Public Record

20th Session | StuCo | Term 2025/26

16th June 2026 | 18:19 - 22:36 | 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 (til 21:00), Katharina Gabriel (til 20:36), Jan Haedicke, Marcus Hansen (til 22:24), Bennet Hartung (til 20:36), Clara Höpfner (til 21:15), John Kaube (from 19:02), Sander König (18:26 til 19:50), Willi Kröning, Niklas Menge (til 22:00), Robert Pohle, Maurice Reitzig (til 21:15), Akin Rosenkranz (til 21:39), Nele Wagner, Paul Weiß (til 22:17), Klara Wilde, Antonia Zahn (til 20:10)

excused MoStuCo: Max Weber, Christoph zur Mühlen

unexcused MoStuCo: Stefan Huber, Henning Sylla, Götz Wagner, Peter Wiemuth

dormant MoStuCo: Nikolai Demisch, Aenna Fink, Carla Franke, Jonah Hohlfeld, Smilla Kreuzberg, Luisa Queck, Linda Raschke, Reiner Sandmann, Leonard Schönfeld, Lenard Thost

present cMoStuCo: Tom Daubmann (Deputy Treasurer), Salty Eisenhauer (Department of Cultural Affairs), Ansgar Gude (Election Board | til 21:00), Anne Kaufmann (Department of Internal Affairs & Election Board | 19:30 til 20:08), Frederike Mönch (Department of Cultural Affairs, Teacher Training Department | til 21:02), Kat Schmidt (Budget Manager)

Guests: Julia Fischer (FSR PAF | til 19:42), Lilou Gläß, Anastasia Hansen (til 20:17), Tilmann Strzata (FSR Pharmacy | til 19:31)

Executive Board: Chiara Daskiewitsch, Jan Haedicke, Klara Wilde

IOTA 01 → 01 | 18:19 | Reports

Klara reports from the Executive Board

- Some of you may have seen the article on Widersetzen and the board in the current issue of Akrüzel. Since the topic is somewhat complex, we'd like to first share our perspective on the events under Miscellaneous so that we can then move directly into a discussion about it.
- The university's International Office is currently planning to create a new student assistant position that would, among other things, serve as a liaison or bridge between Int.Ro and the International Office. This could be very helpful for us, since we have recently been down to just one Head of Department.
- The Frei(t)raum now has a wall and a fresh coat of paint! We're also in touch with the university to see if we can organize a last-minute fundraiser at the university's summer festival.
- The next meeting with university administration will take place on June 24. We'd like to submit our agenda items by Thursday. So please feel free to reach out to us by then if you have any suggestions or ideas.
- The next "Meet and Talk with the Vice President" will take place tomorrow evening. You should have already received an email with the Zoom login information.

Andreas reports from the Election Board

- University elections are currently underway. All students can vote online for student council representatives, the Student Representative Council (StuRa), faculty councils, the Senate, and the Gender Equality Advisory Board. A banner promoting the election is also hanging above the entrance on Ernst-Abbe-Platz, albeit two days late.

IOTA 02 → 02 | 18:21 | Determination of the Quorum and Discussion & Decision of the Agenda

- Of the **34** elected MoStuCo members, **10** have suspended their mandates.
  This leaves **24** MoStuCo members eligible to vote.
- A quorum is reached when **13** MdStuRa members eligible to vote are present.
  A two-thirds majority is achieved with **16** yes votes from the voting MoStuCo members present.
- There are **13** voting MoStuCo members present; the body is therefore **quorate**. A two-thirds majority is **not possible.**

Preliminary Agenda

IOTA 1 Reports

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

IOTA 3 3. Reading & Decision: Supplemental Budget 2026_27 (HHV)

IOTA 4 Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-KOM-016-2026_27 – Closed-door-meeting (FSR PAF)

IOTA 5 Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-KOM-021-2026_27 – Closed-door-meeting (FSR Pharmacy)

IOTA 6 Discussion & Decision: Funding Application FA-STURA-001-2026_27 – Student Zine (Carlo Hoffmann)

IOTA 7 Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-LEHR-005-2026_27 – Expense Reimbursement (Teaching Department)

IOTA 8 Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds "Stay-on-the-Ball" (Niklas Menge)

IOTA 9 Discussion & Election: Diversity Department (Executive Board)

IOTA 10 Discussion: SpoWi-Party (Executive Board)

IOTA 11 Discussion: Haus auf der Mauer Business Plan (Executive Board)

IOTA 12 Discussion: Confidential Record-Keeping for Job Applications (Executive Board)

IOTA 13 Discussion: Show of hands (Klara Wilde)

IOTA 14 Discussion: Next Session

IOTA 15 Miscellaneous

IOTA 16 Discussion: Session Colour

Discussion

- **Julia** would like to move IOTA 9 up on the agenda. The committee agrees to make it the new IOTA 6.
- **Andreas** asks whether the discussion on this topic under IOTA 12 should also be moved up. The motion is rejected.
- **Willis**'s motion of urgency is presented. This concerns the follow-up resolution regarding the funding of the election supplement for the current issue of Akrützel. It is proposed that this be added as a new IOTA 7.

Urgency Motion from **Willi Kröning**: Follow-up decision to M-STURA-007-2026_27, the Akrützel election supplement for the committee elections

Voting: 14 Yes / 0 No / 0 Abstention **accepted**

- **Niklas** explains that the current placement of his agenda item (No. 8) is far too early and that it would be much better to discuss it when it comes up later in the agenda; therefore, it should be scheduled as late as possible—that is, before "next session".

- **Kat** explains that the Finance Department and the Executive Board received a financial motion via email today, marked as an urgent motion. Unfortunately, the email did not provide any justification for the urgency, and furthermore, the proposers are not present.

Urgency Motion from **Kat Schmidt**: Finanzantrag FA-STURA-002-2026_27 Illustrierte Sammlung

Voting: 0 Yes / 11 No / 6 Abstention **rejected**

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

Voting: 17 Yes / 0 No / 0 Abstention **accepted**

Approved Agenda

IOTA 1	Reports
IOTA 2	Determination of the Quorum and Discussion & Decision of the Agenda
IOTA 3	3. Reading & Decision: Supplemental Budget 2026_27 (HHV)
IOTA 4	Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-KOM-016-2026_27 – Closed-door-meeting (FSR PAF)
IOTA 5	Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-KOM-021-2026_27 – Closed-door-meeting (FSR Pharmacy)
IOTA 6	Discussion & Election: Diversity Department (Executive Board)
IOTA 7	Discussion & Decision: Follow-up decision to M-STURA-007-2026_27, the Akrützel election supplement (Willi Kröning)
IOTA 8	Discussion & Decision: Funding Application FA-STURA-001-2026_27 – Student Zine (Carlo Hoffmann)
IOTA 9	Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-LEHR-005-2026_27 – Expense Reimbursement (Teaching Department)
IOTA 10	Discussion: SpoWi-Party (Executive Board)
IOTA 11	Discussion: Haus auf der Mauer Business Plan (Executive Board)
IOTA 12	Discussion: Confidential Record-Keeping for Job Applications (Executive Board)
IOTA 13	Discussion: Show of hands (Klara Wilde)
IOTA 14	Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds “Stay-on-the-Ball” (Niklas Menge)
IOTA 15	Discussion: Next Session
IOTA 16	Miscellaneous
IOTA 17	Discussion: Session Colour

IOTA 03 → 03 | 18:33 | 3. Reading & Decision: Supplemental Budget (HHV)

Motion Text

Dear MdStuRa,

Here is the promised supplemental budget.

To make it as easy to understand as possible, I've made two major changes to the presentation:
First, I've added an extra column showing the figures from the 2026–27 budget. In my opinion, this makes it easier to compare the respective figures and the changes between the budget and the supplemental budget.
Second, I'm attaching the preliminary explanatory memorandum, which will be sent to Internal Audit along with the plan once the supplemental budget is approved. This way, the changes that have been made may already be more clearly justified. Of course, I remain available before and during the meeting to answer any questions.

Best regards

Kat Schmidt
Budget Manager

Discussion

- **Kat** presents the motion. At the last meeting, we had budgeted 5,000 € instead of 7,200 € for tax refunds, since we would not have had the funds to pay the full 7,200 € currently required. Compared to the last meeting, this line item has now been adjusted to 7,200 € because, as part of legal proceedings, we happened to receive a commitment from the Gera Public Prosecutor's Office for exactly the amount needed. In addition, we should also take into account the revenue from KoaLa. Furthermore, the question remains as to how we can best account for the planned financing of the Frei(t)raum.
- **Klara** explains that we had discussed donations for the Frei(t)raum with Ms. Kracke back in December. The plan was simply to collect donations. But then Willi reminded her that a budget line item is still required for this, and that means there's a cap, no matter how much revenue is generated. We're not allowed to budget for donations we haven't received yet as revenue.
- No further comments

Point of Order from **Jan Haedicke**: Termination of the Reading

no objection, Point of Order accepted

IOTA 4 → 4 | 18:42 | Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-KOM-016-2026_27 – Closed-door-meeting (FSR PAF)

Motion Text

See project description

A positive recommendation from the FSR-Kom is on file as 11/2/3.

Discussion

- **Julia** summarizes the proposal. The closed-door meeting is scheduled to take place the weekend after next. There are no lodging costs, but there are costs for meals. The main purpose is to prepare for the transition to the new term, as some of the more experienced members will be leaving and their knowledge needs to be passed on.
- **Niklas** asks how the meal costs are broken down.
- **Julia** explains that they planned based on the full overnight interest rate in order to have a sufficient buffer, since there isn't a shopping list yet.
- **Niklas** thinks it's excessive to base rates on the overnight rates from the ThürRKG. He recommends using other closed-door meetings as a guide.
- **Freddy** asks whether it wouldn't make more sense to plan with a little more leeway rather than risk having to make a subsequent decision.
- **Andreas** disagrees, since it is not a small buffer, but 2.5 times that of other student department councils.
- **Willi** agrees, but defends himself by saying he didn't have a shopping list. The amount spent on food could certainly be cut in half.
- **Kat** is particularly critical of decisions made after the fact regarding business trips (which include closed-door meetings).
- **Marcus** argues that these are FSR-Kom funds and that FSR-Kom agreed to the financing.
- **Andreas** felt the same way at the beginning of the legislative term. Since then, however, he has come to realize that it makes sense for the Student Council to review it again. The FSR-Kom believes that since they have a lot of money, they can afford to spend it freely. He therefore thinks it's important that we make sure the student body's money isn't thrown out the window.
- **Paul** doesn't understand the statement, "If we have to cut back, they have to do the same.", because they are simply different entities. As long as the FSR committee isn't short on funds, it doesn't see a need for the Student Council to get involved.
- **Niklas** disagrees. The FSR Committee does not spend any money. The StuRa spends the money, since it has the decision-making authority. Nor are we questioning whether the PAF should go on a retreat. That decision is entirely up to the FSR-Kom. The issue here is the proportionality of the individual expenses. This discussion isn't just out of thin air, because other FSRe are showing that it can be done much more affordably.

Amendment from **Marcus Hansen**: In the text of the resolution, change "888 €" to "666 €". In the budget, change the meal allowance to 618 €.

- **Paul** reiterates that these are the FSR-Kom's funds and that the committee has already allocated them.

amendment from **Marcus Hansen**: Marcus Hansen

Voting: In the text of the resolution, change "888 €" to "666 €". In the budget, change the meal allowance to 618 €. Yes / 7 No / 4 Abstention **6** accepted

- **Nele** explains that the daily rates are used as a guideline. She doesn't expect that much money to be needed. She therefore thinks it's a good idea to lower the rates a bit, because otherwise the calculations wouldn't make much sense, and other organizations might base their future rates on amounts that are far too high.

Amendment from **Niklas Menge**: Change the approved amount to 300 € and the catering budget in the financial plan to 252 €

Point of Order from **Willi Kröning**: Verfahrensvorschlag – Neue Redeliste für Änderungsanträge und die Unterbrechung der aktuellen Redeliste.
objection from **Niklas**: Proposed Procedure – New speaking list for amendments and suspension of the current speaking list.
Voting: Niklas Yes / He understands the approach but sees it more as an overall discussion and therefore does not see the need for a separate speaking list. No / 10 Abstention **4** 3accepted

- **Niklas** explains his amendment.
- **Julia** thinks that's too tight a budget. She acknowledges that 800 € isn't necessary, but 252 € isn't enough. Six meals are needed. Among other things, they plan to bake a pizza. They'll also need food for the hike. She agrees with the previous amendment.
- **Marcus** agrees with Julia.
- **Tom** says that there will be four more closed-door meetings this fiscal year. Niklas's proposal is, in fact, lower than all the other closed-door meeting proposals. He lists the respective costs. He thinks Marcus's amendment makes relatively good sense. If necessary, additional conditions such as "Only reasonable quantities of food may be purchased." could also be adopted here.
- **Ansgar** asks why we don't lower the price further and let the FSR pay the difference itself if it wants to.
- **Niklas** doesn't want to require our HHVs to verify the "reasonable quantities" requirement in the end. And 660 € is still a lot of money.

John Kaube is entering the session at 19:02.

Point of Order from **Willi Kröning**: Immediate Vote
objection from **Niklas**: He hopes for a productive discussion going forward.
Voting: 8 Yes / 6 No / 4 Abstention **accepted**

amendment from **Niklas Menge**: Change the approved amount to 300 € and the catering budget in the financial plan to 252 €

Voting: 1 Yes / 10 No / 6 Abstention **rejected**

Amendment from **Andreas Bagehorn**: Change the total amount to 350 €. Change the item "Meals" to 302 €.

Point of Order from **Tom Daubmann**: Proposed Procedure – Let's discuss the numbers first before we propose any further amendments

no objection, Point of Order accepted

Point of Order from **Willi Kröning**: Proposed Procedure – Conduct a survey in 50-step increments
objection from **Andreas**: He would like to receive some input on the content first.
Voting: 3 Yes / 10 No / 4 Abstention **rejected**

- **Andreas** has already discussed what an appropriate amount would be in the FSR committee. From his own experience, he can say that 20 € per day per person is more than enough.
- **Kat** refers to Tom's suggestion regarding the requirements. She has no objection to specific requirements, but agrees with Niklas that vague requirements are difficult to verify.

amendment from **Andreas Bagehorn**: Change the total amount to 350 €. Change the item "Meals" to 302 €.

Voting: 6 Yes / 6 No / 6 Abstention **rejected**

- **Paul** emphasizes that in the end, it's not the amount that matters, but whether we want to get involved.

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena Approves the release of funds M-KOM-016-2026_27 in the amount of 666 € from budget line A.01.35 (FSR-Kom) for a closed-door meeting of the FSR PAF.

Voting: 15 Yes / 3 No / 0 Abstention **accepted**

Explanation of Vote

title: /
declaring person: Paul Weiß
reading aloud: no
received: /
declaration: With its decision to cut funding requests approved by the FSR Committee, the StuRa has once again, without any discernible necessity, overruled a decision made by the FSR Committee. By making cuts to budget proposals—some of which are arbitrary—based on its own calculations and estimates, and by insisting on purely structural jurisdiction, the StuRa contributes to the perception of an out-of-touch body that does not primarily focus on the interests of students, but rather on the particular interests of individual members and bureaucratic minutiae.

Explanation of Vote

title: Consider Budgetary Costs
declaring person: Niklas Menge
reading aloud: no
received: /
declaration: I find it disappointing that the Student Council approves such a large amount of money and handles the funds of its members—which are collected from all students—in this way, throwing so much money at individuals and giving an FSR a sum many times greater than what an average household spends on food, based solely on the statement "we won't spend that much anyway" PERIOD.

IOTA 5 → 5 | 19:17 | Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-KOM-021-2026_27 – Closed-door-meeting (FSR Pharmacy)

Motion Text

See project description

The FSR-Kom has issued a positive recommendation with a vote of 9/1/5.

Discussion

- **Til** from the Pharmacy Student Council (FSR) presents: Some adjustments were made to the financial plan in consultation with the HHVs. He shows the current version. It is largely based on last year's plan.
- **Katharina** asks why a person signed the minutes as the record keeper but was not present.
- **Till** replies that there must have been a mistake in the log.
- **Kat** suspects that the person signed because she is the chair, not because she took the minutes. So all that needs to be removed is the word "minutes".
- **Ansgar** asks whether, in the interest of fairness, we shouldn't raise the allowance for meals to the same level as the PAF.
- **Kat** believes that this goes much further against the FSR Committee's wishes than suddenly approving more money than they had agreed to.
- **Niklas** counters that it was just stated that this amount is not enough and cannot be financed, and warns that, based on the reasoning from the previous agenda item, this money will definitely not be sufficient, and therefore a subsequent resolution would be absolutely necessary—which, however, must be prevented at all costs.

Point of Order from **Willi**: immediate vote

no objection, Point of Order accepted

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena Approves the release of funds M-KOM-021-2026_27 in the amount of 850 € from budget line A.01.35 (FSR-Kom) for a closed-door meeting of the FSR Pharmacy.

Voting: 17 Yes / 0 No / 1 Abstention **accepted**

- Niklas unpacks a typewriter to put his personal explanation regarding the vote on the previous agenda item in writing for the minutes. At the request of the minute-taker, he leaves the meeting to do so, in order to prevent the noise from the typewriter from disrupting the proceedings.

Niklas Menge is leaving the session at 19:26.

IOTA 9 → 6 | 19:29 | Discussion & Election: Diversity Department (Executive Board)

Motion Text

We have received an application for the position of Diversity Officer. You can find the application in the non-public meeting materials.

Discussion

- **Julia** introduces herself. She's interested in the position and is already connected with Philine through the Disadvantage Compensation Working Group.
- **Ansgar** asks about her favorite emoji. It's the one with the sunglasses.
- **Willi** asks if the application has been coordinated with the FSR. Julia replies that it'll work out.
- **Marcus** asks her what her favorite color is. It's purple.
- **Willi** asks about her favorite dinosaur. It's the stegosaurus.
- **Andreas** asks about their specific concerns. The main goal is simply to provide general support to the working group and the department.

Julia is leaving the session at 19:32.

It is being discussed internally.

Mandate Review and Counting Commission consisting of **Tom Daubmann, Robert Pohle and Andreas Bagehorn**

no objections

Julia is entering the session at 19:33.

Niklas is entering the session at 19:33.

Anne is entering the session at 19:38.

Election for: Head of Diversity Department (*2 available position(s)*)
candidates + Election results:

- Julia: 16
- No: 1
- Absention: 0
- Invalid: 0

elected, accepts it

IOTA 6 → 7 | 19:40 | Discussion & Decision: Funding Application FA-STURA-001-2026_27 – Student Zine (Carlo Hoffmann)

Motion Text

See the project description

Julia Fischer is leaving the session at 19:42.

Akin Rosenkranz is leaving the session at 19:44.

Discussion

- **Carlo** presents the proposal. The plan is to create and print a small magazine. They are requesting assistance with the printing costs. A funding request has also been submitted to the Studentenwerk to cover the remainder of the printing costs. However, they have not yet received final confirmation of this. The zine is intended to be distributed primarily in the relevant degree programs.
- **Nele** has a question regarding the print run: to what extent the costs are to be reduced and whether there is already a specific offer.
- The print run has been reduced to 2,000 copies, but they'll likely use better paper. There isn't a new quote yet. He estimates that it will cost around 500 € to 600 €.
- **Robert** asks whether it wouldn't make sense to distribute the whole thing digitally.
- **Carlos** says, of course, it could also be done through online platforms. There's already an online beta version. However, he sees greater value in the physical format and would view an online version more as a supplement.

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena approves funding request FA-STURA-001-2026_27 in the amount of 150 € from budget line A.08.01 (Funding for External Projects—Other).

Voting: 15 Yes / 1 No / 2 Abstention **accepted**

Sander König is leaving the session at 19:50.

IOTA 7 → 8 | 19:50 | Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-LEHR-005-2026_27 – Expense Reimbursement (Teaching Department)

Motion Text

As part of the Conference of All Teacher Education Students (KoaLa) from May 22 through May 25, 2026, a series of workshops was held on topics currently relevant to education policy and teacher education.
As part of this event, a workshop on the topic of "AI in Schools" was planned by Felix Fahnroth from the German Language and Literature Education program. Unfortunately, he had to cancel due to health reasons, and Max Krischeu, from the Math Student Council, stepped in to lead the workshop on very short notice.
All KoaLa presenters received 200 € for their workshops, unless they explicitly declined, and we would like to offer Max the same opportunity, especially since he stepped in at such short notice.
Due to Max's dedication and the overwhelmingly positive feedback following the workshop, we would like to provide him with a one-time expense reimbursement of 200 €.

Discussion

- **Freddy** presents. KoaLa took place a few weeks ago. There were workshops on one of the days. The speakers all received 200 €. One person had to cancel at the last minute. Max stepped in and led a really good workshop. That's why he should also receive the 200 € retroactively.
- **Willi** asks why expense reimbursement is a separate funding approval. He would prefer that the budget simply be adjusted in the original KoaLa funding approval and that the expense reimbursement then be approved by the StuRa.
- **Kat** notes that if the department had already approved the AE with an M number, it would be very difficult to change that now because we would then lack the basis for the decision.
- **Anne** agrees with Kat.
- **Willi** does not think the department's decision is necessary if the expense reimbursement were to be processed through the old funding authorization.
- **Niklas** thinks we should leave it as is. That way, it's cleaner. Given that this was a last-minute substitution, it makes sense to handle it separately afterward. It's fine to treat this as a new budget approval.
- **Willi** says that the text of the resolution needs to be amended anyway because it doesn't mention the expense allowance.
- **Kat** thinks it would be too much of a hassle for the finance department to change the funding approval at this point. Since M-LEHR-008-2025_26 (the original funding authorization for the entire KoaLa project) is already in the accounting system and M-LEHR-005-2026_27 (the new funding authorization for expense reimbursements) has already been approved.
- **Freddy** doesn't care how precisely it's done. She would prefer to do it in whatever way is easiest from a financial standpoint.

Amendment from **Willi**: Amend the text of the resolution to read: "The Student Council of the FSU Jena approves a one-time expense reimbursement for Max Krischeu for conducting a workshop at KoaLa 2026 under funding allocation M-LEHR-008-2025_26 in the amount of 200 €"

- **Kat** would like to refer back to her previous comment.

amendment from **Willi Kröning**: Change the text of the resolution to: "The Student Council of the FSU Jena resolves to grant a one-time expense reimbursement to Max Krischeu for conducting a workshop at KoaLa 2026 under funding allocation M-LEHR-008-2025_26 in the amount of 200 €"

Voting: 9 Yes / 6 No / 0 Abstention **angenommen**

Explanation of Vote

title: Pure Frustration
declaring person: Niklas Menge
reading aloud: no
received: 8:00 p.m.
declaration: I know exactly why I'm sitting here under the table, frustrated. PERIOD.

Amendment from **Andreas Bagehorn**: Amend the text of the resolution to read: "The StuRa resolves to approve funding M-LEHR-005-2026_27 in the amount of 200 € and, thereby, a one-time expense reimbursement for Max Kriescheu in the amount of 200 €."

- **Willi** formally objects to this.

amendment from **Andreas Bagehorn**: Amend the text of the resolution to read: "The Student Council of the FSU Jena approves the release of funds M-LEHR-005-2026_27 in the amount of 200 € and, accordingly, a one-time expense reimbursement for Max Kriescheu in the amount of 200 €."

Voting: 14 Yes / 1 No / 1 Abstention **accepted**

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena Approves the release of funds M-LEHR-005-2026_27 in the amount of 200 € and, accordingly, a one-time expense reimbursement for Max Kriescheu in the amount of 200 €.

Voting: 15 Yes / 0 No / 1 Abstention **accepted**

IOTA 10 → 9 | 20:07 | Discussion: SpoWi-Party (Executive Board)

Motion Text

We had a clarifying discussion with the FSR SpoWi regarding the party that was canceled on short notice.
The question now is whether the FSR will cover the €100 cancellation fee or whether the FSR members will have to pay it out of their own pockets.
We would like to resolve this together.

Discussion

- **Jan** recounts what has happened so far.
- **Akin** asks how this came about.
- **Jan** explains that an event organizer was approached by the FSR SpoWi. The organizer had sent several proposals, and the SpoWis accepted one of them. They did not realize that by confirming their acceptance in an email, they had entered into a contract. They thought they had merely made a non-binding reservation. They subsequently canceled at the last minute, citing problems with the StuRa as the reason.
- **Kat** adds that the FSR would like the €100 cancellation fees to be paid from the FSR fund. The question now is where we stand on this.

Anne Kaufmann is leaving the session at 20:08.

Antonia Zahn is leaving the session at 20:10.

- **Andreas** asks why you should decline an invitation if you don't think you've made a binding commitment yet.
- **Bennet** says that, strictly speaking, we can't go along with that. But since it's supposed to be an FSR event, we could turn a blind eye.
- **Willi** asks whether we're even allowed to pay for this. He also wants to know whether the FSR has shown remorse and learned from this.
- **Jan** says that the person who wrote the emails seemed very downcast. Another person seemed less understanding.
- **Akin** asks whether they were older or newer members.
- **Kat** replies that we don't know for sure whether the person in charge is new. In any case, we're already familiar with the finance manager, and she's probably been with us for quite some time.

Anastasia Hansen is leaving the session at 20:17.

- **Klara** brings up Willi's point again—whether we're even allowed to do this. She'd like to first discuss whether we want to pay for it and then, if necessary, consult with the legal department to clarify that we're actually allowed to do so. She's also concerned that, in the future, students

might be afraid to organize events and take on financial responsibility if they have to cover the costs on their own in case of mistakes.

- **John** says that the Executive Board and the Finance Department would have helped if they had been asked. So there's no reason to worry.
- **Salty** says that as long as the learning component is there, it would be reasonable to cover the costs.
- **Kat** says that something must have gone wrong with the venue as well, since there wasn't even a contract. She doesn't expect something like that to happen again.
- **Andreas** says that when mistakes happen, people shouldn't have to bear the costs personally. The only question is whether it was really ignorance or intent.

Point of Order from **Jan**: Public Opinion on the Cancellation Fee Policy

no objection, Point of Order accepted

Opinions are gathered about whether the FSR SpoWi must cover the cancellation fees out of its own pocket or whether they will be paid from the FSR fund.
Result: 10 paid privately / 5 paid by FSR if it is legally permissible

IOTA 11 → 10 | 20:27 | Discussion: Haus auf der Mauer Business Plan (Executive Board)

Motion Text

An initial jury meeting was held to discuss the new business plan for the Haus auf der Mauer. We would like to report on this meeting and gather input for the next one.

Discussion

- **Klara** explains the situation. The new budget must be approved soon. However, much remains unclear at this point. Increased expenses are expected for painting work and an upgrade to the locking system. At the same time, the city has announced its intention to use one floor itself. No notice of termination has been received yet. On the one hand, this would reduce costs. On the other hand, it would fundamentally alter the building's student-oriented character. The EAH would then likely withdraw from the project as well. It is unclear whether the EAH's Student Council would do the same.
- **Niklas** thinks it's nonsense for the city to be involved in this and likes the current group of partners for "Haus auf der Mauer."
- **Kat** finds the planned increases financially challenging. Given our current budget situation, we can't handle them. The earliest we could implement them would be next summer semester, but it would be better to wait another semester so that we can first allocate some funds back to our operations, which will likely be scaled back due to the tight budget. Furthermore, it's not feasible for us to budget for costs that could still fluctuate by 5,000 to 10,000 up or down. Our financial resources simply aren't that extensive. We need planning certainty.
- **Marcus** feels that the city is harming the project.

Katharina Gabriel is leaving the session at 20:36.

Bennet Hartung is leaving the session at 20:36.

- **John** asks if there have been any discussions with the city.
- **Klara** confirms this. A representative from the city is always present at the jury meetings. In addition, the Student Services Organization is currently in discussions with the city regarding the alleged termination.
- **Marcus** asks if we should perhaps contact the city council.
- **Tom** agrees with Marcus and calls on our well-connected members to do so.

IOTA / → 11 | 20:43 | Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds M-STURA-007-2026_27 – Follow-up decision (Willi Kröning)

Discussion

- **Kat** explains the situation.
- No questions

Draft Resolution: The Student Council of the FSU Jena resolves to increase the budget allocation M-STURA-007-2026_27 (Special Edition: Akrützel Committee Elections) to 517.88 €.

Voting: 13 Yes / 0 No / 1 Abstention **angenommen**

IOTA 12 → 12 | 20:46 | Discussion: Confidential Record-Keeping for Job Applications (Executive Board)

Motion Text

As you all surely know, we try to take minutes of as much as possible. This includes the debates we hold without the candidates present. The problem here is that MdStuRa members and the minute-takers have access to these debates, even if the candidates are excluded.
This raises the question: Should we continue to take minutes of these debates?

Discussion

- **Jan** presents the motion.
- **Kat** points out another advantage: this way, the non-public portion can't be sent out by mistake.
- **Salty** generally thinks it's a good idea to keep a record of what happens during the debate.
- **Kat** understands this well. She believes that the problem isn't easy to solve.
- **Niklas** explains that the problem of accidental viewing can be easily avoided by creating the relevant section of the minutes in a separate document, which is then printed out, placed in an envelope, and filed away. A note can then be written on the envelope specifying which individuals are not permitted to read the contents. If the digital file is then deleted immediately, people would have to go out of their way to look at that section of the minutes, and it would be protected from accidental viewing.
- **Jan** wonders whether the added value justifies the effort.
- **Salty** thinks that, in the end, it's probably really best not to log that.
- **Ansgar** would like it if the underlying reasoning behind decisions were clear.
- **Lilou** mentions that there have also been cases where the public was excluded from more than just personnel discussions. She would like to distinguish between such cases.
- **Niklas** provides examples of concerns that are frequently raised in discussions to put things into context: the holding of multiple offices, conflicts of interest, etc., were topics in the past

that were sometimes discussed without the candidates present, and the course of those discussions could be relevant and interesting for future meetings.

IOTA 13 → 13 | 20:54 | Discussion: Show of hand (Klara Wilde)

Motion Text

At the last meeting, we already began discussing possible additional hand signals for our meetings. We'd like to revisit that discussion here and hopefully reach a conclusion.

Here's a preliminary list of situations for which we could potentially introduce hand signals:

- Get to the point
- That's beyond the scope of this discussion
- Speak up, please
- False statement
- Fact check, please

Feel free to think about which of these you consider useful and which you don't before the meeting.

Discussion

- **Klara** introduces the topic.
- **Andreas** would first like to note in general that hand signals are fantastic. He would distinguish between hand signals that are generally relevant and those that are important for the current speakers. He advocates for "dagegen" as a supplement to acclamation and "Technical" as an indicator in cases such as technical problems. In addition, the hand signals that are relevant to the speakers should be mirrored by the meeting chair.
- **Kat** is also a fan of hand signals and thinks that perhaps different hand signals could be introduced for GO and PE, so that it's always clear from the hand signal which of the two is being referred to.
- **Willi** has a problem in that learning hand signals feels to him like learning a completely new language. On top of that, he feels like he has to constantly scan the entire room to see if anyone is making a hand signal. That makes it hard for him to focus.
- **Ansgar** doesn't see a problem with the same hand signal used by GO and PE that Kat had mentioned.
- **Kat** points out that there's also the option of using OpenSlides, since members can provide feedback digitally right there. She'll stay on top of it so we can try it out at one of our next meetings.
- **Marcus** thinks we might be able to get that for free through the fzs.
- **Ansgar** explains that we can also have it hosted through Fachschaften.org.

Chiara Daskiewitsch is leaving the session at 21:00.

Ansgar Gude is leaving the session at 21:00.

Frederike Mönch is leaving the session at 21:02.

- **Niklas** doesn't see the problem with having to learn an entire language. However, he does see the risk that the hand signals "Technical" and "directly related" could be misused.
- **Tom** has frequently had disagreements with OpenSlides in the past. He suggests using Antragsgrün instead. He also asks, "directly regarding this", whether this is even compatible with our Rules of Order, since a speaking list is actually required.
- **Kat** questions to what extent the "Antragsgrün" initiative would be feasible, since it is a program proposed by the Green Party and is therefore politically partisan. That would have to be examined first.
- **Andreas** responds to Tom's follow-up question "on this very point": The speaking order is defined in the Rules of Procedure, but deviations are permitted "if this seems objectively necessary".
- **Tom** on nonpartisanship: In his opinion, "Antragsgrün" is not a product of the Green Party.
- **Kat** quotes the legal notice from Antragsgrün, which says something different. But the code is open source on GitHub, so it's definitely worth considering simply hosting your own independent clone. To do that, though, you'd need to talk to our technical team.
- **Ansgar** reiterates that you can definitely have OpenSlides hosted by fachschaft.org.
- **Klara** asks: Should we continue discussing a show of hands now, or should we try out the technical options first and, if necessary, come back to the show of hands later?

Point of Order from **John**: Views on the Further Proceedings

no objection, Point of Order accepted

Opinions are gathered about whether we want to try out digital tools first or continue thinking about new hand signals.
Result: 10 digital tools / 5 hand signals

IOTA 8 → 14 | 21:13 | Discussion & Decision: Release of Funds "Stay-on-the-Ball (Niklas Menge)

Motion Text

Good evening,

As we learned today, the Executive Board likes to stay on top of things, but when things get stressful at times, that seems difficult.

Following up on my survey regarding the StuRa Executive Board, I'd like to take this opportunity to apologize for not staying on top of things, and I'd now like to get back on track and submit the following motion:

75 € + 5 € buffer for a 2025 Women's European Championship soccer ball to help me stay on top of things.

As a budget line item, I'll just suggest "office supplies" 🙂

It's a bit too late for me to handle the financial plan and form right now, but when I'm back at the Finance Committee, I'll be happy to fill them out in person.

The quote is below; please refrain from asking questions—the whole point of this is to ask them at the meeting ;P

Best regards,
Niklas Menge

Proposal: https://www.sport-boeckmann.de/a/adidas-konektis-pro-ball-weiss-blau-rot-lucid-lemon-gr-5/jh1261-5?campaignCode=idealo

[Note from the Executive Board: If you're wondering why this agenda item is named differently than is usually the case for funding approvals, we'd like to briefly explain it here. As you can see from the form, Niklas submitted the funding approval as M-BALL-042-2026_27. This caused us a great deal of (head)ache when naming the agenda item, so we ultimately gave up. However, the text of the resolution includes the M-number as it was submitted, so as not to completely spoil the fun.]

Discussion

- Niklas presents his proposal.

Maurice Reitzig is leaving the session at 21:14.

Clara Höpfner is leaving the session at 21:14.

- This IOTA is lost in translation. Lots of German puns which cannot be fully translated without loosing the word play.
- **Andreas** is confused as to why we're dealing with this. Kerstin could have just ordered it; after all, it's supposed to be paid for out of the "Office Supplies" budget.
- **Marcus** would like another ball for the FSR Info, or rather, paid for by the FSR Info. The idea of getting a ball from the 2024 Men's European Championship has been floated.
- **Niklas** agrees with Andreas's suggestion. However, he has unfortunately already submitted the motion to the StuRa and would like to prevent the ball from being purchased twice by mistake—unless the Finance Committee also needs a ball, in which case two balls are, of course, fine.
- **Kat** has a counterproposal. Some small handballs were found in the Kom camp. Would the Niklas ones work, too?
- **Niklas** emphasizes that balls have a wide range of uses. There are many different types of balls with varying qualities. The balls from the warehouse have valves that stick out slightly and therefore do not meet his personal standards. However, it all depends on what the Executive Board plans to do with the "stay-on-the-ball" initiative.

Amendment from **Tom Daubmann**: Change 75 € + 5 € buffer to 40 € + 10 € buffer
Change every instance of "Ball" to "Kloß"
Change "2025 Women's European Soccer Championship Ball" to Giant Cuddly Kloß
The budget will be adjusted accordingly

- **Tom** explains his motion: We can't really stay on top of things in our offices, but we're all the better at it when it comes to our cuddly friends. All our stuffed animals are very important for our well-being and emotional support. Tom speaks from experience, since he spends too much time in the offices. Overall, we end up staying with the cuddly ball more often than staying on the ball. But the cuddly ball is too small. So we need a bigger one, because: We shouldn't stay on the ball—we should stay with the Dumpling!
- **Kat** would like to distance herself from the nickname cuddly dumpling.
- **Andreas** also advises against buying a cuddly dumpling, since this is already the FSR Medicine mascot and it could give the impression of favoritism. On the other hand, of course, it could also make it clear that we take the medical students seriously and want to support them.
- **Marcus** likes the idea of a beanbag, but thinks it's too expensive.
- **John** has a new idea for boosting morale on a tight budget: Merz cardboard cutouts.
- **Willi** isn't some cardboard cutout of a low-income worker from a small-to-medium-sized business.
- Parliamentary interjection by **Tom Daubmann**: Willi cardboard cutout!
- Interjections from **various people** in the legislature: NO!
- **Marcus** suggests a punching bag. You could even put pictures of the people who are currently frustrating us on it.
- **Akin** would like to see various displays of StuRa legends.

- **Andreas** wants to stay on the ball and get back to the topic of balls. While there's always something to eat in the Executive Board's office, there's rarely anything to drink. He suggests the best ball ever: thirst-quenching gum. After all, a rectangular block is also a ball if you just choose the right standard or metric.
- **Akin** suggests a punching bag again. And then a boxing ring.
- **Jan** wants a ball made of cement—it can't fly around. (It remains unclear whether this is an advantage or a disadvantage.)
- **Willi** is against violence—even against punching bags. Besides, he doesn't want to give the impression that people are engaging in sports activities in an administrative office.
- **Marcus** is in favor of a tabletop treadmill.

Point of Order from **Tom Daubmann**: Introduce a "Fun Motion" under the heading "Fun Motion" for fun motions.

Objection from **Various attendees**: A discussion ensues. It is agreed to prepare an agenda item on fun motions for the next meeting.

withdrawn

- **Tom** suggests introducing the heading "Fun Motion" to make the distinction between serious and humorous motions clearer.
- **Jan** thinks it doesn't really matter that much.
- **Willi** agrees with Tom. He would like to suggest "Fun and Games", or "SuS" for short.
- **Paul** also wants the seriousness—or lack thereof—to be clearly evident.
- **Andreas** says that what a member submits doesn't necessarily reflect the StuRa's priorities.
- **Klara** also thinks that making a distinction doesn't really help, because people can always misunderstand it. When we decide on something, it takes effect anyway, whether it was a joke proposal or not; when we reject something, it just doesn't get implemented.
- **Kat** points out that the internal audit report always includes the number of funding requests submitted and the number of those that were approved. So, at least in the statistics, it would make a difference if a large number of frivolous requests were submitted and rejected.
- **Paul** picks up on Klara's point: Precisely because the resolutions are binding, it would be important to make a clear distinction there. That way, it would also be clear from the outset what is really meant by a "fun motion."

Point of Order from **Tom Daubmann**: Postponement – We should first clarify in a discussion item at the next meeting how we generally intend to handle "joke motions" before we vote on this one.

objection from **Kat Schmidt**: The FSR Committee has already addressed "joke motions" and voted not to consider a motion. So the damage has already been done.

Voting: 5 Yes / 4 No / 1 Abstention **accepted**

Explanation of Vote

title: /
declaring person: Marcus Hansen
reading aloud: no
received: /
declaration: I think it's a shame that we postponed the amendment to this agenda item.
This amendment would have ensured that we stay on top of things and strongly support our FSRe.
The amendment read as follows: "Everyone present must participate in the public viewing of the FMI student representatives in June." That's a real shame!

IOTA 14 → 15 | 21:39 | Next Session

Discussion

- **Jan** wants to go back to the two-week schedule.
- **Marcus** asks if we still need to have a meeting in June. That is, in fact, the case.
- **John** asks what we'll do if there's a soccer game. Klara says that in the past, updates on the current score were provided even during the meeting. We could do that again if it ensures that enough MdStuRa members are present.
- **Kat** asks if we could catch Andreas and Niklas briefly to discuss the supplemental budget. Andreas isn't involved in the public viewing event, so Niklas would also be available for a short time.

IOTA 15 → 16 | 21:41 | Miscellaneous

Widersetzen

- **Jan** explains the situation and reads the Akrützel article aloud.
- **Klara** describes the situation from our perspective: We've actually discussed this topic before at a StuRa meeting. The issue was that "Uni gegen Rechts" (UgR) wanted support for the action week against fascism. Since this action week was initiated by another student body and we have a general cooperation agreement with UgR, the application wasn't a problem for us.
  Then UgR got back to us and wanted to convene a full student assembly as well. We'd also reported on this in the StuRa: We saw no reason to do so because the contact persons hadn't prepared an actual resolution or anything else that would have required an official student general assembly. The organizational effort therefore didn't make sense to us. We conveyed this and then heard nothing more.
  Then, suddenly, flyers and posters from "Widersetzen" started appearing everywhere. These invited students to a general student assembly in HS1, which was problematic in several ways: the university had in fact not approved the booking of the lecture hall following an internal discussion, so the room information and the resulting association with the university were incorrect. Since the assembly had not been convened by the StuRa, it was also not a general student assembly.
  For this reason, and also because there is no cooperation agreement with Widersetzen, we had to ask our organizations not to share the call to action. Despite repeated inquiries, we were unable to obtain any clarification on who exactly is organizing the event, so a cooperation agreement could not be drawn up.
  Akrützel did not check with us before writing the article. That's also a shame, because a counterstatement would certainly have been helpful.
  Our question for you: Do you have any further questions about the situation? Do you think it makes sense to draft a statement by the next meeting?
- **Jan** adds: Those in charge didn't want to (not just couldn't) tell us who is now responsible. In addition, we received different—and at times contradictory—information from several different people (on the same day). For example, first we were asked to repost the call to action,

and then we were asked to book the HS.

He also brings up the exchange with Akrützel again: Akrützel did not respond to our email informing them that they had to delete the "Widersetzen" post. That's why Jan messaged the Instagram account directly from his personal account. This led to a brief exchange on Instagram, but no longer conversation.

- **Andreas** views the situation critically, especially since it's somehow clear from the previous email exchange that those in charge knew that a general student assembly is a specific type of meeting that only the StuRa can convene. We had our hands tied—for example, regarding the inquiry about the lecture hall. He feels that this may not have been understood, at least by the opposition. Furthermore, it now seems that Akrützel has made a mountain out of a molehill. So he doesn't think it's a bad idea for us to issue a counterstatement.
- **Kat** agrees with Andreas: We never had the opportunity to book the space, since there are clear agreements with the university regarding this. It's also very difficult to support the whole thing in a non-partisan way, since it specifically involves the AfD party convention.
- **Marcus** says that Widersetzen could have simply convened a general assembly on their own by collecting signatures. But they didn't do that.
- **Tom** strongly disagrees when it comes to nonpartisanship.
- **Lilou** asks how many people a statement would reach—certainly not as many as the Akrützel article. Wouldn't it make sense, then, to aim for a right of reply in Akrützel?
- **Paul** thinks we don't really have anything to be criticized for. In the interest of de-escalation, he's in favor of issuing a joint statement with Akrützel.
- **John** agrees with Paul's point and also hopes that the statement will end up in the Akrützel.
- **Willi** isn't sure whether a joint statement might look like an attempt to influence the decision, since we're the ones paying for the Akrützel, after all.
- **Lilou** suggests that we phrase the statement as politely as possible.
- **Marcus** points out that the StuRa has an entire page in the Akrützel that we can claim. He also agrees with Willi that it won't look good if we do this together.
- **Paul** understands the objection. At the same time, we are, in a sense, Akrützel's superiors, and it is worth criticizing the fact that no request for a response was made. He could also envision a more general article.
- **Tom** is more in favor of issuing a joint statement with Widersetzen. After all, we don't have a dispute with Akrützel, even if that wasn't exactly proper from a journalistic standpoint. If Widersetzen isn't interested in issuing a joint statement, then Tom would be in favor of just letting the whole thing drop.
- **Andreas** definitely wants some kind of correction. The misrepresentation of the facts casts us in a bad light.
- **Paul** clarifies once again what he means.
- **Kat** definitely thinks that internal communication regarding the Akrützel should be improved in the future.

Niklas Menge is leaving the session at 22:00.

Permanent StuRa Reservation / Game Nights

- **Klara** presents her idea: She wants to do something for the younger members (not her own, but those of the StuRa) and also accommodate the room management by simply reserving the room every week and then, during weeks when there are no StuRa meetings, using the room for a variety of other events, such as coworking, lectures, game nights, etc.
- **Jan** had subsequently considered using the room for a presentation meeting in three weeks.
- **Andreas** thinks it's a nice idea.
- **Ansgar** would like a room with better acoustics and is asking for suggestions.
- **Marcus** is in Lecture Hall 1
- **Tom** suggests Abbeanum 1.
- **John** suggests holding the HS under the cafeteria (E28). The acoustics are good there, and there are table microphones.
- **Kat** asks if we can still get in and out after 8:00 p.m., since the cafeteria closes then. The answer is yes. There's a separate entrance.
- **Lilou** suggests a lecture hall at the IP.
- **Andreas** objects to Tom's suggestion and proposes the Senate chamber.
- **Marcus** agrees with John.
- **Ansgar** also likes E28 and thinks we should try to schedule the FSR committee there as well.
- **Robert** returns to the original proposal and says he likes it.

Paul Weiß is leaving the session at 22:17.

Kat would like to say a few more words about "fun motions"

- **Kat** returns to the topic of "fun motions" and points out that the HHVs would also have to approve them. So even if something like that is passed, it doesn't mean it's automatically approved.
- **Tom** would also find it difficult to rely on the HHVs to take them out.
- **Ansgar** reports that the FSR committee actually had a serious discussion about Niklas's joke motions, so they were clearly not meant to be jokes.
- **Jan** says that, according to Niklas, they weren't really prank proposals either.

Point of Order from **Marcus Hansen**: Closing of the agenda item – Marcus has to leave in 3 minutes and would like to address the meeting's theme.

objection from **Tom Daubamnn**: Tom gives an incredibly long speech, only a tiny portion of which deals with the subject of the motion. Instead, his goal is to stall for time until Marcus has to leave. He succeeds (though not entirely unscathed).

Voting: 1 Yes / 3 No / 2 Abstention **rejected**

Marcus Hansen is leaving the session at 22:24.

- **Andreas** clarifies once again: Niklas's proposals started out as jokes, but became a little more serious as he worked on them, so they ended up being something in between.
- **Kat** definitely sees it that way when it comes to the cup holders. As for the idea with the oven, though, she really hopes Niklas wasn't serious. Otherwise, she's worried he might have sniffed a little too much filament.

- **Ansgar**'s point was that the FSR Committee discussed these as entirely legitimate motions.
- **Andreas** believes that the determination of what constitutes a "fun proposal" and what does not can, in and of itself, only be made by the person submitting the proposal. It is therefore always a vague term that cannot really be defined by others.

IOTA 16 → 16 | 22:29 | Session Colour

Discussion

- **Andreas** suggests line-heart-pink.
- **Andreas** suggests the surprise color for Niklas: 50/164/95.
- **Jan** suggests FDP yellow.
- **Tom** suggests PAF Orange.
- **Nele** suggests olivine green.
- **Andreas** suggests the Inventarisierungsguru-sweater- green.

Point of Order from **Klara Wilde**: Opinion gathering on the Session colour

objection from **Andreas Bagehorn**: Dear StuRa, dear Executive Board, dear guests, dearest Fri(e)da,
As early as the 19th century, Alexis de Tocqueville warned against the tyranny of the majority.
But what this opinion poll would reveal is even worse: a tyranny of the "maybe" majority.
Not only is the student body as a whole represented in a significantly unrepresentative manner—since every person present has the right to vote—but it isn't even necessary for a majority of this questionably assembled group to agree on the color.
So what this means is this: The most important decision of the meeting is not made by the Executive Board—which enjoys the explicit approval of the majority of the representatively elected student body—but by a group of people who cannot make decisions on behalf of the student body.
Therefore, it is the responsibility of every student representative to put an end to this tyrannical practice!
Voting: 5 Yes / 1 No / 0 Abstention **accepted**

Opinions are gathered about which should be the session color for the current session.
Result: 6 line-heart-pink / 3 Surprise Color / 4 FDP Yellow / 3 PAF Orange / 5 Olivine Green / 3 Inventory Guru Sweater Green
→**The session color will be line-heart-pink.**

Personal Statement on the Agenda Item

title: WOW.
declaring person: Willi Kröning
reading aloud: No
received: /
declaration: WOW.

☀️🏀 *We'd like to thank everyone who has read this far for sticking with us, and we hope you have a week that isn't too sunny.* 🏈☀️

Jena, October 5, 2026

Jan Haedicke
Session Leadership

Chiara Daskiewitsch, Klara Wilde
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 (Fürtstengraben 1)
- EAP: Ernst-Abbe-Platz
- CRJ: Campusradio Jena