

Idea/Policy:	Generative AI [link to policy]
Date/Time/Location:	25 th November 2025 / 16:00 – 17:00 / The Guild
Student Attendees:	Jacob Dyke, Education Officer - Chair Max Williams, Sustainability Officer
Staff Attendees:	Jane Baston, Student Voice & Rep Manager – Staff Chloe Batten, Student Voice Coordinator (Democratic Engagement) - Secretary
Apologies:	N/A
Actions/Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CB circulate revised policy to members of the AG and Fern (student proposer). ▪ CB send minutes to Chair for approval. ▪ CB coordinate a second meeting if requested by AG members.

Minutes

JB – provides a summary of the purpose of an Action Group (AG) – to look at the policy or idea and work through what the Guild wants to do, either implement, reject, or send it to the All Student Vote (ASV). An AG may also amend policy.

JD – establishes context of the GenAI policy and approach for the meeting – we'll work through the suggested policies line by line.

JD – the first policy is “The Guild to eliminate use of Generative AI in areas such as marketing”. Does the Guild actually do this? Officer training encourages Officers not to use AI. Can't point to where it's being obviously used. Should ask Fern (proposer of the policies) whether she has examples of usage.

JD notes that GenAI does ease some tasks.

JB – eliminating GenAI would make Student Rep signups slower. We use Power BI to bring various bits of information together into one spreadsheet. Also exploring the use of Copilot.

JD – notes Copilot is useful for understanding implied/unspoken meanings within emails

JB – suggests the policy could recommend not to limit use of GenAI but give the Guild a preference of not using AI.

JD – adds - or to not actively promote use

MW – we're discussing two separate ideas. There is how the Guild uses AI vs how it externally encourages AI. MW suggests splitting the policy in two – internal policy not needing student input and policies more directly about students.

JB – suggests keeping both elements in the policy, e.g. the Guild will insert into its Ethical and Environmental (E&E) policy...

MW – if it's in the E&E policy then does it need to be a Guild policy as well? Agreed that it should be because then there is a student mandate behind it.

JB – the intention of the policy is about the Guild acting in an environmentally, ethically, socially responsible way

JB edits the first policy point to be, "The Guild will look to change to its Ethical and Environmental Policy to state that Guild staff, Officers, and Student Groups will be discouraged from using generative AI tools within their work."

*Group begins discussion of **second policy point**, "The Guild will look to change to its Ethical and Environmental Policy to state that Guild staff, Officers, and Student Groups will be discouraged from using generative AI tools within their work."*

MW – student groups are supposed to follow policy

JB – use of GenAI is very difficult to police. If student group uses AI and complaint is made it would be difficult to prove.

MW – we don't want to falsely accuse

JD – none of this is enforceable

JB – always an element of that. Some of it is about having the principle there even if we can't enforce or police it in a particular way

MW – would we have criteria of what it means to use/not use AI? E.g. guild will use x website to see if AI has been used. We'd have to be specific. Is that fair?

JB – a student could appeal

MW – people who have used it would slip through net. It adds pressure to students who *haven't* used AI

JD – raises concern about it getting to the point that someone's found to be using AI and gets banned from running in an election

JB – using AI doesn't affect election being free and fair because everyone can access it

JD – reflects that it almost makes it more fair

JB – we'd be casting a pre-judgment on student for using AI, when it's for students to judge candidates. Guild tries not to put things in policy that pre-judges candidates.

JD – students might falsely report candidates for using AI if they don't like candidate

JB – we can look at encouraging students to develop their manifestos without use of AI.

MW – can we include this in training. Students can tell when something's AI generated and don't like it. Guild could say, "We can tell, we won't stop you but students will notice and that may impact how they vote"

JD – suggests a 'this written by AI' tag

JB – again, this is asking people to make a judgement

JB – there's an education element – candidates needing the understanding to be able to write their manifesto and know its purpose. Should understand that you are scrutinised, will be measured on this, and that's part of why it's better they write it. Otherwise, being held to account on something you didn't write or don't necessarily want

Suggestion to meet with Fern to discuss changes to the policy made by the AG.

*Group begins discussion of **third policy point**, "Officers to lobby the University to alter the "Student and PGR guidance on using GenAI tools ethically for work" guidance so that it discourages students from using Generative AI as part of their submissions (with exceptions for studies on generative AI)."*

JD – what's classed as studying GenAI? Unis are starting to require students use AI and teach students how to use GenAI. How might it impact Guild's need of working with the university? Are we representing students properly by not engaging with AI?

JB – we can do both. Post-16 skills whitepaper talks about GenAI. Guild can take stance and say we disagree.

JD – doesn't disagree. JB – offers saying we have concerns instead

JD – issue is jobs of tomorrow will have AI, and are asking students for AI skills. If focusing on students' jobs of tomorrow we're doing a disservice to students if unsupportive of these jobs

MW – agrees AI is “needed” (in quotation marks). Some things are useful. Some things not and are used and abused e.g. writing 2 sentence email. Yes, there are jobs needing AI but policy is about the university being very pro-AI/lot of encouragement of it

JD – questions this

MW – courses have assessments on the level of which students can use AI. From a little to everything (data courses, especially).

MW – the uni's AI training for students doesn't mention impacts of AI other than one 2 sentence paragraph. Which doesn't mention ethical or environmental implications, or using AI responsibly or efficiently.

Should focus more on how we can give students more info about the ethical use of AI. Not that we don't want people using it at all, but thoughtfully and responsively and when you actually need. Not just a google alternative.

JD – suggests lobby university to show students efficient use of AI, as a policy revision

MW – there's detailed training on the Sustainability in Action course, but this is expected learning. Can't force students to take it or penalise if they don't. It has good info about ethical usage of AI.

JB – university's GenAi student guidance webpage has 2 sentences on ethical implications. No mention of it using power, electricity, or water.

JD – doesn't everything

JB – AI uses substantially more of these resources than other things

CB – people who live near to large data centres are experiencing negative impacts to water and air quality. Data centres are often built near low-income, rural communities, worsening racial inequalities. Idea that the world reacts less to issues affecting these communities so there's little protest.

JB – AI and its data centres increase use of fossil fuels, due to need for constant and reliable supply of energy. Has a negative impact on the climate, with worse effects on the Global South.

MW – need reliable energy source so fossil fuels rather than wind or solar

Not saying don't use AI. Only use it if you need it. Knows many students using it as a Google search. More education is needed rather than just about how to reference it, but how to actually use it.

Agrees AI is important. But preference for it differs college by college. Law hates it. Life and Environment love it because of data mapping tools, etc.

JB – words policy to reflect 'necessary use' or 'requirement of assignment'. Notes that it should say students and "researchers" given reference to PGR guidance in policy

JD – next steps are to send to Fern (student proposer) to see what her reaction is. We may need another meeting.

MW – may come back with other reflections

Meeting ends.