**Leicester 100 meeting minutes**

**Introduction**

Victoria Boulton, the Students’ Union Chair, opened the meeting thanking everyone for attending the meeting and outlined the agenda and policymaking process.

Victoria explained that quorum for Leicester 100 is 75. The meeting had 91 people in attendance, so the meeting was quorate.

**Proposals**

**Lowering Food Pricing on Campus- Grace Lewis-Bettison**

Victoria invited Grace Lewis-Bettison into the room where they provided an overview of the policy they presented. Main points included:

* It is unreasonable to make students to pay prices and staff to pay high prices for food on campus
* DMU is in the city centre and they have lower prices
* The opening times of the outlets on campus.

Grace proceeded to answer questions from Leicester 100 including:

*Q- Should prices come in line with Sainsbury's?*

A-Negotiations may be challenging due to there being a proximity issue, but voting against the pricing means there should be sway to make an influence on pricing.

*Q-Are most food outlets owned by the university or private?*

A- All are university-run by Leicester Service Partnership. I will elaborate on this in my speech for the policy.

*Q- If private owned, are they regulated by Leicester University themselves? Is this what affects the price?*

A- This is understandable, but with student influence, we should be able to debate the university and make this change.

No one presented a speech against the proposal, so Victoria invited the room to discuss the idea. Key feedback points included:

* We agree broadly with the proposal but have concerns surrounding the funding for this, the prices mentioned, and the variety of food available
* We are in consensus, but we wanted to know about how this would be implemented and if this would be all campus stalls
* In my time as a student, I have seen prices keep increasing across my degree, and we are in broad agreement
* We have a concern with not having enough information about the renting costs for stall holders which could influence the price
* I'm also happy with it. I've struggled with affording food on campus for my whole degree so lowering prices would be great
* I completely agree, I struggle to find any points to counter the proposal as well.

Victoria determined there was an overall consensus for the proposal to pass, but asked everyone to vote for legitimacy.

Out of 91 voting members, 88 voted to pass the policy, with 2 against and 1 abstain. The proposal passed and Victoria invited Leicester 100 to provide feedback on how this idea could be implemented. Key suggestions included:

* It should be considered whether this could affect other outlets
* Grace raised that the changes would be for all outlets, for example Percy Gee and the Library. Free hot water access is an issue in the medics building as it is not free. Hopefully this will be free in the short term and there will be cheaper options in long-term
* We wanted to know how much it would cost at Brookfield canteen and we would also like opening times to be extended
* Grace responded saying they will speak to more Business students but hope to have outlets open at 5 and 6pm so it will help students with late lectures on campus.

This proposal will now be taken forward by a Task and Finish Group, including Grace, students, and Officers, where the Students’ Union will lobby for these changes to take place.

**Extended Bus Operation Timings- Zia Ali**

Next, Victoria invited Ajay Reddy, the Sports and Societies Officer, to present an idea on behalf of Sports Council. The idea was originally proposed by Zia Ali on the Ideas System. Ajay presented an overview of the idea.

Ajay then presented an argument for the proposal. Leicester 100 was then invited to speak against the proposal.

Questions were then asked to Ajay including:

*Q- In the mornings, getting from Oadby to campus means the buses are either full and/or late. Would you consider adding two morning 8am buses to facilitate more students getting to campus?*

*Q- Considering the current cash flow of the university, and the issues this presents, how would this be financed?*

A- I am not sure

Victoria reminded Leicester 100 that Ajay did not originally propose the idea and sensed a general theme of disagreement. Other feedback included:

* I don't oppose the idea behind the proposal but it doesn't read very clearly. It mentions extra buses on a Sunday at the start but nowhere else after, and doesn't seem to suggest how it could be implemented, only that it should
* I do understand the frustrations with the buses not running late and it is definitely something that could be amended however I do also think there are some changes that need to be made to the proposal to make it clearer
* I believe it would help a small portion of students, but the consequences generally are not mentioned
* Also financially, would it be used by enough people to make it worth it, or would implementing more buses at 8am be more effective to the majority?
* The proposal itself would be more impactful if it mentioned how many students this affects, how many go to clubs which finish late/start early, how many feel unsafe walking back to their accommodation after the last bus, etc
* I think buses would be more useful later at night than in the morning. Yes, it might be helpful to more people at 8am but surely safety at night is more important than convenience in the morning?
* I'd be inclined to agree but that's where you need student input from a survey etc
* I agree that it is beneficial to have extra buses
* We agreed, but are concerned with how this would be financed. We would need information about how this would work, and the proposal is vague to reach a conclusion
* Idea is good but we don't need two buses in the evening and from experience, evening buses aren't busy. In the morning we need more buses and need to have one be a double decker so students can arrive on time
* We agree in theory but implementation is a concern, considering funding
* We agree in theory but we don't think it's feasible financially and there are benefits missed in the proposal
* The proposal didn't mention other societies in proposal
* We agree but need to know about the costs
* Overall, we agreed, but there were some disagreements.

Victoria sensed that there was general agreement, but because people thought the policy needed improvements, Victoria suggested that Leicester 100 voted on a policy suggestion to take the idea to the next Leicester 100 meeting as fully-formed proposal. 90% of voting members of Leicester 100 voted to take the idea back to Sports Council and the student. The idea would be taken to the next Leicester 100 meeting in term two.

**Revitalise the Botanical Gardens and Allotments to Function as a Community Garden- James Chick**

James Chick, Sustainability Officer of the Students’ Union, was invited to provide an overview of the policy. Key points included:

* We are in a climate crisis and students are worried about the climate
* Lancaster University has a similar scheme for growing food
* This idea could also help tackle the cost of living.

Next, James presented a speech for the proposal, then Victoria invited Leicester 100 to provide questions to James.

*Q- The Botanic Gardens are open to public, so how would you avoid damage to the gardens?*

A- There would be a separate section for students where the food would be grown.

*Q- How would you stop invasive species from being grown?*

A- There will be a black list for things that would not be allowed to be grown.

Feedback and speeches against the proposal included:

* My only real concern with the proposal is how you identify those who are struggling with the cost of living, and whether it may be fair to allocate a portion of the produce to students who haven't contributed to growing it. Other than that, no issue
* I also feel that most lower income background students may get the highest student loans and the most well-off students would get the lowest student loans meaning it is those well-off background students who are struggling and in need of the support, but then also should their families be giving them more finance to make up for it
* think it would be too complicated to figure out who needs to support the most - who gets what loan and who has what income and who has what support from their parents. You'd have to do that on a case-by-case basis and with the number of students at the university, I don't think that would be feasible
* I think the botanical gardens is lovely as a wild natural place, why does it need to be ruined and become essentially a farm to harvest loads of vegetables etc
* It'd be much more straightforward (and fair in my opinion) to split the produce amongst those who grew it
* Whilst I don’t disagree with the idea behind the proposal, I disagree with how it’s being put forward and I see several issues with it
* There can be health and financial concerns with offering plant-based options on campus, and there are cultural and sensory aspects to consider so students have options to eat safe foods.
* We agreed in principle that having a community garden is important but there are issues with how long crops take to grow and students may not get anything from it
* One student raised there could be a log book approach where the productivity of food needs to be considered
* One student raised would food be distributed needs to be considered
* Overall, it is a good idea but might be more of a more society thing than a university thing because students might be too busy or not care so they need more knowledge about pesticides etc
* Overall, we were in agreement, but how it is implemented is something to look after, especially with maintenance during holiday periods and the time to learn the skills could take time
* One student raised who would protect the garden and how would this be available to students?
* One student suggested an amendment because of the implementation challenges so that the university can use SEED funding to plant fruit orchards rather than having a community garden. This would be available on campus and is less to maintain

Victoria determined there was no clear consensus for the proposal, so she proposed that the policy is moved to the next Leicester 100 meeting as a policy suggestion. This would allow the proposer to make changes and consider the feedback.

Out of 64 voting members, 76% voted to refer the proposal back to the student so they can make amendments and bring the proposal to the next Leicester 100 meeting.

**Motion to Transition the University of Leicester Catering Across University Campuses to More Plant-Based Options- Adam Morgan**

Finally, Victoria invited Adam to bring their proposal. Adam presented an overview of the policy, with key points including:

* We are on track to have 1.5 to 2 degrees of warming even if we take no action
* Universities can have an impact by bringing more plant-based options
* We know that there are different reasons why people might not be able to eat plant-based food, which is why we are not proposing 100% plant-based for all stalls.

Adam then presented a speech for the proposal, then someone from Leicester 100 presented a speech against the proposal:

* I have an issue with the figures being ambitious. If you buy food on campus, vegan options are already here. Food should be the last thing to work on now to address sustainability. There are other things that should be addressed now as it is a touchy subject and 100% of options is challenging for people with nut and soya allergies. It is worth making vegan options but health aspects and religion need to be considered.

Further feedback on the proposal included:

* There is no precedent that students want most of the on-campus food to be plant-based, aside from the votes in the Ideas System. As I understand it there have been several options openly available which offer just plant-based, ethical, or vegan options and these have shut down due to a lack of interest. If the proposal is successful then it will hugely impact the vendors currently offering food on-campus, and they may decide to move elsewhere where they can offer their full menu without restriction. The impact will also extend to partners often seen at Student Union events, such as Dominos or Nando’s as they’ll see their footfall decrease if they are forced to offer plant-based options. The split between 60% on-site and 100% for events doesn’t make much sense, especially considering that the argument for offering 60% on-site is to allow those with religious or dietary restrictions to still find food options. Are those same people going to be denied a full meal at events? However, my main concern is for those with issues surrounding food. I think particularly of those with neurodivergence and conditions such as ARFID. These groups have consistent safe foods and cannot transfer to an alternative, so they would be forced to find an alternative off-campus or go without. The plan to begin with a 60% majority and increase by 5% each year threatens to cause a lot of distress to those who physically can’t tolerate the alternatives, and it threatens to reduce their participation in events.
* Plant based fake meat is expensive and could raise concerns due to the cost of living
* The figures are too far-fetched. Not every canteen can have vegan food, vegan food can be processed, there can be issues for people who are neurodivergent, and people need to make their own choices
* I agree that 100% is too ambitious. The number should be reduced so some people can still have meat etc
* We agree to disagree and think it is excessive pushing for 100% and it disregards people who would like cultural food etc
* Overall, we disagreed because the number is too ambitious. There are other ways to focus on sustainability because food is a touchy subject
* We disagree. We like having more options but 100% is too ambitious.

*Q- A sudden change to vegan options might be a shock to some students. How will you go about this?*

A- We will start with 60% of options initially and there will be focus groups to make sure that these decisions are inclusive.

*Q- There is a lot of backlashes against vegan food e.g., Beyond Meat. How would you ensure suppliers are ethical and how would this be monitored?*

A- We will look into companies and find healthier options and take these to LSP and Plant-Based Universities have chefs who could support with this. We would share information on the website on how to make your own plant-based meals. If there is the funding, we could give free samples of food to students to try before it is implemented.

*Q- The proposal says it is about being inclusive of dietary or religious requirements, hence the 60% figure. But also, that events should be 100% plant based, which threatens to lock out the people you're claiming to include. Why is this?*

A- If the university have plant-based options, it will help them meet their climate goals. If you have no issues, then 100% helps the university achieve their goals. If a student has issues with this, the event organisers would cater to their needs.

Out of 84 voting members, 81% voted against the policy, meaning that this policy was rejected.

**Close**

Victoria thanked everyone for attending the meeting and asked that everyone checked they filled in the attendance form.
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Sabeel Suleiman
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**Apologies:** Mohammed Siddiqui, Shamiso Sheta, Ajit Arjun Pawar, Aalok Gohil, Rufaro Chitenga, Paras Chopra, Isabel Higham, Uday Vikas Chary Ausali, Cleophee Cornou, Atrindu Mukherjee, Shivani Gundla, Sam Ashton, Paarth Acharya.

Minutes compiled by Lucille Gwati and Amelia Jones on 28th November 2024.