

Lancaster University Students' Union Annual General Meeting 2025: Minutes

4:30pm, Tuesday 17th June 2025 (Week 29) in [Faraday Lt](#) and online via Microsoft Teams

A recording of the meeting can be found here: [LUSU AGM 2025 Teams recording](#)

Introduction

Papers: [Minutes of the LUSU AGM 2024](#)

Time in recording: 36:00

The Chair introduced the meeting for both in-person and online attendees. The Chair thanked attendees for being present.

The Chair introduced the minutes of the LUSU AGM 2024 for approval. The minutes were approved by a simple vote by a show of hands.

End of Year report

Papers: [LUSU AGM 2025, FTO Report June 2025](#)

Time in recording: 41:30

Harrison Stewart presented the report on-behalf of the 2024-2025 Full-Time Officer team. Harrison spoke to the successes of all four Officers over the academic year. Harrison emphasised Cerys Evan's work to give LUSU a bigger platform on a national level; Jack Watson's work to develop the democratic governance of both sports and societies, success in Roses, and success stepping-in for Cerys; Ella Smith's work leading difficult and emotionally charged campaigns throughout the year; and his own work to scrutinise the University's sustainability work and improvement of the offer in The Sugarhouse.

Harrison spoke with pride about the continued and growth of student democracy within the Students' Union. Harrison encouraged attendees to support that continued growth.

Student: Are there any final comments about the hostile culture that Cerys resigned over?

Harrison Stewart: Cerys faced some difficult circumstances in her role and in contact with some student leaders. There was a lot of bullying from the wider student body. The Union and students lost a brilliant leader due to the bullying and harassment she endured.

The Chair thanked Harrison Stewart.

Motion 1: Refuse to Affiliate (when affiliation reopens) the Reform UK Society in its Current State

Papers: [LUSU AGM 2025, Motion 1 - Refuse to Affiliate \(when affiliation reopens\) the Reform UK Society in its Current State](#)

Time in recording: 52:00

The attendance of the meeting was checked to confirm quoracy for motions. The meeting was quorate.

The Chair laid out some ground rules for debate:

- a) Treat each other with respect,
- b) No speeches over 2 minutes,
- c) No circular debates.

The Chair explained the need for respectful and constructive debate, and the need to keep comments brief to provide ample time for all four motions to be debated.

Joshua Thelwell was invited to speak present Motion 1 on behalf of those who proposed it. There was a technical fault at this point in the meeting which meant that Joshua could not be heard in the meeting. The decision was made to move to Motion 2 and resume debate on Motion 1 when technical faults had been resolved.

Motion 2: Deeper Financial transparency and Student Involvement

Papers: [LUSU AGM 2025, Motion 2 - Deeper Financial transparency and Student Involvement](#)

Time in recording: 1:06:30

The Chair introduced the motion and presented it on-behalf of Liam Wright in their absence. The Chair invited attendees to speak for or against the motion.

Student: I think it would be great to have more access to the financial information of the Union.

The Chair asked for further comments and moved the meeting to a vote. The Chair explained the need to announce results of votes on motions after the meeting to give the Union ample time to verify the votes cast.

Result:

A total of 349 valid ballots were cast for Motion 2, the meeting was quorate at the time of voting. 6 in-valid ballots were cast by members who either did not attend the AGM or did not register their attendance.

FOR:	312 (95%)
AGAINST	7 (2%)
ABSTAIN	10 (3%)

This motion was passed by the AGM and was then taken to the Trustee Board for ratification.

Motion 3: Introduction of an Environment and Ethics Officer

Papers: [LUSU AGM 2025, Motion 3 - Introduction of an Environment and Ethics Officer](#)

Time in recording: 1:16:45

The Chair invited Sam Burgess to present the motion. Sam Burgess was joined by Oliver Mulcahy and Guy Boonyarakytin. Oliver, Sam & Guy presented a short presentation in support of their motion. They spoke about the effects of climate change and the impact on the future for Lancaster students. They also outlined the scope and responsibilities of the proposed role of the Environment and Ethics Officer.

The Chair invited an opposition speech.

Student: we heard in the FTO report earlier that a major success of this year had been the slimmed-down FTO team. This sounds like it should sit within the team as it currently exists.

Student: the Students' Union lost £330,000 in the previous academic year. Environment is covered already by one FTO, can the Union afford a fifth Officer role?

Student: this position would be cut under Reform UK DOGE. This is indoctrination into the eco-cult of the big climate con.

The Chair reminded attendees to stay calm.

Student: you said someone else should address this in their role; I say don't they have enough to do in their role? There might be some cost associated to the role, if the climate gets worse it is going to be a whole lot more expensive. I think this can't wait, we have to do something.

Student: there seems to be a common theme of the Union losing money on initiatives like this.

Sam Burgess: I am going to respond to point of inclusion in current FTO roles. We feel this is important enough to require a separate position. This will also encourage passionate people to apply as they don't feel represented in the role descriptions.

Oliver Mulcahy: every organisation on the planet has emphasised the impact of the climate crisis. Nothing will negatively impact students more in the future. We can't just summon money out of the thin air, but we need to have a serious discussion about diverting money into this role.

Student (online): I have a couple of concerns about the budget. To employ another Officer goes back on everything Cerys did. With Supper Club being cut, I worry that something like this there isn't much else the Students' Union can do. I'm not sure a Full-Time Officer could do much.

Sam Burgess: we did submit the proposal with a more detailed overview of the what the role would cover. They would liaise with students, societies & campaigns and work with the University to make sure we are as ethical and environmentally conscious as possible. There is work to be done.

Student: We can't afford this role with other things being cut. Harrison Stewart has done excellent work in his role. It would make more sense as an LCO role or as a FTO team priority.

Student (online): I think the Wellbeing Officer and Women's Officer have done some excellent campaign work and no one has told them they couldn't change anything. I think this would be a similar opportunity to provide a figure head for campaigns to ensure effective change happens.

Student: I don't think anyone could argue against the climate. We already have a net zero policy to 2030. We've already reduced emissions. My concern is that we've made a role just for people to put on their CV.

Student: A point person for campaigns to go to is absolutely vital, having someone to hold the University to account is also important. It is a massive task. Money has to be found somewhere.

Student: Having someone at the top will help organise people on the motions. The University is doing a lot, but it is superficial. Having an organised student body would be very beneficial. If this doesn't pass, are there alternative ways to organise students?

Guy Boonyarakytin: a lot of this work is being taken on by other Officers, they should be properly recognised for this work. We are very open to negotiations about what the role looks like.

Student: A lot of similar goals within the role is similar magnitude to the sexual harassment campaign this year. We don't have the money for another FTO but it could work as an LCO role, and a figure head in meetings. I think that is the best compromise.

Student: If we are talking about expanding the FTO team, there are more applicable roles needed. As a society president, I think we should re-introduce the Societies and Media Officer as they are completely separate from sports teams.

Student: I think we have covered the financial question. We need to spend our money effectively. Students, our age, aren't experts. If we are taking this seriously, we need to work with experts outside the University. Let's take this issue seriously please.

Student: I think more care for the environment and ethics would be the remedy for the issue. Divesting from unethical companies is part of the root of what students need. We need to understand how much has been lost and that the University should be investing in the future of the planet and our health.

Sam Burgess: I wanted to respond to the argument that students don't know anything. The people in the University making decisions are also not experts in the climate. The executive board come from a range of fields but not climate science. They don't necessarily have any more expertise than us. Having a Full-Tiem Officer who can work with the University to create better proposals. The University is becoming more commercialised and is not listening to the science. This is a way we can hold them accountable to what students want.

Sam Burgess: the point about the Societies Officer, we think this role would go some way to help. The Environment and Ethics Officer could support those societies who work in this field and who require more assistance.

The Chair closed debate and moved to a vote.

Result:

A total of 315 valid ballots were cast for Motion 3, the meeting was quorate at the time of voting. 3 in-valid ballots were cast by members who either did not attend the AGM or did not register their attendance.

FOR: 135 (43%)

AGAINST	136 (43%)
ABSTAIN	44 (14%)

Given the extremely close result, and despite its failure to be approved, the motion was passed to the Full-Time Officer group for consideration at the first possible opportunity.

Motion 1: Refuse to Affiliate (when affiliation reopens) the Reform UK Society in its Current State

Papers: [LUSU AGM 2025, Motion 1 - Refuse to Affiliate \(when affiliation reopens\) the Reform UK Society in its Current State](#)

Time in recording: 1:55:00

The Chair invited Joshua Thelwell (online) to present the motion. The Chair explained the need to debate the amendment before the motion.

Joshua Thelwell (online) presented the motion with a short supplementary PowerPoint presentation. Joshua outlined the motion, the reasons it has been brought to the AGM, and concerns about the conduct of the executive of the Reform UK Society. They outlined considerations about freedom of speech and defamation.

The Chair asked attendees to remain calm and moved the meeting onto the amendment.

Amendment 1, Motion 1

Papers: [Amendment 1](#)

Time in recording: 2:00:00

The Chair invited Jack Eccles to propose the amendment.

Jack Eccles proposed the amendment and sought to challenge some of the assertions made in the motion proposal.

The Chair asked attendees to remain calm.

Jack Eccles outlined some of his views on the matters raised in the PowerPoint presentation. Jack explained that many of the comments had been taken out of context and that anything included in them was protected via freedom of speech legislation.

The Chair invited Harrison Stewart and representatives of the Societies Committee to speak, as pre-arranged with the Chair.

Harrison Stewart: LUSU as a Students' Union must remain politically impartial. It cannot ban a registered political party from campus, but this motion does not concern that. Most of the accusations within the motions would already be handled within the existing societies affiliation process. Affiliation cannot be refused on the basis of individual conduct, all student leaders are bound by the Student Code of Conduct. The provisions of the motion can be followed within the existing procedures within society affiliation. I don't think a motion is required.

Cali-Rose Foster (on behalf of Societies Committee): we understand the concerns raised in the motion and the impact on student wellbeing. LUSU members must follow the Union's Code of Conduct. Student leaders' conduct is held to a higher standard and they are expected to undertake training, act in an inclusive manner, and uphold LUSU's values on equality and respect. Understanding the responsibilities of an executive is one of the criteria which we, the Societies Committee, use when judging affiliation applications. Misconduct, including harassment and hate speech, is a breach of the Code of Conduct.

The evidence presented is very concerning, but relates to one person, not the society generally and the AGM is not the right forum for conduct complaints. We urge those presenting the evidence to submit a complaint to LUSU so this can be investigated. An upheld complaint against an individual could inform a decision on society affiliation if that person is part of the proposed executive committee. However, the Union cannot pre-emptively ban a political group from seeking affiliation.

The Higher Education Act requires Students' Unions to protect lawful free speech. While LUSU doesn't have to endorse offensive opinions, it cannot refuse affiliation because of them. We have been advised that if this motion passes, the Trustee Board would likely have to reject it because of the legal risk.

Many of the safeguards the motion proposes are already LUSU policy and evidence of misconduct can already be used to deny affiliation. Banning a political society or putting restriction on their affiliations is unlawful. Trying to do so would be ineffective and draw national media attention.

Due to funding issues, new society affiliations aren't currently open and unlikely to open again soon. It is crucial that we LUSU a safe and inclusive space, but we ask that everyone think carefully as to whether the motion is the most practical and effective way of doing that.

The Chair invited the motion proposer and amendment proposer to speak.

Joshua Thelwell (online): we acknowledge that pre-emptive banning wouldn't work. The motion aims to raise awareness. We would like to see more transparency behind the affiliation process. They have already gone onto media outlets and called themselves the Lancaster University Reform UK Society, without affiliation is concerning.

Jack Eccles: Even if it passes, the motion goes to the Trustee Board, and they won't pass it. This whole thing is about free speech. The petition only given me more exposure and they've resorted to attacks on my personal character. I would encourage the proposer of the motion to invest their time in more insightful endeavours in the future.

The Chair opens the amendment for debate, reiterated the ground rules, and encouraged the need to respectful debate.

Student (online): I think the whole thing makes so many people uncomfortable, even knowing that potential affiliation exists. Even giving this a platform does so much damage to the student community. The Students' Union allowing a student to come here and say the r-word, how are you letting this happen? This is going to damage the student body more than anyone realises.

Vulnerable people are affected by this kind of speech. The Students' Union needs to be transparent about what they can or cannot do and why.

Student: it feels as if I am in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's Central Committee.

The Chair asked attendees to refrain from the banging the table.

Student (cont.): I wear my union jack tie with pride. What about my comfort? I feel uncomfortable about political oppression. Vote Reform UK.

Student: University is a lovely place, student come from all over the world and meet each other, based on their interests, and that is where the activist tradition in UK universities comes from. What is being suggesting is that there is a limit to who is allowed to do that. I don't want to see a Reform UK Society, the debate we are having is if they should build themselves up. When I was President of Politics Society, we had people come up to us and say they felt uncomfortable or offended by different ideas. However, people have a right to offend. There are issues about personal conduct, but that is not the debate here, it is about a society that wants to affiliate itself.

Student: I think even though this motion can't feasibly be passed, it's still an important thing to bring up. If we just let this slide, it says a lot about the kind of culture that we have and the way we choose to amplify voices that actively perpetuate hate. That is hate speech and he's the leader of the society. He said it was ok for him to use the r-slur because somebody called him a Nazi. He is the leader of a political society. When I see the Reform UK Society, I feel uncomfortable and I'm aware that many girls on campus do as well. I was in one of those group chats, and he did make me feel uncomfortable, as well as many other girls. We shouldn't allow someone like that to lead a society.

The Chair asked attendees to allow the speaker to speak.

Student (cont.): We should vote for this motion not because we're trying to revoke free speech, but rather because we want to say that we won't accept this kind of behaviour.

Student: I think it is clear that the Students' Union aren't going to enact the motion if passed. We should vote for the motion and allow the Union to deal with those legal issues.

The Chair asked attendees to stay on the content of the motion.

Student: I see people in here who voted for every political party on the spectrum. I think it is unfortunate that we have to debate this. It is an unfortunate situation that Reform UK did so well in the recent elections, however they are a force in politics. On this campus we have a vast array of political opinions, we should be allowing people to congregate and express their opinions. I know people here I vastly disagree with, for example the Communists, but I will never stop their right to stand in Alex Square and sell papers. We need to look at how LUSU works. LUSU have a role in ensuring societies are a safe place. If the Reform UK Society decide to start up and elect Jack Eccles as their President that's different. The society does not currently exist. We should allow it to exist alongside the other political societies. However, LUSU can have issues if Jack is elected the President.

Student: I would like to note some of the wording in the amendment which states that motion includes lies and edited screenshots. The proposer of the amendment also referred to the evidence in the motion presentation as taken out of context. This does not negate the language used, which is not useable under any circumstances. I feel this is not necessarily a question of

freedom of speech. Hate speech is not protected under the free speech laws because it is a criminal offence.

The Chair asked attendees to allow the speaker to speak.

Student (cont.): Even if he would defend his actions as not hate speech, it creates a threatening environment for students on campus as they feel they are being targeted or oppressed. I don't care if it is a joke.

The Chair asked attendees to allow the speaker to speak.

Student (cont.): I simply request that if this is the man chosen to represent the group, it should not be a thing to review.

The Chair reminded attendees that the discussion should be based around the content of the motion.

Student (online): I don't think it would benefit on-campus politics to have an affiliate Reform UK Society. They demonstrate a lot of hostility and empty statements. From the point of view of freedom of speech, you can't show hostility to every idea you disagree with. I don't think they are going to foster an environment that is positive for freedom of speech. As a queer person, I think they could potentially harm the LGBT community by spreading bigotry and impacting our own freedom of speech. They don't respect the freedom of speech for people they disagree with.

The Chair invited Jack Eccles to respond.

Jack Eccles: I was reading the r-word off a screenshot.

The Chair asked attendees to allow the speaker to speak.

Jack Eccles (cont.): I read the evidence on the board. To the person who said that women feel so uncomfortable around me. It is a baseless accusation based on zero evidence; these are just personal attacks. Trying to undermine my character and all it has achieved is that I have been on national news. Everyone should respect people's freedom of speech, even if you disagree. I am not a fan of the Community Party, but I don't think they shouldn't exist. As much as you disagree, you don't decide the law. I have not committed any hate speech under the law whatsoever. The University has all the evidence shown here and I've not got in trouble with them. Even if this passes, the Trustee Board will shut it down.

Student: I would like to call upon the women in the room. Please raise your hand if you've been personally affected by this man.

The Chair asked attendees to allow the speaker to speak.

Student (cont.): Please note that I do not consent to being filmed by the gentleman at the front, unless it is in an official capacity.

The Chair urged attendees to remain calm and asked speakers to move away from personal attacks.

Student (cont.): I am not going to make this a personal character evaluation, but the Reform UK Society in this moment has had terrible conduct within this AGM. If this is a demonstration of

how they will act as a society, I call into question their own personal conduct. If this is how we are to see them as a society, as representatives of the University, are we really to allow them to be affiliated to legitimise their actions? Given their disrespect to speakers today, specifically women, I would like to note further evidence of their discrimination and hatred upon campus, fostering an environment of unsafe personal misconduct. Given their conduct today, we should not allow them to become a society. We all deserve a safe society and freedom of speech, which they disrespect themselves. Ignorance will be the death of democracy. As with Reform UK, affiliation being the death of safety across the University campus. Please also note that the society itself is no longer a safe and inclusive environment.

The Chair asked the speaker to conclude their point.

Student (cont.): I argue that they not be affiliated as a society on the basis of safety. They are not an inclusive and safe society to be affiliated with the University, regardless of their chairman. Multiple members of their society are sat here today and have evidenced their conduct. I don't need to say more about how they have acted.

The Chair closed debate and move the meeting to vote on the amendment. The Chair clarified the resolutions of the amendment and its impact on Motion 1, if passed.

Result:

A total of 368 valid ballots were cast on the Amendment 1 for Motion 1, the meeting was quorate at the time of voting. 20 in-valid ballots were cast by members who either did not attend the AGM or did not register their attendance. 3 ballots were manually added or amended as requested by attendees.

FOR:	35 (10%)
AGAINST	329 (89%)
ABSTAIN	4 (1%)

The amendment failed.

Motion 1: Refuse to Affiliate (when affiliation reopens) the Reform UK Society in its Current State

Papers: [LUSU AGM 2025, Motion 1 - Refuse to Affiliate \(when affiliation reopens\) the Reform UK Society in its Current State](#)

Time in recording: 2:44:15

The Chair recalled the meeting and announced the result of the vote on Amendment 1. The Chair reiterated the ground rules, discouraged circulator debate, and emphasised the need for brevity in future speeches.

Student: I think the very prospect of this motion is an abject disgrace, shame on those who sought to propose it. What we are here to debate very clearly is the formation of a Reform UK Society. This is not about Jack Eccles. If Jack Eccles was looking to start a Gardening Society, we would not be sat here debating it for crux of this, the nature of this is Reform UK. They have the right to exist. The University or SU cannot blanket ban a political party from forming on campus. The University themselves are more than aware of everything Jack has said, and he has seen no

disciplinary action for it. I would like to respond to this idea that's been floated around that this breeds a culture we don't like. To the people who feel personally offended that somebody else has different political beliefs, I say grow up. A university campus is not a forum for you to censor people who disagree with you. They have every right to form and every right to exist as a society. I would like to respond to the person who accused me of being a Reform UK member. I have been a member of the Conservative Party for 10 years and I take no shame in that. Finally, I would like to address the precedent this sets. I will remind you that we have an affiliated Communist Party on campus, a many of whom have promised to put myself and my colleagues in gulags, should they ever so be built. Would you like to set the precedence of we don't like your political beliefs; therefore, we can band together and get rid of you. This is a matter of green eggs and ham. You may find if you do try your green eggs and ham, you may just enjoy it. I implore you to vote against this motion.

Student: The political aspect of this has been discussed to death. I would like to highlight the apolitical part to this. If we look at the Reform UK Party as an apolitical entity simply doesn't offer anything new or fresh to LUSU. The societies all offer something specific, new, and something that is often marginalised. For example, religious groups or groups that never make up the majority in this country. Fundamentally, the Reform UK Party is a men's party. That is fine in itself but they have promoted how men are being marginalised. I don't know where this has come from because ultimately men are not marginalised. In The Tab article that Jack Eccles was interviewed in, he said that the left are putting men down and raising women up. I'd love to live in that society because ultimately women are not being raised up. This group is just promoting misinformation. The affiliation with this group promotes misinformation and it doesn't bring anything new or exciting to LUSU. If Jack Eccles was starting a Gardening Society, if we didn't have that, go ahead. Yes we don't have a Reform UK Society but people would be more open to that if they were actually promoting something new and fresh. They are promoting bigotry. That's not new or fresh, and it isn't going to help or push anything forward. If they articulated their points more eloquently, with less intimidation as we've seen in this room today, I think a lot of us would not be pushing this motion. We are supporting this motion because affiliation with this party means that as a University with a group of people that think they are oppressed when fundamentally they are the oppressors.

The Chair asked the speaker to conclude their point.

Student (cont.): That's it. Thank you.

Student: I would like to say that I totally support freedom of speech, but the society itself if questioned within itself. I've known a lot of people who say they are frightened by this new Reform UK Society, they don't feel safe anymore. Especially, the party itself is a bit questionable and we don't know its vision yet. Because of that, they feel frightened. I know one student who said to me that they're not going to come next year because they think Lancaster is not safe anymore. The reason for that is because of this society and the people who represent it. I think if we continue to allow this to exist, I totally like competition but the thing is that the society is a bit questionable. I've got a flat mate from Saudi Arabia, he said to me that because I am brown and because I am from a different religion and background, I'll start to feel a bit threatened. I say that we should not allow the Reform UK Society to exist, at least for now. At least we know that the future of it, things start to become more clear because now because a lot of people in Lancaster are frightened.

The Chair identified the next few speakers and explained that not everyone who wishes to speak will have the opportunity.

Student (online): I would like to say that to my understanding affiliation is a privilege and not a right. Their free speech is not being restricted if they are not allowed to affiliate. This Students' Union is meant to represent students, that includes a whole lot of people who would feel threatened by a Reform UK Society being allowed to be considered. As a trans+ individual, I fully agree with that. I feel they represent a more extreme anti-trans+ view, or at least that is part of what they represent. I think that saying no to allowing what they represent to be part of what LUSU endorses isn't restricting their free speech it is letting LUSU say this kind of hate is not OK.

Student: I have a small point and a question for the Reform UK people. First a big argument seems to be that you don't believe a lot of the points that obviously Jack has made, or other people who represent the Reform UK Party have made, are hate speech. As the proposer of the motion showed, is that hate speech is when comments are made that are very explicitly insulting and harmful to a minority, as decided by the minorities themselves. As we have seen in this entire debate, minorities do not feel safe. The motion present that the society should not be allowed to affiliate if they cannot prove that they will not promote hate speech and they will allow minority students to feel safe. So I'm asking the people of the Reform UK Society, can you prove or can you give some evidence that you will actually make the campus a safe place and also that the University will actually follow through with its ideas that they will not allow hate speech to be promoted. While the University has rules, the reason this is being promoted is that a lot of people are afraid that they will not actually follow through. They will do what is easiest, which is to let it happen as opposed to fight against it.

The Chair explained that for the sake of time, debate would move to the next speaker.

Student: I think on the floor today there's been a bit of a wrong focus on what the motion is about. I noticed a lot of people talking about how we should allow political differences on campus, and I absolutely agree with that. I think the motion was specifically addressing the harm that could be caused to the largest student community if this specific society doesn't specify that they are going to accepting of everybody; we are going to allow trans+ people or queer people, or migrants to come into our discussions without feeling threatened or without having any insults levied against them. I want to say that the whole free speech argument, it has been dealt with very well, you are allowed to have your group meet on campus. You can speak about whatever you want while you are here. The difference is that the motion is about affiliating yourself with Lancaster University and I think the rules for that should be a lot stricter.

The Chair explained the need for ample time to discuss the remaining agenda items and called the meeting to vote on Motion 1. The Chair encouraged attendees to continue debate in their own time.

Result:

A total of 356 valid ballots were cast for Motion 1, the meeting was quorate at the time of voting. 20 in-valid ballots were cast by members who either did not attend the AGM or did not register their attendance.

FOR:	315 (88%)
AGAINST	36 (10%)
ABSTAIN	5 (1%)

This motion was passed by the AGM and was then taken to the Trustee Board for ratification.

Motion 4: Make all pints on campus £1

Papers: [LUSU AGM 2025, Motion 4 - Make all pints on campus £1](#)

Time in recording: 3:12:00

The Chair informed the meeting that the meeting was no longer quorate. Therefore, it was unable to pass Union policy. The Chair explained that debate could still take place and that a decision on any future progress of the motion would be taken by Democracy Committee.

The Chair invited Coby Keigher to present the motion.

Coby Keigher presented the motion with a short supplementary PowerPoint presentation. Coby outlined the reasoning behind the motion, their desire to improve campus life, and their personal desire to enjoy a cheap pint on campus.

Student: Can we take an indicative vote to show our support for £1 in theory?

Student: This motion might bankrupt the University and LUSU but who cares? Let us discuss the previous motion for students.

The Chair reminded the speaker that the meeting was currently debating Motion 4.

Student (cont.): Banning BAE Systems, a great local employer, terrible. Banning meat on campus, that is ruinous to our local campus community. Banning fossil fuels companies as well from Careers events. This Union has a long history of doing ruinous motions. On the topic of this motion, the issue is that our campus culture is in decline. You cannot fix that until you save JCRs and their budgets, that have been gutted over the past five years. They are the lifeblood of our campus and have been destroyed. Their money has been shuffled off some LUSU vanity projects. We need to back our JCRs and make LUSU great again.

The Chair questioned the relevance of the speaker's point.

Student (cont.): It is completely relevant because it is about campus culture.

Student: After the previous motion I could certainly do with a £1 pint right now. What pints do LUSU sell? Right now, it doesn't own the bars, The Sugarhouse hasn't got beer taps. I would love a £1 pint, but LUSU currently doesn't sell a single pint at any price.

Student: I would like it minuted that it is "Trev" and not "Trev's".

Student: Please let's not bring politics into this. This is about pints not politics. Whatever your views on BAE Systems, personally I think they are war criminals, I'm to going to bring that into this.

The Chair asked attendees to allow the speaker to speak.

Student (cont.): I think this is a good idea to get interest in bars because we need more people to be more involved in the bar culture. I am all for them staying open as well. They had a lot of good atmosphere and they'll be sorely missed if they have to close. We have to balance that against

the profit they might make, is it really going to make enough if all the pints are £1? Even if more people buy them, which I expect would happen. Would it be more prudent to introduce a price ceiling? Max £3.50 or £3. Going from £3.60 to £1 is quite a steep action.

Student (online): While I do understand that this motion is difficult to implement, given there would be a loss of money. I think it is true that it would benefit University culture. I know for a lot of people the kind of lack of campus bars has been quite detrimental to their social lives. It has made it harder to find a third place on campus where people can socialise outside of their flats and lectures.

The Chair identified the last 2 speakers on the motion.

Student: I am very supportive of this motion but I think it ignores one of the major issues that is preventing a lot of the bars on campus from thriving. That is that they are never open. I remember in my first Term, Bowland Bar would never be open when we'd go there. I imagine this is an issue that a lot of people in this room have also dealt with. I would like to propose that we not only make all pints £1, but also make the bars 24/7. This would allow more student jobs. We all know students' sleep patterns are not the best, so you would definitely find people at the bars at 4am on Tuesdays. I think this is a lucrative opportunity to make money.

Student: I am a shareholder at BAE, I ask that you withdraw your comments accusing me of war crimes. This is a very juvenile motion proposed by people who probably don't understand economics. What this essentially does is imposes a price cap, this is something we've known the negative effects of since the Romans. You set the market price artificially below the equilibrium price. This increases consumer surplus. Of course we want cheaper pints, but producers don't want to see it for less of a profit. Producers lose money at this price. You are only causing them to want to retract their supply. I want to respond to the idea that students are really going to miss these bars. As someone who has been on a JCR, the excuse we are given time and time again as they restrict opening hours, is that nobody uses them. They are not profitable to run. Students aren't using the campus bars. We can pretend that we'll miss them but the reason they've had to cut back in operating hours and increase prices is because they're not turning a profit. If you want to fix the issue, proposing a price cap is not the way to do it. You fix campus culture, you say to JCRs: we want you to host an event in your bar to increase demand without completely messing up the market.

The Chair closed the debate and acknowledged that the meeting had, at this point, overrun its originally scheduled end time.

Accounts & Affiliations

Papers: [LUSU AGM 2025, Annual Report 2024](#) & [LUSU AGM 2025, AGM Affiliations](#)

Time in recording: 3:26:15

The Chair invited Harrison Stewart to present the accounts and affiliations to the meeting. Harrison Stewart asked for them to be taken as read.

The Chair invited attendees to take few minutes to re-read the accounts and affiliations before a simple show to hands vote.

The meeting was at this point was no longer quorate to ratify the account and affiliations (less than 150 members in attendance). The Chair invited questions from attendees.

Questions for the Trustees

Time in recording: 3:31:45

The Chair invited questions for the Trustees from the room or online.

Student: I have a question regarding JCR budgets. I wanted to express my disappointment that we've been cut further from £1100 per year to £800, and that's a further cut from the approx. £5000 we received a couple of years ago. JCRs, and by extension the Colleges, are a key part of this University. We're the first people students see in Welcome Week. We organise the entirety of Welcome Week. We organise the entirety of Winter Ball. Welfare events throughout the year and just £880 for that a year is simply not enough. In the future, could this be reevaluated? Budgets go up and would the SU and the Finance Team also look at their policy of us profiting because it's simply not feasible for us with this budget. Founders cost Bowland £600, with £600 coming from Lonsdale. We won three years in a row. Would this be reevaluated? I think we're not going to be able to exist with these budgets if we keep going down, we'll lose our events. We can't run anything anymore and that just adds to the criticisms of Colleges because we just can't do anything anymore.

Harrison Stewart: I was expecting that. I understand how difficult it is to run a College with little money. I did it, granted, not with the tight budgets that you have now. I think the finances of the SU are in a very difficult situation, so cuts are going to be made everywhere. I'd like to credit the LUSU Senior Management who left Colleges to be the last area cut. I think you're going to have a fantastic advocate for the Colleges in Rory O'Ceallaigh as President next year. I'm pretty sure Rory will have your best interests at heart and I'm sure things will be reviewed as the year progresses.

Student: Do you know anything about affiliations? Are there a chance that they'll open up looking any better? The University is in a tight financial spot, is it likely that a society could be affiliated next year? Just wondering because I want to start my own, not for any other reason.

Harrison Stewart: it all comes down to staff capacity, also the money we can give societies, but mainly staff capacity. It is in our interest to affiliate as many amazing societies as possible, so we're not doing it for an ulterior motive. At the moment the SU does not have the money or staff capacity to open up affiliations. Looking forward, the University is likely to cut our block grant so things can only get worse. I would advise societies who are not yet affiliated to form a collective and lobby the University directly for more funding. Societies, sports clubs, Colleges all our student groups make student life here. If you're annoyed that the SU doesn't have the amount of money that it needs to make these societies, then tell the University to give us more money.

There were no further questions. The Chair closed the meeting and thanked attendees.