

Bristol Student Community Partnership

Meeting Minutes



Date/time	Friday 22 October 2021 14.00pm -15.30pm	Venue	Zoom call
Chair	Gerry Rice - Dean for Students, UWE Bristol		
Attendees	Lucinda Parr (UoB), Curtis Asante (UoB), Ben Pilling (UoB), Ruth Day (UoB), Ewan Doswell (Bristol Waste Company), Cllr Guy Poultney (BCC), Dr Jill White (Resident Group Representative), Andrew Waller (Community Representative), Liam O'Shea (UoB), Gerry Rice (UWE), Sharon Evans (UWE), Emma Dent (UWE), Fiona McVey (Community Representative). Emma Williams (Bristol Waste) Richard Johnson (BCC Private Housing), Ben Pilling (Bristol SU), Jenifer (Bristol Waste), Sarah Lynch (City Office), Steve Ayres (BCC Neighbourhood Enforcement)		
Actions			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) LO to create actions register and request individual actions updates in advance of meeting 2) RD to consider what an ethical lettings charter that goes beyond existing certification scheme might look like 3) BP to explore signposting students to Residents Associations via SU Volunteering Portal. 4) Cllrs to take concept of "Library of things" to next green mingle. 5) GR to circulate UWE revised disciplinary policy when finalised 6) All to populate Google Doc with relevant policy documents 7) LO to provide piecemeal updates on approach set out in Respect proposal response, including developed collateral 8) EW to meet with UoB comms to discuss messaging collaboration 9) RJ to ask private housing team how BSCP can collaborate with private landlords to help with noise pollution. 10) RJ to ask Private Housing to brief on capacity to enforce HMO licencing 11) RJ and AW to liaise on residents joining quarterly landlord and reps meeting, and collaborate on newsletter messaging 12) LO and GR to share student enrolment numbers for 2021/22 ahead of next meeting 			
Agenda			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome and quick introductions (all) 2. Minutes of last meeting – for approval (all) 3. Respect for Communities proposal - partnership responses (all) 4. BCC Private Housing Team introduction (JM) 5. Action Plan reporting (all) 6. General updates (all) 7. AoB 			
1)	<u>Welcome & Partnership Background</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GR Rotating Chair • GR welcomed all to the meeting and individuals introduced themselves and their role to the group. 		

2)	<p><u>Previous Actions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous minutes were reviewed and approved.
3)	<p><u>Group Updates</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RD continuing to consider ethical lettings charter that goes beyond existing certification scheme. • Cllrs to take concept of “Library of things’ to next green mingle. • BP confirmed exploring signposting students to Residents Associations via Volunteering Portal.
4)	<p><u>Respect for Communities proposal - partnership responses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LO submitted his presentation to the Group. LO went through the key highlights from his document report with the focus on, ‘Tone, Timing & Reach’. • Tone: The thinking about tone would be presented via various channels, and platforms. The aim would be to find the right ‘tone’, which would continue to be a challenge – push and pull, carrot and stick. • LO encouraged the Group to read his report/ document. Engaging behaviour experts at the University to inform tone and talking to students themselves – what do they think of what they get and what will work better? • Exploring various creative approaches through a whole network of student coms channels inc. email, signage, social media with an ad-based creative approach and other channels such as the student blogs, student media platforms etc. • The ‘Shush Poster’ campaign is being looked at as part of a wider review, looking at how it can be further enhanced. • Reviewing web content and other messaging to aid clarity and resonate. • Enlisting student champions to be advocates for the cause. • Desire to work with Bristol SU and BCC to amplify approach. • Timing: Residents Association want early intervention, and this has been met by continuing to reenforce the messaging throughout the year. • Messages shared across academic year, including before students start at the university. Messaging ratcheted up at key points of the year e.g. joint VC letter to students, VC and Mayoral address to students at start of academic year to set the tone. • Mandatory online induction module in place and other various campaigns, e.g. ahead of summer move in from halls of residence. • LO said there was potential to further enhance online modules and looking at how to make these more engaging. • CA role is also key in engaging with students before they move to community, and the use of social media – add-based created approach trailed for Halloween. • Reach: LO confirmed the UoB is aiming for 100% of the target audience, however 100% would be a difficult goal to achieve, but nonetheless, that would still be the UoB’s goal, and the UoB would always continue to work on it. • UoB would continue to use a mix of different communication channels. I.E Emails, social media, signage, in-person talks, door knocking etc. • FM: Posed the question, ‘Is there mandatory training?’ • LO: Confirmed that the accommodation office induction for all those in accommodation was mandatory. • AW: Asked if there was a way to monitor these results? • LO: Confirmed that he would find out if Students can register online before doing the modules, which would be logged as an action.

- LO also confirmed that the Mayor made an address that went out to all Students, and strong community messaging was promoted, that Students should consider themselves as members of the city with obligations to others.
- LO: UoB always looking at ways to further embed, and track engagement.
- LO is optimistic, and even though these issues will continue to be a challenge, UoB is committed to continue to do its best.
- EW: asked if UoB comms messaging include waste management’?
- LO confirmed UoB’s messaging does include waste as an issue.
- GR provided further updates from UWE. Highlighted key processes which he confirmed are very similar. Online module development, and bringing modules together to target students. Health & Safety, Waste, Noise and what being a good neighbour means.
- GP asked if Cllrs could share the [joint VC letter](#) with residents. UoB and UWE confirmed.
- AW: Thanked UoB for thorough response – a lot to be positive there. UoB is undertaking broad range of activity, and UWE doing similar things. However, asked why is it that if the messaging is so good, there are still problems/issues, and the community is still on the receiving end of student behaviour’?
- Community knows a lot of work taking place, and the messages shared are the right ones.
- AW believes that this must mean that the messaging is not getting through. Wants UoB to conduct further diagnosis as to why this is still happening, which would have to be more detailed, which he believes comes down to, ‘reach’.
- AW recognised voluntary engagement is best, but recommends that UoB makes use of ‘mandatory practices. Suggest UoB looks at more scope for mandatory engagement, and not just at induction, but during many other key milestones.
- GR confirmed that students must register at the start of every year, and the messaging is repeated at multiple points throughout the year. On mandatory principle, GR compared with individuals understanding and knowing we shouldn’t speed when we drive, we pass a test, there is enforcement, and yet, many people consciously speed and get caught by the police. There is no way to share a message and force engagement with that message. What you can do is track who’s received it, but not who has understood and acted on it. Have to wrap around intentions with practicalities – the best way to deliver messages and best way to help people live up to expectations, with realistic sanctions if needed.
- AW reinforced his views, and still believed that there must be greater use of mandatory engagement. AW also proposed the introduction of more disciplinary actions, and enforcement – must work with education.
- GP appreciates that things are getting better, esp. Op Beech, however felt that even if only 10% gets through the gaps, improvements still need to be made.
- GP believes that acceptable behaviour should be included into contracts, which will help, esp. students in halls. Proposed if there was a way this could not only be incorporated into the accommodation contract, but also the university’s student contracts.
- GR said student contracts stress potential impact on academic journey if expected behavioural standards are breached. There is a process to go through, and a set of expectations.
- JW asked how many students there are. UWE and UoB will circulate enrolment figure ahead of next meeting.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FM raised complaints statistics report showing increase in complaints. Believes UoB are not being firm enough in disciplinary action and wanted to see more correlation between complaints and sanctions. It now feels like complaints result in a visit and a warning, but not a lot else. • Parties used to be an automatic trigger for a higher sanction because they were a premediated violation of our local rules, and they felt this too has gone, together with the community fund and student ambassadors. • LO: there is a danger of associating antisocial behaviour to just students, but it is in fact a societal and city-wide issue, and the university is not entirely responsible for behaviours, and these issues cannot be resolved alone. • Accepted complaints have gone up but there is a context to this, including the pandemic. Considering other many variables, i.e., closure of the night-time economy last year, many students did not travel over the summer, many people WFH. Beech was more well-known than in previous year. Number of complaints does not equal number of incidents. These are not excuses, but key indicators to add context to the data. • LO confirmed that the Community fund is still being considered, and looking at how best to proceed, and how it will work, especially with regards to impact. • FM understands anti-social behaviour is a city-wide problem. Confirmed she believed that there has been an increase in incidents. i.e., Noise pollution. • GR confirmed that we are all trying to address these issues. Exploring thresholds, and noise. Behaviours etc. GR still felt strongly that most students are decent individuals. GR felt strongly that everyone in the group is invested. The reps in the meeting are all committed, and efforts show commitment from the Universities.
5)	<p><u>BCC Private Housing Team introduction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Richard Johnson confirmed that he was not in the Licencing Team but was asked to join in their stead. • GR: Posed the question ‘how can we engage private landlords/colleagues to respond to noise pollution?’ • Action was given to RJ to take back to his team, and report back to the Group with updates. • RJ confirmed that the Landlords and Agents have quarterly meetings and make use of a mailing list with a small population of licenced Landlords, RJ confirmed happy to help use these channels for comms. • AW: Reiterated that he believes that most of the problems with regards to Students and noise pollution, is with students living in HMOs. AW posed the question to the group that, ‘is there a way that private landlords and the city council’s Private Housing team could be instrumental and help be more responsive to how we can resolve these issues? Students are landlords’ tenants. HMO licencing relates to management of tenants’ behaviour. Sense that conditions are not being enforced by the council. Is there scope to create a housing working group, with UoB, RD, Flatline, Bristol SU lettings, BCC Private Housing, etc. • JR: Could invite landlords and reps to come along to BSCP – they may not take that up. Residents might be better to join their quarterly (West of England) meeting. • RJ and AW to speak after meeting to take action forward.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GP said unlicensed HMOs are one of biggest problems. GP has a letter from BCC saying licencing enforcement is not a priority. This creates bad incentives for landlords. • GP asked for someone from Private Housing could join next meeting with briefing on state of capacity in HMO enforcement. • RJ to pick up action with licencing team. • GR: Recommends that if Private Housing can share info ahead of next meeting
6)	<p><u>Future Meeting Timetable</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future meetings were confirmed and scheduled to January 2022 with an alternating Chair (Cllr Paula O'Rourke) from all involved parties.
7)	<p><u>AOB</u></p> <p>None</p>