I'm sending everything with this email (poster, info sheet + consent, Padlet link, and the plan for the session). If you're up for it, I'd appreciate any thoughts you have, big or small. The workshop is designed as an **open discussion** around three main topics, to encourage participation, share lived experiences, and guide conversation through **open, accessible** (but still critical) **prompts and activities**. These include visuals, drawings, short notes, journey maps, scenarios, and storyboarding (see session plan).

I'd especially love your thoughts on:

I have added my thoughts in pink!

- Overall **concept**: Does it feel relevant, useful, and interesting?

Yes, it really does! Firstly, in terms of the delicate task of truly listening and understanding the lived experience of people working in LCC (and UAL) and then applying the knowledge that results - or creating the relationships that allow for working relationships – that make co-created spaces in which we can all thrive. I was part of some disability training led by Neuro box yesterday that focussed on people who are neurodivergent and what needs should be considered : in the conversation afterwards the staff present talked about the struggle to teach in an environment that is almost designed as the antithesis to those needs – calm, quiet, time rich and personal… the staff involved were either neurodivergent or dealing with disabilities and felt their student cohorts were at least 50% neurodivergent. We discussed how long it takes to get support outside of the university setting and the difficult relationships between private diagnosis and prescription action.

It was also often very positive in terms of strengths and challenges around different conditions: an interesting question when the landscape is essentially challenging, but it did manage to create pockets of positivity and empowerment – so, I guess it is worth recognising that the existence of this session is a positive thing that hopefully fosters empowerment and community!

- **Clarity**: Does the poster make sense? Is anything confusing or overwhelming?

  I think the overall feel visually is calm and welcoming, and everything feels fully and thoughtfully explained.

What does SIG stand for?

"Staff will be excluded" Does this imply that staff will be a threat to this process– could you say- "this is a private, student space to ensure….." and have student voices been actively "silenced"? I don't mean to doubt that these vital questions haven't been asked, and opinions haven't been sought – but have they been supressed?

I think the question and answer format for the form is brilliant - I thought 5 pages felt a bit daunting but they are actually very short – is it good to include a time e.g "5 minute read" although I get that that won't be the case for everyone if they are dyslexic etc.

- Tone & **accessibility**: Does anything feel off, too academic, or unclear?

  No, I don't think so – see comments above : Some of it is necessarily formal, but it gives you the sense that this is proper and can/will be taken seriously

- **Padlet** & **session plan**: Does it seem like something students would feel comfortable engaging with? Are the activities engaging? Is the pace okay?
- I would maybe foreground the actual questions more – perhaps by making them a little bigger but not bolder? They are really well judged and accessible questions I think
- Great that you summarise and give examples of policies – a tiny thing, but is it worth putting the link with the summaries instead of in a list at the end, so that participants can go straight to the ones they think are relevant?
- **Barriers** or friction: Is there anything that might make someone hesitate or feel unsure about taking part?