



FRIEDRICH-SCHILLER-
UNIVERSITÄT
JENA



Public Record

10th Session | StuCo | Term 2025/26

10th February 2026 | 18:20 - 21:30 | SR 114 | Carl-Zeiss-Straße 3

DISCLAIMER: *This translated record is not legally binding and just for informational purposes. For the legally binding document see the german version.*

present MoStuCo: Andreas Bagehorn, Chiara Daskiewitsch, Jil Diercks, Carla Franke (til 18:44), Jan Haedicke (til 19:00), Marcus Hansen, Jonah Hohlfeld (til 18:44), Clara Höpfner (til 21:25), Stefan Huber (til 19:00), Levke Jansen, John Kaube, Willi Kröning, Robert Pohle, Maurice Reitzing (til 21:25), Akin Rosenkranz (from 18:25), Leonard Schönfeld, Götz Wagner (til 20:05), Nele Wagner, Max Weber, Paul Weiß (til 21:27), Klara Wilde, Antonia Zahn (til 21:27)

excused MoStuCo: Katharina Gabriel, Bennet Hartung, Niklas Menge, Christoph zur Mühlen

unexcused MoStuCo: Reiner Sandmann

dormant MoStuCo: Nikolai Demisch, Aenna Fink, Smilla Kreuzberg, Luisa Queeck, Linda Raschke, Luise Stroisch, Henning Sylla, Lenard Thost

present cMoStuCo: Tom Daubmann (Deputy Treasurer), Salty Eisenhauer (Department of Cultural Affairs | til 20:20), Dario Holz (Chief Editor Akrützel), Daniel Lenhardt (Public Relations Department | 19:01 til 20:20), Kat Schmidt (Deputy Treasurer), Paul Staab (Administrative Board StuWe | til 21:15)

Guests: Charlotte Brost (FSR PoWi | til 20:28), Wolf Gollhardt (FSR PoWi | til 20:28), Lea Koenzen (CRJ), Jasper Robeck (til 18:58), Johann-David Roth (til 20:20)

Executive Board: Chiara Daskiewitsch, Marcus Hansen, Klara Wilde

IOTA 01 → 01 | 18:20 | Reports**Willi reports from the Senate**

- There were two appointment procedures, and both proposed lists were approved.
- There is now a recognition program for long-standing members of university.
- There was an e-teach network meeting in Thuringia; the university's participatory forum and the lecture series on L3 are continuing. In addition, the Digital Competence Forum will take place again.
- Travel expense reports are gradually being processed and are currently only six months behind schedule.
- There was discussion about amending the university's constitution; this will be further developed at the next meeting.
- A resolution regarding the procedure for expanding the academic profile is to be adopted; this will first be discussed by the Extended Executive Committee and then submitted to the Senate.
- The general examination regulations were approved for bachelor's, master's, and teacher training programs, though not unanimously: all student senators voted against them and issued a personal statement on the matter. More detailed information can be found in that statement. The framework regulations will take effect in April. We wish all examination offices the best of luck with their prompt implementation.
- There are proposals from various faculties to amend their academic regulations in the run-up to Friedolin 2.0.
- **Jil** asks why the senators voted against the general examination regulations; more specifically, she asks about the points of criticism outlined in the statement.
- **Willi** explains that the statement presented to the Senate did not reiterate the points of criticism, but merely provided a rationale for the unanimous "no" vote. He argues that one cannot in good conscience vote "yes" if, from the students' perspective, there are still issues with the general examination regulations. However, the points of criticism remain identical to those in the StuCo's statement.

Akin Rosenkranz is entering the session at 18:25.

Klara reports from the executive board

- Meeting with university leadership
 - The quiet rooms are expected to be available again and announced by the start of the summer semester.
 - We have now received feedback from Department 4 regarding the Frei(t)raum. They approve of the concept so far, but would like to have another in-person meeting. The GreenOffice has offered to help furnish the space. The university leadership would also like to participate in fundraising events.
 - In addition, Framework Agreement VI and university funding were discussed. The university leadership would like to know how the student body wants to be involved. There

is to be a transparent planning phase, and we were assured that there are no plans to discontinue study programs. After all, the goal is to address declining enrollment numbers. That cannot be achieved by reducing the range of programs offered.

- There will also be spots for student representatives during the site visit for the Excellence Initiative application. We should have submitted our nominations by the end of March.
 - There is a desire for more active communication with the Student Advisory Board of the city, and more seats on the board should be filled.
 - The GreenOffice has offered to share an office with the Nightline. The phone line could be set up through us.
 - Unfortunately, there were problems with SR309 again. The SDS student group had used the room for an event that was canceled by the university. Apparently, the event was not organized by the SDS itself but by an external group, and it involved showing a film that university leadership views very critically.
 - A referendum on the semester ticket must be held again by April at the latest.
- A constructive discussion was held with the "Förderverein der Fachschaft Wirtschaftswissenschaften e.V." regarding inventory.
 - Hannah Schier has resigned from her position because she has started a semester abroad. Akin Rosenkranz will take her place on the Student Council.
 - At the last executive board meeting, we noted Jan Hillebrandt's resignation. No one else will be taking his place, so we now have only 35 elected MoStuCo.

Paul Staab hints at an IOTA for the next session

- The next session will focus on the future of the Rosenmensa. Initial discussions on the matter have already taken place.

IOTA 02 → 02 | 18:27 | Determination of the Quorum and Discussion & Decision of the Agenda

Determination of a quorum

- Of the 35 elected MdStuRa members, 08 have suspended their mandates. This leaves 27 MdStuRa members eligible to vote.
- A quorum is reached when 14 MdStuRa members eligible to vote are present. A two-thirds majority is achieved with 18 yes votes from the voting MdStuRa members present.
- There are 22 voting MdStuRa members present; the body is therefore **quorate**. A two-thirds majority is **possible**.

Preliminary Agenda

TOP 1 Reports

TOP 2 Determination of the Quorum and Discussion & Decision of the Agenda

TOP 3 2. Reading & Decision: Budget Plan 2026_27 (Finances)

TOP 4 3. Reading & Decision: Amendments about Employment Contracts (Internal Affairs Department and Management)

TOP 5 2. Reading & Decision: Amendments about Election Regulations (Internal Affairs Department)

TOP 6 Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-KOM-013-2025_26 – KlTa FSR PoWi/SoKu (FSR PoWi)

TOP 7 Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-SPORT-009-2025_26 – DHM Volleyball (Sports Department)

TOP 8 Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-PSY-018-2025_26 – Expense Allowance Logo Contest (FSR Psychology)

TOP 9 Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-STURA-027-2025_26 – Attorney fees (Executive Board)

TOP 10 Discussion & Decision: Resolution of pending legal disputes and payment of outstanding funds (Chantalle Arsand)

TOP 11 Discussion & Decision: Administrative Board StuWe (Executive Board)

TOP 12 Discussion & Election: Chief Delegate KTS (Executive Board)

TOP 13 Discussion & Election: Head of SemTix (Executive Board)

TOP 14 Discussion & Decision: Demonstration of solidarity with UKJ (Christop zur Mühlen)

TOP 15 Discussion: Next Session

TOP 16 Miscellaneous

TOP 17 Discussion: Session Colour

Discussion

- **Marcus** would like to move the Head of Semtix from IOTA 13 to IOTA 6
- no objections

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena Approves the agenda as presented below.

Voting: 22 Yes / 0 No / 0 Abstention

accepted

Approved agenda

TOP 1 Reports

TOP 2 Determination of the Quorum and Discussion & Decision of the Agenda

TOP 3 2. Reading & Decision: Budget Plan 2026_27 (Fimances)

TOP 4 3. Reading & Decision: Amendments about Employment Contracts (Internal Affairs Department and Management)

TOP 5 2. Reading & Decision: Amendments about Election Regulations (Internal Affairs Department)

TOP 6 Discussion & Election: Head of SemTix (Executive Board)

TOP 7 Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-KOM-013-2025_26 – KlaTa FSR PoWi/SoKu (FSR PoWi)

TOP 8 Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-SPORT-009-2025_26 – DHM Volleyball (Sports Department)

TOP 9 Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-PSY-018-2025_26 – Expense Allowance Logo Contest (FSR Psychology)

TOP 10 Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-STURA-027-2025_26 – Attorney fees (Executive Board)

TOP 11 Discussion & Decision: Resolution of pending legal disputes and payment of outstanding funds (Chantalle Arsand)

TOP 12 Discussion & Decision: Administrative Board StuWe (Executive Board)

TOP 13 Discussion & Election: Chief Delegate KTS (Executive Board)

TOP 14 Discussion & Decision: Demonstration of solidarity with UKJ (Christop zur Mühlen)

TOP 15 Discussion: Next Session

TOP 16 Miscellaneous

TOP 17 Discussion: Session Colour

IOTA 03 → 03 | 18:40 | 2. Reading & Decision: Budget Plan 2026_27 (Fimances)

Motion Text

Moin,

let's move on to the second round of the budget plan. Since we unfortunately didn't have a quorum during the first vote, we'll try again. There are no changes to the version that was approved at the last session.

LG Nele

Discussion

- **Nele** presents the IOTA. Since there were no questions about the budget plan last time, she has no further comments.
- **Levke** is calling on everyone to voice their concerns and suggest changes so that a compromise can be reached and we can avoid a budget freeze.
- **Willi** emphasizes that there could be protests by the FSRe and departments if a budget is not approved soon.
- **Jil** condemns this rhetoric and makes it clear that this is a democratic vote in which no one is being forced to do anything.

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena decides on the present budget plan for the fiscal year 2026_27.

Voting: 19 Yes / 3 No / 0 Abstention

accepted

IOTA 04 → 04 | 18:43 | 3. Reading & Decision:

Amendments about Employment Contracts (Internal Affairs Department and Management)

Motion Text

Dear all,

In collaboration with management and the legal department, changes to the regulations regarding employment contracts and personnel have been discussed over the past few months. You will find the results in the attachment. First, there are two sets of amendments (financial order and order of the StuCo) that are to be formally adopted. We have also attached a side-by-side comparison of the old and new versions to better illustrate the changes.

Best regards

The Internal Affairs Department

Discussion

Carla Franke is leaving the session at 18:44.

Jonah Hohlfeld is leaving the session at 18:44.

- **Marcus** explains that there was an amendment and reads Niklas's comments aloud. The Internal Affairs Department requests a postponement in consultation with management.

Point of Order from Andreas Bagehorn: End of Reading

no objection, Point of Order accepted

IOTA 05 → 05 | 18:45 | 2. Reading & Decision: Amendments about Election Regulations (Internal Affairs Department)

Motion Text

Dear all,

In coordination with the University's Election Office and Legal Office, we have drafted amendments to the constitution of the student body and election order. In particular, changes have been made regarding the public nature of the elections. Public access is always a sensitive issue, as various university buildings are accessible only to the university community, and election results should also be made available only to the university community. For this reason, numerous provisions in the election regulations have been amended. Additionally, when the financial regulations were amended regarding the financial officers of the FSRe, the election regulations were overlooked. We would therefore like to address this issue at this time.

During the last election, there was also a minor issue regarding the number of seats in the StuCo. Therefore, the "Composition" section of the constitution of the student body will be slightly amended here to establish a specific cutoff date for determining student enrollment figures.

Best regards
The Internal Affairs Department

Discussion

- **Andreas** presents the motion.
- no questions

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena decides on the following amendments to the 11th amendment to the constitution and the 6th amendment to the election order of the Student Body of the FSU Jena.

Voting: 20 Yes / 0 No / 0 Abstention

accepted

IOTA 13 → 06 | 18:47 | Discussion & Election: Head of SemTix (Executive Board)

Motion Text

Hello everyone,

We have received an application for the SemTix Department. You can find it in the non-public session materials.

If you have any questions, please let us know; we'll be happy to forward them.

Discussion

- **Jasper** introduces himself. He was in contact with Helen and is a commuter himself. That's why this issue is very close to his heart. The fact that this volunteer role doesn't require late-night meetings is an added bonus.
- **Stefan** asks what his favorite area of law is.
- **He** likes criminal law, but not civil law.
- **Nele** asks if Helen has already told him about the tasks.
- **He** confirms this. They spoke on the phone and discussed the matter.
- **Paul Staab** asks if he's up for a general vote.
- **He** is happy to help, but he's never done it before.
- **Paul Staab** asks whether it is also an option for him to go back to the old model (without the "Deutschlandticket").
- **He** wants to try to keep the "Deutschlandticket", as it is particularly important for commuters. However, if the price rises too sharply, we'll have to see what the student body wants. He sees himself as a facilitator of the student body's decision.

Jasper is asked to step outside.

It is being discussed internally.

Jasper is invited back in.

Amendment from Marcus Hansen: replace " _____ " with Jasper Robeck
no objection, accepted

Mandate Review and Counting Commission consisting of **Stefan Huber, Willi Kröning and Tom Daubmann**
no objections

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena elects Jasper Robeck as head of the SemTix Department.

Voting: 18 Yes / 1 No / 1 Abstention / 0 Invalid **elected, accepts**

Jasper Robeck is leaving the session at 18:58.

IOTA 06 → 07 | 18:59 | Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-KOM-013-2025_26 – KlTa FSR PoWi/SoKu (FSR PoWi)

Motion Text

Hello everyone,

The Political Science Student Department Council (FSR PoWi) has submitted a funding request for a study retreat in the amount of € 1 200. The FSR-Communication issued a positive recommendation on this matter at its 6th meeting on January 21, 2026 (18/0/0). A positive review from the Finances is not yet available.

Best regards

The Executive Board

Discussion

- **Wolf** from the FSR PoWi presents the motion.
- no questions

Stefan Huber is leaving the session at 19:00.

Jan Haedicke is leaving the session at 19:00.

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena decides on the M-KOM-013-2025_26 in the amount of € 1 200 from the budget title A.01.35 20-cent-Topf (FSR-Kom) for the closed-door-meeting SoSe 2026 of the FSR PoWi/SoKu from April 24 til April 26 2026.

Voting: 16 Yes / 0 No / 2 Abstention

accepted

Daniel Lenhardt is entering the session at 19:01.

IOTA 07 → 08 | 19:01 | Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-SPORT-009-2025_26 – DHM Volleyball (Sports Department)

Motion Text

Hello everyone,

The Sports Department has submitted a request for funding to cover the registration fees for a volleyball team participating in the German University Championships (round-robin tournament) from April 1 to June 30, 2026.

You can find all further details in the public session materials.

Best regards

The Executive Board

Discussion

- **Nele** presents the motion. The agenda item had previously been postponed because it concerned expenditures for the coming fiscal year, but no budget had been approved. Since we approved the budget today, we can now approve the release of funds.
- **Levke** notes that there don't seem to be any questions and suggests moving on.

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena decides on the release of funds M-SPORT-009-2025_26 in the amount of € 100 for the DHM round-robin tournament Volleyball 2026.

Voting: 18 Yes / 0 No / 0 Abstention

accepted

IOTA 08 → 09 | 19:03 | Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-PSY-018-2025_26 – Expense Allowance Logo Contest (FSR Psychology)

Motion Text

Hello everyone,

The Psychology Student Department Council would like to hold a logo contest and reward the winner with a small monetary prize from its own budget.

Best regards

The Executive Board

Discussion

- **Marcus** presents the motion. Expense allowances can only be decided by the Student Council, which is why this item is on today's agenda.
- no questions

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena decides on the expense allowance of € 50 for the FSR Psychology logo contest from the release of funds M-PSY-018-2025_26.

Voting: 15 Yes / 3 No / 0 Abstention

accepted

Marcus Hansen hands over the session leadership to Klara Wilde

IOTA 09 → 10 | 19:04 | Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-STURA-027-2025_26 – Attorney fees (Executive Board)

Motion Text

Hello everyone,

In September, the StuCo approved a settlement agreement and an agreement granting rights of use. Our lawyer's services have now incurred corresponding costs. The exact amount was not yet determined at the time the resolutions were passed; only a draft invoice was available. Therefore, the agreements were approved without the release of funds or specific cost figures. However, the StuCo was informed that attorney fees would be incurred upon approval of the agreements. In the meantime, the agreements have been signed by both parties, so we have received a final invoice from our attorney.

The budget line item for legal assistance fully covers the costs.

Best regards

The Executive Board

Discussion

- **Klara** explains that there was a question regarding the session material about whether a payment had already been made. The Executive Board and the Finances looked into this again. An advance payment had already been approved at that time via release of funds M-024-2024_25 on July 30, 2024, in the amount of € 2 005. Of this amount, € 1 501.19 was paid out. At the last meeting of the previous term, the StuCo approved the settlement agreement and the agreement granting rights of use. This decision resulted in the remaining legal fees, consisting primarily of settlement fees, appointment fees, etc.
- **Willi** asks why the release of funds is only happening now.
- **Klara** explains that, at the time of the vote, a final amount had not yet been determined, so it was decided not to set a specific amount for the time being. She adds, however, that a draft bill had already been available.
- **Willi** asks when this draft was first available.
- **Klara** replies that she found an email dated July 2. At the time, she had just been elected to the board and was not responsible for legal matters. Therefore, she does not know why this was not shared with the committee.
- **Paul Weiß** says that the invoice should have been attached to the session materials back then, or that Willi could have asked about it otherwise.
- **Willi** says that he can't ask if he doesn't know there's something to ask about. He also points out that Jil had asked in September and was told at the time that there was no invoice.
- **Paul** says that it's his fault then.
- **Levke** asks whether the costs can be covered by our legal assistance fund.
- **Klara** says that this is the case, but that she also understands that legitimate criticism is both

appropriate and necessary at this point.

- **Willi** says he thinks it's bad that the committee had to make the decision in September without having all the information.
- **Kat** generally believes that resolutions should not be passed without specifying amounts.
- **Levke** asks for the chronological order of events to be explained again.
- **Klara** explains, based on the documents, what was decided and when.
- **Levke** points out that a similar decision was made at some point during her time on the board and that this should perhaps be reviewed again for security reasons.
- **Klara** agrees that an estimate of the total cost should be prepared before a decision is made, and that, ideally, a decision should then be made regarding that total amount.
- **Willi** asks how much we would have had to pay if we hadn't made that decision back then.
- **Kat** explains that it's not that easy to say, since there are too many possible outcomes. If we had rejected the settlement, we would likely have had to pay an appointment fee anyway, since the meeting had already taken place. Of course, we wouldn't have had to pay the settlement fee without a settlement—but if we had gone to court instead, we might have faced other costs.
- **Willi** is calling for a specific investigation into the issue.
- **Paul Weiß** explains that the process was initiated under his predecessor, Peter. He did not intentionally withhold information from the committee. However, he cannot rule out the possibility that emails may have been lost due to an awkward transition period during his own onboarding. He, too, would welcome a joint review of the matter. However, he criticizes the fact that he was not consulted prior to the session.
- **Klara** supports the call for a thorough investigation.

Antonia Zahn is leaving the session at 19:20.

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena decides on the release of funds M-STURA-027-2025_26 in the amount of € 4 488.51 from budget line A.07 – Legal assistance for attorneys' fees related to settlement agreements.

Voting: 17 Yes / 0 No / 0 Abstention

accepted

IOTA 10 → 11 | 19:25 | Discussion & Decision:**Resolution of pending legal disputes and payment of outstanding funds
(Chantalle Arsand)****Motion Text**

Over the past three years, the Student Council's finances have experienced significant delays in the disbursement of approved funds. Several students and one organization had incurred expenses for approved projects and submitted their expense reports in accordance with regulations. However, despite repeated assurances during meetings with various members of the finances and the executive board, no payments were made.

According to former board members, expense reports were not processed for an extended period of time because a former finance member refused to approve payments for personal reasons. The number of pending payment requests continued to grow. Subsequent board members were also unable to clear this backlog.

Instead, smaller amounts and other projects were handled first, while larger payments that had been pending for some time were left unresolved, as the workload had clearly become too overwhelming. As a result of this inaction, several student volunteers were forced to take legal action after their reminders went unanswered. A total of six orders for payment were issued. The Student Council formally objected to these, which led to legal proceedings rather than payment.

This led to several lawsuits filed against the Student Council, as well as counterclaims filed by the Student Council. In this regard, it is particularly important to note:

- The original payments had been reviewed and approved by several people (the dual-review principle: FSR finance officers and StuCo finance officers).
- Counterclaims were directed exclusively against those individuals who had filed claims themselves, but not against other parties involved
- Other individuals involved in the same projects are not currently being prosecuted, and no action is being taken against "improper payments" in that context, despite the fact that the student body is a member corporation under public law
- Instead of first attempting to resolve the matter out of court or seeking reimbursement, lawsuits were filed immediately.
- This is particularly problematic given that all those involved are (or were) student volunteers.

Legal developments In December 2024, the case **Chantalle Arsand v. Student Council** was decided entirely **in favor of the plaintiff** (Chantalle Arsand). **The Student Council shall bear the full costs of the proceedings.** (See Appendix A1)

An appeal against the judgment filed by the Student Council together with its attorney, a specialist in construction and architectural law, was dismissed by the court. **The Student Council is also responsible for these costs.** (see Appendix A2)

According to members of the Student Council, subsequent proceedings were then to be conducted using a new and improved strategy that would do everything differently. In December 2025, another court hearing began; in January 2026, the court ruled entirely in favor of the plaintiff (the

Förderverein) in the case **Förderverein der Fachschaft WiWi der FSU Jena e.V. v. Student Council**. **Here, too, the Student Council bears all costs, including interest.** (see Appendix B1)

A counterclaim filed by the Student Council against a former member, challenging the latter's claim, has not yet reached its first hearing, but even before the proceedings began, the "Student Council's attorney had to admit" that € 1 637.10—which accounts for nearly half of the total claim—**was being sought unjustly**. I quote verbatim: "Upon further review, it is acknowledged that ZA 956 cannot be attributed to the defendant. The lawsuit is being partially withdrawn in the amount of this ZA 956, which is € 1 637.10." This, too, has already incurred immense costs for the Student Council; expenses for our own attorney, as well as for the opposing party and court fees, have already been incurred even before the first day of the trial—simply due to sloppy work and a lack of oversight. Further similar or comparable shortcomings will be uncovered and will result in additional costs. In another ongoing case (scheduled to begin in January 2026), the court has already made it clear that only the financial order is decisive for disbursements—**not** internal interpretations (resolutions would have to include project descriptions or similar) or additional hurdles. This assessment was also accepted by the Student Council's legal representative. It is therefore likely that this proceeding will also result in a ruling against the Student Council. **The general consensus that only a resolution and a receipt or proof of payment are necessary and binding has been recorded and documented in court.** The resolution need only include the name of the project, and it must be clear that the committee approved it. All of this information was and remains available to the Finance Team and the Student Council Executive Board.

Financial and structural consequences

The ongoing proceedings are incurring significant costs:

- Attorney fees (both our own and the opposing party's)
- Court costs
- Late payment interest
- Long-term retention of staff resources in the Student Council

Given that the **semester fee is currently € 7.00**, this means that a significant portion of student fees is spent exclusively on legal disputes—not on student projects or programs—or, to put it another way, a large number of students are currently paying their fees solely to cover legal proceedings. This runs counter to the fundamental principle of managing student funds in a fiduciary capacity and also places a lasting burden on volunteers.

Discussion

Max Weber is leaving the session at 19:26.

- **Klara** introduces the topic by briefly outlining the different types of proceedings. She also explains that we've had legal expense insurance since 2017. She contacted our case manager to ask whether the proceedings had already been reported there. They hadn't. However, we can submit them retroactively and potentially receive a refund, or reduce future payments to a maximum out-of-pocket expense of € 150. She also explains which amounts have already

been paid and which payments are still pending. A more detailed overview will be sent to all MoStuCo and cMoStuCo members shortly.

Antonia Zahn is entering the session at 19:30.

- **Kat** refers to §6 (10) of our order of the StuCo regarding benefits arising from decisions.
- **Jil** feels that this refers to her, but believes that she would not benefit from the decision.
- **Willi** agrees with Jil because it involves the repayment of money that was advanced.
- **Kat** points out that the discussion regarding the member's expulsion must also take place in the member's absence.
- There is no need for discussion within the committee.
- **Andreas** would like an explanation of what has happened so far.
- **Klara** provides a brief overview of the chronological sequence. This will also be made available afterward.
- **Klara** addresses the specific concerns that the board and the finances (as well as our lawyer) have regarding the resolution. The most important point here is that the costs have already been incurred. The court costs will not change. At most, we could avoid individual attorney's fees for court appearances, but we would definitely have to pay both our lawyer and the opposing party's lawyer. In one case, there is currently a more intense debate on the issue. We should at least wait for the outcome of this proceeding. There is also concern that this resolution could open the door to abuse in the future and undermine our financial order.

Daniel Lenhardt is leaving the session at 19:47.

- **Andreas** asks if Klara can explain in more detail the procedures in question.
- **Klara** explains what procedures exist, what they entail, and which ones we have lost.
- **Levke** says that she really just has some questions she'd like to ask Chantalle. She asks if Chantalle will be present at one of the upcoming sessions.
- **Klara** does not know this.
- **Levke** finds it odd that parts of the text are written in the third person and don't really seem as though Chantalle wrote them herself. She agrees with Klara's argument regarding the validity of the FinO and opposes ending the proceedings.
- **Paul Weiß** summarizes that, in the previous (unsuccessful) proceedings, the judge based his arguments solely on the German Civil Code (BGB) and did not address the FinO.
- **Jil** thinks that Chantalle was more concerned with avoiding further costs by terminating the proceedings now.
- **Kat** points out that we pay our lawyer based on the RVG (German Lawyers' Fees Act) and the amount in dispute, not on the amount of work involved. So we owe him this amount either way once the proceedings are concluded. Going to the second instance or similar would entail additional costs; that is certainly correct. But simply "letting the current proceedings run their course" is not nearly as problematic.
- **Robert** fears that another change in leadership would lead to further setbacks.
- **Klara** acknowledges the concern but points out that, as part of the preparatory work for this session, a great deal has been documented and organized. This would make it possible for new board members to get up to speed within a few hours.

- **Klara** reads Niklas' comments on the proposal.

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena decides:

- All pending legal disputes concerning outstanding payments and claims for reimbursement against the parties are hereby terminated with immediate effect by the Student Council, represented by its Executive Board.
- No further legal action or appeals will be pursued in the current proceedings.
- The outstanding amounts that have been approved but not yet paid out will be paid promptly and in accordance with the applicable financial order.
- The purpose of this resolution is to avoid further costs related to legal proceedings, attorney fees, and interest, and to ensure the responsible and prudent use of student contributions.

Voting: 3 Yes / 15 No / 0 Abstention

rejected

IOTA 11 → 12 | 20:04 | Discussion & Decision: Administrative Board StuWe (Executive Board)

Motion Text

Hello everyone,

As discussed at the last meeting, we need to propose new candidates to the KTS for the StuWe's Administrative Board. These candidates will then be elected by the KTS.

We have received three applications from individuals who would like to serve on the Administrative Board on behalf of the student body. You can find these in the non-public meeting materials.

Discussion

- **Marcus** presents the motion.

Götz Wagner is leaving the session at 20:05.

- **Paul Staab** introduces himself. He has been doing this for several years now. This would be his final term in office. His collaboration with Helen has always gone well.
- **Marcus and Paul Staab** both speak in favor of Helen. Unfortunately, she can't be here in person today.
- **Marcus** introduces himself.
- **Levke** asks if Marcus feels underutilized in his role as a board member.
- **Marcus** says he wants to step down from his position on the board by April at the latest, which is why he isn't fully occupied.

Marcus and Paul are asked to step outside.

Point of Order from Willi Kröning: Pausing of record keeping

Objection from Kat Schmidt: She is against suspending the record entirely. She advocates for the record to remain non-public.

withdrawn

Point of Order from Willi Kröning: Non-public record-keeping

Objection from Tom Daubmann: Marcus can also read the non-public record.

withdrawn

Point of Order from Willi Kröning: Pausing of record keeping, until Marcus and Paul Staab return to the session

objection from Kat Schmidt: Some form of record-keeping would be useful.

Voting: 11 Yes / 0 No / 5 Abstention

accepted

It is being discussed internally.

Marcus and Paul are invited back in.

Johann-David Roth is leaving the session at 20:20.

Salty Eisenhauer is leaving the session at 20:20.

Daniel Lenhardt is leaving the session at 20:20.

Point of Order from Levke: Secret ballot

no objections allowed → Point of Order accepted

Amendment from Marcus Hansen: Replace the resolution text with "The Student Council of the FSU Jena decides to nominate Helen Würflein for the Administrative Board."

no objection, accepted

Amendment from Marcus Hansen: add resolution text 2: "The Student Council of the FSU Jena decides to nominate Paul Staab for the Administrative Board."

no objection, accepted

Amendment from Marcus Hansen: add resolution text 3: "The Student Council of the FSU Jena decides to nominate Marcus Hansen for the Administrative Board."

no objection, accepted

Mandate Review and Counting Commission consisting of **Willi Kröning, Tom Daubmann and Andreas Bagehorn**

no objections

Wolf Gollhardt is leaving the session at 20:28.

Charlotte Brost is leaving the session at 20:28.

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena decides to nominate Helen Würflein for the Administrative Board.

Voting: 15 Yes / 0 No / 2 Abstention / 0 Invalid

Nomination accepted

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena decides to nominate Paul Staab for the Administrative Board.

Voting: 8 Yes / 5 No / 4 Abstention / 0 Invalid

Nomination accepted

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena decides to nominate Marcus Hansen for the Administrative Board.

Voting: 12 Yes / 2 No / 3 Abstention / 0 Invalid

Nomination accepted

Klara Wilde hands over the session leadership to Marcus Hansen.

IOTA 12 → 13 | 20:37 | Discussion & Election: Chief Delegate KTS (Executive Board)

Motion Text

Hello everyone,

We have received an application for the KTS main delegation. You can find it in the non-public session materials. If you have any questions, please let us know; we'll be happy to pass them along.

Discussion

- **Paul Staab** introduces himself. We, as the Student Council of the FSU Jena, have delegated only one person to the KTS. He is stepping forward for the position because he would like to run for the role of spokesperson. He would be very happy if someone else were to run for the position of chief delegate (and spokesperson); in that case, he would withdraw his candidacy.
- **Kat** asks how many delegates the FSU Jena can send to the KTS.
- There are two chief delegations and countless deputy delegates.
- **Tom** asks how urgent it is.
- **Paul Staab** explains that the deadline was yesterday/today.
- **Willi** is asking about alternative applications to other universities.
- **Paul Staab** says that there is only one candidate, but that KTS traditionally has a dual leadership structure.

Paul Staab is asked to step forward.

Point of Order from Tom Daubmann: The upcoming debate will be closed to the public until Paul Staab re-enters the room.

no objection, Point of Order accepted

Point of Order from Jil Dierks: Debate on personnel

objection from **Andreas Bagehorn:** A personnel debate can only be convened to discuss personnel matters.

Voting: 2 Yes / 7 No / 7 Abstention

rejected

It is being discussed internally.

Paul Staab is asked to come in.

Amendment from Marcus Hansen: replace “_____” with Paul Staab

no objection, accepted

Mandate Review and Counting Commission consisting of **Tom Daubmann, Levke Jansen and Akin Rosenkranz**

no objections

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena elects Paul Staab as the chief delegate of the FSU Jena Student Council to the Conference of Thuringian Student Bodies.

Voting: 4 Yes / 7 No / 6 Abstention / 0 Invalid

not elected

- **Paul Staab** once again encourages everyone present to apply.
- **Willi** will be a guest at the next KTS meeting.

IOTA 14 → 14 | 21:12 | Discussion & Decision: Demonstration of solidarity with UKJ (Christop zur Mühlen)

Motion Text

Hi,

As we are all surely aware, collective bargaining negotiations are currently underway again in the public sector, and thus also for many professions here at the university. These negotiations have been accompanied by warning strikes. During the warning strikes by nursing staff, there have reportedly been an increasing number of unpleasant incidents—with reports of intimidation, resentment, and a clear lack of understanding toward the striking nursing staff.

In response, the Jena Feminist Strike reached out to the FSR (Medicine) with a request to support the strikers by signing and publishing a statement of solidarity. To gain a broader perspective, the Medical Student Department Council also contacted the UKJ's JAV and ver.di. They, too, share the concerns of the Jena Feminist Strike.

(<https://sat.verdi.de/presse/pressemitteilungen/++co++12a95692-fcee-11f0-b32b-61dbd1e2d41e>).

The Association of Democratic Physicians as well

(<https://www.vdaee.de/2026/solidarisierung-mit-den-beschaeftigten-des-ukj/>).

At the FSR meeting on January 29, 2026, the matter was discussed, and it was unanimously agreed to support it. However, the general consensus was that it would be better to bring this to the StuCo for a vote. One reason for this referral is legal concerns regarding whether an FSR is even permitted to sign such a document on its own. Another reason for referring it to the StuCo: the right to fair collective bargaining should apply to all members of the university community. If that right is at risk of being undermined, then we as the student body should speak out against it as a whole.

I would really appreciate it if a clear majority here in the committee would also support the nursing staff in the ongoing collective bargaining negotiations. Based on the draft from the Jena Feminist Strike, I have adapted the solidarity statement for the StuCo.

Statement of Solidarity:

As the Student Council of Friedrich Schiller University in Jena, we are committed to ensuring high-quality, needs-based healthcare. Care work, which is undervalued both socially and structurally, is indispensable to the functioning of our society. This recognition must also be reflected in the incomes of those who work in this field.

In recent days and weeks, we have received multiple reports from employees at Jena University Hospital regarding restrictions on the right to strike, particularly by doctors. Reports range from disciplinary actions and the targeted assignment of patients to subtle forms of pressure aimed at preventing strikers from exercising their rights. Especially in areas such as surgery, the operating room, and intensive care, where the workload is already extremely high, nurses' right to strike is often portrayed as a disruption to the "daily schedule" rather than a legitimate means of securing better working conditions.

We, the Student Council of Friedrich Schiller University in Jena, unequivocally stand in solidarity with the striking employees and demand: The free exercise of the right to strike; without consequences, without reprisals.

Nursing, patient transport, and technical assistance are not “support professions”, but rather an indispensable, central part of the healthcare system. Poor working conditions undermine the quality of care and, consequently, the quality of healthcare. The workers’ demands are justified, and their efforts to secure better working conditions through strikes are a fundamental right.

Doctors, too, must respect and facilitate the right of nursing staff to strike, provided that there is no risk to patients. Treatments can be postponed, even if this may seem inconvenient for patients at first. We, too, are patients and potential patients. Ultimately, we all benefit from improved working conditions in the nursing profession. The right to strike is non-negotiable and cannot be subject to hospital hierarchies.

With solidaric regards

The Student Council of Friedrich Schiller University in Jena

Discussion

Paul Staab is leaving the session at 21:12.

- **Marcus** is presenting the motion because Christoph is sick.
- **Levke** asks if it’s urgent. Otherwise, Christoph could surely present the matter better himself once he’s back on his feet.
- **Marcus** says he can’t quite figure that out.
- **Willi** asks how many students are affected.
- **Marcus** replies that these are probably mostly EAH students, or a few former nurses who are now studying medicine or something similar.
- **Klara** says that there are actually quite a few students (including those in other fields) who work in nursing alongside their studies.
- **Levke** adds that this isn’t just about nursing staff, but about all employees. That actually includes quite a few students.
- There is debate over whether this applies only to nursing staff or to all employees.
- **Paul Weiß** asks to what extent this is actually relevant, given that the declaration of solidarity is unambiguous on this point.
- **Kat** points out that the text of the resolution refers to “nursing staff”, which means the resolution isn’t entirely accurate in terms of content.
- **Levke** believes that the entire solidarity statement can be considered the text of the resolution and that this makes the matter clear.

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena decides to show solidarity with the nursing staff at the UKJ during the ongoing collective bargaining negotiations. The Student Council of the FSU Jena therefore signs and publishes the adapted declaration of solidarity.

Voting: 14 Yes / 0 No / 3 Abstention

accepted

IOTA 15 → 15 | 21:21 | Next Session

Discussion

- The next meeting will be held on February 24, 2026.

IOTA 16 → 16 | 21:23 | Miscellaneous

- **Willi** says that the finances team has received feedback that FSRs feel overwhelmed by all the emails. Instead, Willi would like to offer a less frequent but regular newsletter format.

IOTA 17 → 17 | 21:24 | Session Colour

Discussion

Maurice Reitzig is leaving the session at 21:25.

Clara Höpfner is leaving the session at 21:25.

- **John** suggests 67/0/0.
- **Willi** suggests PAF-Orange.
- **Andreas** suggests Fri(e)da-Caramel.
- **Leo** suggests C21709.
- **Nele** suggests Sun-Yellow.
- **Marcus** suggests Pyrite.

Akin Rosenkranz is leaving the session at 21:27.

Levke Jansen is leaving the session at 21:27.

Leonard Schönfeld is leaving the session at 21:27.

Antonia Zahn is leaving the session at 21:27.

Paul Weiß is leaving the session at 21:27.

- **Tom** suggests the harmonic mean of all suggestions.
- **Irgendwer** suggests Lilac.
- **Dario** suggests MioMio-Ginger-Red.
- **Max** suggests Bengalo-Fire-Red.



Point of Order from Andreas: Meinungsbild

no objection, Point of Order accepted

Opinions are gathered about which color should be used for the current session.

Result: 3 67/0/0 / 2 PAF-Orange / 3 Fri(e)da-Caramel / 1 C21709 / 6 Sun-Yellow / 5 Pyrite / 4 harmonic mean / 2 Lilac / 4 MioMio-Ginger-Red / 2 Bengalo-Fire-Red

→ The session color will be sun-yellow.

 *We wish everyone who has read this far the best of luck during exam season.
We hope this little break from procrastination was both informative and entertaining.* 

Jena, April 4, 2026

Marcus Hansen, Klara Wilde
Session Leadership

Kat Schmidt, Klara Wilde, Marcus Hansen
Protocol

Begriffserklärung

- StuCo: Student Council
- FSU: Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena
- EAH: Ernst-Abbe-Hochschule Jena
- MoStuCo: Member(s) of the Student Council
- cMoStuCo: consultant Member(s) of the Student Council
- IOTA: Item on the Agenda
- StuBei: Student Advisory Board (of the City of Jena)
- StuWe: Studierendenwerk
- FSR: Student Department Council
- GO: Order of the Student Council
- FinO: Financial Order of the Constituted Student Body
- CZS: Carl-Zeiss-Straße
- UHG: University main building (Fürstengraben 1)
- EAP: Ernst-Abbe-Platz
- CRJ: Campusradio Jena