



Leicester 100 meeting minutes

Introduction

Victoria Boulton, the Students' Union Chair, opened the meeting thanking everyone for attending the meeting. Victoria explained that quorum for Leicester 100 is 78. The meeting had 75 people in attendance, so the meeting was not quorate.

Victoria explained the way that today's Leicester 100 meeting would be structured, and that due to timing we would not have time to feedback from the table discussions. They also explained that this would be their last meeting as Union Chair, and introduced Siya, the incoming chair. Siya expressed their excitement at starting the role, and also asked the room to thank Victoria for all her hard work.

Proposals

Revise the Discounts and Scholarships Programme- Ayo Akinsinmide

Victoria invited Ayo Akinsinmide into the room, where they provided an overview of the policy they presented. Main points included:

- Ayo introduced the fact that Academic Council have been working on this particular proposal, which had been brought forward by the Distance Learning PTO, Natalie Hayward
- The scholarships and discounts scheme is currently differently presented and applied between campus, international, distance, undergraduate and postgraduate students. Within the current system fee discounts (such as the 20% alumni discount and the 10% international family discount) are classed as scholarships and are often unable to be combined with scholarships based on merit, background or subject area.
- Different Midlands Universities allow similar combinations, scholarships and discounts
- The outcomes they would like to see are:
 - Separate discounts from scholarships and allow at least one discount and one scholarship to be combined.
 - Introduce the 5% full fee incentive/discount to home and international campus students.
 - Introduce a scholarship for undergraduate distance learners.
 - Introduce a merit-based scholarship for home-campus postgraduate students and look at other home-campus postgraduate scholarship opportunities.

Victoria invited the room, and those online, to discuss the idea. Key feedback points included:

- One group noted that they were broadly in favour, but had some reservations about who would get this and why. Specifically, it was stated that they don't just want them handed out, and should be earned. This was echoed, with comments that there should be discounts for people who deserve it
- There were concerns raised around where the money would come from, and they were worried that international fees would be increased to find the money for this. There were also concerns that it could impact other scholarships, would could see a

reduction. It was suggested that introducing partial scholarships or external funding partnerships could be a more sustainable approach.

- It was also noted that, as the cost of living becomes more of a factor in choosing unis for future students, having more academic scholarships could help with bringing in more students in the future years
- It was also suggested that broadening the spectrum of who can access these opportunities would support a more diverse range of talented students and promote greater equity in higher education.

Leicester 100 then completed an indicative vote. Out of 71 voting members, 58 voted to pass the policy (82%), with 4 against (6%) and 9 abstains (13%). Victoria informed the room that as the indicative vote passed, there is clearly a consensus this was a good idea, and it will be brought forward at next Leicester 100 meeting.

The development of a university-centralised behaviour policy- Amrita Matharu

Victoria invited Arifa Kanom, speaking on behalf of Amrita Matharu, into the room, where they provided an overview of the policy they presented. Main points included:

- Currently, there is no general policy around behaviour, and no standardised way staff can respond to behaviour
- Behaviour issues include noise, students moving around, exiting and entering in sessions, causing significant disruption to students' education
- It was stressed that this would not be about punishment but about creating a professional environment
- They would like to see the development of a centralised policy by the university, resulting in staff being provided with processes of what should happen in the face of bad behaviour
- This would create a consistent environment for students

Arifa proceeded to answer questions from Leicester 100, including:

Q - What kind of offenses and punishment would we see punished?

A – Arifa outlined the kinds of bad behaviour

Q - How do you decide what's too much?

A- It is about ensuring fairness and consistency

Victoria invited the room, and those online, to discuss the idea. Key feedback points included:

- There was significant concern that a behaviour policy would be too difficult to enforce in practice, and wouldn't have the desired effect of ensuring consistency. There was some agreement that in principle it was a solid idea, but there were repeated doubts shared it would be something impossible to implement successfully
- There were also fears expressed that such a policy might cause more harm and problems if there is defiance.
- It was also suggested that as adults, students should have the agency to waste their own time if they wish, and therefore a centralised policy is unnecessary

Leicester 100 then completed an indicative vote. Out of 72 voting members, 17 voted to pass the policy (24%), with 44 against (61%) and 11 abstains (15%). This meant that the indicative vote did not pass.

More ethical banking for the Students' Union- James Chick

Victoria invited James Chick into the room, where they provided an overview of the policy they presented. Main points included:

- James explained that the SU currently banks with NatWest – he noted that Natwest was not an awful bank, but not the best when it comes to ethical and sustainability practices
- If the SU changes bank, this could show their radicalness and their rejection of these practices, which could have an impact on other SUs and even the University itself
- James also noted this would be a simple change – the SU seemingly banks just for convenience, meaning it should be easy to divest from NatWest
- NatWest scored 17 out of 100 on the he Good Shopping Guide's Ethical Banks and Building Societies Ratings Table, which is very low. NatWest is known to have engaged in acts of environmental malpractice, linked to north sea oil companies, active in occupied Palestine regulatory breaches and fines
- It was also suggested that the SU could not claim to be squeaky clean with ethical practices if they continue to bank with NatWest
- James explained he hoped that this policy would have a domino effect of impact – and make the SU aware students are pushing for change

Victoria invited the room, and those online, to discuss the idea. Key feedback points included:

Q- Who would the SU bank with if not NatWest?

A- James suggested other options based of research, such as Triodos.

Victoria invited the room, and those online, to discuss the idea. Key feedback points included:

- There was general strong agreement that the proposal was clear, with a simple and quick solution
- There some concerns that it would be difficult to find a bank ethical or sustainable enough
- There were also some fears that banking with a smaller bank would significantly increase banking fees, or lead to the SU missing out on financial benefits
- One group did have some questions about whether the policy would affect the SU student society bank accounts negatively, but were generally in favour

Leicester 100 then completed an indicative vote. Out of 66 voting members, 46 voted to pass the policy (70%), with 9 against (14%) and 11 abstains (17%). Victoria informed the room that as the indicative vote passed, there is clearly a consensus this was a good idea, and it will be brought forward at next Leicester 100 meeting.

Demilitarise Uni of Leicester- Ethan Cross

Victoria invited Ethan Cross into the room, where they provided an overview of the policy they presented. Main points included:

- It was noted that Uni of Leicester has many ties to companies that provide weapons, research and careers. This is especially true of Space Park, where arms companies also have a presence. The companies that have ties to the University have provided weaponry to various forces, including weaponry for the Israeli military.
- The outcome of this proposal would be to lobby the university to cut these ties. The SU would meet with senior leaders, and not facilitate or work with the Careers team until arms companies are banned from campus.
- It was also noted that having seen extreme videos of violence and suffering using these weapons in the recent year, it was difficult to see the people profiting from these deaths coming on to campus.
- UoL have placed themselves as a key player in the arms industry and we should fight against this.
- Over 1000 students have signed an open letter supporting cutting these ties.

Victoria invited the room, and those online, to discuss the idea. Key feedback points included:

- There was a general strong agreement that, morally, cutting ties with arms companies would be correct
- There were concerns raised that if the University cuts its major contracts, it could take a massive financial hit. Thought would need to be given to how to navigate the financial issues to make sure the University can survive financially.
- There was some suggestion that students should be given the choice themselves to engage with these opportunities, and that banning them would stop students from being able access career paths they wished to follow

Leicester 100 then completed an indicative vote. Out of 71 voting members, 46 voted to pass the policy (65%), with 16 against (23%) and 9 abstains (13%). This meant that, if the meeting had been quorate, it would have gone to referendum. This policy proposal will return to Councils, with a decision to be made at a later date.

Executive Elections Discussion

Victoria introduced the Elections Questions, and explained the way the discussion would run – that the tables/groups would discuss and the notes would be collated to improve future elections.

The questions posed were:

- What is the ideal number of candidates to vote for in each position?

- How should student leaders be appointed? Do you think candidates should be shortlisted before running? Only elected? Appointed? What your thoughts are on this?
- If shortlisting is followed by an election for those shortlisted:
 - What could the process include?
 - How many candidates is an ideal number?
 - Who should do the shortlisting?
 - What should the application process look like?
- Should we allow voting on mobile devices? If yes, how should we approach the rules on this?
- What do the Executive Elections mean to you as a student?
- What would make an enjoyable voting week for students?
- Which freebie did you enjoy the most during the elections?
- What freebies would you like to see in the future?
- Did you vote in the Executive Elections? If not, why not?
- If you voted in the elections, why did you vote?
- How did you decide who to vote for?
- Did you review any resources to help you decide who to vote for?
 - E.g., candidate manifestos/200 words/candidate social media pages/SU candidate videos/survey etc.

The notes from these discussions are available as an appendix to these minutes.

Policy Lapse Discussion

Reed gave an introduction to the Policy Lapse discussion, and some general Officer recommendations around the lapsing policy. They will have until the 6th May at 9 am to vote. The policies include:

Activities Officer Role Description

It was noted that this role doesn't exist anymore.

The recommendation is to vote not to renew this policy.

15% of voting members voted yes. The policy lapses.

Yes	3
No	17
Total votes	20

Black Role Models

This policy called for Black History Month celebrations – something which now happens regularly, and has been implemented. It also includes some out-of-date names.

The recommendation is to either renew or not based on interest, as policy can be reallocated to new officers.

83% of voting members voted yes. The policy is indicatively renewed, subject to approval of the approval of the minutes at the next Leicester 100 meeting.

Yes	25
No	5
Total votes	30

Boycott The Sun Newspaper until Page 3 is removed

This is straightforward, as there is no page three anymore and no newspapers are sold on campus.

The recommendation is vote not to renew this policy.

83% of voting members voted yes. The policy lapses.

Yes	6
No	25
Total votes	31

Digitising All Required and Suggested Readings

It was noted that, since this policy had passed, a lot of reading lists have been digitised, but not all,

The recommendation is to either vote to renew based on interest.

96% of voting members voted yes. The policy is indicatively renewed, subject to approval of the approval of the minutes at the next Leicester 100 meeting.

Yes	27
No	1
Total votes	28

Disinvestment Defence

It was noted that this was a specific proposal regarding events that were taking place at the time, and is no longer relevant.

The recommendation is to vote not to renew this policy.

32% of voting members voted yes. The policy lapses.

Yes	7
No	15
Total votes	22

Leafleting during Elections

It was noted that this policy is good in principle, as leafleting is a good way for students to be informed about elections.

The recommendation is to vote to renew this policy.

63% of voting members voted yes. The policy lapses.

Yes	17
No	10
Total votes	27

Listing the full ingredients on all products in the library cafe and Delicious

Not having this present makes it difficult for students and staff to tell allergens. It was noted that the campaign has mainly been achieved, and that the policy is outdated.

The recommendation is to either ask Sustainability Council to bring an up-to-date policy back next year, or vote not to renew

One of the members of Leicester 100 noted here that it is student experience that this hasn't been done very well at some food outlets, so it could be worked on. Reed noted that students could be asked they could vote to send it to Sustainability Council for this.

96% of voting members voted yes. The policy is indicatively renewed, subject to approval of the approval of the minutes at the next Leicester 100 meeting.

Yes	25
No	1
Total votes	26

Lobby City Council to Rename De Montfort Hall

It was noted that the context for this was that it was felt that students should not graduate in a hall named after Simon Montfort, an individual who held deeply antisemitic beliefs.

The recommendation is to either vote to renew or not based in interest.

58% of voting members voted yes. The policy lapses.

Yes	15
No	11
Total votes	26

Support for the Prescription Charges Coalition

In principle, this policy is fine. It was noted that some of the statistics are out of date, and a number of actions have already been completed.

The recommendation is to either ask Liberation council to bring a revised up-to-date policy forward, or vote not to renew.

52% of voting members voted yes. The policy lapses.

Yes	11
No	10
Total votes	21

Support Student Sex Workers

In principle this policy is fine is fine, but some of the information is out of date.

The recommendation is to either vote or renew or not based on interest.

68% of voting members voted yes. The policy is indicatively renewed, subject to approval of the approval of the minutes at the next Leicester 100 meeting.

Yes	17
No	8
Total votes	25

To make exams fairer for all by implementing an "exams48" policy

In principle, this policy is fine. The policy is requesting that students must have 48-hour break between exams. There are some questions around how practical this could be.

The recommendation is to either vote to renew or not based on interest, it is a policy that can be reallocated to the appropriate Officers.

89% of voting members voted yes. The policy is indicatively renewed, subject to approval of the approval of the minutes at the next Leicester 100 meeting.

Yes	31
No	4
Total votes	35

To support the campaign for DSA

This policy is no longer relevant, as this campaign is no longer taking place.

The recommendation is to vote not to renew this policy.

29% of voting members voted yes. The policy lapses.

Yes	8
No	20
Total votes	28

Wasted Food

This policy calls for reducing food waste.

Principle is good however this policy now has clear problems, including outdated language.

Since this policy has passed, food waste has been minimised, with the community kitchen and food rescue volunteers fully in operation

The Recommendation for this policy is to ask Sustainability Council to update the policy and bring it back next year or vote not to.

79% of voting members voted yes. The policy is indicatively renewed, subject to approval of the approval of the minutes at the next Leicester 100 meeting.

Yes	30
No	8
Total votes	38

Workers' Rights Consortium

This policy was asking us to join a consortium targeted at North America. It doesn't make sense to do this.

The recommendation is to vote not to renew this policy.

33% of voting members voted yes. The policy lapses.

Yes	9
No	18
Total votes	27

Close

Victoria closed the meeting and thanked everyone for their attendance.

Attendance:

Aalok Bhavesh Gohil

Aaron Joseph George

Abby Simpkin

Abim Ibitoye

Aisha Nana Muhammad

Alaa (Ella) Moursel

Amrit Singh Dhot

Anushka Agarwalla

Avinaba Majumdar

Avtar Singh

Ayinawu Abdul-Samed

Ben Greatorex

Ben Jackson

Charlotte Chapman

Christina Oyalegan

Clement Omogbai Uanseru

Cleophee Cornou

Cynthia Warutere - excused for illness at 19.06

Diya Kulshrestha

Edward Holloway

Ella Chadwick

Elsa Darr

Emily Culshaw

Emma Good

Erin Stoves

Ethan Woodhead

Hannah Troop

Ibrahim Christopher

Isabel Higham

Isaiah Meadows

Ishan Bhakta

Izzy Marks

Janine Samji

Jay Gill

Jessica Danquah

Jude Macnab

Khadeejah Pirzada

Leon Lehal

Lisa Martin

Lucy Arnill

Mahnoor Raja

Manraj Layal
Matthew Clack
Megan Ives
Megan Memi
Mohammed Siddiqui
Molly Mather
Molly Taylor
Monica Patel
Muhammad Qaasim
Nadia Hossain
Nasar Yamin
Nawar Nusaiba
Niamh Perks
Nimi Manku
Olivia Phoenix
Rachel Eng
Raj Vaghela
Rama Dhanda
Sabeel Suleiman
Samad Nawaz
Sean Gjoka
Seher Zainab
Shamiso Sheta
Syed Usama Meer
Tanvi Indoria
Tea Kreka

Tega Adaware

Tom Patterson

Vlad Makar

Wasiu Abiodun Omoniyi

William Blewitt

Yendi Ayendwa

Zihua Wang

Zohran Arif

Apologies:

Paarth Acharya

Christine Mathew

Marianna Kalantzi

Esther Gbadebo

Tanya Ori

Charlotte Shenton

Charlotte Chapman

Atrindu Mukherjee

Vinay Reddy Thudi

Esha Mahmood Ramzan

Paras Chopra

Natalie Hayward

Svetlozar Ivanov

Hannah Burke

Minutes compiled by Emma Reed.