PsychUP for Wellbeing

Student Advisory Board Meeting 2 – Thursday 1 April, 10.00-11.30

Meeting minutes

Present	Apologies
Srishti Agarwal, UCL (SA) Andrea Carstensen, UCL (AC) Sophie Churchill, King's College London (SC) Jordan Elliott, Imperial College London (JE) Cate Goldwater-Breheny, ICL (CGB) Rachel Gu, UCL (RG) Annie Hata, UCL (AH) Nellia Kornilova, UCL (NK) Ritvij Singh, Imperial College London (RS) Thomas Steare, UCL (TS)	None
In attendance Laura Gibbon (Minutes), *PsychUP for Wellbeing* Coordinating Director, UCL (LG)	

Action summary

Action	Owner	Timeframe
Those open to being the first Chair send their name to LG; and LG to randomly select from the names given	All/ LG	01/04/21
Members to re-read Terms of Reference so that any changes can be made at the next meeting	All	13/04/21

Discussion

Item
1. Welcome LG welcomed the Board. There were no apologies.
2. Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising Minutes accepted.
3. Advisory Board planning It was agreed the student Chair would rotate, with members interested in being Chair for any one rotation putting their names forward to be selected at random. Rotations will last for one meeting with the student group and one meeting with the whole Board. **ACTION**: Members open to being selected for this rotation to send their names to LG

The meeting on 13 April will be a review meeting, where the Board will discuss the Terms of Reference (changes to be agreed); ways of working with the professional members (confirming how attendance at professional meetings will work); and any training needs.

ACTION: Board members to re-read Terms of Reference so that any changes can be agreed at the next meeting

4. Co-production

A key objective for the student Board will be to help develop the programme co-production strategy, such that we move beyond project-level co-production and the issues associated with this (e.g., difficulty consulting with as wide a range of students as we would like; keeping student steering groups involved when there are 'slow' periods on projects) – towards innovative co-production in each of the other programme workstreams.

The Board discussed whether members could take the lead on engaging students in the work of particular workstreams:
-   This is most likely to be relevant for four of the workstreams: Research & Evidence; Prevention & Community; Steps Model; University Clinics & Support for the System.
-   One possibility, to be discussed further at the next meeting, is that the programme maintains databases of students who have registered an interest in a particular workstream/ topic. The lead Board members for that workstream would engage with this group in the first instance – e.g., discussing and testing ideas – before doing wider consultations with the student community.
-   'Special interest' groups could be kept engaged with newsletter 'round ups' relevant to that workstream, curated by the student Board leads.
-   A number of possibilities for engaging the wider student community were discussed, including university Instagram accounts; external blogs/ university newspapers and other media; using existing networks (e.g., transition mentors); choosing particular times of the year to focus on communicating with students (e.g. around exams, University Mental Health Day etc).

The Board discussed the fact that there are some university communities where those in leading roles (e.g., academic reps) have the respect and trust of members. However, there are also university communities which are more superficial and where efforts from leaders could be seen as tokenistic, contributing to student cynicism about university communications. There are no easy answers to this problem, but there is a need to try to make communications as genuine as possible.

5. Any other business
None.