

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

Tallinn

September 9th, 2025 no 8

Start of the meeting at 18:12, end of the meeting 19:50

Chaired by Alexander Rein Robas

Minutes secretary: Kirke Piiskoppel

14 out of 15 were present: Hanna Savolainen (MS Teams), Maksim Dolinin, Sten Unt, Markus Käpp, Arqum Shahid, Jan Enriko Viidermets, Annemari Riisimäe, Sander Roosimäe, Iiris Aljes, Ketter Aljes, Ramon Kulp, Ander Mägi, Saara Katarina Merioja (MS Teams), Karolina Perv

Invited: Kadri Jürissaar, Emili Järv, Kristin Liias (MS Teams), Kristina Keerdo

Absent: Maris Kortel

On the agenda:

I Elections

1. Election of members to the Audit Committee

II Confirmations

2. Approval of the nominees for the Golden Badge of Merit (closed part of the meeting)
3. Adoption of the "Procedure for Submitting and Reviewing Whistleblower Reports"

III Discussions

4. First reading of the Student Union Action Plan 2025.

The agenda was approved unanimously.

I Elections

1. Election of members to the Audit Committee

Candidates:

- Kadri Jürissaar
- Grete Kalvet
- Maarja-Helena Veskimägi
- Dauri Kivipuur

One candidate is present: Kadri Jürissaar.

Candidate's speech:

Kadri Jürissaar: Hello! My name is Kadri Jürissaar. I like dogs and saffron milk caps. I started university in 2018, and for five years I have been a tutor, a student counsellor, promoted my field of study, participated in several student organizations, and for the past five years I have organized events both within and outside the university. I am currently working in the Department of Marketing and Communication. I know university life from both the employee's and the student's perspective. My daily work requires me to be competent in document management. I am able to remain attentive and notice important details, even when deadlines are pressing. My attentiveness, systematic approach, ethical attitude, and experience would be a good addition to the current Audit Committee.

Questions and answers:

Karolina Perv: Why did you decide to run for the Audit Committee now?

Kadri Jürissaar: Alongside my studies, there were all kinds of projects and activities, and at that time it did not seem like the right moment to get to know the Student Union. I was still aware of what was happening, but it did not feel like the right time to get more closely involved. In the last couple of years, I have become more interested. I have been in closer contact with members of the Student Union. I have a foundation to build on and bring my own new, fresh ideas to the table to help contribute to the development of the Student Union.

Karolina Perv: Do you have an understanding of the duties?

Kadri Jürissaar: I know members of both previous and current Audit Committees from before they joined, and they have broadly talked about what the work of the Audit Committee involves, what the workload is, and what can be initiated as independent projects.

Maksim Dolinin: You have already asked former and current Audit Committee members about the workload. Do you have time to deal with it alongside your job?

Kadri Jürissaar: I have thought about that. I just finished my activities with the dance ensemble Kuljus, four hours of training plus everything else that came with it, which freed up enough time to manage with the work in the Audit Committee. I have learned how to balance.

Markus Käpp: You mentioned that you have been involved in organizing large projects. Which projects have you been part of? What has been the most difficult part of that?

Kadri Jürissaar: Within the university, I have been involved in organizing the campus party, various ceremonies, and worked closely with the Department of Marketing and Communication. Outside the university, the TUNNE gala for the last two years. My responsibilities have included managing the team, the additional volunteer team, a lot of communication and coordination, ensuring that information flows clearly and that everything works on the day of the event. When there is a human factor, it is unpredictable, something changes, someone does not show up. I think this interaction, communication, empathy, everything related to the team, is challenging but also exciting.

Speech in support:

Letter of recommendation for Kadri Jürissaar:

As a former member of the Student Union Audit Committee, I have observed Kadri's activities and development at the university for years, and I can confirm that she is a dedicated, precise, and systematic person who is perfectly suited for the work of the Audit Committee. Her many years of experience in university student life have given her a thorough understanding of TalTech's structure, internal processes, and organization of student life. In addition to her work as a tutor and student counsellor, Kadri has worked in TalTech's Department of Marketing and Communication, where her daily tasks have included managing invoices, checking reports and contracts, and monitoring budgets. These skills are directly transferable to the work of the Audit Committee. Her attention to detail and ability to remain precise even in stressful situations are remarkable. She has been the warehouse manager for the dance ensemble Kuljus for years and has always taken care of the preservation and maintenance of valuable national costumes. Kadri is always responsible in her work, able to notice even small inaccuracies, and offer constructive solutions. In addition to her technical and analytical skills, she is a cooperative, positive, and eager-to-learn person with whom it is easy to work. As a former member of the Audit Committee, I am convinced that Kadri's professionalism, experience, and ethics are a valuable addition to the Audit Committee. I fully recommend her for this position.

Respectfully

Henri Olavi Suomilainen

Election committee

- Maksim Dolinin
- Karolina Perv
- Ander Mägi

Maksim Dolinin: A little about the election procedure. A ballot will be given against a signature. Choose one candidate; you do not have to choose anyone if you do not wish to. Fold the ballot and place it in the box.

The Election Committee will go to another room to count the votes.

At the regular meeting No. 8 of the Student Parliament of Tallinn University of Technology, Maksim Dolinin was elected to count the votes of the Election Committee. There were 12 members of the Student Parliament present, 12 members received a ballot, and there were 12 ballots in the ballot box.

Election results:

Dauri Kivipuur: 0

Grete Kalvet: 0

Maarja-Helena Veskimägi: 0

Kadri Jürissaar: 12 votes

IT WAS DECIDED:

1.1 The third member of the Audit Committee is elected to be Kadri Jürissaar.

1.2 The decision takes effect upon adoption.

VOTING RESULTS: 12 votes in favor.

II Confirmations

1. Approval of the nominees for the Golden Badge of Merit (closed part of the meeting)
2. Adoption of the "Procedure for Submitting and Reviewing Whistleblower Reports"

The floor is given to the Chairperson of the Audit Committee, Emili Järv.

Emili: I hope you all reviewed the document. I made the three changes that were proposed at the previous meeting. I kept the comments in place. There was some confusion regarding the confidentiality issue — I replaced the term with "by name." It should now be clear that a person submits the information together with their name. I added the internal audit section. In 3.5 we improved the wording. Any comments, questions, or thoughts? Yes, I know what you're going to ask, Maksim. Maksim is going to ask whether we informed the internal audit. Yes, I was CC'd on that email myself. The internal audit has been informed that they are mentioned in the document.

IT WAS DECIDED:

1.1 Adoption of the "Procedure for Submitting and Reviewing Whistleblower Reports"

1.2 The decision takes effect upon adoption.

VOTING RESULTS: 12 votes in favor.

III Discussions

1. First reading of the Student Union Action Plan 2025.

The meeting continues at 19:05.

The Chairman of the Student Body, Alexander Rein Robas, presents the Student Union 2025 Action Plan for its first reading.

Alexander Rein Robas: As of now, since we are preparing a new Development Plan and its period will begin next year, covering 2026–2030, we decided with the Board that this Action Plan should reflect the activities of this half-year. Hopefully, we will be able to approve this Action Plan at the next meeting. We'll listen to your comments and ideas, make additions, and then the first reading of the new five-year Development Plan will take place at the November meeting. First, I'd like to ask you, the Student Parliament. At the moment, we are using the structure of the previous Action Plan, which was made a year ago. This time it will be exceptional — for half a year. Do you think we should remove the items that have a duration of more than one year or shorten those activities until December 31? Maksim Dolinin: So, we will adopt the Development Plan in November? Then it would basically last from November to December.

Alexander Rein Robas: Yes. Well, I mean, we'll adopt the Action Plan in October, and it will apply from mid-October until the end of the year. The Development Plan we'd like to adopt in November, which would be valid from the new year.

Alexander Rein Robas: The Action Plan has indeed been somewhat on the back burner. The Board believes that the Student Union can still manage for half a year following the current Development Plan, but we'd still like to go through this Action Plan together now. So, should we keep the items with only a half-year perspective or with a one-year perspective? Right now, we've set it to end on December 31, and there are different implementation periods — for some items ongoing, for others specific months are listed — so in that case, we'll leave December as the endpoint. Does that seem logical to you? Alright. You've also had the chance to review the changes and ideas in your committees. Are there any items that caught your attention?

Maksim Dolinin: I have one procedural question. If we don't manage to implement all proposals and comments today, can we list them as comments, and the Board will make corrections later?

Alexander Rein Robas: The idea is exactly that — we want to gather as much feedback from you as possible so we can refine it for next time. Then it will go through the respective areas once more. Due to a technical issue, the question was not fully heard, but it concerned section 73.

Alexander Rein Robas: Yes, in that case, the responsible person is simply the one handing things over, which in this case means the Executive Manager.

Due to a technical issue, the comment was not heard.

Alexander Rein Robas: Well, in some sense, yes, it was an interesting situation — since for the past nine years, we've had the same Executive Manager, it turned out that no one could really verify the

handover documentation other than the person herself. Based on the feedback now, the handover went well, so it seems there's no big issue with that.

Due to a technical issue, the question was not heard.

Alexander Rein Robas: As far as I know, the heads of divisions have reviewed it — in marketing, Kristiina, and for the Executive Manager, our new one. For our own areas, we reviewed and reflected ourselves. We've had joint meetings. After this reading, we'll definitely review it again and assess whether it's necessary to collect additional input from the staff for certain points.

Due to a technical issue, the question was not heard.

Alexander Rein Robas: And of course, it goes through them as well.

Alexander Rein Robas: Most of the changes here are wording adjustments and small removals. I also noticed, for example, that regarding the development of Student Union information channels — just to share some news — the Julius Tipikas podcast has ended; there will be no more episodes, and we will not be investing in it for the next half-year. In general, most things remain relatively the same. For example, "EV formal gathering" actually refers to the ceremony, so that's a small linguistic correction. And where we specify that before the Tipikas March, the Student Union will cover the event — that's self-evident, as it's organized by the Student Union.

Due to a technical issue, the question was not heard.

Alexander Rein Robas: The biggest change is in point 2.1. Previously, our Development Plan emphasized that the Student Union should focus on having as many organizations as possible. But now we recognize that we've reached a good number, and the focus should instead be on helping the existing student organizations operate successfully and actively. The focus is on quality, not quantity. Already, there are concerns — for example, the Gaming Club and Startup Garage don't have their own offices. Since there's no additional space available, there's no need for more organizations. Rather, we'll help the existing ones improve. For instance, the last funding competition was one of the weakest in recent years, which also shows there's room for development.

Due to a technical issue, the question was not heard.

Alexander Rein Robas: We clarified that the outcome isn't just that we've communicated it, but that students actually know about it. We've already made progress on this — for example, at the beginning of the academic year, there was a lecture for international students that I personally gave, where we introduced the activities of the Student Union, explained the ISIC card options, and in general, told them what to do if they have an issue. There's already been a result — people have contacted us directly, even written to me personally. So the outcome is that people are aware. Some still somewhat fear the Student Union. We also added the organization of the Lecturer's Gala, which will take place this year as well. It's a highly valued event by the university, and we already have a project manager for it, Carolyn Rõuk.

Due to a technical issue, the question was not heard.

Alexander Rein Robas: In this case, it was indeed referring to a specific meeting period, which has already taken place. This needs to be corrected.

Maksim Dolinin: Under results, it says it takes place twice a year.

Alexander Rein Robas: Ah, then it should say once, since it was this year.
Maksim Dolinin: No, it actually takes place twice a year. The implementation period isn't June–July.

Due to a technical issue, the comment was not heard.

Alexander Rein Robas: Ah, yes, it's incomplete.

Maksim Dolinin: That's not the only incomplete sentence.

Alexander Rein Robas: Yes, it has indeed been left incomplete. If you can point out more incomplete sentences, that will only be helpful for us.

Maksim Dolinin: How should section 61D be understood?

Alexander Rein Robas: The change is in red. It's about lowering the goal.

Maksim Dolinin: Lowering the goal is the direction of the Action Plan or a new one?

Alexander Rein Robas: I can't comment on Kristiina's behalf, but I'll clarify it as soon as possible. I think she's referring to the actual feedback survey, which indicates that the current metric is 35%, and in a half-year perspective, the goal is to raise it to 40%.

Maksim Dolinin: Why does it say "remains" there then?

Alexander Rein Robas: The "remains at 65%" part was already there, just hasn't been removed.

Due to a technical issue, the question was not heard.

Alexander Rein Robas: I have the same question myself. I've read that sentence before. It probably places greater responsibility on the Student Parliament — for your visibility to increase. The opportunities and representation that you can provide. But what is your function? It's always been a rather vague term. Let's try to clarify it somehow. What wording could we use? What can we do to increase your visibility?

Due to a technical issue, the question was not heard.

Karolina Perv: "Changed" is also a strange word.

Alexander Rein Robas: It's more about forming an opinion.

Maksim Dolinin: Attractive image...

Alexander Rein Robas: Are there any other points that stand out?

Hanna Savolainen left at 19:25.

Jan Enriko Viidermets: Point no. 6.8, under results, says, "There is a strong candidacy for each Board position, and suitable successors are found for each position." How do you interpret "suitable"?

Alexander Rein Robas: In the sense that each position has certain expectations, but those expectations haven't been explicitly stated. A strong candidacy doesn't refer to the quality of the candidates themselves but rather that there are many candidates.

Jan Enriko Viidermets: But for each Board position where there's a strong candidacy — it might be that only one person applies.

Alexander Rein Robas: Like me.

Jan Enriko Viidermets: Yes, exactly. But still, it says that suitable candidates are found. From this sentence, I read that it ensures that suitable ones are found.

Alexander Rein Robas: That strong candidacy isn't about the first part of the sentence. I think it's not about the candidates' quality but rather that we have more people applying — more options. Yes, that's what it should mean.

Jan Enriko Viidermets: I understand, yes, that more people apply, but you mean specifically for Board positions? Because during the previous Board, I don't recall many people applying.

Alexander Rein Robas: The idea is exactly that — to have more choice. More than one candidate. It's our own Board's responsibility to work on image and attractiveness.

Maksim Dolinin: Yesterday we discussed point 4.7. It says "positive praise"? Can praise be anything other than positive? And why is the word "praise" used here?

Alexander Rein Robas: That's a very good question. I didn't add that there. I'll add a comment to it. It remains open for now. The last part of the sentence was added, but the word "praise" wasn't corrected.

Emili Järv: Participation in the work of TalTech's Senate committees and councils — we can see places where the activity and the result are exactly the same. The result and the activity should be different things; there's no point in writing the same sentence twice. They can't be identical. I'll send those to you later.

Alexander Rein Robas: Yes.

Emili Järv: Maybe you can comment on 2.2, why it's like that?

Alexander Rein Robas: I can't.

Emili Järv: Cell 37 — the result is very vague, might as well have written nothing. The same issue is in cells 70 and 71; those are a bit better. When we talk about finances and sales revenue, none of the indicators are tied to how many partners we have, how many new collaborations, etc. It should be expressed somehow. If it's about the Student Union's finances, that should be reflected realistically. Cell 55 — the Student Union is listed as responsible for TalTech's sports results. The Student Union cannot be responsible for that. We can only be responsible for ensuring that sports representatives are present, but not for the results. Cell 62 — the Student Union should be transparent. There, it says we promote our team events on social media, which is nice, but I think we should rather promote when a Board member attends a meeting or your meetings with the Rector — a much better way to make us more transparent. I feel like the priorities are misplaced.

Alexander Rein Robas: It doesn't directly refer to those outings, but yes.

Due to a technical issue, the question was not heard.

Emili Järv: A typical mistake — cell 69, where things are mixed up. It talks about budget drafting, but the last sentence under "activity" refers to reporting and making summaries. That has nothing to do with budget drafting. If anyone wants to include that in the Action Plan, it should be written elsewhere. That's my short summary, but there are more issues.

Alexander Rein Robas: Write them all down.

Unheard who asked: Point 2.2 — does it refer to all student organizations?

Alexander Rein Robas: It's more of a wording issue. It's stated in our Development Plan that we want to organize those trainings.

Karolina Perv?: They haven't been held in recent years.

Alexander Rein Robas: We'll try to do better.

Due to a technical issue, the question was not heard.

Kristin Liias: The first cell of point 2.2 has been discussed for at least two years — to create this big training Excel. Does it exist? Has any progress been made?

Alexander Rein Robas: I can't answer that right now. I need to check with Sirely. As far as I know, no, but then it should be created. Does the Student Parliament wish to add or comment on anything else? I think the picture is quite clear — there's still room for improvement. Thank you for your comments! Emili and Kristin, I'll be waiting for your more detailed review. Does anyone want to raise any other topic?

Due to a technical issue, the question was not heard.

Alexander Rein Robas: Exactly. Materials were submitted late for the last two meetings; we'll make sure that next time the materials are submitted two weeks in advance, as required.

Due to a technical issue, the comment was not heard.

Alexander Rein Robas: Exactly. We'll try to do our work as efficiently as possible. Any more comments?
(Unidentified text in between.)

Alexander Rein Robas: Yes, yes, of course.

Due to a technical issue, the question was not heard.

Emili Järv: The issue here is that there's no system where a council selects its members and then informs the Student Union. Then the Audit Committee's task is to check twice a year who the members are and, if they find errors, inform the secretary to correct them. The system is broken. There's no process for information to flow back to the Student Union. If the Board has any ideas on how to fix this, please share them.

Unheard who asked: Actually, the responsibility could be assigned to the Student Councils — once they have confirmed members, they could pass that information on.

Emili Järv: Very good idea. I wanted to bring up another point — there's no system for how members of the Research Council are selected. Each Student Council does it completely differently. Usually, people are just pushed into it. There's no transparent system requiring them to elect representatives. For example, if you said that each Student Council must hold an election — there are simple ways to do that transparently. I'd give you the credit for setting those rules; it would make things much better.

Ander Mägi: At the School of Science, it's written in the rules how elections are conducted. The Education Manager finds candidates, they're confirmed at the General Meeting, and if someone wants to run on the spot, they can.

Annemari Riisimäe: At the School of Engineering, if elections need to be held, they are. Candidacy is on-site, with a short presentation. Transparent.

Alexander Rein Robas: At the School of IT, we completely lack a system. The School writes to us saying they need new people. And if someone shows even minimal interest, it's formalized. For example, I'm currently in my School's Council. I can check how it's been done before — whether it really has been such a liberal process.

Alexander Rein Robas
Chair of the meeting

Kirke Piiskoppel
Secretary of the Meeting

Extras

1. Procedure for Submitting and Reviewing Whistleblower Reports
2. Student Union Action Plan 2025