student engagement, amongst other issues.
Achievements thus far include PGT Student mental health and support during the summer, the PGT Dissertation Survey, Doctoral Breakfasts and finalising the University Challenge representatives.

SU Community Officer
The Community Officer led with the items they have completed thus far which included creation of Liberation Networks, the student submission for the Mental Health Charter, working with Diversity and Support Groups and working with University on cost of living interventions. They highlighted their key responsibilities and meetings they attend. The main priorities for the remainder of the year include supporting the Mental Health Charter onsite visit, revamping the Inclusivity Award, making the campus more accessible, reviewing counselling, mental health and wellbeing services and inclusivity training.

SU Education Officer
The Education Officer introduced items that she is currently working on which included issues around assessment and feedback, online and in-person exams, personal tutors, study spaces, unit evaluations, embedding sustainability into the curriculum. She highlighted the meetings that she attends and her support in the Teaching Excellence Framework for the submission from the students perspective. |

Chair:	L.Volentir
Date:	29/11/2022

	SU Sports Officer The Sports Officer provided an update on the year so far where there was a change in kit suppliers, increase in inclusion and welfare, Instagram use to increase engagement, new sports facilities to be introduced and promoting competitive and recreational sport. Current projects include increasing engagement in sports competitively and recreationally through an interhalls football competition, embedding sustainability, officer elections and maintaining relationships with external partners such as BUCS (British University and Colleges Sport) where she is a regional representative and sits on the national advisory board. **SU Activities Officer** The Activities Officer introduced their key responsibilities and reported on their achievements thus far. This included providing pay to student groups that participate in University open days because open days are often during holidays as such students might not be willing to come unless incentivised. Seven new societies were affiliated, progress on the LinkedIn Volunteer Recognition Scheme has been made, formal breakfasts between outstanding student leaders from different areas of the SU and the Vice Chancellor have been organised as well. Moving forward, there is a focus on ensuring proper handover between committees, coordinating campus wide events, lobbying for equitable distribution of employability resources among all University faculties and working with international societies. **SU President** The President provided an introduction to the meetings he is a member of and an overview on the issues he has worked on which included the Transport Strategy, SU Trustee recruitment, working with the Head of Commercial on cost of living offers, response to staff strikes and student media development. For the year ahead, there will be a focus on Transport Strategy, increase awareness of cost of living challenges, and engaging with students to ensure student voice is heard. Officers asked SUmmit members if they had any questions. No questions were posed by members.
9.	**Standpoint proposal creation** Due to time constraints, this item not covered but consideration will be given to help support SUmmit members to create Standpoint Proposals for future meetings.
10.	**Any Other business** The Activities Officer asked SUmmit Members to promote the NUS referendum to their respective groups as Members are influential individuals in their communities. He also wished to clarify that the representation on input into the SU taking a stance regarding the UCU strikes was wider than the comments given in the SUmmit Teams group.

The meeting ended at 19.40

Item number	Action

Chair:	L.Volentir
Date:	29/11/2022