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Introduction:

Dear members of the Participation Day, as well as interested participants and readers,

Participation Day, which took place on November 8th 2018, is now behind us and at this point we would like to thank again everyone who was part of it: it was great to see how high the participation and motivation were, and to think together about ideas and solutions for more involvement in our University. It was nice to see that only in a few hours so many ideas were developed and how many of you stayed for a long time and collaborated with us. Thank you! We also want to sincerely thank again our moderators Lena Liberta, Susann Hippler, Andreas Kettritz, Andreas Mai, Sebastian Metag and Max Merkel and our speakers Charlotte Reineke, Margit Czenki and Christoph Schäfer. Thank you!

In the past months, the Bündnis Partizipation (Participation Alliance) has continued working on the results of Participation Day. We gathered the discussions’ content and ideas from the thematic rounds and reviewed them in consultation with some of you. The result of this is finally this documentation, in which we wanted to illustrate the incredible density of thoughts and ideas of the day and to bundle and record the potentials that arose through the work of many on Participation Day. You can read again about how the idea really came to Bündnis Partizipation and how we developed the Participation Day. In addition, you will find a summary of the lectures on co-determination and participation at universities and on artistic methods of participation, as well as the written and processed contents of the discussions and ideas of the thematic rounds. To conclude, we wrote a small reflection and prospect on how we think the Day worked out and what should be happening now.

Ok, now what? The documentation itself is only an intermediate stage of collaborative processes for more opportunities of co-organizing at Bauhaus University Weimar. As the list containing concrete project ideas at the end shows, there are some basic points with which we could start actualizing those ideas to move towards a participative university. The task now is to guide those project ideas in the right direction and realize them. So we would like to conclude with this welcoming invitation: for things to continue, we need more people who are motivated, have a bit of time and who are ready to wear the hat for such a project. Who wants to join?

We are looking forward to hear from you!
Enjoy the reading,

Your Bündnis Partizipation
Universities are very particular institutions. They are places where research is conducted, where we design, teach and learn. But they are also where we discuss, argue - and sometimes even party. Out-dated ways of thinking are called into question, new ways are opened up, even if there is no fixed destination yet. Questions are asked, even when it is unknown whether answers even exist. These are the places where designs for a future society are sought and developed.

To accomplish these tasks, our university receives public funding and enjoys a high degree of autonomy. Autonomy means the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of research, art, and teaching at the university. This autonomy is maintained by the democratic structures of the university. Committees are elected, the Bauhaus-Universität Senate on a centralized level, and faculty councils at a decentralized level. In addition, the board of governance and the boards of deans are composed of elected members. Study regulations and the appointment of professors are discussed in the committees. Strategic planning and concrete measures are presented and discussed in the Bauhaus-Universität Weimar Senate. All of the university status groups take part: professors, scientific and artistic staff, staff in technology and administration and students as well.

This means that the opportunities to participate in university issues are diverse, and that they are also being used. Is that enough? Or vice versa: why do we hear over and over that the opportunities for participation are insufficient, that more information and more participation by all members of the university is needed? Why is that?

The demands for democratic participation in a university are particularly high; universities are public spaces and role models. They are places where students want to be involved in shaping and creating; learning, for example, how to design planning processes and how to involve those who are affected by it. Many students do not want to wait for some official yet cumbersome committee to set things in motion. Therefore, it must be possible to evaluate the university based on the demands and values it conveys.

To add to this, a university is a very complex entity. Its members have very different perspectives and goals. The time a student spends at the university is relatively short - usually only a few years. Scientific staff usually stay longer as they want to qualify as a specialist and for example write a doctoral thesis. Staff in administration and technology as well as professors set themselves up for a permanent position at the university. It is easier for them to get involved in the interests, structures and tasks of the university. Students, on the other hand, have examinations, internships, and may even study abroad during the short period of study, meaning there is little time left for them for election preparation and committee
work. International students in particular often find it difficult to adequately participate on committees since committee work is conducted in German and many international students only spend one or two semesters in Weimar.

In short, the challenges of participation are especially apparent at Bauhaus-Universität Weimar. New ways of adequately integrating students into planning and decision-making processes are needed. Because involvement, participation, experiencing and testing opportunities for participation are, after all, also part of the development of a student’s character and personality, one of the university’s major goals. In its new April 2019 constitution (“Grundordnung”), Bauhaus-Universität Weimar determined not only the participation in elections and committees but rather, it has also stated in the preamble:

„The task of all Bauhaus-Universität Weimar status groups is to participate in shaping the present and future of Bauhaus-Universität Weimar. Bauhaus-Universität Weimar actively promotes the participation of all its members in the development of the university. It sees itself as a role model and a place where the culture of democracy is actively lived and developed. It offers space for dialogue, taking responsibility and learning participative processes.“

What does that actually mean in practice? Instruments which allow the continuous involvement of students and all members of the university in planning and design processes are being developed. This requires information, communication and exchange, and enables the testing of new formats, such as digital platforms. In this sense, the decisions that are ultimately made by the elected bodies can be better informed and made comprehensible. On the other hand, extended opportunities for participation come with obligations. These includes the willingness to balance, to compromise and to take on responsibility. Participation and responsibility are two sides of the same coin.

With Tag der Partizipation (Participation Day), a process has been set in motion that can help challenge established ways of thinking and open up new possibilities. Bauhaus-Universität Weimar intends to successfully complete a concrete draft for a future society. All members of the university can contribute to this.

Prof. Dr. Winfried Speitkamp
President of Bauhaus-Universität Weimar
Statement by the Student Government on the Documentation of Bündnis Partizipation on the first Tag der Partizipation (Participationday)

StudierendenKonvent, the Student Government, of Bauhaus-Universität Weimar, as the university’s highest student committee, has a fundamental interest in more attention to the topic of participation at the university. An open exchange outside of committee structures constitutes a lower inhibition threshold for an equal participation of all status groups. Therefore, we support Bündnis Partizipation as an addition to the existing structures of the student representation as an alliance partner. We particularly welcome new approaches and easier accessibility. Therefore, establishing and expanding the format of Tags der Partizipation has a high priority for the Student Government. The first event facilitated a productive discourse in which university-wide topics were documented and first ideas for solutions could be developed. The focus on improvement of construction processes and the flow of information are of particular importance for us. At the same time, new topics have opened up. The student representation can also benefit in this respect in that students become aware of concrete fields of action and then engage in the given structures. Processes for integrating all the status groups of the university have been initiated in some cases earlier. With the previous processes, as well as Tag der Partizipation itself and the follow-up, including this documentation, the driving forces have this time achieved a more concrete and thus more consistent result than ever before. With an approach different from ours, which still complements our work, we see the high value of the format. Consequently, it is a concern of the Student Government to support the next Tag der Partizipation. The critical approach of Bündnis Partizipation with its own work testifies to the desire to draw the right conclusions for this.

With kind regards

StudierendenKonvent of Bauhaus-Universität Weimar
“Aufgabe aller Statusgruppen der Bauhaus-Universität Weimar ist es, Gegenwart und Zukunft der Bauhaus-Universität Weimar mitzugestalten. Die Bauhaus-Universität Weimar fördert daher aktiv die Beteiligung aller ihrer Mitglieder an der Entwicklung der Universität. Sie versteht sich als gesellschaftliches Vorbild und Ort, an dem die Kultur der Demokratie aktiv gelebt und weitergedacht wird. Sie bietet Raum für Dialog, Verantwortungsübernahme und das Erlernen von partizipativen Prozessen.”

Excerpt of the preamble of the constitutional order of the Bauhaus-University Weimar

In November 2018, the Bauhaus University Weimar, represented by the Senate, gave itself a new constitutional order. In the preamble text of this basic order is the following paragraph, in which the university establishes its orientation on the issues of democracy and participation. The following documentation is in the understanding of following this commitment.
In 2017, as part of the 100th anniversary of the Bauhaus, a redesigning of the main building’s front campus of the Bauhaus University Weimar was planned. The discontent for both the procedure and results of this planning led to protests, in which students and university members took part. Protesters called for a direct participation in the planning process and spoke against parts of this process’s previous results. The disagreements could not be resolved in the multiple meetings with the university management. In 2018, the discontents eventually peaked with the occupation of the so-called Campusbuche, a beech tree which marked the foundation of the Arts and Design faculty. The occupation’s goal was to prevent the threatening felling of this tree during the construction. In the end, the cutting down of the tree could not be stopped. However, from this moment of conflict emerged a dialog between students and the university’s presidential board, with the motivation to prevent such incidents in the future. This is how the Bündnis Partizipation was formed, consisting of students, representatives of the StuKo, the Raumstadion initiative and the presidential board. The common goal of Bündnis Partizipation was and still is to find out how the collaborative developing and designing of the university in the future can be more anchored in everyday life. The goal is therefore to develop and implement solutions for it.

The collective discussions led to the first realization that a) there was no common understanding of participation and b) there was uncertainty about the requests and needs of university members in regard to issues and opportunities for participation. In light of the demands mentioned in further discussions and exchanges, we decided to organize an event. This event would provide information on participation and a space for exchange and networking, and would identify the needs and wishes of the university’s members regarding participation. We invited speakers to report on their experiences of practical participation and to give a theoretical background of the topic. Together with employees of the development and communication university departments, we developed a concept for the methodical course of the discussion rounds. In a first query the university members’ requests and needs were collected, and they were also asked in which areas they wish to have more opportunities to take part in the university’s organization. Out of the collected topics we created subject areas, which were then discussed and further thought about in working groups during the event. This is how Participation Day in November came to be.
In order to give participants general informations about participation and to present examples of its different forms and possibilities, the event started with three presentations on the subject. While Charlotte Reineke was giving a general overview of involvement in universities, Christoph Schäfer and Margit Czenki presented some of their artistic-architectural participatory projects on which they worked and currently work. There are short summaries of these presentations on pages 12 to 14.

After this start, the participants could develop in six different thematized rounds concrete solutions to implement more participative possibilities. In order to organise the choice of themes in a participative way, the themes were gathered beforehand on displays installed on the campus during multiple weeks and then divided in six sections (see pages 10 and 11). From this were established the theme and discussion rounds. The discussions of the six groups were led by moderators and oriented towards three questions:

What is the status quo of participative possibilities in the respective theme?
How can and should this participation in the respective theme look?
How and with which methods can this state be achieved?

This is how in several hours of work the different propositions for forms and methods were developed, showing how more participation could be established in the respective areas at our university. To conclude the event, presentations of the developed approaches were made by the representatives of each group.

After the event the results were edited in a publicly accessible Cloud Document and the participants were given the possibility to supplement the results from the thematic rounds. In this way, we wanted to gain a better understanding of the results, some of which were set out in key points. These supplemented results are documented on pages 17 to 39.
FLOW OF INFORMATION

- "Easy and public online-surveys about current topics"
- "More information about the work and ideas of the presidential board"
- "Survey tool of StuKo"
- "Carsharing platform (searching/offering) for example the pinboard in Mensa"
- "To make university-wide questionnaires and surveys on specific themes through Stuko or other committees possible"
- "Main spokesperson for questions about participation in the university (I would like to do this or that, who should I contact?)"
- "Communicating the bases of participation (representative and direct) through an introductory event at the beginning of the studies"
- "EXTERNAL PERCEPTION “
  - “Teaching, contents : view towards the outside? What connects the university inside and outside and what is the actual reality?”
  - “Bauhaus 100 events: so it’s not only about tourists and city marketing. We are also Bauhaus!”

EQUAL PARTICIPATION

- "No longterm study fees for Highschool and Middleschool teaching programs in case of schedule conflict between two universities”
- "Child friendly uni : BUDDY co-parenting”
- "More international"
- "Remove the language barrier in the university communications (German/English)”
- “Gender-sensitive lecturers”

BUILDINGS AND SPACES

- "Campus designing”
- "There should be an official and broadly inviting participative procedure for every redesigning or construction project at the university”
- "Building projects like the Campus redesigning”
- "Phase Zero – Survey of university members about their needs, before it comes to tendering (public Hearing, surveys,...)”
- "About the daily use of the Campus -> more installations/exhibitions from students”
- "Free space, managed and designed by students themselves”
- "please put seats near the Chair- and some tables”
- "The Square – delimited space on the Campus where a presentation can take place”
- "participate in the structural orientation and organization of the univeristy (chairs in the Mensa courtyard, sustainable buildings (Grey water etc))”
- "more rooms for group work!!!”
- "Better storage for artworks - organizational”
- "room availability registry/room exchange (University Commons – better use of existing ressources)”
- "The library should also be opened on Sundays... and Saturdays until 4 PM is not enough”
- "drink water dispenser in M7!”
- "Longer opening hours”
COURSE CONTENTS AND TEACHERS

- "organization of the teaching offer, more specifically the occupation, creation of chairs, as well as infos on it. Example Design Faculty, MKG: beloved chair of Experimental Television is removed, promise of replacement announced, does not happen though! Suddenly at the same time there is hardly the possibility to take film projects with the discontinuation of “Video” in VK"
- "All lecturers should be chosen democratically. (de)select the executive board."
- "be able to rate and deselect teachers - having a say on the quality of teaching."
- "more interdisciplinarity - for engineers also."
- "I want to participate in the choice of themes in seminars."
- "more self-determined und well supervised projects."
- "organization of the teaching"
- "co-organization of projects/moduls content in project-based study programs -> content fitting needs of students"
- "Teaching content"
- "decision about the offer of topics for architects (What kind of concepts are students intrested in?!)"
- "For KG: no establishment of master courses in a university which is actually designed for project classes/course selection -> University politic"
- "Course evaluation -> suggestions of students should be discussed and taken seriously by the teachers."
- "How is bad criticism of classes/teachers dealt with?"
- "better participation of students at semester conferences."
- "Selection of topics for which there should be events"
- "Inclusion of structural change processes in teaching"
- "Teaching education: more integration of interests -> authorisation for more art projects/-classes in the fine arts"
- "[...] say towards quality of education."
- "participation in classes"
- "restructuring of teaching contents"
- "Painting is the reason why a school was founded here in 1860. The ultimate goal of all artistic activity is CONSTRUCTION! DO YOU WANT TOTAL CONSTRUCTION!? Schwerbelastungskörper? Panoptics? The Great Wall of China or Ground Zero? Let’s collapse"
- " No longterm study fees for Highschool and Middleschool teaching programs in case of schedule conflict between two universities"
- "voice and consultation regarding occupation of professors and visiting professors"

CAFETERIA

- "More vegetarian/vegan"
- "Sustainability should play a bigger role."
- "Open the Mensa also in the evening at least until 8 p.m."
- "Why aren’t we asked how we want the cafeteria to be designed? #Less queuing"
- "What about cooperation with farmers? Every now and then growing vegetables - and Mensa cooperation - more regional weeks"
- "More vegan food please"
- "Less chopped soy- more vegetables!"
- "Smoothies in glasses instead of plastic in the Mensa would be sooo great"
- "Please regular vegan meals (= everyday)"
- "More vegan dishes please! On some days there are three to choose from, on others not a single one.”
- "Glutenfree meals please, less tomatoes"
Charlotte Reineke studies social sciences at the Ruhr-University Bochum and is research assistant at the Office of Cooperation RUB/IGM. She explained in the first part of her presentation the difference between co-determination and participation. She stated that the concept of co-determination corresponds to the institutionalisation of participative possibilities, in order for the political claim of democratic participation to become fair in legitimate processes. In economy and administration, this co-determination amends political civil rights. As examples she cited committees and explained how legitimised personnel- and workers councils stand as complement for political-democratic participation. As this kind of co-determination is generally a matter of representative participation, she stated that it could lead to misjudgements on the part of the representatives regarding the needs of those represented. It also normally involves time-consuming procedures and the possibility of participation has to be recognized in the first place. As opposed to co-determination, the concept of participation is about the participative opportunities beyond co-determination. The form of participation is then freely chosen by the participants and is not institutionalised or formalised. From there she went specifically on the notion of direct participation, describing its possibility for individual articulation of interests or ideas without going through an institution. As advantage of this form of participation she named the access to new expert knowledge, the expansion of communication between different actors and groups, as well as the increase of acceptance in decision making and the feeling of belonging to organizations.

In the second part of the presentation, she spoke about the application and organization of participation in universities. As suitable she described clearly defined projects in which specialised knowledge (the users) is valuable and which enable the specific and goal-oriented commitment of the different participating actors, like in the case of construction projects or the development of mission statements. She named the round table method as one way to implement participation. In these round tables, representatives of institutional committees, along with other non-institutional interest groups, experts and users, come together to exchange on specific themes, without necessarily making binding decisions. An openness and low-threshold in those round tables are vital, so that no one is excluded.
The artist Margit Czenki presented in her talk the development process for a temporary Campus (2011-2015) of the Zeppelin University in Friedrichshafen. Commissioned by the university as momentary solution (during the construction work for a new campus), a temporary campus of about 180 containers and a quick-build shed was designed and developed in a participative process with the users, an architecture office and the artists Margit Czenki and Christoph Schäfer from PlanBude. The aim was to create a diversity and a quality of space despite the cheap and standard elements and to use this provisional arrangement as an experiment to combine art, teaching and architecture. Margit Czenki used the term “accelerated wish production” to describe the procedure of the artists to carry out intensive participation in conceptual planning and design under time pressure and to develop design ideas by querying requests, preferences and ideas for certain atmospheres in the rooms. For example, quotations from the fields of film and music were used to make an atmosphere imaginable and thus approach the design.

With the creation of eleven seminar rooms, 80 employee offices, a check-in, a fully equipped Café, an improvised cafeteria, work spaces and an Open Test Haus (a student managed campus building), a first full-featured campus of the Zeppelin University was conceived in a participative manner.

To ContainerUni: [http://containeruni.de](http://containeruni.de)
Talk -

PlanBude Hamburg –

Christoph Schäfer

The artist Christoph Schäfer presented in his talk the development process and work of PlanBude, a transdisciplinary planning office in the fields of art, architecture, urbanism, social community work, music and cultural sciences. The PlanBude was founded as a result of the protests in St. Pauli against the planning around the Esso high-rise building site, in order to organize the participation and planning process commissioned by the Hamburg-Mitte district. The goal and approach of PlanBude is to develop and use new, intensive and artistic participative tools, which can, with the knowledge of many, give planning process a new direction. The central part of PlanBude’s work is the wish-production. In the participation process, not only are needs and wishes requested, but there is also the possibility and space for the participants to find, express and therefore “produce” their wishes.

Directly at the construction site with an office in a container on the Reeperbahn, and with
various methods, the diversity of the parties involved was addressed in Hamburg. Among other things, low-threshold, multilingual, non-verbal, cross-age, outreach, artistic, informative and inquiring methods were developed, such as Lego and dough models for shaping one’s own ideas, seminars in pubs and clubs, lessons in local schools or questionnaires from/for children and young people. The result of this work was the development of the St. Pauli Code in which the collected contributions were bundled, analysed and clustered. After a public presentation in the district, the code was negotiated with the authorities, the politicians and the owner and now forms the planning basis for the following architectural competition and further steps.

To PlanBude: https://planbude.de
Thematic round

Flow of Information

about the collection, expansion and transparency of information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS QUO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is already there (green cards)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transcripts on websites (of committee meetings, which are distributed all-over and therefore not easily accessible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pin-boards and posters (analog)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Display of information through introduction week, Immafeier, university website, M18, posters, calls, e. g. social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• E-Mail to all (can be sent through the SCC, but 1,5 weeks delay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Internet pages (+ Piazza, FB, M18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outh-to-mouth exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public meetings (senate, faculty board, student councils)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is missing (yellow cards)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Place with current Uni-News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• (individually combinable) Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low-threshold access to information on processes in the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regular table/info meetings (study programs, environment,...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal invitation by teachers, students, etc. to events etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At least feeling not enough information on existing possibilities of participation, StuKo, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uni-encompassing mail list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Edited informations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was discussed that there are already a lot of informations, but they are spread on internet and therefore hardly accessible. In addition, most of them are not edited (for example long transcripts), making it also difficult to access. It is often not clear which information is to be found where. Processed informations are missing above all. It was expressed that the demand for information should become an “automatic” one, and the need of physical spaces for exchange was also discussed.
### WHAT IS DESIRED

**Content** (on which information is wanted)

- Outside effect/communication towards the outside
- Big structural reconfigurations
- Appointments (for example when will this be discussed in committees etc.)
- Possibilities to use rooms and spaces
- Study-/work relevant content
- Student/subcultural event calender
- Important, big events
- Spokespersons at the university

**Format**

- Wall newspaper, more central and refurbished poster walls
- Info room (meeting room)
- “E-Mail to all” (edited/individual, 1x a month)
- Events
- Fireside chats (already existing exchange format of Urbanism, in which students have informal presentations on internships, semesters abroad etc., every Wednesday)
- Consultation hours (of the executive board)
- Digital opinion board

It was essentially about the aspects a) the development criterias for informations concerning everyone and b) the individual choice of content, on which each personally wants to receive information.

Here was discussed which content is relevant for who and who can decide about that. It was asserted that not all information is equally relevant for all members of the university. Specific content should otherwise be automatically communicated to all members or every member of a sub-group (for example to all the faculty or study program, etc.). The problematic question is: Who determines which information is relevant for who? It was discussed that a regular information input will be needed, but it should be customized according to individual interests.
POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

Three groups respectively developed a concept

Tile-based personalized information platform (11 Points)
- Filter (self adjustable)
- Central Login (no extra Login for accessibility)
- Not linear
- Additional once per month Newsletter (Top themes)

E-Mail list (12 Points)
- Open for all (everyone can give information)
- Verification of information before sending
- Easy and widely distributed possibility of registration
- Content: meetings, important news

Newsletter (10 Points)
- Individually adjustable (subscription to particular themes and fields)
- Levels: Uni, Faculty, Programs
- Themes: University politics etc.
- Kind of information: Events and news
- Edited informations, everyone can submit informations
- Headline structure with options for more info
- Participation-related; containing infos on possibilities/forms of participation as well as when important decisions are made

what happens next?
## Thematic round

### Equal Participation

*about equal participation - child-friendly, gender sensitive and international*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS QUO</th>
<th>What are the barriers/obstacles?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What does participation means?</strong>&lt;br&gt;What has to be taken into account for an equal participation?</td>
<td><strong>What are the barriers/obstacles?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possibility to take part in the community in daily-life, influence on decision processes and decision making</td>
<td>• Time and energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students who are not from academic families -&gt; Barrier</td>
<td>• Language barrier (in different ways: for internationals, but also through academic language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who is the university? mutual perceptions und better familiarization with all status groups</td>
<td>• Time-restricted flexibility ex. care of relatives, necessity of a side-job while studying, higher burdens and need of time because of disability or illness, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Competences</td>
<td>• Missing childcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal living conditions not constituting an obstacle</td>
<td>• Missing considerations for disabilities/illnesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participation of international students in discussions and decision making</td>
<td>• High institutionalization and a lot of additional obligations as discouraging and not possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To let students with children take part in the lessons= bring them along!!! CO-parenting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

### How can we overcome barriers?

- Allowing self-study de facto
- Awareness towards various challenges
- Information and communication also always in English (English as the norm)
- Limit free spaces + heads + access = Family conscious/awareness (Co-parenting, Buddy) for everyone
- Enabling agenda-setting without attendance (at meetings etc. by institutionalized possibility to put topics on the agenda (e.g. by mail) etc.)
- Incorporate possibilities for participation in daily-life —> mailboxes etc. (see ex. Planbude)
- Clear, relevant communication and binding events
- Availability of e. g. child care
- Presentations/seminars etc. to better understand different living realities
- Specific events on precise themes to work on them, with clear timeframe

---

**what happens next?**
LEHRINHALTE
TEACHING CONTENT

Was soll sein?
Ideen

Lösung 1
Mach dein Modul
- Erarbeitung in: Workshop/Woche/Semester/…
- Umsetzung in Semester-fällende Veranstaltung
- Kooperativ entwickelt und gehalten
- 6 Rollen: Organisator, Zentrale, Teamleiter

Lösung 2
Freiraum
- Teamfindung, Ausarbeitung, Planung
- offenes Format gehalten von Lehrenden & Studierenden & Co.

Lösung 3

INSTITUS- TAg

Leistung
- Leuchtturm von Haltung zogen
- biologische Entwicklung der Inhalte
- Qualitätsansprüche müssen erfüllt werden
- Vertrauen in den Prozess von innen & außen

Lehrende
- Wissen über das Interesse der Studierenden
- Weitergabe von Wissen der eigenen Profession

Bedürfnisse
- Wünsche
- Interessen

Persönliche Interessen einbringen können
Aktuelle Themen behandeln

Einblick in Lehrkonzeption gewünscht

Was gibt es schon?
- Semesterkonferenz
- A&U (Einladung)
- Bauhaus-Semester
- Freies Projekt
- Themen/Projekte in Seminaren einbringen

Referate
- Top der Lehre
- Wortschau
- Netzwerk

Status quo
**Thematic round**

**Teaching Content**  
*about the selection and assessment of teaching contents*

### STATUS QUO

**What is already there (blue cards)**

- Semester conference Architecture and Urbanistic (evaluation sheets)
- Bauhaus semester, student teaching projects
- Free project
- Bringing in topics and questions in seminars
- Tutorials
- Reports
- Work exhibition
- Network
- Evaluation sheets, rare discussion rounds with the students and teachers
- Education/teaching day
- Students in education

**Needs/Requests/Interests?**

Which requests could the various status groups have in the participation process regarding teaching content? What could be their needs and interests?

**Students:**
- Insight into teaching conception desired
- Deal with current topics
- Bring in personal interests

**Teachers:**
- Expansion of knowledge through exchange with students
- Knowledge about the interests of students
- Passing on knowledge of one’s own profession
- Possibility/time to prepare for the chosen topics

**Direction:**
- Be a guiding light, demonstrate good attitude
- Quality requirements must be met
- Dialogic development of the content
- Trust in the processes from inside and outside
- Proportionality of expenses and costs
POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

Three groups each created a concept in parallel

Solution 1 - Make your module (13 Points)
Idea for a new course format, which is divided in two phases

Phase 1:
- Development of the module in workshop/1 week/1 semester
- At first find ideas and brainstorm, there could be input talks, pitch, workshops
- Then finding teams, elaboration, planning of the module

Phase 2:
- Implementation of the module in a semester-long course
- The planned module is developed and maintained cooperatively
- Roles: organizers (Teachers and students from phase 1) and participants (students who didn’t take part in the planning)
- Opened format, held by teachers and students together

Solution 2 - Free space (3 Points)
"There has to be more open space to introduce new teaching content!"

Solution 3 - Institute Day (15 Points)
Events taking place regularly, in which teachers and students can reflect on the semester, criticism and acclaim is appropriate and requests concerning teaching content can be talked about

- 1 x per semester, format open space, discussions at eye level with teachers and students who belong to an institute, students can bring in their own experiences, documentation in connection, results will be applied in the next semester.
- The event is for everyone – relaxed atmosphere – no courses - coffee and cake

- Inter-faculty?/change of perspective

what happens next?
Thematic round

**Selection of Teachers**

*about more co-determination in the selection of teachers*

### STATUS QUO

divided in: Professors, Assistant Lecturers, Students in Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is already there (blue cards)</th>
<th>Still missing (yellow cards)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professors:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appointment lectures (public)</td>
<td>• Trial course with students’ feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student representatives (lack of involvement and influence noted)</td>
<td>• Mandatory evaluation of teaching desired (teaching test for the three favourites is possible in some vocational regulations, but the wish on student side is partly not followed up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students on the faculty council</td>
<td>• Bigger/wider student participation desired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student representatives (lack of involvement and influence noted)</td>
<td>• Faster procedure desired to secure student participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assistant Lecturers:

**Guest professors**

- Appointment lectures
- Applications
- Open positions

**Open questions**

- What comes after the appointment procedures?
- Who selects?
- Insight into the application process?
- Research focus important
- Temporary (guest lecturers)
- Payment after completion
- Favorites or friends of the professors are hired above all

- Information on process desired
- Highly visible platform (visual) desired
- Available application desired
- Updating of your teaching assignments
- Criticism platforms (anonym, permanent, must have attended a course)
STATUS QUO

divided in: Professors, Assistant Lecturers, Students in Education

What is already there (blue cards)  
Still missing (yellow cards)

Biggest problem here was the lack of knowledge about the procedures and non-transparent contracting

Students in Education:

- First time in bauhaus semester student led seminars
- Student tutors
- Partial payment

- More student tutors
- Information requested: how can I offer a course?
- Supportive mentoring desired

Idea is good, but implementation difficult, problem is mostly confirming and canceling of professors for the purpose of supervision

We weren’t quite sure about the status quo. We have determined that we have little information about who became a professor (when, how and why). A link was often made to the Flow of Information group, for the lack of knowledge about that situation.

NEEDS/REQUESTS/INTERESTS

divided in: Professors, Assistant Lecturers, Students in Education

The requests were also solution ideas, which were summarized in the solution section. We added points to topics which we want to «solve» or for which we had concrete ideas

Professors

- Transparent selection procedures (also means informations on the process)
- Direct-selection procedure --> opinion (in appointment lectures for attendees)
- Student representation in contract negotiations (for students relevant, for ex. presence in weimar for consultations, no salary)
- Regularly consulted opinion on teaching during the term of office (evaluation sheets are a beginning, but not sufficient, because often not evaluated with students and no visible improvements)
- Temporary vocation (new application) (based on the principle of junior professorship or tenure track)
- Release of the students during application lectures (no classes take place, not only the possibility to unregister, but also allowing more participation of professors and employees)

Assistant Lecturers

- Insight into hiring procedure
NEEDS/ REQUESTS/ INTERESTS
divided in: Professors, Assistant Lecturers, Students in Education

- Eventual influence on selection, visible applications and influence on call for applications (ex. display with research focus and academic course of study, etc.)
- Informations (what the person does)=previous key point
- Competence in the subject area (was about the complaint from a group member who was taught by a visiting professor who had had little or no contact with the topic of the course)
- Evaluation (with follow up) (therefore the wish to evaluate assistant lecturers with follow ups)
- Teaching tests (sessions) selection through professorship, but almost veto right
  Discussion: is a time delay with teaching tests problematic if a position must be filled urgently, ex. because of illness, etc. - which is worse: an unoccupied position or an “undemocratic” occupation of the position because of emergency?
- Recruitment by topics of the student body (what are the main topics students want, which ones are missing? ex. faculty of architecture: a stronger focus on sustainable building is desired in the building construction department of the university —> teaching assignment would then be advertised with this focus
  Discussion: how can a picture/opinion about it be raised by the students so that all opinions are included?

Students in Education

- Freely curated compulsory module in self management (group?) as experimental field (for all study programs, whenever wanted for one’s own learning, with the support of the uni)
- More student tutors
- Professors are required to support a student-run course (so that security prevails over payment and supervision, appreciation of commitment, number limitation possible, but for each professorship at least one per year)

Discussion: isn’t that the case in the bauhaus semester? no, because supervision by professors is still required - however this should no longer be necessary!
POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

divided in: Professors, Assistant Lecturers, Students in Education

Professors

- Direct selection: ballots for appointment lectures -> publication of the results (view from above, not intended to be binding, but to give more weight to student votes, for representatives. If only 10% of the audience voted for the lecturer(s), but he/she is still accepted, this should be made transparent)
- Public teaching test of the «best» possibility to make appointment regulations mandatory, release of duty necessary (possibly committee afternoon) (the best= ones with the most votes in the direct selection)
  Discussion: the process is too long when a position must be filled quickly! fear that nobody takes part in the selection (reason for it: no interest? no information on the persons and impacts? no time in parallel with courses?...therefore:
- Release of students et al. during application lectures or the lecture is part of a course attended by students (included in the semester plan, the lectures do not come as a surprise; no exemption, rather cancellation of classes, exemption is already there.)
- Temporary appointment and new selection professors legislation (question: after how many years? safeguards for professors: one objection was: ‘should professors land on the street when they are voted out?’

Assistant Lecturers

- Gathering of topics through forms with supporters (minimum number) (volunteering students suggest teaching topics, according to which the position is to be filled (ex. sustainable construction, wood construction, realistic design...), topics will be proposed in a notice or online, students can vote for a topic)

- Selection procedure of topics through StuKo/Faculty student council/direct selection? (only on topics with the most votes)—best 3 or up to a specific percentage; StuKo and faculties vote directly which of the main teaching topics are to be offered

- Open call through faculty of the student suggestions which come from the two previous points, it is about getting assistant lecturers for student-chosen topics, not only needed ones (the result is forwarded to the faculty issuing the offer, which must integrate the result in this offer.)
POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

divided in: Professors, Assistant Lecturers, Students in Education

Students in Education

• Change of all examination regulations for free mandatory module (as a prerequisite of the following points. Examination regulations stipulate that ECTS/and courses may only be issued by professors or assistants)
• Free self-managed space for implementation and place for exchange (a room or extra building for this new module – this is where the administration (students or extra positions) and the event rooms should be located)
  Discussion: does a spatial separation also ensure an ‘ideal’ separation of classical university and student modules?
• New position for support and coordination of the free module (content supervision)
• New position for support and coordination of the free module (content supervision)

what happens next?
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Thematic round

**Cafeteria**

*about cafeterias - menu, access and sustainability*

### STATUS QUO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is already there</th>
<th>Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mensa Committee, with representatives of all cafeterias of the Studierendenwerk Thüringen</td>
<td>• Existing participation formats do not work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mailboxes in the cafeteria to express opinions/wishes</td>
<td>• Structural defects (nobody sees where the line ends, children’s area)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The status quo is essentially determined by three points: first, it was found that formats already exist for co-designing the cafeteria, but that these either do not function, are not perceived by people as functioning or are generally not seen (there is no knowledge about their existence). The second point concerns dissatisfaction with various aspects of the cafeteria. On the one hand, its structural/spatial organisation associated with a lack of hospitality and, on the other hand, the meal offer and the catering process, which are associated with a lack of transparency and quality. The third point is the upcoming redesigning of the cafeteria, informed by the present managing director of the Studierendenwerk, Dr. Ralf Schmidt-Röh. This redesigning will entail various - and some considerable - changes in the previous catering process, menu and design.
NEEDS/REQUESTS/INTERESTS/SOLUTIONS

- Participate in the spatial designing/spatial appropriation of the cafeteria
- Having a say on the menu
- Post information about the redesigning of the cafeteria
- Feedback after giving input through mailboxes
- Giant mailboxes (to make this participative tool more visible)
- Place pen and paper beside mailbox (to lower the hurdle to participate)
- Expand outdoor area
- Integration/Information about the design of the temporary canteen during the reconstruction
- Cafeteria round table with kitchen manager (to talk about lack of participation, organization and quality with the cafeteria direction and all interested parties)
- Public hearing for the planning
- Children’s area (barrier-free and colourful) and food (healthier)
- Cafeteria like an extended living room (more quality of stay)
- Preparatory meeting for the Mensa Committee (meeting of the respective Mensa Committee student representatives with all interested parties in advance in order to obtain opinions)
- Excursion of our cafeteria (staff) to other cafeterias (getting to know other ways of meeting similar requirements)

In the course of the discussion, Dr. Schmidt-Röh demonstrated his willingness to exchange views on the concerns of the users of the cafeteria, for example at a meeting with him and the kitchen manager. He also announced that the plans for the upcoming redesigning would soon be published and could then also be discussed.
FURTHER STEPS

- Public letter to the cafeteria
  (to present proposals for further action and to report on the existing situation and problems)

- Contact with the Mensa Committee and meetings (to involve the Mensa Committee representatives in the consideration of new or improved ways of participation)

- Contact with Mr. Schmidt-Röh
  (asking for further information and integration into the topic)

what happens next?
### Thematic round

#### Buildings and Spaces

*about buildings, their use, parts of the University buildings and spaces*

#### STATUS QUO

**Themes**

- Lack of space (cu), new spaces
- More public use. Space, former M18 Garden
- Participation in building projects
- Informations regarding campus planning
- Construction noise

**What is already there**

- Applying for a space (little chance of success)
- Federal Student Representatives Council (of the planning study programs, including Urbanistics)
- Some projects/concepts have rooms - others do not
- Asking for permission somewhere = hurdle
- Unclear what I can do/where
- Only “State of emergency“ summary?
- Protest
- Campus
- Online Competition
- Ministry (Thür. Ministry of Infrastructure and Agriculture[?])
- Uni-Website: not up-to-date
- 2 people from StuKo have seat right

**What is already there (continued)**

- Keep doing until one complains...? Or just let it go because of consequences
- Usage – Design in the M18 garden and now?
- Influence from the StuKo in its meetings as a guest
- For example, Faculty Student Council was looking for Q3 members for the jury competition
- StuKo/FSC high inhibition threshold
- Service Center properties @ BUW
- Allocation by Fac. A+U, Fac. A+D of informations (more rooms, transparent allocations)
- StuKo-Representatives: too structured, one person w/ great responsibility, short legislature (information - no right to vote)
NEEDS/REQUESTS/INTERESTS/SOLUTIONS

- e. g. Container
- Duration summary? map accessible space
- Experimental fields on campus -> learning process (several at different locations - central)
- IMMEDIATELY: temporary workspaces until long-term space solution is found
- Information about the “official“ contact point for space allocation
- Good, faster(!) communication of this contact point for allocation of space by the university/to professors (clear contingent, which spaces can be allocated (permanently), clear breakdown: What is easily possible here? But general openness, awareness, space for students, autonomy, student self-administration - enrolment in list)
- Courses in a concrete university context <-> Transparency, Platform - List of future projects
- Professional participation work - not only voluntary
- Space for initiative proposals
- Phase 0: co-formulate the call for proposals
- From both follows: Back to the Rooooots: Form follows function! Openness to results
- Mix of methods (respecting diversity of groups, addressing ALL, participation as a service -> professionalism)
**Summary: 3 Aspects.**

**Working spaces:**
The allocation of the workspace is in the hands of the students and is done by an ominous Excel spreadsheet. Approximately 20 requests were rejected and this is not acceptable. Therefore there must be more working space, best would be now. Containers could be a solution.

**Usability of the public space at university:**
The M18 garden was our „playground“ - it’s gone now. Does that mean that we can spread out all over the main campus, or that we don’t have our own room outside anymore? A solution should be found so we can continue to have the area of the M18 garden (with its function) in the future, even if it is no longer clearly delimited by a wall.

**Participation processes and future:**
The potential of the Bauhaus was not exploited: in the future, the students should be actively involved in such important transformations. It should be done through broad participation, and its implementation must not be delegated to volunteers, but should be organised, implemented and evaluated by experts. In addition, the students who are after all trained for construction projects should simply be involved in the various stages of such a project at the appropriate positions according to their qualifications. (well summarized under the section Back to the roots).

what happens next?
With approximately 100 participants, informative and motivating lectures, concrete ideas from the thematic rounds as well as a positive and constructive atmosphere, Participation Day was in our view a successful progressive start for more participation. The large number of participants, along with our discussions extending far beyond the originally planned timeframe, and in particular the concrete suggestions and ideas, are signs of interest in the topic and the willingness to participate in the development of the university itself. We think the aims of the event to inform about the topic of participation and to create a space for exchange have been achieved.

The fact that the majority of the participants were students and that most of the requests/needs collected in advance were about student concerns leads us to assume that the promotion of the event and the chosen communication channels did not sufficiently reach the other status groups in order to do justice to our claim of addressing all members of the university. We also regret the small amount of international participants which is probably also linked to our preliminary communication. The predominance of student participants led to a relatively low level of networking and exchange of opinions between the status groups. Despite the very committed work during the event, absence of this networking is possibly one of the reasons few of the project ideas were pursued by the participants themselves afterwards. In the end, it also shows that more resources are needed to create a framework that really makes it possible for everyone to participate in a barrier-free, simple way and to let their ideas and knowledge flow in.

Our support to connect with the participants afterwards on the basis of the subject areas has so far been unsuccessful. Accordingly, most of the ideas that emerged are still waiting to be implemented. We conclude that the event was successful in revealing, negotiating and producing ideas. Their implementation, however, is a new task that the event could not accomplish and which depends on the involvement of enough people.
The campus construction work and the felling of the tree marking the foundation of the Faculty of Art and Design began about a year ago. The inauguration of the new campus is scheduled for April 2nd 2019. Especially in the context of the upcoming festivities, we do not want to forget the existing conflicts in the course of this process, which could so far not be satisfactorily solved. The common exchange within the framework of Participation Day and the continuing exchange within the Bündnis Partizipation are the right step to avoid these conflicts in the future: we have ideas and concrete projects on how to improve the communication and cooperation between members of the university concerning its development and use. Implementing them is now the next step, considering that the previous one was not in vain, and if the starting point of the process is to be taken seriously. It goes without saying that the development and implementation of new methods does not happen by itself and requires resources as well as energy. Even if everything might not work directly and might not even achieve the desired effects, not trying would certainly be the wrong solution.

We do not want to be satisfied with the current situation or to relativize and hide the existing dissatisfactions. We would therefore like to have the will to try new paths, to move towards an everyday life with less frustrating and paralyzing conflicts, towards developments and plans that are acceptable and enriching for all those involved and affected. The implementation of concrete projects is now on the agenda. But for this we need support. The conclusion of this documentation is therefore - instead of a conclusion - a listing of some ideas developed within the process, which in our opinion should be initiated. We would like to show with which various possibilities to continue and at the same time motivate people to dedicate themselves to the ideas. In this way, we want to create a university we organize and develop together, in which participation can be learned and experienced in the sense of a school of democracy and in which direct participation of all members becomes part of everyday life.
...AND THIS IS WHERE WE SHOULD START (10 POINTS)

• E-Mail to all
The wish was expressed several times to be able to send an e-mail to all members of the university - if possible also without the present lead time of three weeks.

• Informational graphics and better communication of the participation opportunities at the university
An understandable and accessible informational graphic of the university's organization and the (representative and direct) opportunities for participation should be produced and be easily accessible on the Internet and on campus.

• Survey tool for committees and others to gather opinions from university members
An online survey tool that allows a large number of people to be questioned quickly and spontaneously about a specific question or topic (e.g. in the case of a pending decision in a student council, another committee or in the case of planned changes). This survey tool could be developed with students in the context of a seminar or project and then introduced.

• Platform for the collection and targeted viewing of reports
The aim of such a platform would be to collect logs of committees, etc. in a (virtual) location, to provide them with a search function (by keywords) and therefore make them more easily accessible.

• Personalized information platform or newsletter
A personalized information platform would make it possible for everyone to stay informed on topics that they can choose and filter themselves.

• Aiming the next Participation Day
The event can be used to test different participation forms. In addition, the event should take place once a year to ask the members of the university about their need to participate and to find out where more involvement and co-determination are desired.

• Development of guidelines for participation in construction projects
A semester project or an intensive seminar is possible, in which guidelines for the participation in building projects at our university are worked out with students.

• Participation in concrete examples
In a semester project or seminar, participation procedures and formats can be learned and implemented practically using an example at the university. It would be important for the results to be incorporated into the structuring of the university.

• Round tables
Relevant, affected and interested persons could come together in a working group to discuss various topics on an equal footing: this could create more awareness and further action could be planned.

• Revision of the recruitment regulations
Ideas and suggestions for the recruitment process were made, which can be incorporated into the recruitment regulations.
Thank you very much!
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