MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

Tallinn August 26th, 2025 no 7

Start of the meeting at 18:00, end of the meeting 20:41

Chaired by Alexander Rein Robas
Minutes secretary: Kirke Piiskoppel
12 out of 15 were present: Maksim Dolinin, Annemari Riisimäe (via MS Teams), Sten Unt, Sander Roosimäe, Ketter Aljes, Ander Mägi, Markus Käpp, Arquim Shahid, Jan Enriko Viidermets, Maris Kortel (via MS Teams), Karolina Perv, Hanna Savolainen (via MS Teams), Ramon Kulp
Invited: Mark Toomsalu, Karoliine Orav, Kristina Keerdo, Emili Järv
Absent: Saara Katarina Merioja, Kea Kristiin Laanmets

On the agenda:

I Confirmations

1. Approval of the Student Parliament 2025–2026 work plan;
2. Proposal for Taking a Position;

II Discussion

3. First reading of the procedure for giving and verifying a tip;
4. Proposal for amendments to the Statutes;
5. First reading of proposed amendments to the Student Life Funding Regulation;
6. Representation of the Student Parliament at the Kick-off event, Student Parliament image.

The agenda was approved unanimously.

The original agenda was amended. Approval of amendments to the Statutes was moved under discussions, the proposal for taking a position was moved under confirmations, and the Rules of Symbolics as well as TalTech students' opinion on the current IT situation were removed from the agenda.

Amended agenda:

I Confirmations

1. Approval of the Student Parliament 2025–2026 work plan
2. Proposal for Taking a Position

II Discussion

1. First reading of the procedure for giving and verifying a tip;
2. Proposal for amendments to the Statutes;
3. First reading of proposed amendments to the Student Life Funding Regulation;
4. Representation of the Student Parliament at the Kick-off event, Student Parliament image.

The amended agenda was approved unanimously.

I Confirmations

1. **Approval of the Student Parliament 2025–2026 work plan**

The Chairman of the Student Body Board, Alexander Rein Robas, is given the floor to present the 2025–2026 work plan of the Student Parliament. The members of the Student Parliament have reviewed the document.

Alexander Rein Robas: In broad terms, this is *copy-paste* from previous years. I changed some things, for example, today's meeting was actually supposed to include the HKT report, but Karoliina Rebane completed it earlier. The bigger change compared to last year is that the first reading of the action plan was postponed to the September meeting, since the challenge with the action plan is that we are currently in the period of preparing a new development plan, and therefore the preparation of the new action plan was left aside. We will take it so that at the next meeting, in October, we can approve it. And then the infamous Development Plan 2026–2030 will come up for its first reading in October, and hopefully we can adopt it in November, at the latest in December. Other than that, everything else is the same as last year. Does anyone have any questions at this point?

Maksim Dolinin: I rather have a question for the Audit Committee regarding the sixth regular meeting. Is it possible to move the annual report of the Audit Committee earlier, so that we don't have a logical error where the new Audit Committee has to present it?

Emili Järv: Yes, that logic holds. We will amend the Statutes and the Rules of Procedure so that the mandate of the new Audit Committee begins from the moment of election. We will change it so that the transfer happens within the same period. Otherwise, it is also illogical, because currently the Audit Committee has no transfer period, but it should have one.

Alexander Rein Robas: Understood, I'll also make a note for myself that we will take up this topic at the next meeting. Does anyone else wish to give feedback?

Emili Järv: The Rules of Procedure provide that the Audit Committee gives an assessment of the work plan.

Kristin Liias: I have two concerns. First, it is not translated, but that's a minor issue. The second problem is that the action plan should not be postponed a second time. I'm not satisfied with that.

Alexander Rein Robas: There was actually a lot of confusion with this transfer, I must admit. But the point was that we were focused on the new development plan, and the action plan was sidelined. In summary, in our board's assessment, the Student Union is capable of surviving this short period without an action plan. Are there any further comments?

Emili Järv: No, everything else is fine.

Alexander Rein Robas: Alright, in that case, does anyone else have comments? From the Student Parliament, is anyone opposed to the 2025–2026 EK work plan?

IT WAS DECIDED:

1.1 Approval of the Student Parliament 2025 – 2026 work plan
1.2 The decision takes effect upon adoption.

VOTING RESULT: 12 votes in favor.

The 2025–2026 Student Parliament work plan is unanimously adopted.

2. Proposal for Taking a Position

Maksim Dolinin: Last time we discussed that we have a concern that students do not know what rights they have. We have several documents that state the obligations, but there is no position for university staff to rely on in order to protect students if necessary. We are confirming this proposal for taking a position. I will also outline the timeline. Once we have the proposal, we can include it in the action plan, we can develop it further, we can prepare a document that consolidates all rights, this document will go to the university lawyer, who will review it and then it will be approved by the Student Parliament (in the same way as with the mental health proposal) and then proceed to the Senate, to become a university-wide document, so that support staff can protect students. For example, right now it is not possible to protect students if a co-supervisor refuses to sign the thesis. Similarly to the tip line that Emili will talk about later, if a separate section appears in the action plan, the system can be further developed. We have already discussed this last time, so today if there are additional questions, they can be raised, and after that we will decide whether to adopt or reject it.

Alexander Rein Robas: Thank you, Maksim! Please, the floor is yours. I understand that no one has comments.

IT WAS DECIDED:

2.1 Proposal for Taking a Position. 2.2 The decision takes effect upon adoption. VOTING RESULT: 12 votes in favor.

Proposal for Taking a Position is unanimouslt adopted.

II Discussion

1. First reading of the procedure for giving and verifying a tip;

Alexander Rein Robas: The procedure for giving and verifying a tip-off will be introduced by the Audit Committee – Emili and Kristin.

Emili Järv: Hello from us! First of all, thank you for agreeing that the candidacies for the Audit Committee will be included in the materials for next month's meeting.

Emili Järv introduces the background of the document.

The document arose from two different needs:

1. According to the Rules of Procedure, the Audit Committee processes all complaints received about the work of the Student Union, but there are no rules on how to handle them. This

means the Audit Committee has very free hands, but in fact, things should not be done randomly. Often these matters involve sensitive situations, personal data, reputational risks, and the information in the complaint should not be handled carelessly.

2. At the last meeting of the previous Student Parliament, the topic of the student tip line was raised. Has anyone noticed that there is a tip-off button in the Student Portal? It is the university's tip line, handled by the university's internal audit. We have discussed this with the internal audit. The Audit Committee has been told once that it is meant for students, and also that it is not, so as student representatives we were not sure whether the university wanted students to use it. Students face some issues the university does not want to deal with or directs them to handle in ways that are not reasonable from a mental health perspective. For example, the university has a document stating that if you have a problem with your studies, you must first talk to your study consultant, and you are supposed to speak directly to the person responsible for the course. It is a long and complicated situation. Therefore, the previous Student Parliament was asked whether they wanted to create a dedicated tip line for students, where they could bring their concerns and ideas, which would then be forwarded to the Board or the Student Parliament. That brings us to this document.

Questions and Answers:

Emili Järv: Are there any questions about the background? If not, then I would like to introduce the document to you. We prepared the document based on the internal audit document, adjusting it to consider student specifics. Since it is a new document, I don't have any proposals or amendments to read out, so I'll ask instead: was there anything in the document that caused confusion? Why does a certain process work that way? Was it understandable and logical?

Kristin Liias: Or anything missing?

Karolina Perv: Section 2.2 says the tip-off is submitted confidentially through a web form. If a person does not leave their contact details, what happens then?

Kristin Liias: Sections 2.1.1 and 2.2 describe two formats of submitting a tip: either you provide your contact or you don't, but in either case you are informed about it. Wait, there's a mistake here – we'll fix that.

Emili Järv: The idea is that you can submit a tip-off anonymously or confidentially, but in any case, when you submit it… you know what, we'll review that section. In principle, you can submit a tip-off anonymously or confidentially, and you can also include your details. If you do not submit anonymously, you will receive a notification. If you submit anonymously, obviously we cannot send a notification.

Alexander Rein Robas: In short, you can submit the tip-off confidentially either way, the only difference is whether you include your details or not.

Emili Järv: Maybe we should remove the word "confidential," because confidentiality is the default. So the form will say: submit anonymously, and if you don't submit anonymously, then we send you a notification.

Alexander Rein Robas: I've added a comment for you to review later.

Kristin Liias: Yes, it should be distinguished as anonymous vs. non-anonymous, since "confidential" is confusing.
Emili Järv: Thank you for the question! Any other points like this?

Maksim Dolinin: Have you already asked the internal audit whether they agree to take over some of the issues caused by staff members? You've written that complaints related to staff are forwarded to the internal audit. Have you checked with them if they are okay with that?

Emili Järv: We haven't discussed that with them, but I'd also point out that not all complaints about staff would automatically be forwarded to the internal audit. I think each situation needs to be assessed case by case. Some certainly would not be forwarded by a Student Union representative. It would probably not be productive to forward everything all the time. But it is part of the internal audit's role to investigate complaints about university staff, so they cannot exactly refuse.

Alexander Rein Robas: Which section were you referring to?

Kristin Liias: Procedural section 3.3.3.

Emili Järv: Agreed, I think we can clarify that section. Some cases definitely don't need to go to internal audit. Let's add "case by case."

Arqum Shahid: If, for example, it involves a criminal act (reported through the tip line) and the information is escalated, does the Student Union representative remain the contact person? If no contact details were given, how does that work?

Emili Järv: If someone reports a crime, or if during the process we discover a crime or something prohibited by law, then the Audit Committee will file the report. If it is not anonymous, we will also forward the tipster's contact details to the police, because we do not hide information from the police. If it is anonymous, then the Audit Committee remains the intermediary.

Kristin Liias: We should clarify who acts as intermediary in the case of an anonymous tip-off. Replace "Student Union" with "Audit Committee" in section 3.5.1.

Maksim Dolinin: In that case, shouldn't we also notify a university unit, so they are aware that a crime occurred within the university? Otherwise, it might seem like we are unilaterally handling such issues.

Emili Järv: In cases of a crime, the information will in any case be forwarded.

Arqum Shahid: TalTech has an Ethics Committee. Will the case be assessed under that?

Emili Järv: Yes. The Audit Committee itself will not decide what is ethical and what is not.

Arqum Shahid: Section 3.1 says that one member of the Audit Committee reviews the content. Why not all members together?

Emili Järv: The committee has three members, and the document says "a member," otherwise it would mean that the mailbox could only be opened if all three were present at the same time. That would not be practical. It makes more sense for one member to review it. If it is a simple case, they can forward it if necessary. If it is a longer and more complex complaint, then it is reviewed and analyzed together.

Kristin Liias: Since tip-offs can vary widely, it is easier if one member handles it first.

Emili Järv: Also, if one member is sick, then otherwise the entire committee would be unable to review complaints.

Arqum Shahid: What if the tip-off concerns a member of the Audit Committee?
Emili Järv: Tip-offs about the Audit Committee are forwarded directly to the Student Parliament. Are there any further questions or suggestions? If not, we would like to adopt it in two weeks.

Maksim Dolinin: Before the Student Parliament adopts the document, shouldn't it be coordinated with all the other parties mentioned in the document?

Emili Järv: Honestly, no. The university has the same document, and these tasks are part of their responsibilities anyway.

Maksim Dolinin: Just so that they are aware that if information comes in and the Audit Committee forwards it…

Emili Järv: That possibility has always existed, even without this paper. Previously too, complaints could be submitted to the Audit Committee, and we would forward them to the internal audit if necessary. I don't see any conflict here.

Kristin Liias: We could send them an email out of courtesy.

Maksim Dolinin: That would be very nice!

Emili Järv: Any more thoughts, questions, comments? Seems not. In that case, we'll make those few changes and add it back to the materials. Thank you for your attention.

2. **Proposal for amendments to the Statutes;**

Emili Järv: I would like to start this agenda item with some history to give context on how we got here. Last year, a working group was formed with the goal of amending the Statutes of the Student Body. From their meetings came this version of the Statutes, which also has an explanatory memorandum. These amendments were then taken to TalTech's lawyer, everything was discussed, and many additional ideas arose about what should be changed or revised in the Statutes. After that, the project manager for amending the Statutes changed, then there was a three-month summer break, and now we are here. It has been a long, long process, and we are trying to get back on track. First, we will look at these amendments, see if there are any questions about them, think about them, and afterwards review those ideas discussed with TalTech's lawyer. From there came many different ideas, and we can see whether you would like those amendments in the Statutes or not.

Comments:

The entire text replaces TTÜ with TalTech. Should not cause any issues.

Previous section 1.5, now 1.1, concerned the Student Body's symbols. In the new version, colors are not listed, with the reasoning being possible obsolescence. Instead, reference is made to the Rules of Symbolics. It is not good practice to repeat the same information in different documents. The Rules of Symbolics are also outdated, and that will be addressed separately.

Previous section 2.1.1: a linguistic adjustment. The law's name has changed, and the wording must be reviewed to ensure it uses the actual name of the law in the Republic of Estonia.

Previous section 2.1.2 (still 2.1.2): just a linguistic proposal to make it clearer and avoid more changes later.

Section 3.1 – Who are the Student Union bodies? Previously section 3.1 did not provide clarity, so it was moved up as section 1.7. Clarify who the bodies are, what the Student Parliament is, and what student councils are. By law, all universities must have their own student union, so we specify who they are at TalTech. To avoid confusion in the future, we start the Statutes with these terms.

Section 3.5 now talks about the Student Union having a Board, not the Student Parliament. It also introduces the direction of quality of education, which was not previously in the Statutes.

Sass left at 19:01. Returned at 19:04.

Section 3.6 concerns the rule that members of a body cannot delegate their powers to other members. This was moved under the Student Parliament, since student councils can delegate; the original placement was not correct.

Section 3.8 is simple in substance but was written very confusingly. If you are a member of the Student Parliament and you graduate, then your mandate continues until the end, but if you are exmatriculated, then your mandate ends immediately.

Section 3.9 is a linguistic clarification: not just "members" are absent, but "voting members."

Section 4.2.2: the previous version listed certain regulations. In reality, there are 13 such documents, but only 4 were listed here. The list was incomplete, and it makes no sense to list them all because if a new document is created, then the Statutes would need to be changed. Instead, the Statutes refer to the Rules of Procedure, and the Rules of Procedure contain the full list of Student Union documents.

Section 4.2.12 was removed entirely, as its meaning was unclear. For example, "student association" was not a clear term for readers.

Section 5.5 was clarified: it is not possible for representatives of one faculty to be entirely absent. The point was made more specific. The idea is that if elections for the Student Parliament take place within an electoral district, each faculty has its own candidates. This will be reviewed again in the working group's next meeting.

Section 5.7: we changed who convenes the meeting for confirming election results. If the Chairman does not convene it, then any member of the Student Parliament can convene it. The Student Parliament elections have their own election committee whose role is procedural, to confirm that procedures were followed. Often, election committee members are not otherwise involved in the Student Parliament's work, so in practice, this clause did not make sense. It was therefore changed to the Chairman of the Board.

Ander Mägi: If we use "Student Parliament" in one place, we should consistently use SP (EK) everywhere?

Emili Järv: Yes, these will be corrected.

Section 6.6 was duplicative and removed. It had already been addressed earlier.

Section 7.1 wording was improved for clarity. It concerns the work of the Board of the Student Body and refers to the Rules of Procedure regarding the replacement of a member.

Section 7.4 was changed: previously, the mandate of new Board members began on the 90th day. This meant recalculating each time when the mandate started, which caused issues and risked violating the Statutes. Now it is set to July 1, which aligns better with real life. Regardless of elections being held earlier, this adds flexibility.

Alexander Rein Robas left at 19:14.

Section 7.5.3 concerns the tasks of the Board of the Student Body. The Statutes now include the Board's responsibilities for creating staff positions, deciding how they are filled, and who exactly occupies them. This clarifies how the Student Union functions.

Section 8.3 explained what a student council is. The working group found this redundant and unnecessary.

Karolina Perv: Is the term "student council" mentioned elsewhere? If we remove the section defining it, won't that cause more confusion later?

Emili Järv: I assume it's stated somewhere else. I'll highlight it for review.

Karolina Perv: Right now it seems confusing if it's missing completely. Student councils also rely on the Statutes.

Emili Järv: I completely agree with you. I will check, and if it's not defined elsewhere, we won't remove it and will instead write a clearer definition.

Sass returned at 19:18.

Section 10.1 clarified that oversight is over all Student Union bodies, not just the Student Union as an organization. This aligns with the Rules of Procedure, which state that the Audit Committee also checks the work of the Student Parliament and student councils.

Maksim Dolinin: About student councils: section 8.1 already defines them. Section 8.3 duplicated this.

Ander Mägi: I understood section 8.3 as defining only what a student council's active group is – essentially a leftover clause.

Section 10.2 added Student Union staff members, who were not mentioned previously in the Statutes. Since they actively carry out tasks assigned by Student Parliament members, it was important to include them.

Section 10.3 clarified that in a conflict of interest, an Audit Committee member must recuse themselves from the specific process, not from the entire committee.

Section 10.5 changed the rule on mandates: previously, the Audit Committee's mandate lasted until new elections. This caused a procedural gap where the outgoing committee technically no longer existed but still had to present the report. Now it is written that they have 30 days to complete handover and finish activities. Once elections are announced, the start date of new mandates will also be recorded.

Section 11.1 was no longer necessary and removed.

Sections 11.2 and 11.3: the current version referred to a "council." While there is a University Council, that is not what was meant here, and it will not adopt this document.

Emili Järv: Does anyone have questions or thoughts on these points?

Ander Mägi: I'd add that this refers to the Higher Education Act.

Emili Järv: The topic continues. During the meeting, interesting discussion points arose that we should genuinely discuss, because you will decide what is written down.

Notes from Emili:

1. Procedural issue. The document currently says "Chair of the Student Parliament," but the idea was to replace it with "Chairman of the Board," since in practice that is the presiding officer. However, in discussion with the lawyer, we considered that if for some reason the Chairman cannot preside, it would be better to use "meeting chair," which resolves the problem.
2. For electronic voting we technically don't have an election committee. The same logic as in the Rules of Procedure applies: electronic voting is possible, with exceptions if necessary. The entire procedure is already in the Rules of Procedure. Maybe we should consider whether it is necessary to include it in the Statutes at all, or whether the Rules of Procedure are enough.
3. Conceptual issue: should we allow decisions to be made without convening? Currently not possible. We would need to define which decisions can be made that way (e.g., not elections). But some decisions could be adopted without a meeting, with its own procedure. Do you want to add that possibility to the Statutes?

Maksim Dolinin: Would those have to be digitally signed?

Emili Järv: That would need to be agreed on.

Maksim Dolinin: Through what channel would this approval take place?

Emili Järv: We would specify that. For example, via email, with five days to respond. If no one responds, this minor matter could be considered adopted.

Karolina Perv: But how do we define a “minor matter”?

Emili Järv: That could be defined by exclusion – specifying what cannot be done without convening. The details we can work out together. The question is, do you want this possibility included conceptually in the Statutes?

Maksim Dolinin: Could the distinction between major and minor matters be written into the Rules of Procedure instead?

Emili Järv: Yes, also in the Rules of Procedure, but it must exist in the Statutes to create the possibility to include it in the Rules.

Maksim Dolinin: What form or template would be used?

Emili Järv: We can decide that ourselves, but it would go in the Rules of Procedure.

4. Procedural consistency: currently it says documents take effect when “confirmed.” The lawyer suggested they should take effect when “adopted.” That way, minor language corrections can still be made afterwards.
5. On the Board’s competence: the lawyer asked how the Board adopts decisions. This is not currently written anywhere. We would add that the Board can adopt decisions with two votes in favor, and if there are disagreements, they can be recorded in the minutes. It would make sense to define this.

Maksim Dolinin: Would this be included in the Statutes’ explanatory section, or in the Rules of Procedure?

Emili Järv: I think it should be written under section 7 of the Statutes, since Board decisions are significant.

Maksim Dolinin: But then any future amendment would need to go through the Senate. Rules of Procedure don’t need Senate approval.

Emili Järv: True. All changes must be logically distributed between the documents. But conceptually, if we adopt that Board decisions are made with two votes in favor, that should be recorded. Since it is not currently defined, it cannot be monitored. In the Rules of Procedure, under revisions, it says that an Audit Committee member who disagrees can record a dissenting opinion. The same could be done for the Board. Right now, it is completely unregulated.

6. Question arose whether we receive financial donations. We do not, so no need to address it.
7. We agreed that all terms used in the Statutes should be listed at the beginning for clarity.
8. The Development Plan Act should not be in the Statutes.
9. The Student Parliament announces elections. This must be added.
10. The lawyer suggested that since the duties of the Student Parliament are not well defined, there should be a reference somewhere on how to act. This will go into the Rules of Procedure, but referenced in the Statutes.

11. The Statutes say closed meetings can be held, but not how. Question to you: how?

Alexander Rein Robas: You announce that you want a closed meeting, and then vote.

Emili Järv: Yes, so it should state that if someone proposes a closed item or meeting, then a vote is held.

12. Conflict of interest is not addressed. So far, none of the Student Union documents define what conflict of interest means in our context. Do you agree to add it to the Statutes? I don't have wording for you yet, but at least the section would exist.

Ander Mägi: That would be good, it would help new Audit Committees orient themselves.

Emili Järv: Yes, agreed. For context, the internal audit nearly fainted when they heard we didn't have it written down.

13. The lawyer asked whether we want to approve documents retroactively. I think not – it sounds like fraud.
14. It is not correct to call Student Union staff "personnel." These are volunteer positions, even if linked to stipends, so they should not be treated as staff. We will add definitions for who is a member of the Student Union and who is a staff member. Procedurally, we will no longer talk about "staff members" but about Student Union members.
15. The Student Union has its own property, such as chairs and tables. The Audit Committee should review it. The Statutes do not currently address how to dispose of property, so we will add that. It is simple: we follow the university's property management principles.

Emili Järv: That's all the points. We will try to compile everything, and maybe we can show something in October, but I can't promise. Any more thoughts?

Maksim Dolinin: About the entire process of review and approval: once this document is approved, will we then work on amending the Rules of Procedure?

Emili Järv: Yes, once the Statutes are done, we will start updating the Rules of Procedure. If there are no further questions, then thank you!

3. First reading of proposed amendments to the Student Life Funding Regulation;

Emili Järv: This is not my or Maksim's agenda item, but the current Chairman of the Funding Committee, Anna, was unable to attend, and Maksim is the future Chairman of the Funding Committee.

Maksim Dolinin: First, let's ask if you know what Student Union funding is. The Student Union organizes funding competitions for different student organizations – annual support, big projects, and small projects. We distribute the money fairly so that no one is left out, as long as the projects meet the regulation and the evaluation matrix. Since we often receive applications for trips, motivational events, and birthdays – which are not the main purpose of the Student Union – we decided that the regulation needed to be changed. So, we reviewed the regulation to see how it could be improved.

Emili Järv: The purpose of the amendments is to clarify or add provisions so that the document better reflects the Student Union's goals in providing funding.

Amendments:

1.1.1 Added education and promotion of student life. Under the old regulation, educational projects such as conferences or trainings could not be supported.

1.1 Reworded for clarity – instead of "development directions," it now refers to "development plan directions," meaning those agreed in the development plan.

2.6 Instead of stating directly that projects "are supported," it now says they "can apply." Otherwise, it seemed like support was guaranteed. It was also added that projects must be from a TalTech student council or organization.

Maksim Dolinin: There have been cases where a project was formed with a TalTech student as the project lead but 17 participants from the University of Tartu, and they applied for our funding.

2.6 Apolitical – no religious or political activities will be supported.

Emili Järv: If someone wants to do something connected with political parties, that is not allowed.

2.7 New section added to define what exactly a project is.

Maksim Dolinin: Sometimes someone just wants to "develop something," but there is no end product, no competitions, nothing – that won't be supported.

Emili Järv: Needs to be clarified further. For example, if a technical club wants to build things just for the sake of it, that doesn't qualify. The activity must have clear outcomes.

2.8 Clarified that big and small projects have the same purpose. The separate wording for small projects was removed, along with "preserving traditions," which sounded outdated. Projects should have other goals.

Maksim Dolinin: Because really, it's the same thing, just with a smaller budget.

2.10 Definition of small projects removed.

2.11 Board reserve fund. Money accumulates from leftover funds from previous projects. This can be used to support new events being held for the first time. Applications will be assessed the same way, and from next year it can also be done via the funding platform.

6.3 Clarified: if the project budget is not approved by the Chairman of the Funding Committee, the Student Union is not obliged to provide support.

Emili Järv: Organizations had inflated their budgets to get more money. Previously, they only had to inform the Chairman; now approval is mandatory.

7.2 Defined who leads the competition.

7.4 Repeated definition of who leads the competition.

7.5 Clarification: the meeting doesn't need to be face-to-face, it can be online.

7.6 The project manager must be identified within the project team.

Alexander Rein Robas: Isn't that already on the platform?

Maksim Dolinin: Yes, but the platform automatically lists whoever has access, which doesn't always reflect reality.

Emili Järv: Exactly, the system doesn't show the actual situation.

10 Annual support competitions now take place in January instead of December. Organizations struggled to prepare all documents in time and lost points for reporting. Christmas is also a difficult time for accounting.

12 Goals section was clarified and made more precise.

12.2 New point: big projects no longer support trips, birthdays, etc.

Maksim Dolinin: This only applies to big projects. Annual support can still be used – organizations must choose whether to buy a fridge or go on a trip.

Emili Järv: The Student Union was starting to look like a place to apply for birthday cake money.

13.6 The restriction on political and religious projects was moved forward in the text.

15 Small projects now have the same goal as big ones.

18 Purpose of the Board reserve fund.

Maksim Dolinin: It was already specified earlier that the committee must coordinate with the Board's decision.

New section 19.5: defines when a project officially begins in terms of funding. Once the first expense is made, the application cannot be submitted – no retroactive support. This does not apply to the reserve fund.

Alexander Rein Robas: Was the word "unforeseen" mentioned?

Emili Järv: I noticed that too.

Alexander Rein Robas: What does "unforeseen" mean in this context?

Maksim Dolinin: For example, once an organization realized after planning an event that security services were necessary, which hadn't been budgeted initially.

Emili Järv: Expenses must be made within six months after results are announced. Otherwise, it isn't really "unforeseen."

19.6 Clarified when the project application start and end dates must be, including the schedule.

20.1 Added a conflict of interest clause, consistent with other documents.

Emili Järv: Here, conflict of interest means you cannot be an active member of the organization applying.

Maksim Dolinin: Or have actively contributed in the previous calendar year.

23.1.2 Instead of "organization," now "applicant," because individual students can also apply.

Maksim Dolinin: But that comes with its own risks.

23.2.1.1 The Student Union may give money to organizations in advance with a guarantee letter, if the organization has no available funds. But restrictions may apply: for some projects, advance payment may not be possible. There have been cases where we didn't want to give money in advance to avoid losing it.

Maksim Dolinin: This was already included before but explained more complexly. The new point makes it simpler for both the committee and applicants.

24.2 Annual support deadline extended.

Emili Järv: Are there any questions? Since we didn't make further changes, shall we adopt it?

It was unanimously decided that the proposed amendments to the Student Life Funding Regulation can be adopted today.

IT WAS DECIDED:

3.1 Adoption of the updated Student Life Funding Regulation.
3.2 The decision takes effect upon adoption.
VOTING RESULT: 12 votes in favour.

The Student Life Funding Regulation is unanimoussly adopted.

Maksim Dolinin: The October competition will already take place under the new regulation.

4. Representation of the Student Parliament at the Kick-off event, Student Parliament image.

Alexander Rein Robas: Jete asked that one SP member who participated in the Kick-off event yesterday share what happened and how the station went. Any volunteers?

Ander Mägi: The SP station could have been a place to spark ideas for students. At our station, we had ball pits with statements about the Student Parliament written on them. Students had to sort them from one bucket to another, deciding whether they were true or false, and we would comment on the statements. From my personal experience, many of the statements started repeating, there were a bit too many balls, and since it was the last station, the issue was that freshmen had already received their freshmen bags and left. The idea was good, but in practice the explanations took too much time. Next time, fewer statements would be better.

Sass: I tested freshmen bag recipients, one of them said: “The Student Parliament is not corrupt.”

Ander Mägi: There was a bit too much information all at once, and I had to speak very loudly, which made it difficult to keep focus.

Mark Toomsalu: Should we have a separate station just for the Student Parliament next year?

Ander Mägi: Yes, in a different location and with a different order, maybe some variation, because we also lacked enough manpower.

Alexander Rein Robas: It would have been good to use the entire corridor so we could fit longer queues. There’s room for improvement.

Karoliine Orav: I’d disagree about the location – the SP and Student Union stations should be separated, because the freshmen bags were blocking the SP station.

Alexander Rein Robas
Chair of the meeting

Kirke Piiskoppel
Secretary of the Meeting

Extras

1. Student Parliament 2025–2026 work plan
2. Amendments to the Statutes
3. Proposal for taking a position
4. Procedure for giving and verifying a tip