

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

Tallinn

November 11th, 2025 no 10

Start of the meeting at 18:03, end of the meeting 20:58

Chaired by Alexander Rein Robas

Minutes secretary: Kirke Piiskoppel

12 out of 15 were present: Maris Kortel, Maksim Dolinin, Jan Enriko Viidermets, Annemari Riisimäe, Sander Roosimäe, Markus Käpp, Sten Unt, Arqum Shahid, Ketter Aljes, Iiris Aljes, Ramon Kulp, Ander Mägi, Hanna Savolainen

Invited: Emili Järv, Kristina Keerdo, Karoliine Orav, Nora Eensalu, Kadri Jürissaar, Kristin Liias (joined later)

Absent: Karolina Perv, Saara Katarina Merioja

On the agenda:

I Approvals

1. Approval of the Statues

II Discussions

2. First reading of the Student Body Development Plan 2026–2030
3. Report of the Student Union Action Plan for Period I
4. Regular Report of the Board
5. Report of the Quality of Education Working Group (HKT) for the Autumn Period 2025

Alexander Rein Robas: One change became apparent in the agenda – the regular report of the Board will fall under the Student Union Action Plan Report for Period I, therefore we do not have one item fewer, it will simply be included under that point.

Hanna Savolainen: Can we no longer discuss the items if this is the approval of amendments to the Statutes?

Emili Järv: Actually, it was supposed to be the first reading of the Statutes.

Alexander Rein Robas: Okay, then we have no approvals today.

Emili Järv: Would it be possible to move the Statutes to the second topic? Unfortunately, Kadri will be late and I also have to step out once to carry out other Audit Committee work.

Alexander Rein Robas: No problem.

Karoliine Orav: Would it also be possible to move the HKT report higher?

Alexander Rein Robas: No problem. Is anyone opposed to the current agenda? Alright, then the agenda is adopted.

Changed agenda:

I Discussions

1. First reading of the Student Body Development Plan 2026–2030
2. First reading of the Statues
3. Report of the Quality of Education Working Group (HKT) for the Autumn Period 2025
4. Report of the Student Union Action Plan for Period I

The changed agenda was approved unanimously.

I Discussions

1. First reading of the Student Body Development Plan 2026–2030

Alexander Rein Robas: I also spoke a little with people from the university management, and they are finally beginning to understand what they want to do over the next ten years, meaning that we now have a clearer picture regarding our own development plan for the five-year perspective. We must also ensure that our development plan does not work against their goals, and vice versa. You received this document. I hope you had time to review it. Should I read everything out loud, or shall we move on to the changes?

Maksim Dolinin: Are these changes compared to the previous development plan, or compared to what?

Alexander Rein Robas: The current version of the document is the new development plan, which is based on the previous development plan. It is prepared as a clean version, meaning we have not included tracked changes, so you can see what has been changed. If you want to reference the current development plan, then open the present one. There are also some points I have in mind that we want to change or add. Wording changes on the title page. We combined some points. Values – we added belonging. We found that belonging should be a core value of the Student Union, because internally we support each other as an organisation, and we want students to support each other as well, and this was not sufficiently mentioned in the previous development plan. It does not matter how we

express this in practice, but belonging is an important value for us. I am interested in Karoliine's comment regarding the point on expertise. What is "problematic"?

Karoliine Orav: This explanation could be discussed.

Alexander Rein Robas: Alright, let's start with that then. Let's do it so that I open the previous development plan and we can compare the changes. SU mission – exactly the same, it summarises things well, we fully agree. The only thing we changed was that the previous version said all TalTech students, but here we wrote it more generally, as we are not, first of all, the advocacy body for all students; rather, we represent the interests and rights of the Student Body and stand for the quality of education. Because the advocacy body is you, the Student Parliament.

Vision – we mainly changed the idea that we did not see the Student Union as particularly important to the Estonian public, and if we are, then it is through the Federation of Estonian Student Unions (EÜL), which is directly responsible for this. We aim to be a strong partner for them, and they shape policy. Kadri, what is the final point?

Karoliine Orav: Everything that is highlighted in colour is under discussion. We are seeking your input.

Questions and answers

Hanna Savolainen: A comment about the mission – *huvisid* or *huve*?

Alexander Rein Robas: I think *huve* wasn't the correct word. Kadri, Emili, you know better?

Hanna Savolainen: Or *hüvesid*?

Alexander Rein Robas: Emili, is it *huvisid* or *hüvesid*?

Emili Järv: *Huvisid*, because *hüvesid* means something else in Estonian. Ah, whether *huve* or *huvisid*. We concluded that *huvisid* is more linguistically correct, although none of us are language experts.

Kristina Keerdo: EKI says both are acceptable.

Emili Järv: Alright, then both forms are possible. Decide as you prefer.

Alexander Rein Robas: If you want *huve*, we can use *huve*. If you want *huvisid*, we can use *huvisid*.

Kadri Jürissaar: If the meaning is the same, then the form is the least important problem.

Alexander Rein Robas: Is the meaning the same?

Kadri Jürissaar: Yes.

Alexander Rein Robas: We won't change it for now. Let's move on to the values. The value of expertise. Karoliine, what discussion do you want? Is this wording good or not?

Karoliine Orav: The question is whether this wording is okay, what is your opinion, what should this value include?

Alexander Rein Robas: If you read it, you'll understand what values are meant.

Maksim Dolinin: Does the sentence end where it says “ning”?

Hanna Savolainen: What is the ending then?

Kadri Jürissaar: When we had the development plan discussion, the question was what we want from this vision. Where the Student Body wants to be in five years. Back then, my proposal was whether we want to link the vision somehow with the goals of education and student life, which are elaborated further below. But I understand the wording was not finalised.

Alexander Rein Robas: Yes.

Maksim Dolinin: It cannot remain like this. Right now it says “a partner to the university”, nothing is connected to students. Based on this sentence, one could say the Student Union exists only for the university.

Alexander Rein Robas: Based on the whole sentence?

Hanna Savolainen: What if we add “in terms of student involvement”? Would that help clarify the sentence?

Alexander Rein Robas: Okay, so like this: “The vision of the Student Union is to be a top-level student representation organisation in Estonia, a valuable partner to the university, and known for its expertise, transparency, innovation and student involvement.” Shall we return to the wording later? Alright, let’s move on to the values.

Alexander Rein Robas: Value number one – expertise. The wording is currently unchanged, but perhaps you have a better proposal for the wording? When you read this word, does the description match it?

Emili Järv: Dear chairman, perhaps you could share some background on why we decided to change the values in this form. Or whether we are proposing to change them.

Alexander Rein Robas: At the moment, we are not changing anything here.

Emili Järv: To give overall context.

Maris Kortel: What was wrong with the old values?

Alexander Rein Robas: We had several discussions, and the purpose of those discussions was to think about what is currently good and where to put more focus. For example, belonging – mentioned little, but an important value for us. At the same time, we did not want the list to become too long. There were five different values in the old plan; we thought it could be fewer. For us, “openness” is one, “innovation” is one, “sustainability” is one, “determination” is one. So we simply removed “openness”; we are innovative. We felt that this term already captures it. Instead of determination, we thought we should focus more on sustainability. Quality over quantity.

Kadri Jürissaar: For context, at that time the discussion was that the university has six values that no one ever remembers. The university wants to move towards values that are clearer, so that staff know what the values are. So why not the Student Union as well? There were five values, but can we list our values? In short, are all five necessary? As Sass said, we concluded that some fit under others, and that this is more logical and easier to remember for ourselves.

Alexander Rein Robas: Ideally, all members of an organisation should know its values. Ideally by heart.

Kadri Jürissaar: The idea is not that we memorise them to recite if someone asks, but that if we know them and they are logical and understandable, then through our work and behaviour we strive towards them. That is the purpose of values, not just having them written in a document that is nice to read occasionally.

Alexander Rein Robas: I propose we return to this later. Maybe the idea will settle. Moving on to the goals, education topic. Karoliine, would you like to comment?

Karoliine Orav: I would rather comment that we do not need to compare the old and the new, but if there are questions about the new version, then ask. You have had time to review it beforehand if you have questions.

Kadri Jürissaar: The important thing is that it should be a coherent whole for the next five years, not about how it differs from the previous version.

Alexander Rein Robas: But Karoliine, please go ahead.

Karoliine Orav: I have nothing to say, I'm waiting for your questions if you have any.

Maksim Dolinin: Can you explain what is meant under point 1.4? I see a conceptual error. The Student Parliament adopts positions, then someone goes to the university representative and says we have a position, but we don't check whether anything actually gets done. The whole title of this section is "goal". Our goal cannot be just to show something. If the Student Parliament adopts a decision, then we must show it to the university, and the university must say what they will do with it. Right now, this says absolutely nothing. The goal is not simply to display something.

Alexander Rein Robas: Your point is that the idea seems unfinished.

Maksim Dolinin: We show something somewhere and then disappear.

Alexander Rein Robas: What could be added?

Maksim Dolinin: For example, that it is reported to someone, such as the Student Parliament, or that it is addressed at the Voice of Students event – something like that. There must be a result. Simply drafting a document, walking in enthusiastically, and saying we have a new document, and they reply "very nice", is not enough.

Karoliine Orav: Wouldn't going more into detail belong to the action plan?

Maksim Dolinin: But we still need a goal; our goals cannot be that we just show something. That is not an activity.

Alexander Rein Robas: Any other questions regarding this point? Then for now we will take into account that we will add an activity that shows we are actually doing something with it. Any other points? If there are no comments, I assume it is acceptable.

Markus Käpp: There are a lot of spelling mistakes here, is it just a draft and is that okay?

Alexander Rein Robas: It is a draft and that is okay.

Karoliine Orav: If you notice anything, please write it down.

Alexander Rein Robas: But let's move on. The statement that we ensure favourable conditions is questionable.

Maksim Dolinin: Yes. The whole process of who is accepted as a student organisation, under which regulation – it is not sustainable. These conditions are not favourable. We provide the opportunity, but the conditions are not favourable.

Alexander Rein Robas: But can we promise that in five years the conditions will be favourable?

Maksim Dolinin: If we want to have 200 organisations, for which we do not have the budget to maintain, then we can say the conditions are favourable, but the entire activity is not sustainable.

Alexander Rein Robas: I understand this point, and we had the same discussion with Hendrik Voll today. We will have the opportunity on Friday to speak about this before the Senate Council. And I plan to raise this exact issue – that we lack resources, space, funding – to provide favourable conditions. To go in with the aim of convincing them to allocate more resources.

Hanna Savolainen: A comment on the same point: perhaps simply leave “conditions” and remove “favourable”. The goal is not quantity but also quality.

Alexander Rein Robas: That is why we thought that if we keep the phrase “primarily for sustainable development”, then this shows we want quality. But I understand the concern with the current wording. Would it help if we move “for sustainable development” earlier in the sentence?

Hanna Savolainen: Just remove “favourable”.

Alexander Rein Robas: Understood.

Kristina Keerdo: Simply write that the SU ensures opportunities for the creation of student organisations. We create the opportunity, but we do not have to specify what the conditions must be.

Alexander Rein Robas: Does that resolve this point?

Nods

Alexander Rein Robas: Alright. I see the next comment. Point 2.6: “Student Life Committee – at the moment this is one-directional, meaning it is unclear whether the Student Union is making decisions or someone else.” The idea here is that we must communicate these needs upwards, where decisions are made, because ultimately the Chancellor is responsible for real estate, and the Chancellor also prepares their own development plan. Our goal is to include a comprehensive point in the university's development plan that ensures when feedback comes from students, it must be considered, and we help to gather that feedback. So, bottom-up. Hopefully that answers the question?

Maris Kortel: Yesterday at our Student Life field meeting a question came up about the wording “incl. the Senate”? Why is the Senate listed separately?

Alexander Rein Robas: That wording, if I'm not mistaken, is a leftover from the previous development plan. Actually, it wasn't. I think Mark added it himself. Or Karoliine, do you remember who added it?

Karoliine Orav: We wrote it all together, it doesn't matter who wrote it, we can't say. There are many different governing bodies. The Senate is simply one where we participate.

Alexander Rein Robas: We are also represented in the Senate, so we can bring topics directly there. But feedback does not necessarily go only to the Senate. Essentially, we can remove it, because the Senate already falls under governing bodies. Okay, we'll remove it.

Maksim Dolinin: Is this the only point where cooperation with the university's governing bodies is mentioned?

Alexander Rein Robas: No, in the third block the structural units are listed. Let's move on for now. Also keep in mind that our job is to figure out the action plan as well — if it's hard to come up with an activity for a particular point, think about what activity supports it. If no activity can be found, then the point itself is problematic. If there are no questions, let's move on to the third block.

Sten Unt: One wording issue in point 3 — is "strong" effective? It is a bit vague in this context.

Alexander Rein Robas: How do others feel?

Karoliine Orav: This comment comes from the meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee — whether "strong" is the right word to use.

Maksim Dolinin: Influential?

Alexander Rein Robas: There is a risk of word repetition.

Hanna Savolainen: In that sense, the vision already uses "top-level" and "sustainable".

Alexander Rein Robas: "Top-level" and "sustainable" also repeat.

Kirke Piiskoppel: Capable?

Alexander Rein Robas: I'll check the definition in Sõnaveeb as well. If you agree with the definition there, we'll use that instead. Good. Do you have comments regarding the goals of the third block? I have a question about point 3.4 — here we currently have "environmentally sustainable", with "environmental" in brackets. The word "sustainable" next to it can be interpreted in two ways, and we want to indicate the other definition. Perhaps the correct word here would be "continuity", meaning that the organisation is continuous. But we also want to bring out that in our activities we consider environmental sustainability.

Maksim Dolinin: Could we not replace it with "environmentally friendly"? Then we wouldn't need brackets.

Alexander Rein Robas: We could also just write "more sustainable". But overall — more efficient, more sustainable. The question is how we phrase it. I propose "more effective, more sustainable and more continuous". Then "environmentally sustainable" would be replaced by "sustainable". What do you think of this wording? Should it be "more environmentally friendly and more sustainable", or "more sustainable and more continuous"?

Maris Kortel: In my opinion, “more environmentally sustainable” is not comprehensive; one can also be resource-efficient in finances, labour, etc. The environment is important, but in this context “more sustainable” in general is already good.

Alexander Rein Robas: So, remove “environmental”. Do others agree?

Nods

Alexander Rein Robas: Kadri has also commented in the meantime — point 3.7, is “turvamiseks” (to secure/protect) the correct word?

Kadri Jürissaar: We read it and discussed it, but “long-term securing”, is it the best expression to use there? We checked Sõnavaab.

Emili Järv: “Protection of security”. It should be changed.

Alexander Rein Robas: I can explain this point more broadly. It turned out that there is currently no measure protecting us from having our budget significantly cut. This comes from Mark’s experience when he visited Croatia. At their university there is a specific clause stating that the university budget cannot reduce the student budget by more than 10% within a given period. So, this point is meant to reflect that, but there are certainly many other situations where our future could be more firmly secured.

Emili Järv: The point itself is fine, but “*turvamine*” is not suitable.

Alexander Rein Robas: What would be the correct word here?

Sander Roosimäe: “For securing” could be replaced with “for ensuring” (*kindlustamiseks*).

Alexander Rein Robas: Does that work for everyone?

Nods

Maksim Dolinin: I have a question about point 3.6. Don’t we want to add that the Student Parliament (EK) should be productive? Right now, it sounds as if we are simply motivated and trained.

Alexander Rein Robas: Well, all of us would like you to be productive.

Maksim Dolinin: And that is also a goal.

Alexander Rein Robas: Yes. Do you wish to be productive for the next five years?

Ander Mägi: Efficient?

Maksim Dolinin: “Efficient” or “productive”?

Hanna Savolainen: “Efficient” is shorter and more Estonian, but maybe “productive” is more easily understood.

Alexander Rein Robas: I see “a strong and expert decision-making body” here — maybe we could write “a productive and expert Student Parliament”?

Jan Enriko Viidermets: The SU is capable, but the Student Parliament is strong and productive.

Alexander Rein Robas: I'm not sure what I'm supposed to conclude from that...

Kristin Liias joined at 18:55.

Maris Kortel: Should we remove "motivated"?

Alexander Rein Robas: But why? It is still good if you are motivated. You can be productive even without motivation.

Hanna Savolainen: "Outcome-oriented"? Maybe that is better than "productive"?

Alexander Rein Robas: Okay, but is there always an outcome?

Kadri Jürissaar: Yes, a good point — a result is the desired end form, not just doing-for-the-sake-of-doing but actually reaching somewhere.

Alexander Rein Robas: Any comments? What is your direct preference for how you want to be in the future? I wouldn't make this list much longer.

Hanna Savolainen: The goal is not to be productive; the goal is to reach outcomes. Why couldn't the goal be reaching outcomes?

Alexander Rein Robas: Productive and outcome-oriented?

Maris Kortel: Since this is a development plan, we are striving toward an ideal. Whether we achieve it or not is another question.

Ander Mägi: The word "productive" sounds like we are just producing piles of Word documents.

Emili Järv: I would like to point out that "outcome-oriented" is a risky word; at least I have not seen the outcome indicators of the Student Parliament. First, we must define what the outcomes of the Parliament are. But if you define them, then I am fully supportive.

Alexander Rein Robas: I see that "expertise" covers the idea that your productivity is not meaningless productivity. Perhaps change the order of the words so that it becomes "expert and productive". What shall we do?

Hanna Savolainen: Let's change the order of the words.

Alexander Rein Robas: So "expert and productive". Alright. In that case, let's go back to the first page — mission, vision and values. Perhaps you have developed new thoughts regarding the wording? Do the values reflect what this development plan describes?

Hanna Savolainen: Should it say "student representatives" or "members of the Student Union" or something else? Does this concern the Student Union or us as the Student Parliament?

Alexander Rein Robas: It refers to members more generally.

Maksim Dolinin: But the whole document is called the "development plan of the Student Body"?

Alexander Rein Robas: True, but here it says the Student Union bases its activities on these values. It implicitly describes that we are expert and that we create a sense of belonging. "Student representatives" is broader — not only us here in the room and the Student Union, but also those who

participate in faculty decision-making bodies and representatives elsewhere. It is written with that broad meaning in mind.

Hanna Savolainen: That makes it clearer.

Alexander Rein Robas: Since we did not find explanatory notes for the previous development plans, this is how I interpret it. Thoughts? Does anyone feel that a value is missing, or that we should not remove openness or determination?

Sander Roosimäe: “Student representatives are experts in their field of activity” — does this not define it through themselves?

Alexander Rein Robas: Do you want to use “specialists”?

Sander Roosimäe: Experts.

Alexander Rein Robas: Can we guarantee that?

Markus Käpp: Are we experts?

Alexander Rein Robas: I believe we know what we are doing. I would say yes.

Hanna Savolainen: There are similar repetitions in other places too; it simply explains the idea and that is fine.

Alexander Rein Robas: In this explanatory context it is fine. We’ll leave it as it is, it has always been like this. Tell me how it sounds to you.

Jan Enriko Viidermets: How do you ensure that first-year students can join the Student Parliament—students who have never dealt with this before? Are they immediately experts?

Alexander Rein Robas: No, but they can become experts here. The goal is also that when you leave, you are richer in experience. At your first meeting you didn’t fully understand everything either, but later you have more experience. And again, we can contribute by sharing our knowledge and experience with others so that the bar remains high. From that comes the overall sustainability.

Hanna Savolainen: This leans more toward a goal, not a value. The question is: is this a goal or a value?

Emili Järv: You can also look at it this way: a regular student organisation and the Student Union cannot have the same standards. If we are the Student Union, it must be adequate and competent activity, and I think “expert” in this context means exactly that. If some organisation ends up having to cancel an event because something went wrong, the Student Union cannot operate that way — and if it does, then the Audit Committee comes to you. The way I see it, our value is that we have that standard. And regarding first-year students, we also have a selection process.

Hanna Savolainen: That explanation helps.

Kristin Liias: A real-life example — when the third Audit Committee member was elected, there were many applications, but half of them were from first-year students, and they did not show up. A first-year student is not familiar with university processes; the same standard should apply to a student in a Student Union position.

Alexander Rein Robas: We did not tell them to come.

Emili Järv: That does not mean that first-year students cannot be in the Student Parliament or in the Student Union — there have been such people, and they have done very good work. It simply means that the person understands what they are doing and does it well, or at least at a solid level.

Hanna Savolainen: We were also elected here, so it can remain.

Alexander Rein Robas: Another thought: it is very difficult to understand where these points originally came from. If you were not around at that time, you do not know how these points were formulated. When we adopt the development plan, we should also write an explanatory note to pass on a piece of the present context and decision-making background. If we include a point, we should explain why it is there or give an example of a current issue. That way in the future one can understand the context and background, what the root problem was and what we tried to address. So far it has been a very vague document, intended to leave as much operational freedom as possible, but at the same time focused enough to guide activities. Then it becomes clear if some problems no longer need attention. There might be points in the current plan that have already become irrelevant. But are there any comments about the sustainability point?

Jan Enriko Viidermets: “For the SU, determined and consistent activity towards achieving goals is important.” Determination seems more appropriate.

Hanna Savolainen: It should be in the same form. “Determination and consistency”, but that is not logical. Rather “determined and consistent activity” sounds more logical.

Jan Enriko Viidermets: But right now, it says “consistent activity”.

Hanna Savolainen: Ah, okay. So, which one is it?

Alexander Rein Robas: Before it was “determined” and now “determination”.

Jan Enriko Viidermets: The important thing is that it is determined and consistent, though...

Hanna Savolainen: Should it be “determined activity” or...

Alexander Rein Robas: I think here we have two adjectives describing the activity.

Hanna Savolainen: What you (Jan) said actually works well.

Alexander Rein Robas: Okay, I can see that no more new ideas are emerging. In that case, we’ll take your feedback, go through it once more, prepare a clean document, and hopefully we can approve it at the next meeting.

2. First reading of the Statues

Emili Järv: Hello from my side as well! In any case, I hope you understood what we wrote here. In the explanatory note, the bold text shows the changes we made after the previous round. If you find a change that has not made it into the explanatory note, please let us know. But since this is the Statutes,

we will do it the same way as before: we will go through all the bolded points. Many of them are changes we discussed earlier, but this time we implemented them. Does that work? Great.

– “Student Union (ÜE)” was changed to “Student Parliament (*Esinduskogu*)”. In some places you will still see ÜE, but only in the sense in which we understand the Student Union.

– The definitions inside the document are now placed at the beginning of the document for clarity.

– In the previous version, we used the term “personnel member”, but the lawyer’s comment was that it implies an employment relationship, which we do not want, since there is no employment relationship. We concluded that the correct term is “member of the Student Union”. The question arose whether the duties and rights of members of bodies apply to them. No, because the Student Union itself is not a body. It is not a member of a body.

– Last time, the name of the Higher Education Act was incorrect; we corrected it.

– We found that the Statutes did not specify who announces the regular elections of the Student Parliament. We added that the Student Parliament announces the regular elections.

– Point 5.5 previously described electoral districts and mandates. Since we have a separate Election Rules document, it is unnecessary to duplicate the Election Rules in the Statutes. We added only brief information here. More specific information goes into the Election Rules. Fun fact: tomorrow is the meeting on amendments to the Election Rules.

– In point 5.9.2 we tried to clarify how members can be removed. Hopefully it is clearer now. If you have a better proposal, feel free to share it. We found that “and/or” is more logical in this context.

– In point 5.10 we added the word “from the composition” at the beginning of the sentence. One extra word and it becomes much clearer.

– Last time we discussed whether it is possible to take decisions without convening a meeting and which decisions those may be. It was already stated that certain things may not be decided without convening, and the list of such cases was included. Some positions may be adopted without convening, except for the listed matters.

– Point 6.6 did not exist before and had poor wording. We added that members must be informed at least five working days in advance. You can now evaluate whether, in the case of an extraordinary situation, five working days might be too much.

Hanna Savolainen: I would say that five days — if the notice is given on a Friday or Thursday, the weekend is also included, and it becomes a full week.

Emili Järv: That is exactly why it is always a week — the notice must be given the next day. Unless someone suddenly decides on Monday morning to hold a meeting on Friday evening.

Maksim Dolinin: Is it working days or calendar days?

Emili Järv: Working days.

Maksim Dolinin: Maybe it should be calendar days?

Emili Järv: What do you think?

Jan Enriko Viidermets: Some people don't read email on weekends.

Emili Järv: With working days, you could get a situation like something happens right before Christmas. For example, on 20 December — then the meeting could only take place on 2 January. That's a radical example.

Jan Enriko Viidermets: But that is inevitable.

Emili Järv: I agree.

Hanna Savolainen: Then let's use 7 calendar days.

Emili Järv: Ah, so to increase the calendar days to avoid the holiday problem? Your decision.

Maksim Dolinin: According to the rules, the Student Parliament (EK) is on break during Christmas. Can an extraordinary meeting be held during the break?

Emili Järv: It is not regulated anywhere.

Maksim Dolinin: If EK is on break, then it should not be possible.

Emili Järv: It is not defined either way. A fair point — does "break" also mean a break from extraordinary meetings? You decide. I'll add the comment so we can return to it.

– Previously, all mandate lengths were defined in full years, which caused problems of up to two years. For example, someone's mandate is from 1 July to 1 July. Suppose a Board member must leave office ten days earlier — the Student Parliament allows it, but the Statutes do not. In law, there is no such thing as a "conceptual year"; there is only a 365-day year. To overcome this obstacle, we concluded — although it is inconvenient to write — that Board members are elected for up to 26 months. So two years and slightly more. This gives flexibility when needed. Otherwise, errors occur.

– In point 7.5.5 we added the action plan before the areas of responsibility.

– In point 7.5.6 a few provisions relate to assets, but after doing inventory yesterday, we realised we have very little property. The question is how to use the property we do have. We changed the wording to align with the recommendations.

– In point 8.5, 14 months — previously it was 1 year. The same reasoning as before.

– In point 8.6 — why was it changed this way? Firstly, we know that the elections of the Student Councils' Boards generally take place earlier than one month before the start of the mandate. Secondly, last time we made the same change for the Board. This point had simply been overlooked. The aim is to give more flexibility to the processes of the Student Councils. The 30 days were simply changed to 90 days.

– In point 9.1, again a property matter; we changed the wording. Substantively nothing changes for us.

– In point 10.2 concerning the Audit Committee — again 14 months instead of 1 year.

Emili Järv: I'll return to point 6.6. What do you prefer? Or do we leave it as 5 working days?

Jan Enriko Viidermets: If it's calendar days, then the holiday period wouldn't count.

Emili Järv: Those two things don't exclude each other. But what do you think — if we need to call extraordinary Student Parliament meetings in July or December, can we? My logic says we don't take a break; "extraordinary" means *force majeure*. My logic says we do not pause. But using calendar days doesn't have to contradict that. Essentially, it becomes just a difference of two days. But if you're afraid someone might start sending calendar invites on Christmas Eve, then we can leave it as 5 working days.

Hanna Savolainen: Working days would be more reasonable, because do we have anything stating that we are not allowed to work on weekends?

Emili Järv: Not explicitly, but here the principle of humanity and reasonableness applies. But nothing prevents us from stipulating that extraordinary meetings must take place on a working day. It depends on the case. Shall we leave 5 working days?

Agreement

Emili Järv: The matter of the holiday break can be placed into the Rules of Procedure. Any other questions?

Hanna Savolainen: Regarding the explanatory note or the Statutes?

Emili Järv: Either.

Hanna Savolainen: Could we discuss points 8.7.3 and 8.7.4 of the faculty Student Council — the budget topic? I would like some input. How is the budget handled? Should it really be discussed at the General Assembly, with confirmations and all? Is it necessary? It seems a bit complicated. In our Student Council there is an issue that this hasn't been done. Since everywhere in the document, it states "General Assembly", there is no provision that allows delegating this further.

Emili Järv: I understand two questions here. First — gather practices on how other Student Councils do it. Whether things are done in the way the Statutes describe. Second — whether this should be written in the Statutes in this form. For example, the council prepares a budget execution report but does not submit it to the General Assembly. I would add a third conceptual question: if we look at Student Councils as faculty-specific bodies uniting students of that faculty, which is correct, what do we expect from them? Who has been in a Student Council? Who knows how different councils manage their financial resources? Have you seen it as a member of the General Assembly? And do you feel you should see it?

Ander Mägi: In the School of Science Council, we also have an obligation to show it, but it is not confirmed. It has rather remained an internal matter for the Board.

Maris Kortel: In the School of Engineering Council, the General Assembly confirms it.

Ramon Kulp: In the Maritime Academy, if a Student Council member wishes to see it, then it must be shown.

Emili Järv: And ITÜK?

Markus Käpp: Sass, do you know?

Alexander Rein Robas: I don't know anything about it.

Markus Käpp: But we do have budget approval at the end, and I don't know whether at the beginning as well.

Sander Roosimäe: The General Assembly must have at least half of its members present.

Emili Järv: Sass didn't remember, the other ITÜK members confirmed that this is indeed how it is. Good, but that is the current practice. The second question is whether it should be the way it is written.

Nora Eensalu: We wanted to respond that when we discussed this, we looked at it from the perspective that it may not always be like that, but this is how we would like the Student Councils to operate.

Emili Järv: I agree. Obviously, we wrote this document as **our** vision. But is **your** vision the same as what is written here? Think a bit more broadly — Student Councils as bodies representing students of one faculty: what should our legitimate expectations of them be?

Hanna Savolainen: In general, it is very difficult to require the General Assembly to approve such things, because in the School of Business and Governance Student Council there are an enormous number of people and full members who have voting rights in certain aspects. So all these approvals are complicated. For example, the annual financial report — the General Assembly cannot approve it, because it takes place in June. The NGO Act allows delegation, but here it explicitly states that the General Assembly confirms it. I would rather leave the reporting of budget execution, because I would like to know more about my own Student Council's finances. In my opinion, it is not sufficiently transparent. So maybe point 8.7.2. The remaining points could stay, but I would remove the approval requirement. And "in accordance with the established procedure" would simply mean what is provided in the Student Council's statutes. The approval requirement is the complicated part.

Emili Järv: I don't see the annual financial report in this context.

Hanna Savolainen: No, no, I only used it as an example. I was referring to the general competences of an NGO General Assembly.

Emili Järv: Ah, okay. We shouldn't mix up the NGO Act and our Statutes. These do not have to be exactly the same things. We have 98% of student organisations registered as NGOs, and the Statutes require them to be NGOs. But it is completely reasonable that they have two sets of statutes — one for their organisation from our perspective, and another from the NGO perspective. I fully agree that it is extremely difficult to gather 150 School of Business and Governance students in mid-June.

Hanna Savolainen: For that reason, I would remove the requirement that the General Assembly must confirm it. But looking at our own Statutes — in a Student Council's statutes it could be defined that the General Assembly consists only of full members or just members. Since we have delegated many General Assembly competences to the Council, most of the budget topics lie there. Requiring General Assembly approval seems very complicated.

Emili Järv: I completely understand if the concern is that a quorum cannot be reached in June. But in other months, a quorum **should** be reachable; otherwise, the question arises — what is the purpose of the General Assembly? It would be like us sitting here every month with only five people and being

unable to pass decisions. If I understand correctly, the problem that the quorum does not form is a separate issue, and perhaps the Student Council needs to re-examine who is accepted as a member. Or, for example, in INSÜK you have a system with different member statuses — some may vote and some may not. The point is that not reaching a quorum cannot be the reason why our expectations for Student Councils should be different. That problem needs to be solved elsewhere.

Hanna Savolainen: When should these budget drafts be submitted? At the September General Assembly? When does that normally happen? I do not know exactly how the money flow works.

Emili Järv: Good question. The Statutes do not specify this — nor should they, in my opinion. There are different options: it can be handled based on the academic year or calendar year. That is also something the Statutes do not need to regulate — it's the freedom each body has. But every member of a body must understand how it works. There must be **some** system according to which it operates. This kind of detail could be regulated in the Rules of Procedure.

Hanna Savolainen: Would anyone like to share more experiences?

Jan Enriko Viidermets: You don't have a clear financial overview in the School of Business and Governance Student Council?

Hanna Savolainen: No, we have the same system as EMERA. I only eventually found out that if I want to see the documents, I can ask. I have never seen the budget itself.

Jan Enriko Viidermets: When the budget approval moment comes, there should be a complete overview.

Hanna Savolainen: When do you submit these, in terms of the calendar year?

Ander Mägi: In the School of Science Student Council, we use the academic year, because it's easier to prepare the annual financial report based on the expenses made during your mandate, instead of having to include six months from before your term.

Hanna Savolainen: But when do you show the budget execution and the draft budgets?

Ander Mägi: At the first General Assembly of the semester it must be presented, approval is not required. First, at the September General Assembly we show the plans. In the new year we present how it went and what the goals for the next semester are. And at the end of the mandate, the Board must present a full report of the achieved goals, which includes an overview of revenues and expenditures.

Emili Järv: Hanna, how does this feel?

Hanna Savolainen: I got input, but does any member of ITÜK want to add something?

Markus Käpp: Before the election of a new Board, the old Board prepared that report.

Maris Kortel: In INSÜK the new Board prepares it with the help of the old Board. When I was on the Board, one approval was in spring, retrospective approval in autumn for summer, and then approval at the end of the semester depending on whether there were changes. If changes exceeded a certain

percentage, the General Assembly had to approve them before larger expenditures were made, either beforehand or afterwards. I believe now it has been changed to cover the entire year.

Hanna Savolainen: I got input. We need to decide whether it should remain as written. Does everyone agree that the councils must start amending their statutes?

Maksim Dolinin: These points have been in the Statutes since 2017.

Hanna Savolainen: But they haven't been followed.

Maksim Dolinin: Yes, that's another issue.

Emili Järv: The question is whether, as the Student Union, we want to enforce compliance. Is it important for us that Student Councils operate transparently? We can also think about different actions if it becomes clear that they are not following the rules.

Maksim Dolinin: Question — when agreements are signed with Student Councils in winter, must they comply with the conditions?

Emili Järv: I don't know.

Maksim Dolinin: What is written in that agreement?

Emili Järv: I don't know what exactly is written in the agreement or whether they must meet specific criteria. During my time I have never heard of issues — it seems no one really checks, the funds are just allocated.

Maksim Dolinin: So, the contract says, "party A" and "party B" and signatures at the bottom?

Emili Järv: I don't know, Maksim. But it's a fair question — we'll add it in. If they don't comply, they don't get the funding; if they don't use funds transparently, they don't get funding. This is for you to decide. I understand we've reached a consensus on point 8.7. Are there any more questions regarding the Statutes?

Hanna Savolainen: Just to clarify — the competences listed under the General Assembly cannot be delegated to anyone else.

Emili Järv: Correct. It's a transparency issue. For example, the Student Council cannot decide that some third party approves things.

Hanna Savolainen: The General Assembly — we can define ourselves who belongs to the General Assembly, right?

Emili Järv: Yes, you define that in your own Statutes. Since I know you accept students from other faculties as well, I strongly recommend considering whether students from other faculties should be approving your budget. Any other thoughts? Will we be approving this next time? One situation is still missing — what happens if the Audit Committee must organise extraordinary elections. That will be added next time.

Hanna Savolainen: Is the conflict of interest mentioned anywhere else?

Emili Järv: Under the Audit Committee. Should it be stipulated somewhere else? For example, under the Board. Did we write in that they must make decisions with two supporting votes?

Maksim Dolinin: Two-thirds.

Emili Järv: Yes, I think we did. In any case, the question for you is whether you think conflict of interest should also be defined under the Board. For example, when all Board members are from the same School and that Student Council submits a request for use of the reserve fund. Can we say that this is a conflict of interest?

Hanna Savolainen: A conflict of interest can exist everywhere. Do we have it stipulated that the Student Parliament cannot function without representation from each School? At the moment, it technically could. Should we then require extraordinary elections if one School loses all representatives?

Emili Järv: Seeing how easily such a situation can arise, I personally would not write that into the Statutes for the sake of future members' mental health. But if *two* Schools lose representation, then yes. The question is: how well can the Student Parliament represent all students if two Schools have no representatives?

Maksim Dolinin: But what if someone simply decides voluntarily that they no longer want to participate in the Student Parliament?

Emili Järv: Yes.

Hanna Savolainen: Technically it is also voluntary resignation if you simply stop showing up.

Emili Järv: True, although not attending meetings is different from being removed.

Hanna Savolainen: This is very critical — if such a situation arises. Right now we have five engineering representatives, the balance is off; the School of Science has only one. If Ander leaves, and I leave, then it's a problem. Do we have people who can replace us? We can end up being a minority.

Emili Järv: The minimum number of members can be 13. Let me throw an idea into the air — do we want a clause regulating what happens if the Student Parliament collapses? Currently, when someone leaves voluntarily or is removed, the next candidate from the same School is taken. If there is no one left from that School, then — Karoliine, correct me if needed — the next person on the list based on vote count is taken?

Karoliine Orav: Yes, ranking is created based on votes, and the next in order is chosen.

Emili Järv: Exactly. If two Schools lose all representatives and there is no one available from either School, then is the Student Parliament still functional?

Hanna Savolainen: The question is how we solve this situation — do we have the option to organise faculty-based extraordinary elections?

Emili Järv: No, in the case of extraordinary elections, the entire Student Parliament dissolves.

Hanna Savolainen: So there's no possibility that if two faculties lose all representatives, we could hold extraordinary elections only for those two faculties?

Emili Järv: A single-faculty extraordinary election is very complicated.

Hanna Savolainen: If two faculties disappear, is there no option to hold extraordinary elections to find representatives for those faculties? Or is it simpler if everything goes into extraordinary elections?

Emili Järv: It becomes difficult — the distribution of mandates becomes complicated. It seems messy in every direction.

Hanna Savolainen: I think it makes sense that if two disappear, then the Parliament dissolves and extraordinary elections are held.

Emili Järv: Does anyone know if extraordinary elections have ever been organised? I think running extraordinary elections is cumbersome — we cannot guarantee they won't fail. If this happens in January, then people may have to run twice, and how do mandates move then? I agree with the principle, but if you want to write it in, then I would think very carefully about how you ensure representation of students from the other faculties. It seems like a very slippery slope.

Hanna Savolainen: I agree — organising extraordinary elections is in general very complicated, and we can operate in a minority up to a point. If we feel we are not receiving input from faculties, then we must simply ask for it.

Emili Järv: Yes, you are entirely within your rights to invite people to give input. Student Councils should be willing to help; that is also in their interest. The second option seems easier to manage.

Hanna Savolainen: And regarding the Board's conflict of interest — has this been about the Student Body Board?

Emili Järv: Yes and also Student Council Boards.

Hanna Savolainen: Student Council Boards should also have conflict-of-interest provisions.

Emili Järv: The simplest solution is to write the same sentence for everyone — put it in point 10.3. It doesn't have to be more complicated: if for some reason there is a conflict, you cannot participate in the decision, and the matter comes to you — the Student Parliament. We can add this sentence to other bodies as well.

Maksim Dolinin: Couldn't we stipulate at the beginning of the document that conflict-of-interest rules apply to *all* bodies?

Emili Järv: People tend to skip definitions and go straight to their own section. Any more thoughts? No? Then we'll add the changes and create a simple way to explain the extraordinary election procedure for the Audit Committee. Will you approve it if the wording is reasonable? Yes. Very good.

Break for 10 minutes. We continue at 20:20.

3. Report of the Quality of Education Working Group (HKT) for the Autumn Period 2025

Karoliine Orav: A brief overview of the Quality of Education Working Group (HKT) and the autumn semester. If there are questions, I can't answer, please don't take it badly. I will talk about the HKT

project, the results of the autumn semester, and feedback from HKT members. HKT is a project initiated by the Student Union since 2010. Its aim is to help improve the quality of education through constructive feedback and to develop a culture of giving, receiving and implementing feedback at the university. It also serves the goal of raising student awareness of the importance of feedback. The project is carried out in cooperation with the Student Councils and their Heads of Education, who help to spread the message about the importance of giving feedback, help find people for working groups, and often participate themselves. The working group consists of 12 members — the coordinator and students from all faculties. Some comparison with spring semesters — number of faculties, number of students, number of respondents from each faculty, comments, since ÕIS allows giving feedback without comments on a five-point scale. And what percentage of students added comments. The working group consisted of the coordinator and 9 team members. Initially it was 12, but some dropped out.

Feedback questionnaire comments from the autumn semester of the 2024/2025 academic year were analysed from the study information system (ÕIS). Between 1 and 3 interviews were conducted per curriculum. The number of interviews depends on whether suitable times can be arranged with all students. Summaries were written for each curriculum, following previously established guidelines. Working period: 10.09–13.11. Summaries were written for 25 curricula (7 in the School of Business and Governance, 2 in the School of Science, 8 in the School of Information Technologies, 5 in the School of Engineering and 3 in the Estonian Maritime Academy). The curricula for which summaries are written are chosen based on input from the faculty. Summaries are sent to Programme Directors and Vice-Deans for Academic Affairs.

A recurring theme is lecturers' teaching ability — the biggest issues with certain courses, according to students, are that "the lecturer is a specialist but cannot teach." It was also noted that lecturers are not motivated, which makes the learning process more difficult for students. There is a lack of practical examples in curricula. Students felt career opportunities in their field should be introduced more. In several curricula, students felt the absence of communication channels between students of the same programme; they wished the Student Union or Programme Directors would take responsibility for this. Regarding the latter, we learned that the Student Union cannot do anything — this is the Programme Director's responsibility.

Feedback from HKT members: the position was marketed realistically. We created a separate job posting with the Student Union, social media promotion. Previously this was not done, it was only advertised via Heads of Education. Additionally, candidates had to submit a motivation letter — we needed to see that they were capable of writing.

Members felt they had sufficient information and materials to carry out their tasks. The biggest challenge was finding interviewees. Students are not interested — especially at the master's level. Often responses simply stop. Students are not aware of this project and are unwilling to spend their free time on interviews. They fear that responses will not be anonymous or that lecturers will figure out who said what. There are significant fears. Master's students are uninterested, saying they only come to receive education, and if they have a problem, they will raise it themselves — they do not feel they should use HKT to express feedback.

Existing questions are too superficial and do not allow in-depth analysis. Members wished for a more even distribution of bachelor's programmes across team members. Some team members ended up with only master's programmes, which made their work harder. It was felt that three interviews per curriculum are insufficient — they provide only a general view. It is possible that only those with negative experiences volunteer, leading to a one-sided outlook. Currently HKT operates on too small a scale; more students could be involved. Development areas: thorough training for HKT members on conducting interviews before tasks begin; updating interview guides/templates; more communication with Programme Directors to get input on curriculum issues and help in finding interviewees; increasing interview numbers; and raising overall awareness of HKT activities. Do you have any questions?

Hanna Savolainen: I have a question — all this information here is very general. Has this information reached Programme Directors?

Karoliine Orav: Yes. Here we only highlighted recurring issues.

Markus Käpp: Show the first slide with the table, please. How are comment percentages calculated?

Karoliine Orav: ÕIS sends us the comments, they are distributed among team members, and they must assess whether they are substantive or not.

Markus Käpp: How is it calculated if last year Engineering had 4629 comments, but this year more respondents yet fewer comments?

Karoliine Orav: Comments reflect whether students wrote a comment with their rating.

Markus Käpp: Interesting — could it be that ÕIS questions were phrased differently? How can the drop be so large?

Karoliine Orav: It may depend on communication as well.

Hanna Savolainen: Should we encourage Heads of Education — they promote completing ÕIS feedback — to communicate that “if you don't have anything to say, don't write anything, but if you genuinely have something to say, then write it”? Because no one feels like writing comments; I usually write meaningful comments everywhere, but there are places where I don't know what to write, yet I still put something, and then it becomes meaningless.

Karoliine Orav: If the comment is meaningful, then of course write it. At the moment people are discussing what to do with ÕIS feedback, because it is not reflected very heavily in reports. Access exists, but exactly how to use it is unclear.

Hanna Savolainen: I have personally given feedback to many lecturers, but there is no guarantee that it is forwarded to them.

Maksim Dolinin: Lecturers see it themselves.

Karoliine Orav: But whether they take it seriously is another matter.

Maksim Dolinin: Officially they can even display comments publicly in ÕIS, so others can see comments about them. Will the general reports by faculty be prepared this year? In 2023 they were done — useful also for public transparency.

Karoliine Orav: I'm not sure which document you mean.

Maksim Dolinin: There is a separate HKT webpage that has faculty-level consolidated reports.

Karoliine Orav: Let's talk about this later — you'll need to show me. This is still being clarified. Thank you!

4. Report of the Student Union Action Plan for Period I

Alexander Rein Robas: The period went positively; there was a lot of activity. The main tasks were completed. I will highlight a few points that stood out.

Row 48 – supporting the development of the Student House. We began establishing a new structural unit, informally called Student House 2. We have not yet decided on the final name, but it will likely be “Centre for the Development of Student Life”. If you know the Textile House, Tom and Taavi plan to renovate the building and bring new energy into it. The idea is to create a new student house so that student organisations have more offices and more common spaces where events can be held. The main selling point is that they want to create a non-profit student bar. Minimal profit. All of the revenue would go into their own fund, which they can use at their discretion to financially support projects. We have discussed this topic extensively; tomorrow is also a bigger meeting. The main concern has been that we do not want an organisation competing with the Student Union; we want cooperation. There has also been more involvement from the alumni centre. Their end goal is to create strong and high-quality alumni who give back to the university through the alumni fund. We will align our goals somehow and work towards the same purpose together. It is a long and complicated topic, and discussions are ongoing.

Another thing to highlight – information channels. What I liked the most was that Juulius Tipikas gained 690 new followers. Good work from the Marketing and Communication team. We also gained followers during Kick-off, reach is increasing. I will not go into more detail. If you have no criticism, we will continue in the same spirit. Once 24 November arrives, we will be able to prepare the report for the second period as well.

Questions raised on the spot

Karoliine Orav: I want to remind you that you all have one email, and please read it and complete the task related to the Lecturer Gala; the deadline is today.

Hanna Savolainen: I have a question. We all received an email about the amendment of the Youth Act and its potential implementing acts. Do we wish to provide input? Issue a position? Are there interested people who would like to form a working group?

Alexander Rein Robas: I encourage you strongly to do so, as this is a national topic.

Emili Järv: A small agenda item — a change to the work plan. I can come and present it if you allow. The topic links to the earlier discussion; we want to amend the Election Rules. A small thing — the work plan states that elections are announced in December. In reality, no one starts working on elections in December. We would move it to January. Theoretically, we would have the Election Rules updated by then as well. Any objections?

Hanna Savolainen: This doesn't conflict with anything?

Emili Järv: No, I don't even know why it was scheduled so early. I cannot justify why it was there.

Hanna Savolainen: Does the approval of the composition of the Election Committee also disappear?

Emili Järv: Yes, but we want to delete that entirely. I understand there are no objections. Great, then it is amended.

IT WAS DECIDED:

1.1 Amendment to the 2025–2026 Work Plan of the Student Parliament

1.2 The decision takes effect upon adoption.

VOTING RESULT: 13 votes in favor.

Alexander Rein Robas: On Friday, a Senate and joint seminar will take place, during which a major decision round will be held on what will be included in the university's development plan. We, as students, will have 10 minutes to present the indicators by which the implementation of the development plan will be measured. We have reached agreement on one point – the student well-being index. The idea is to create some sort of survey or study that measures how the university environment supports students' mental, physical and social well-being. We will turn this into measurable points, and the objective must stay at a certain level or exceed it. A specific number. This is our "foot in the door", so that we can justify it when, for example, we want more facilities. If we see that students are dissatisfied with the quality of education, then we can raise the issue. Through this we can request the most important resource at the university — funding. Having heard this outline, it is also important how this measurability will look. This is an idea pitch, so it does not need to be extremely precise. I would like to know your opinions — how do I go there and ask how to measure student well-being?

Maksim Dolinin: There must be some kind of baseline?

Alexander Rein Robas: Ideally yes — the more precisely we explain it, the better.

Maksim Dolinin: A mathematical basis is needed.

Alexander Rein Robas: What is the rough framework I should present? For example, what are the questions or the basic formula?

Maksim Dolinin: It should be based on how much of student life is influenced by mental health, physical activity and social skills. A 5-, 7- or 10-point scale. It can be converted.

Annemari Riisimäe: Should it be based on scientific methodology? For example, something used at other universities.

Alexander Rein Robas: Yes, it absolutely should. I am planning to look for examples from other universities in the coming two days.

Ander Mägi: Since the index consists of several components, the weight of each component must also be defined.

Ramon Kulp: The idea is good, but for EMERA it would need a completely different structure. For example, during Mental Health Month, most events took place on the main campus, meaning EMERA students could not participate. There are many such cases where EMERA students cannot take part.

Alexander Rein Robas: Should we create it separately for each faculty?

Maksim Dolinin: That becomes too complicated.

Ramon Kulp: Not per faculty, but per colleges.

Alexander Rein Robas: I appreciate your input — now it is difficult to comment on the technical implementation.

Hanna Savolainen: Then this requires thinking beyond the Student Union development plan — you would need to involve the colleges to make it meaningful. More emphasis on unity. And regarding the first topic, that it is not possible to measure the number of student life facilities and opportunities?

Maksim Dolinin: It depends on the state budget.

Alexander Rein Robas: Yes, and some developments are already happening, for example the second floor of the library will undergo renovation. If I presented the topic in this format, the Chancellor would point to existing improvements. But if we link this to the well-being index, and from the Student Union perspective it is not sufficient, then we can address that problem. But this view is too narrow: if we want to highlight other issues too, we may not receive enough support from the university. Another point — regarding mental health, we and the university have very different positions. The goal is not to create opposition. The well-being index is one way to get on the same page for the next 10 years.

Hanna Savolainen: A suggestion — could this be linked with HKT?

Alexander Rein Robas: Yes, absolutely. This should be something everyone completes, so I agree.

Any other topics you would like to raise tonight?

Hanna Savolainen: The same Youth Act issue — do we want to provide input?

Alexander Rein Robas: Note that the EÜL General Assembly is this weekend.

Hanna Savolainen: We should take some time to work on it.

Alexander Rein Robas: In any case, you can also do it independently.

Maksim Dolinin: Shouldn't Sirely manage this?

Alexander Rein Robas: Why?

Maksim Dolinin: She is responsible for public policy.

Hanna Savolainen: The email was sent to us so that *we*, the Student Parliament, would provide input.

Maksim Dolinin: Yes, all of us together.

Hanna Savolainen: We can also form a working group that includes Sirely.

Maksim Dolinin: Yes, that is how it should be.

Alexander Rein Robas: Alright, I will inform Sirely in advance. In the meantime, please start formulating proposals.

Alexander Rein Robas
Chair of the meeting

Kirke Piiskoppel
Secretary of the Meeting

Annexes

1. Changes to the Statues
2. Development plan 2026-2023
3. Report of the Student Union Action Plan for Period I
4. Report of the Quality of Education Working Group (HKT)