

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

Tallinn

December 9th, 2025 no 11

Start of the meeting at 18:00, end of the meeting 20:42

Chaired by Mark Toomsalu

Minutes secretary: Kirke Piiskoppel

14 out of 15 were present: Ander Mägi, Hanna Savolainen, Ketter Aljes, Trevon Peek, Sander Roosimäe, Annemari Riisimäe, Markus Käpp, Maksim Dolinin, Maris Kortel, Karolina Perv (MS Teams), Sten Unt (MS Teams), Jan Enriko Viidermets (MS Teams), Iiris Aljes (MS Teams), Ramon Kulp (MS Teams).

Invited: Mark Toomsalu, Kadri Jürissaar, Anna Suzdalev, Kristiina Vene, Emili Järv, Kadri Jürissaar, Karoliine Orav

Absent: Arqum Shahid

On the agenda:

1. Approval of the substitute for the Board Member in the Field of Student Life of the Student Body;
2. Approval of the Student Body Development Plan 2026–2030;
3. First reading of the Student Union Budget for 2026;
4. Approval of the Statutes of the Student Body;
5. Approval of annual support for student organisations;
6. Approval of the dates of the Student Parliament elections;
7. Report on the Student Union Action Plan for Period II of 2025;
8. Audit Committee Report for Autumn 2025;
9. First reading of the Student Body Action Plan for 2026;
10. First reading of the Election Rules.

The agenda was approved unanimously.

1. **Approval of the substitute for the Board Member in the Field of Student Life of the Student Body**

Mark Toomsalu: I invite the Audit Committee to come forward. Introduction to the topic — next semester I will step down from my position as a Board member in order to move on to other projects. Therefore, we have discussed this within the Board and with various people, and by today we have

reached the point where we have found a substitute member who would be suitable for this position. I now give the floor to Emili, who will present this in more detail.

Emili Järv: This situation is not explicitly regulated in the Rules of Procedure when a Board member resigns voluntarily. What is regulated in the Rules of Procedure is the recall of a Board member. It is reasonable to apply that here — recall and resignation result in the same outcome: the Board member is no longer in office. The Rules of Procedure stipulate that in such a case no elections are held; instead, the Board nominates a substitute candidate, and the substitute serves until the end of the mandate, i.e. until the end of June 2026. The Board has acted responsibly and selected a substitute candidate.

However, a small contradiction has emerged. In addition to regulating this situation, the Rules of Procedure also state: "The substitute may be a Board member with valid authority or a member of the Student Union." I will be honest — this is a textbook example of a provision that was written in anticipation of a situation that has never occurred before. If we look more closely, option A — appointing another Board member as a substitute — would apply for a period longer than six months, meaning one person would have to perform the duties of two positions. The other option would be a member of the Student Parliament (the Rules of Procedure still refer to the Student Union), meaning one of you would have to take on a Board mandate. None of you came here with the expectation that you might have to assume the role of a Board member, so this is not particularly logical.

Therefore, in the interest of the Student Union's overall benefit, I hope that we can, in this instance, collectively ignore that one sentence. When we move on to amending the Rules of Procedure, we can also revise that provision and replace it with something more reasonable. It seems logical that the Board should have the capacity to identify the best possible substitute member. As it stands, this sentence is very restrictive — if there are two Board members and fifteen of you, that leaves only seventeen potential candidates in total. How do you feel about the idea that, in this case, we ignore that sentence?

Agreement is reached.

Emili Järv: If we are all in agreement, then that is fine — there is nothing else we need to ignore. The process is as follows: the Board nominates a candidate, and you approve the candidate. Nothing else is stipulated. I think it is perfectly reasonable that, if you wish, you may ask the candidate questions. If I may guide you slightly: we need a substitute, and unless you find a very strong reason not to approve, I would encourage you towards approval — but of course, I am not pressuring you. Now you have the opportunity to ask questions and think it through for yourselves. I therefore invite forward the candidate selected by the Board — Anna Suzdalev. Anna can introduce herself, but I will briefly mention that Anna has previously held this role, having served as the Board Member in the Field of Student Life. She did somewhat the same as Mark is doing now — she also stepped down from the position earlier.

Karoliine Orav: May I also give a brief justification on behalf of the Board? Sass and I discussed at length who would be the best replacement for Mark. Anna also expressed interest and has prior experience. She has been involved with the Student Union for a long time. Her onboarding would be much easier

than that of someone starting from scratch, which is why we made this decision. You are also welcome to ask Anna questions.

Questions and Answers:

Markus Käpp: What thoughts did you have when this position was offered to you, or when you offered yourself?

Anna Suzdalev: I accidentally overheard that Mark was stepping down, and I joked that imagine how funny it would be if I came back — and for some reason the people around me didn't laugh. Then I thought I'd write to my very good friend Emili, who usually brings me back down to earth, and he said it wasn't actually a bad idea. It wasn't directly someone else's proposal or something I came up with myself — it just happened. As soon as it came up as a joke, my thoughts started rolling and I thought, why not. I haven't had a moment in the past couple of months where a cool opportunity came up that I wanted to take. I talked with the Board and other members of the Student Union, and that's how the decision was proposed to the Board.

Hanna Savolainen: How is your workload?

Anna Suzdalev: I've been very honest with the Board — I work full-time and starting in spring I'll also be in the middle of my thesis marathon. But we discussed this thoroughly and I told them very honestly that attending evening events and similar things — what I call, in Student Union terms, so-called "political events", where it's good for a Board member to be present but not mandatory — will depend on my actual capacity. I can't attend everything. But I said that if they are looking for a Board member who supports the Board, participates in Board work and leads the field, then I do have that capacity. I need to be in the office two to three times a week, and the rest of the time I can work remotely, at TalTech. I don't have a huge amount of time, but I assessed for myself that this is manageable.

Karoliine Orav: Mark will also continue in EÜL and in the Senate until the end of his mandate.

Mark Toomsalu: Does anyone have any further questions? People online? It seems there are no questions. Does anyone want to add anything?

Karoliine Orav: Anna would start from 1 January. If the approval is given today, then Mark will begin the handover.

Markus Käpp: Until when?

Emili Järv: Until 30 June, and in March we will hold regular elections as we normally would, where everyone can run.

Mark Toomsalu: Any thoughts? Then let's proceed to the approval.

Emili Järv: Please raise your hand if you are in favour of Anna Suzdalev filling the position of Board Member in the Field of Student Life of the Student Body starting from 1 January.

All are in favour.

IT WAS DECIDED:

1.1 The position of Board Member in the Field of Student Life of the Student Body shall be filled by Anna Suzdalev as of 1 January.

1.2 The decision takes effect upon adoption.

VOTING RESULT: 14 votes in favor.

Emili Järv: Thank you! With this decision, we confirm Anna Suzdalev as Board Member in the Field of Student Life as of 1 January.

Mark Toomsalu: Thank you to Emili, Anna and Karoliine! Let us move on to the next item.

2. Approval of the Student Body Development Plan 2026–2030

Mark Toomsalu: You have had access to the Development Plan for some time now and have had the opportunity to ask questions. Today we will not go through everything in detail; instead, I ask whether you have any observations or thoughts that you would like to address. This is an extremely important document that will shape the next five years, under which several different Board members will work — multiple generations will pass through its implementation, and you have the honour of approving it. If you have any questions at all, please let us know. People on Teams, are there any questions? It seems there are none, so we can proceed to the approval of the Student Body Development Plan 2026–2030. Members of the Student Parliament, those in favour of approving the Student Body Development Plan 2026–2030, please raise your hands.

All are in favour.

IT WAS DECIDED:

2.1 Approval of the Student Body Development Plan 2026–2030

2.2 The decision takes effect upon adoption.

VOTING RESULT: 14 votes in favor.

3. First reading of the Student Union Budget for 2026

Mark Toomsalu: I invite Kristiina Vene to introduce the third item.

Kristiina Vene: Greetings from my side as well. This is the first reading of the 2026 budget. I already presented it at the extraordinary meeting. In short, to get through today's long meeting more efficiently: if you reviewed the materials, you saw that some rows were highlighted in blue — these were expense lines that changed between the extraordinary meeting and today. If that is acceptable to you, I will not go through all expense lines in detail, but instead explain why certain changes occurred and what information I have received in the meantime.

On 1 December, university budgets were locked. 19 December is the official date when they are approved/adopted. In order to better plan my activities, I contacted the Head of Finance and asked whether our budget had been approved and what I could take into account. I was told that we can proceed with the budget I submitted; some changes occurred during this period. The budget I submitted is clearly set out in the explanatory memorandum and in the budget tables as well.

Total income and expenses from two sources amount to 570,601 euros. For 01CV, 344,201 euros are planned, and the remainder goes to the student organisations' budget. The largest change under SCV2, for example, was that support for the student formula team increased to 43,400 euros (incl. VAT). This has been discussed with the university and the student formula team. Last time we discussed increasing the annual support budget, but it turned out that even the originally planned amount had not been fully distributed, so the funds planned from the Board's reserve moved back, along with the undistributed amount.

01CV – the main budget of the Student Union. Two expense lines are visible — gifts and purchases for staff meetings. I split the original gifts expense line into two to make it easier for myself to manage. From time to time we also purchase snacks for staff meetings, so it is clearer for me to see where and what the expenses are. In substance, splitting this line did not change the budget. IT costs increased because the university made the ChatGPT EDU licence available to employees, and as a result IT costs for units increased. 24 euros × 3 employees per month. Other than that, there were no further changes to overhead costs. There were no changes in personnel costs.

In the project budget, there was a change to one expense line — the lecturers' gala budget. At the previous meeting I mentioned that discussions with the Rector were ongoing regarding whether the funding would come from the Rector's reserve or be included in our own budget. Before the university's budget submission deadline, Karoliine, Sass and I met with the Rector. Based on the Rector's input, I immediately moved the gala budget into our own funds.

Hanna Savolainen: The HKT group — it is written that the budget has been reduced, but it is also said that something increases. If the budget decreased, how can the stipend increase?

Kristiina Vene: That is a good question.

Hanna Savolainen: So does the "Tubli" percentage decrease?

Kristiina Vene: The "tubli" percentage remained a topic that Karoliine and I marked as "needs discussion", because it is a vague issue. Karoliine can add to this.

Karoliine Orav: This semester we paid in the same way as before — the amounts remain the same — but how we will distribute the funds going forward is under discussion. We will no longer look at the "tubli" percentage, because it does not actually indicate anything meaningful.

Hanna Savolainen: But then will the HKT fees — the stipends — be increased or not?

Mark Toomsalu: May I add something? I think the question here is that previously it was 9,880, because 380 was reduced, so it appears that the budget became smaller.

Hanna Savolainen: Then you cannot really say that it increases.

Kristiina Vene: If the "tubli" percentage is removed, then we may increase the stipend amounts from that margin; this is currently under review, and the wording is poor — I will take responsibility for that. There were no other changes under the project expense lines.

Then there is the SCV2 budget. Initially, 70,000 euros were allocated for annual supports; in reality, approximately 39,000 euros were distributed. About 10,000 euros moved back to the reserve fund,

and about 20,000 euros similarly remained undistributed. The student formula team's support increased. The planned SCV2 budget is 226,400 euros. That concludes the changes. I am open to questions.

Maksim Dolinin: A question regarding 01CV. Since we are creating a separate administrative manager position, some of the event coordinator's duties will move there. Can we then say that the event coordinator's workload increases and that it would be justified to raise their stipend, considering that we are essentially creating two new positions?

Kristiina Vene: The administrative manager position is, firstly, such that...

Karoliine Orav: In fact, the event coordinator will also take on an additional event — the lecturers' gala — so their workload will not actually decrease.

Mark Toomsalu: We have also discussed moving the Kick-off orientation under their responsibility.

Emili Järv: At this point, a question to the Student Parliament in general — do you see it as reasonable to increase staff stipends? From the Audit Committee's perspective, it is not reasonable. Last year stipends increased by 10–45%, and this year there is a proposal to increase them by another 8–15%. Is that reasonable? In our view, stipends do not need to increase every year. Yes, workloads differ, but the Student Union has stipulated an expected workload of 4–5 hours per week. Is this reasonable? This is for you to assess and consider. From the Audit Committee's side, we believe that funds allocated to increasing staff stipends could be directed elsewhere.

Kristiina Vene: I reviewed budgets starting from 2022. Let us consider 2022 as the base year, with stipends at amount X. In 2023 they were the same, with a 10-euro change in one individual position. In 2024 the amounts were the same. In 2025 there was a larger increase. In 2026 a similar increase could also be made. The 4–5 hours per week assumption has not been realistic for some time; the workload of these positions has increased, as the university's objectives have changed. The Student Union is moving in a larger direction. One can view this as voluntary work, but I think the perspectives of the executive manager and the Audit Committee differ here. Even if a position is voluntary, it does not mean it should not receive fair compensation. Another angle is that the university has cut its own stipends; if we have capable students doing the work and we can legitimately expect a high standard of work from them, then I personally do not see a problem. If stipends had increased for five consecutive years, that would be an issue. That is my reasoning.

Hanna Savolainen: What bothers me about this budget is that if the amount is 195 euros now, why could it not be 200? That is not a large increase. Over five years it increases slightly, but it is also very unclear how these figures are determined. I understand it is based on workload, but why is it so uneven? Why do some receive 195? Why not 200?

Kristiina Vene: These amounts are calculated based on annual costs. If I start adjusting figures just because one number looks "nicer", then... Also, in real jobs, salaries do not always end in zeros or fives. That does not mean they are uneven. These figures are based on calculations.

Hanna Savolainen: I would like to make a proposal here. If we want the Student Parliament to be more visible, we could direct more funding into the work of the Student Parliament — either by increasing

the coordinator's stipend or, more generally, allocating more funds to Student Parliament events. At the moment, I would say that the overall annual budget of the Student Parliament is quite small.

Kristiina Vene: The Student Parliament coordinator's compensation increased in the same way as that of other staff members. Do you mean motivation events and trainings for you?

Hanna Savolainen: I mean both.

Kristiina Vene: In fact, the Student Union staff has planned to involve the Student Parliament more. This has also been taken into account in the budget planning. You were included in our spa event, and invitations to trainings are open. We are moving in the direction of offering you benefits and bringing you closer to the staff.

Emili Järv: First, regarding the initial response. We also looked at 2022 as the base year. Over four years, stipends have been increased three times, not twice. Second, we also calculated that for those who may not know: the Estonian minimum wage is 5.31 euros per hour gross. If we try to relate this to remuneration at all. I also want to point out that a stipend is not a salary. I hope no one is in the Student Union because of the money — it is an additional motivation. If I take our lowest stipend, which is 175 euros, and divide it not by 20 hours per month but by 30 hours per month, I still get a higher rate than the minimum wage. Perhaps these compensation levels are starting to drift too far out of proportion, especially when we see that other areas are not being increased. I am not saying that the Student Union should not have more money, but rather questioning where we allocate that money.

Kadri Jürissaar: It is also worth considering that while inflation and the overall economic situation are factors, we should also look at whether the share of work tasks actually increases proportionally every year by that amount.

Kristiina Vene: One could equally argue that my own workload should increase massively over five years if my salary increases, for example. It cannot be viewed that way. Naturally, tasks can be added over time, because goals and activities change. Our unit has to be very flexible. If it is not flexible, then it is not possible to work here. Personally, I do not see that... but I also acknowledge that this may simply be a strong difference in perspectives.

Emili Järv: Let us not conflate stipends and salaries. They are not the same thing in any way. I myself gave an illustrative example by referencing the minimum wage, but in reality these cannot be directly compared — they are not linked. When we talk about higher education being underfunded and money constantly being scarce, what impression does it leave of us as an organisation if, instead of investing funds elsewhere, we simply increase staff stipends? And again, I am not talking about permanent staff salaries or Board members, but only about those stipends which, over four years, are proposed to increase for the fourth time.

Kristiina Vene: At the same time, this situation also arises when we say "direct funds to other activities" — we have expense lines that have not been fully utilised. As Executive Manager, or as the person directing the unit's funds, I cannot simply allocate a larger amount somewhere to invest in the unit's future; it has to be very targeted. Here it also matters that I have only three months of experience so

far. In a year's time, I will be much more experienced and will better understand what is happening here — I will know the unit, the staff members and the activities better, and I will be able to provide more informed input when drafting the budget. I see next year as a year where we observe how we manage with this budget. Will I need to redirect funds into our activities? This same discussion has taken place — that we increase staff stipends but do not increase student council funding. In reality, we have a considerable amount of funds in the reserve fund that could be used, and the reason this was not done this year is that we did not take on the responsibility of raising all compensations significantly at once.

Maris Kortel: If I understand correctly, a stipend does not have to be paid out in full for a given month. So why is it a problem if we increase it, provided that people perform work worthy of that higher compensation? If someone genuinely advances a field and contributes significantly, then that small motivational factor — the stipend — could indeed be higher. And conversely, if there is no justification that the workload merits that amount, then it does not have to be paid out in full; perhaps more attention should be directed there. Is it always necessary to pay out the full amount if work of that level has not been done? But again, someone who goes above and beyond and drives things forward does deserve a higher amount, especially if we have the resources.

Emili Järv: First, the problem with increases is always the same. I agree that if we see the organisation has developed significantly and some positions have expanded, then increases may be justified. But at the moment we are increasing **all** positions. In that case, I would like to see clearly why these amounts have increased — where and how. Where do these differences come from? Have responsibilities truly increased across all positions? Second, if there is no clear understanding and we simply increase amounts, then later we cannot reduce them. Instead, we create a new expectation that this stipend corresponds to a certain workload, and if we later want someone to do more, they can respond: "Fine, but then pay me more." I agree with your point, Maris. The problem is that we do not have a robust system for reducing compensation. It is possible in theory, but at least in my four years here, I have never seen it done. How would you even assess it? On what basis would you compare? Suppose I am the external communications coordinator and someone claims I communicated too little with organisations and therefore my stipend should be reduced — how do you calculate that? Or if I am the chair of the funding committee and responded too slowly to emails — how do you proportionally reduce the stipend? In labour law practice, there is no such thing as reducing salary, and I believe the reason is that it is practically impossible to do fairly. If someone is paid per task, then it could be demonstrated. But in principle, proportional reduction is nearly impossible. The only realistic case is when someone does not perform their duties at all. Additionally, if a Board member in the student life field has eight people under them, then they would do nothing else but evaluate whether their team members are fulfilling their duties. That is not the easiest path to take. We make things extremely complicated if we try to increase and decrease stipends dynamically, instead of setting them correctly from the start.

Mark Toomsalu: Thank you for that, Emili. Very good points. Does Kristiina wish to respond?

Kristiina Vene: No, I already stated my position earlier.

Hanna Savolainen: Regarding performance assessment — whether enough is being done or not — we already have a semi-annual action plan performance report that is brought before the Student Parliament. That could very well be the moment to assess this: you can see how much has been done and what the activities were, since we already have that report anyway.

Mark Toomsalu: Thank you, that is a very good idea!

Leana Jete Korb: An idea for the Student Parliament that also came up during last year's budget discussions. It was an idea from the previous Parliament that was left unfinished because additional funds were not secured. Returning Student Parliament members could receive a stipend, similar to returning tutors. If there is room for discussion and a willingness to reallocate funds, this could be something to consider. As a former Parliament member, I do not think every Parliament member should receive a stipend, but returning members could receive a small one, as second-year members add significant value to the work of the Student Parliament.

Mark Toomsalu: Thank you!

Emili Järv: One thing that was not mentioned — when we talk about the budget and the idea that there is "nowhere to allocate funds", we should also avoid the mindset that the budget must grow every year.

Kristiina Vene: That is certainly not my way of thinking either — that I simply have money and place it wherever I feel like.

Emili Järv: Yes, I didn't mean that directly, but in recent years there have repeatedly been situations where the Student Union has gone to the Rector to request additional funding for specific projects. For example, the lecturers' gala or the anniversary of the Student Body, which exceed the budget every year. So it cannot be said that there are no areas where funds could be allocated. I would also like to add that when we talk about the Student Parliament and assessing work quality, it is a very noble idea, but realistically, if we have 25 positions, you do not want to sit here every other month assessing the quality of those tasks. I honestly cannot imagine how to do that even remotely objectively, or in a way that would not turn the meeting into a half-day event.

If we bring an example from real working life, there is a difference between doing a task and doing it well — just like at school, you can complete an assignment, but is it worth a grade of 1 or 5? There is a significant quality difference. You cannot assess that based on the completion of an action plan. In working life, quality is never assessed by changing pay — it is simply too subjective. There are other instruments for that. I strongly urge that we do not go down this road; we would be introducing a source of conflict into the organisation. I fear we would never be able to assess it properly, and all we would end up doing in the Student Union is debating how much money staff members should receive. If anything, then raise stipends, but please let us not go down this path.

Karolina Perv: I agree with Emili's comments. If we start evaluating people's stipends in terms of whether they "deserve" them or not, then theoretically the same logic could be applied to Student Union Board members — but we do not do that, and it would be very strange to start doing so for staff members. Similarly, in real working life, there are periods when you do a bit less and periods when you

push much harder. In real life, a company manager does not start cutting compensation here and there based on that. That would be complete nonsense.

Hanna Savolainen: The action plan performance report was just a small thought experiment when you asked how to obtain feedback. I agree that reducing compensation is a very slippery slope. With increases, I do not see a problem — why shouldn't good work be occasionally rewarded financially? It does not always have to be monetary.

Mark Toomsalu: That could perhaps be a bonus system.

Hanna Savolainen: Yes, a bonus. Not a raise, but a bonus approach. One thing is action plan implementation, but Board members have more insight into how people in their field are working and can also ask them directly.

Mark Toomsalu: Alright, thank you for the feedback. We will take it into account.

Maris Kortel leaves at 18:51.

4. Approval of the Statutes of the Student Body

Mark Toomsalu: The Statutes of the Student Body have been updated. Some of the amendments have been on your table for quite a long time, some arrived a bit later. These also came from the Audit Committee and concern their work. Have any questions arisen regarding this topic?

Hanna Savolainen: Point 8.5, a question intended for the Audit Committee. I had a question regarding Board members. Does this apply to one mandate only? Or does it mean that you can be a Board member only once for up to 14 months?

Emili Järv: If we are talking about members of Faculty Student Council boards, then their mandate lasts once, but nowhere is it stated that they may not have multiple mandates. No one prohibits re-election if that is the organisation's wish. The same applies to the Student Body Board — if someone wishes to serve a second mandate, nothing prevents that if the Student Parliament elects them again.

Hanna Savolainen: Alright!

Emili Järv: Perhaps we can briefly go through the changes highlighted in bold in the explanatory memorandum. Otherwise, we should already have discussed all the amendments made in this document. The Student Parliament is the highest decision-making body of the Student Body, consisting of 15 members elected by students; we added the clarification that, within the meaning of the Higher Education Act, it is the student union. This should avoid any confusion about what is being referred to. This was not a separate clause but is included at the end of the definitions section, for context. If you have questions at any point, please stop me.

Point 7.4, the term of office of Board members — we discovered that in some places working days were used and in others simply days. To eliminate confusion, where only "days" were used, we changed these to calendar days.

Maksim Dolinin: You skipped the conflict of interest.

Emili Järv: Ah, apologies. Point 3.9. We added the same provision that applies to the Student Parliament: in the event of a conflict of interest, the member must inform others and recuse themselves from the decision-making process, to ensure decisions are made on proper grounds.

Point 8.6 — calendar days were added instead of unspecified days.

Point 10.3 — we added provisions on organising supplementary elections for the Audit Committee. If a situation occurs, as happened this year, where only two members are elected in the spring, there should be a real possibility to elect a third member. In recent years, when this happened, various ad hoc solutions were used. We added that if the Audit Committee is not elected in full composition (three members) during the spring semester elections, supplementary elections may be held during the autumn semester to find the missing member(s). The election process is the same as for regular Audit Committee elections. There should be no confusion — they are publicly announced, you announce them, they are publicly posted, and candidates present themselves to you in the same way.

There were a few more references to calendar days, and that concludes the amendments.

Does anyone have questions about this overall? Does it seem acceptable to adopt today? I will add that if you adopt it, it will also go to the Senate for approval. But if you have adopted it, there should be no reason for them to object. Mark, would you like to do the honours?

Mark Toomsalu: Members of the Student Parliament, if you are in favour of approving the Statutes of the Student Body, please raise your hands.

Agreed unanimously.

IT WAS DECIDED:

4.1 Approval of the Statutes of the Student Body 2030

4.2 The decision takes effect upon adoption.

VOTING RESULT: 13 votes in favor.

5. Approval of annual support for student organisations

Mark Toomsalu: For the fifth agenda item, I invite Maksim to speak on the approval of annual funding for student organisations.

Maksim Dolinin: I am using the methodology from previous years. Since you received the explanatory memorandum one day before the materials were due to be submitted, do you have any questions?

Hanna Savolainen: Regarding the Culture Club issue... we know that money remained unused from the annual grants. Do you think that sometimes an exception should be made when it is understood that a communication error has occurred? Inevitably, this was a situation where the information existed but was still lost, and because of that one organisation should not have to suffer.

Maksim Dolinin: No organisation has suffered, because all organisations attended the funding training, where it was mentioned that the call had already been open for two days by that point. Everyone was aware that the call was ongoing and that applications could already be submitted. They had four weeks

to do so. The information was available on the website, in the Yttrium portal, and if they themselves unsubscribed from our communications, then that is not our problem.

Hanna Savolainen: The current situation is such that one organisation is suffering because of unfinished work by the previous board. I do not know how the information was lost there, but the current board is now facing a situation where there is simply a funding gap due to the annual grant issue.

Kristiina Vene: To clarify, as a former Culture Club financial manager for nearly two years and still a member. For financial managers, project calls and annual grant calls are like an amen in church — they are drilled into you through handover documents. I can pat myself on the shoulder: there was never a problem during my time. My knowledge was passed on to the next financial manager, whose mistake this currently is. Nearly 30 organisations received the information and completed everything on time. In fact, they were accommodated and given rooms. I do understand you, but on the other hand there is responsibility: if you are a financial manager and there are five more people on the board who should be checking each other and making friendly reminders. If that combination cannot get itself moving in time, if they do not know what they need to do by when — and this was not the financial manager's first winter — then responsibility lies there.

Maksim Dolinin: I will also mention that there have already been three problems with them since September.

Karoliine Orav: Just a comment... Hanna, you are a member of the Culture Club — let's not create a situation where a conflict of interest arises.

Hanna Savolainen: I understand, I am a member of some organisations and that may influence things. My question is rather about what happens in such a situation now that we have an example. Such matters should probably be communicated even better so that this does not happen again. It is unfortunate that this happened for such a reason. The main problem is that the information did not reach them, which was partly their own mistake. Allegedly it did not reach them, but in reality the information was conveyed by you.

Maksim Dolinin: Three times.

Hanna Savolainen: Communicate the information even more. Nothing can be done retroactively anymore; it is a good lesson learned.

Mark Toomsalu: In response, it is always nice to be accommodating, and I see that this can be important under certain conditions. However, in this situation as well, if we look to the future and assume that the same thing happens to ESN or the Tartu College Society—organisations we would all very much like to fund, just like the Culture Club—then if we have an example ready at hand where we made such an exception, while we had control over the fact that the information was indeed available, the exact same situation could arise with another organisation. If we make an exception once, how do we then justify not making an exception for the next organisation? At the moment, it is unfortunate, but here I side with the Chair of the Funding Committee.

Maksim Dolinin: The information was communicated three times: one email was sent by me, another by Sirely, and the third time it was mentioned during the training. The Student Union is not a parrot

that has to repeat the same information five times within a week. According to the regulations, we are not even required to communicate it separately—we are required to open the project application in the portal. That is all.

Hanna Savolainen: Can you comment on whether there were other organisations that submitted their applications on the last day?

Maksim Dolinin: Everyone submits on the last day. Most organisations send an email asking what the likely amount they will receive is, so they can plan their budget. Then they submit their application, I have three days to review it, and they have five days to make corrections. If they do not manage to finalise it, we can make an exception. We can accept an incomplete application. I then send it back to them again, giving them another five days to correct it. We have always supported organisations if they have honestly said that they will not make it in time. If they want a separate meeting, we hold a separate 30-minute meeting with them to answer their questions. Moreover, when we started addressing the issue, the Culture Club claimed that they had been sent a separate reminder, which is not true.

Hanna Savolainen: The second email that went out—you said that this year you did send two emails?

Maksim Dolinin: The second one was the slides.

Hanna Savolainen: The second email—how long before the end of the call?

Maksim Dolinin: It was sent on the fourth day after the call was opened.

Hanna Savolainen: Since you said that many student organisations submit their applications on the last day...

Maksim Dolinin: They confirm on the last day. I do not know when they start filling them out.

Mark Toomsalu: Thank you, Hanna, for raising this question! Are there any further questions?

Karolina Perv: The Student Union offers the opportunity to receive annual funding; the Student Union does not have to tap organisations on the shoulder to check whether they received the email. If an organisation wants funding, it is the organisation's own responsibility to ensure that everything is done. The Student Union provides the opportunity. In the current situation, the lack of communication has occurred within the organisation itself. I would not look for any faults here on Maksim's or the Student Union's part.

Hanna Savolainen: The Debate Club also did not receive funding. Is that outlined separately somewhere?

Maksim Dolinin: There is a separate point at the end explaining why they did not receive it.

Hanna Savolainen: Very good, thank you!

Karolina Perv: The timing of the annual funding period is in roughly the same timeframe every year.

Maksim Dolinin: Yes, that is known.

Mark Toomsalu: Any further questions on this?

Maksim Dolinin: Let us move on to another issue. We have a regulation called the organisation activity form. Since no one has used it before, we do not know who should approve it. We decided that it should be approved by the Chair of the Funding Committee and the Student Parliament. We allocate rooms to organisations based on the organisation activity form. Where all criteria are met and the form was submitted on time, before the committee meeting, we have the right—after inspecting the offices—to guarantee them rooms for the following year. Is anyone opposed to granting rooms under the responsibility of the Student Union to Juuliuse Jüngrid and the Culture Club for the year 2026?

Markus Käpp: Why three rooms for the Culture Club?

Maksim Dolinin: I cannot say.

Markus Käpp: Because they asked, you gave them?

Maksim Dolinin: Since they have had these rooms for several years and nothing was found to be in violation during the office inspections, and both I and the board member confirmed that we could grant them, then we grant them.

Mark Toomsalu: Also, because one of them is a storage room, shared with the Film Club.

Maksim Dolinin: One is an office and a meeting room. Two rooms are shared.

Mark Toomsalu: Is anyone opposed to granting the offices?

Maksim Dolinin: Hopefully this regulation will also undergo revision, since no one knows how to use it.

Mark Toomsalu: No one is opposed, so these two organisations will receive the rooms. May we proceed to the approval of the annual grants? All those in favour of approving the final results of the annual grants for student organisations, please raise your hands.

Approved. Maksim did not vote in favour.

IT WAS DECIDED:

5.1 Approval of the annual support for student organisations

5.2 The decision takes effect upon adoption.

VOTING RESULT: 12 votes in favor.

Break 19.15-19.25.

6. Approval of the dates of the Student Parliament elections

Mark Toomsalu: I invite the Student Parliament Coordinator, Jete, to the floor.

Leana Jete Korb: I know that at your previous Student Parliament meeting you thought that you could approve the election dates in January. In fact, you did approve that you would approve them in January, but unfortunately there was no one present who could tell you that, firstly, this would put us in conflict with the Election Regulations (both the current one and the one you are about to review), and secondly, that organising the elections would not be feasible within the given timeframe. We are constrained by the new Student Parliament meeting in April as well as the joint Student Parliament and Student Union retreat in early April. In addition, both the currently valid regulation and the one

you are about to review include a clause stating that elections must be announced at least one month before the start of the election period. If we do not want to shorten the candidacy period excessively, the candidacy period would have to start already on Monday next week and run until 11 February. For this reason alone, approving the election dates at the January meeting is not possible. If we were to approve the dates at the January meeting, for example if the meeting takes place around the 10th, this would mean that the candidacy period could only begin after the following meeting, which would be in February, and that would clearly be too late. Therefore, I am presenting you with a proposal in which the candidacy period and the voting period are in line both with the currently valid Election Regulations and with the version that I very much hope you will adopt either today or in January, so that we can organise the elections accordingly. In my view, both the candidacy period and the voting period are sufficiently long to find suitable candidates. At the end of the candidacy period, enough buffer time has been left so that the candidacy period could be extended by approximately seven calendar days if needed, in order to find suitable candidates. There would also be sufficient time to take photos, hold initial meetings, and set up the candidacies in the ElectionBuddy system. The voting period would take place in March, and approximately one week later the gala announcing the election results would be held. This would still leave enough time before the new Student Parliament must hold its meeting on 7 April. Does anyone have any questions?

Maksim Dolinin: If we approve this and also the new Election Regulations, can we apply the new Election Regulations to these elections, even though some activities have already started before the Student Parliament has adopted the new Election Regulations? Can we apply the new regulations?

Leana Jete Korb: My semi-official opinion is that if the Student Parliament sees that the elections can be organised this year under the new Election Regulations—especially if you adopt them today—then I see no problem. If you adopt them in January, then I believe the Student Parliament has the competence to decide that the elections can be organised according to the new regulations, because the activities governed by the regulations will in fact begin later than January.

Maksim Dolinin: Right now.

Leana Jete Korb: Yes, but for example if we talk about forming the Election Committee and the work of the Election Committee as an organ under the old regulations, then the Election Committee dealt with receiving candidacy applications, publishing them, organising voting, and confirming results. At the moment, what is being done is the announcement of the election dates, which is the very first step required. Secondly, the setup of ElectionBuddy begins, which in any case falls under the responsibility of the Student Parliament Coordinator. If you find that these elections should be organised according to the currently valid regulations, then you have the option to confirm an Election Committee even at the January meeting, which would then be responsible for all the tasks of the Election Committee.

Hanna Savolainen: What does “a sufficient number of candidates” mean? Does this mean according to the number of mandates allocated to each faculty? For example, if the School of Business has three seats but only two candidates, then we extend the candidacy period?

Leana Jete Korb: Yes. There must be at least as many candidates as there are mandates allocated to the faculty.

Mark Toomsalu: Any questions?

Hanna Savolainen: Why is it 13 working days?

Leana Jete Korb: Because it runs from Monday to Wednesday, and that Wednesday is chosen so that the following day is a working day, making it possible to receive the results from the ElectionBuddy administrator.

Karoliine Orav: I will add that since this is handled by TalTech's IT department, we have to take their working hours into account.

Leana Jete Korb: So yes, we could not end on a Friday, because then we would only receive the results on Monday. That couple of days has been left to allow time to receive the results. Two and a half weeks is, in my opinion, a reasonably long time for elections.

Mark Toomsalu: Any questions? Are we ready to proceed to the approval? Please raise your hand if you are in favour of approving the Student Parliament election dates.

Approved unanimously.

IT WAS DECIDED:

6.1 Approval of the dates of the Student Parliament elections

6.2 The decision takes effect upon adoption.

VOTING RESULT: 14 votes in favor.

7. Report on the Student Union Action Plan for Period II of 2025;

Mark Toomsalu: Otherwise, Alexander would be standing here giving a long speech, but that will not happen. I am also capable of doing so, but considering the length of today's meeting and the wish to stay within reasonable limits, I will simply ask you this: as you have had the opportunity to familiarise yourselves with the report in more detail, do you have any questions? Any points that require clarification? Any general comments? People online? It seems there are no questions. Then that concludes the report as presented.

8. Audit Committee Report for Autumn 2025;

Emili Järv: As we looked at the agenda and the number of topics, we decided to skip the usual 40-minute presentation and prepared three slides instead. Our idea was to extract a few points from the report that seemed the most significant. We assume you have read the report; if you have questions about other points, please feel free to raise them. We will present our points first, and then you can ask about other matters.

On the topic of financing, we actually have two major concerns. One is that the system by which the Student Union itself organises receipts and expenditure documents is extremely confusing. Expenditure documents are sorted according to the method by which the expense was made, but when we look at the budget, we do not know which expense is being referred to or where that expense is located. From an audit perspective, this is very, very difficult. Not that I am saying anyone is taking money out of the Student Union, but I am saying that if someone wanted to take money out, it would

be very easy, because controlling it would be very difficult. Again, I am not saying that anyone is doing so, but that if someone wished to do so, the system would allow for it.

Kadri Jürissaar: Because there is no system.

Emili Järv: That is to say, there is a system, but it is very difficult to audit.

Mark Toomsalu: We have expenses, they are submitted through the expense portal, there they are, and there are approvers.

Emili Järv: Yes, you are now talking about the process where you make an expense and submit an expense report. I am talking about the fact that we have expenses in many different forms: invoices, expense reports, internal invoices, stipends, guarantee letters. That is, there are many different methods. When we look at the overall budget, you have seen the budget execution view: you click on an item and there is a number plus another number plus another number. And there is no further context. From our perspective, we see one number and a project name, and then we search through one of five folders for documents related to that project, write things down on paper, and start crossing them off. You can see that this system is very complicated. In addition, when we talk about having a large overall budget and project budgets, where there should in fact be an explanation for every figure, the system would already be better if the project budgets actually corresponded to reality. In most cases, when we look at the statistics, the budget is 100, 200, and in one case I even found that it was 1,200 euros smaller than what the budget actually was. For example, if I were a project manager next year and took last year's budget as a basis for building my own budget, and it turned out that 1,200 euros were missing, I would probably be completely stuck as well. So, this is a very significant concern that we want to draw attention to: project managers must properly update their budgets once all expenses have been made. They should also add information about where each expense originated (whether it is an invoice, an expense report, a receipt, a stipend) and how that expense was entered into the Student Union system. Of course, the entire reporting system cannot be fixed with a snap of the fingers, but there are small things that can be done to improve it.

Kadri Jürissaar: I would add that document links are also very helpful, which can be added in SharePoint, so that the audit committee does not have to spend five hours on this.

Emili Järv: Yes, it takes an enormous amount of time. I checked three projects in three hours.

Kristin Liias: Equality of Estonian- and English-language information on the Student Union's websites. The heading says exactly what it means. Based on our development plan, from the perspective of involving international students in student life, it is essentially incorrect if the Student Union's websites contain more information in Estonian than on the English-language pages. As an example, I can bring up our own case: on the Estonian-language Student Union page it is explained clearly what we do and who we are, including names. In English, this information cannot be found, or only partially. It is not only the lack of parity between Estonian and English content, but also the fact that certain information is missing on managed pages, for example EÜL members, senate members, or faculty council members. This information is extensive and constantly changing, but it would be entirely logical for it to be kept up to date. This also includes annual awards, lecturers, start-up awardees, Ylipall, and so on.

Emili Järv: Even on the English-language page the contact details were incorrect – not that information was missing, but the names were wrong.

Kadri Jürissaar: The third topic is the Student Union SharePoint – attention has been repeatedly drawn to it, but no major changes have been made. The logic of the SharePoint is not clearly understandable even to people who have been in the Student Union for two or three years; you still search, think, and go through five folders to find a topic. One could say that the logic is lacking. We want to draw attention to this and suggest that something should be done about it, for example together with the audit committee this spring.

Kristin Liias: Including distinguishing between valid and invalid documents – which is which.

Emili Järv: For example, there are CVs in SharePoint that should not be there, such as CVs that are over 10 years old. My committee made a note about this two years ago, asking why they should be deleted, but to this day they have not been removed, which is a direct violation of data protection requirements. We should start by deleting those CVs and putting the folders in order.

Mark Toomsalu: I wanted to ask, for example with Sirely (who is the internal and external relations coordinator) we also have a Google Drive, specifically so that matters related to organisations are reflected there. My question is, since there is indeed a lot that needs updating, some files are those that we can transfer and have transferred, and some files are constantly live, so that organisations can edit them. I am wondering at what point they should be transferred, because it is not possible to monitor this constantly.

Emili Järv: I understand that you simply need to agree on a point in time when things are uploaded to SharePoint. For example, on the last day of each month, upload the latest version.

Kadri Jürissaar: It depends on how access rights are set up in your drive. What I have done is to put a document in SharePoint with a link. You describe it and everyone can access it via the link.

Kristin Liias: Regarding SharePoint, document editing rights in the Student Council folder.

Emili Järv: An observation that sometimes the files uploaded for you are not in the most appropriate format for that purpose. We see that the best format is with commenting rights, not with joint editing rights. I have also seen cases where commenting is not possible, in which case it is pointless.

Mark Toomsalu: Karoliine also had her hand up earlier.

Karoliine Orav: Actually, Kadri already covered it, I was also going to suggest using links there.

Emili Järv: What other questions do you have?

Hanna Savolainen: Regarding the budget, I also see that the audit committee has made a proposal about withholding a staff member's stipend.

Emili Järv: Withholding has always been discussed as a possibility, and in that sense, it is also a very reasonable option. As I said before, it is relatively difficult to objectively assess how much work someone has proportionally done, but we have also had situations where someone does absolutely nothing, and in that case, it is quite easy to assess. Withholding has always been talked about as a

possibility, but for some reason I have never seen it applied. One reason why I think it is not applied is because there are no rules laid down anywhere about it. I do not think you have seen this document, but the Student Union has something called the Rules of Procedure, which explain in more detail how members organise their work. Our proposal is that this document should describe how the reduction process works: who makes the proposal, who approves it, what criteria must be met, and so on. Because if we end up in such a situation, it is too late to start inventing rules then.

Hanna Savolainen: In reality, considering the previous discussion, I think that offering such a possibility motivates people in the opposite direction, to do the work. If it is regulated, it is much easier to control. In exceptional cases it is seen that if there is a need to reward, then one can reward, but not increase the stipend.

Emili Järv: Yes, it should indeed be an exceptional measure. If a person has essentially done nothing, then it can be used.

Kadri Jürissaar: In other words, so that it would not become the norm.

Emili Järv: That is not the goal, but if there is a need, then there is a possibility. It is not fair to anyone if we make up rules in our heads and apply them against someone.

Maksim Dolinin: I have a general question: when you prepared the report, did you look at reports from previous years?

Emili Järv: Yes.

Maksim Dolinin: Have you observed a trend where something has become worse or something has improved?

Emili Järv: We have rather seen that there are many things that do not change.

Kadri Jürissaar: Some things have improved, but there are also many things that remain the same from report to report.

Emili Järv: For example, those same three points. Hand on heart, I can say that two years ago I wrote exactly the same things, nothing has changed. There is no need to be too depressed though, some things do get better.

Kadri Jürissaar: The most important things work, and then there are support and additional activities...

Kristin Liias: Previously there was also a problem with archiving, that we...

Emili Järv: Because it has not yet taken place. Some things are better. These are not the most critical Student Union problems and therefore they have also not changed. Let us move on to the third slide. There are things that have not changed year after year, and then we would like to talk about things that have changed year after year. This is the Audit Committee. If we go back five years, the tasks expected from the Audit Committee were completely different from what they are now. I will give you an example: the committee also had to write a report back then, it simply wrote that report, and then over five years it was realised that one member of the Audit Committee could occasionally attend Student Union meetings to even know what was going on. When I joined, I was in the Audit Committee

the season before last. We consciously took on the question of what we could additionally offer, that improvement and development function, not only control, so that the Audit Committee would genuinely add substantive value. If we look at the current autumn semester, we have provided quite a lot of that substantive value. None of the things shown on the screen are stipulated in the Rules of Procedure as tasks of the Audit Committee. But this is where we see that we can create value. We are people, we have a broader view, we have the resources to think together and act together. The point of this discussion is that when we get to amending the Rules of Procedure, we should actually redefine the role of the Audit Committee. What is the purpose of the Audit Committee at all, because at the moment we are doing all this out of goodwill and because we enjoy it. But if we look at all other roles in the Student Union, their tasks are defined somewhere.

Kadri Jürissaar: In addition to this, we have the time and the opportunity, and to some extent the obligation, to see the bigger picture. How can you write a report if you know nothing about the second, third, fourth, and so on — then it is very difficult to give an assessment and carry out control. But if we already have this overview anyway, then we could also continue to take the Audit Committee as a whole more towards that role — the role of creating value. Not just writing one report in autumn and one in spring and that is it, but how the Audit Committee can contribute and give back through seeing the bigger picture.

Emili Järv: These three things have not been changed in the last two years. If we have this resource, then we can contribute to putting these things in order. Perhaps we can move towards conceptualising the role in that direction.

Kadri Jürissaar: Especially those things that are not clearly on the desk of a specific position, such as SharePoint.

Emili Järv: These are our thoughts — do you have any thoughts?

Hanna Savolainen: You have done a very good job! Very good cooperation with the Audit Committee.

Emili Järv: It is a pleasure to hear that, because in the end we do this for you. We work for your benefit.

Mark Toomsalu: From the Student Union's side as well, you have added a great deal to the work of the board.

Emili Järv: I ask that you approve our report.

Mark Toomsalu: If anyone is against approving the report, please raise your hand. If not, then it is adopted.

Agreed unanimously.

IT WAS DECIDED:

8.1 Approval of the Audit Committee Report for Autumn 2025

8.2 The decision takes effect upon adoption.

VOTING RESULT: 13 votes in favor.

9. First reading of the Student Body Action Plan for 2026

Mark Toomsalu: I can introduce this topic myself.

Maksim Dolinin: I have a procedural question – if this is the first reading, will there also be a second reading and then approval? Because at the moment this is an incomplete document, we cannot really consider this a first reading.

Mark Toomsalu: We fully agree, this is indeed a very incomplete document. We can additionally agree on the process... Karoliine, may I say that in January there will be a very solid document, and that approval would then take place in February?

Karoliine Orav: What does the Audit Committee think?

Mark Toomsalu: Because right now it is indeed very incomplete; the idea was precisely to show how the development plan aligns with the action plan. It was put together quickly to outline what the main themes could be. I will also show it shortly.

Maksim Dolinin: This cannot be considered a first reading.

Mark Toomsalu: If anyone also had questions, this came up in the Student Life Committee as well – what do the red, green and yellow markings mean? Green means that the given action point has been reviewed and should be included in the next action plan; the wording has also been reviewed and is more or less settled. Yellow means that the point could be included, but the wording is incomplete and still needs feedback. Red marks those points under the development plan where the outcome and actions have not yet been coordinated or perhaps not written down at all. That is essentially the legend for the three colours.

Karoliine Orav: We ask you to treat this as the first reading, because if we only do the first reading in January, then activities are already underway and the action plan is not approved. This way, we can do the second reading and approval already in January.

Mark Toomsalu: Before we come to the second reading and approval at the next meeting, we would like you to have done your own preparatory work – that everyone has read the document and even added comments. It will certainly be shared in good time; we will try to make it available as early as possible. That way, we can already correct things before the meeting if needed and reserve more time during the meeting itself. This is an important document that requires reporting.

Maksim Dolinin: Are you confident that you will be able to present it to us on time?

Karoliine Orav: By 31 December.

Maksim Dolinin: But aren't we on holiday then?

Emili Järv: There are no meetings then.

Mark Toomsalu: You do not have to read it on 31 December.

Hanna Savolainen: I have a question regarding the retreat – it is marked in red, which means it needs review.

Mark Toomsalu: Yes, because there is no action or outcome defined there yet.

Hanna Savolainen: What does “80% of the composition” mean? Eighty percent of which composition? When the spring retreat took place, the old composition was invited – is this meant to be the new composition?

Leana Jete Korb: Last spring I calculated it based on the target that 80% of those who should be invited would attend, and former Representative Council members were treated as an addition. They were considered outside both the Student Union and the Representative Council calculation.

Hanna Savolainen: Did you achieve that?

Leana Jete Korb: I do not remember off the top of my head.

Mark Toomsalu: That would mean that roughly 12 members should be present. It is also perfectly fine to comment on whether the percentage should be higher or lower – this can still be changed.

Hanna Savolainen: That is very good, 12 people is very reasonable.

Mark Toomsalu: I would also add that it came up in the Student Life Committee that a whistleblowing channel should be added, and that social guarantees were also missing – fighting for those. It is not everyday work, but time-dependent, and we need to fight for funding as well.

Maksim Dolinin: Not only for funding, but also for rights.

Mark Toomsalu: New projects have been added as preliminary ideas. It is a complex topic that we want to outline in the development plan – thinking about events, thinking about student councils. At the moment this is still very much in a development phase. Hopefully by 31 December there will be more concrete ideas. Since this is indeed a very early-stage document, I ask you to let us know if you felt something was missing or should be added, or if you have questions.

Hanna Savolainen: I simply think that, in connection with the audit report, you could place the two side by side – the issues highlighted there and whether they are also marked as actions in the action plan. Otherwise they tend to be forgotten. I already see that some points are connected, but it is always good to explicitly include them in the action plan.

Mark Toomsalu: Those two points are also very closely linked to governance. I think that the audit report is certainly a foundation – very good and very clear. Thank you. Are there any further comments or questions? The first reading is concluded.

10. First reading of the Election Rules

Emili Järv: I will give an introduction. We have discussed this here before; the concern was that we had an unfortunate election committee that did not really have much purpose and that we wanted to replace. This work turned out to be much more thorough than we could have expected at the beginning, so a big thank you from me to everyone with whom we completed this very quickly. When we initially talked about the election committee merely as a unit that carried out technical tasks, we came to realise during our discussions that there was probably another underlying idea as well: the separation of powers. It should not happen that, for example, if we had written that all activities are carried out by the Board, the Board elects you and you elect the Board — democracy probably should not work that way. Therefore, we did not write it like that. We created a separation of powers so that the elections are organised by the Representative Council Coordinator as an individual, operational responsibility lies with the Board Member for the Academic Affairs area, and everything is overseen by the Audit Committee, which had previously been completely excluded from the process. Previously, the election committee effectively audited its own activities. We did not prepare an explanatory memorandum; I hope you will manage without it. Substantively, we did not change very much. We mainly changed things that seemed extremely illogical, adjusted timelines, and divided responsibilities

among different parties: most responsibilities were assigned to the Representative Council Coordinator, some to a Board member, and some to the Audit Committee. We described all of these roles and responsibilities. At the beginning of the document, the responsibilities are listed, and throughout the document they are consistently applied. We tried to make the document somewhat more readable. Another thing we changed concerns the issue of how rankings are calculated.

Maksim Dolinin: And which rankings.

Emili Järv: Yes, and which rankings. We ourselves did not realise this at first, but there were actually two different formulas for compiling a ranking. This does not concern the situation where there is a general ranking based on different numbers of votes. Rather, we found that there were different formulas for calculating the overall ranking and the faculty-specific ranking, which to us is complete nonsense. Now they are calculated in the same way, because otherwise there is no point. We also clarified what happens if two candidates receive the same number of votes.

Leana Jete Korb: Previously, it was different both at the faculty level and for the overall ranking. In general, the final step was drawing lots, but the intermediate steps were unclear.

Emili Järv: Now we draw lots earlier. We no longer compare candidates based on who submitted their application earlier. If there is a deadline, no one can be blamed for submitting on time even if someone else submitted earlier. Quite simply, if there is an equal number of votes, lots are drawn.

Leana Jete Korb: There is one distinction. For example, if a Natural Sciences candidate received 50 votes and an Engineering candidate also received 50 votes, then in the overall ranking the Natural Sciences candidate would be placed higher according to the formula, because they received relatively more votes within their faculty. We did not invent this formula ourselves; it already existed.

Emili Järv: My example was that if there are two Engineering candidates who received the same number of votes, we draw lots rather than looking at who submitted their application first. We also clarified the part concerning situations where deficiencies are found in an application, specifying how much time is given to remedy those deficiencies. This had not been defined before.

Leana Jete Korb: For example, in previous elections there was a situation where a few candidatures had defective documents, and because of that the candidacy period had to be extended. Now we have written in a possibility that if either the Representative Council Coordinator or the Audit Committee finds deficiencies in a candidacy application, they can notify the candidate and the candidate then has a set number of working days to correct the deficiencies. One thing we removed entirely was a provision that previously existed in the rules stating that the proportion of international students in the Representative Council must not exceed the proportion of international students at TalTech. We removed this for two reasons. TalTech itself does not have a precise definition of who counts as an international student, and there is no clear statistical data. Erasmus students cannot stand as candidates. Only full-time degree-seeking students may stand for election to the Representative Council.

Emili Järv: The fact that Erasmus students cannot stand has always been included; we merely changed the wording to make it clearer.

Leana Jete Korb: We also found that the clause concerning international students is restrictive to democracy. If we limit how many people with that background may sit on the Representative Council, while at the same time saying that we have democratic elections, then we felt that this is contradictory. It is better to remove it altogether than to try to reword it. If one day the TalTech student body decides that it wants 15 international students in the Representative Council, then who are we to forbid that?

Markus Käpp: Is drawing lots also regulated? How exactly does that work, and who has to be present?

Emili Järv: I think it was not specified who must be present. But we can add that, for example, the lot is drawn by the Representative Council Coordinator, but the Audit Committee must be present. A multiple-eyes principle. We could also state that at least two thirds of the persons conducting the elections must be present. Mark, perhaps you could already add a comment on that. If someone scrolls all the way to the end, where the appendix on paper ballots is, then I will honestly say that this is a dreadful situation that I hope never happens. But we tried to design it in such a way that if it ever does happen, it can at least be carried out physically and democratically. The previous version could not be described that way at all; it was extremely odd.

Maksim Dolinin: Under the old regulation, it was not possible to carry this out in the colleges.

Emili Järv: Exactly. With paper ballots, it was not possible to vote in the colleges. There was also, for example, a provision that ballot boxes had to be transported by an armored vehicle. We changed it so that elections can be carried out in the colleges and in a more or less logical way. But it is still extremely difficult to carry out the process so that everything is correct, so we hope that ElectionBuddy works.

Hanna Savolainen: A question regarding clause 9.1, election campaigning. Promising a material benefit — for example, if I hand out pens, is that something else?

Emili Järv: A pen is kind of borderline. But what is mainly meant here is something like “vote for me and I’ll give you five euros.”

Leana Jete Korb: I would say that this can also be linked to good practice in parliamentary elections — what is allowed there is allowed here, and vice versa. We did not find it necessary to define the boundaries very precisely. Whether making stickers is allowed but giving away a book is not — that felt somewhat absurd.

Emili Järv: Students also do not have money.

Maksim Dolinin: There is one loophole: technically, if you start handing things out a week before the period starts, then it is not campaigning and does not violate the rules.

Leana Jete Korb: Whether that complies with good practice is a separate question.

Emili Järv: Agreed — it would not comply with good practice and would result in a warning. A second violation would result in removal from the list of candidates. We would not encourage you to engage in such behaviour.

Ander Mägi: I found a small error — in clause 1.2, the time format, the colons should be removed.

Leana Jete Korb: We must admit that the old regulation contained an enormous number of spelling errors. We corrected a great many of them and updated the formatting to a more modern standard.

Emili Järv: The Rector has the obligation to organise extraordinary elections of the Representative Council if the Student Union cannot organise the elections or if the quorum decides to dissolve. This was already stipulated before — that these elections are conducted by the Rector. Previously, the Rector also had an election committee. We removed the term “election committee”, but we left the Rector the possibility to decide who will conduct the elections on their behalf.

Mark Toomsalu: Are there any questions or thoughts?

Leana Jete Korb: If the only comment concerns the drawing of lots, perhaps we could write that in immediately and, if you are ready, proceed to adoption?

Emili Järv: If you do not see anything else to change — because neither do we — then if it is not adopted, no direct conflict arises. Life would simply be nicer if we had a clear and valid election regulation.

Mark Toomsalu: Is everyone in agreement that we add the clause on drawing lots and proceed to adoption? Is anyone against?

Hanna Savolainen: Not against, but we should quickly do a joint check for typographical errors.

Emili Järv: A linguistic review will be done anyway, and formatting can still be adjusted.

Maksim Dolinin: Isn't it specified in clause 10 who those persons are?

Emili Järv: No, it is not. Attention please — it seems that the second sentence of clause 10.7 duplicates clause 10.8, so we would remove it?

Ander Mägi: Yes, you are right.

Emili Järv: Does anyone object? Raise your hand.

Maksim Dolinin: Doesn't that concern different rankings?

Emili Järv: Ah yes, sorry. Those were not different.

Leana Jete Korb: Then we would end up with two similar sentences.

Emili Järv: We should not. The issue is not what to write, but where to write it so that it is in a logical place.

Ander Mägi: Then add it as a reference — "as stipulated in clause ...".

Leana Jete Korb: That would then require creating a new clause 10.9.

Maksim Dolinin: If the Rector conducts the elections and a similar situation arises?

Leana Jete Korb: Then the same rules apply.

Markus Käpp: The election committee no longer exists, so who then conducts the elections?

Leana Jete Korb: We defined that clearly in clause 4. It is never just one person; at least two people are involved.

Emili Järv: And clause 4.1 applies to regular elections.

Maksim Dolinin: Did you also mention that in the case of paper-ballot elections, members of the Student Union are not considered trustworthy persons?

Emili Järv: We actually wrote the opposite — that they are trustworthy. Very trustworthy.

Leana Jete Korb: Previously it was written that during paper-ballot elections there must be at least two members of the election committee present at the ballot box. We specified that now there must be at least one person conducting the elections and one member of the Student Union present.

Emili Järv: We widened the circle. In each college we can appoint persons who are authorised to guard the ballot box. The paper-based process must be more or less logical, but we hope it will never happen because it is so complicated.

Leana Jete Korb: We also added "other persons confirmed by the Rector's directive".

Kristin Liias: Essentially, all the question-mark areas were delegated to the Rector.

Leana Jete Korb: Previously, the elections were signed off by the Board, but we found that this did not comply with the separation of powers, so now it is done by the Rector. In some cases, regular elections are also signed by the Chair of the Audit Committee and the Representative Council Coordinator. The Rector confirms them.

Emili Järv: That is for the signing before the Rector confirms the results, not the final results themselves. The Rector still confirms the final results. Another thing we clarified better was when the results must be sent to the Rector for confirmation — there are no longer any problems there. We made a substantive change in clause 10.9. Could you bring that up once more, so we can see whether everyone agrees?

Mark Toomsalu: Is anyone against? It seems not. First of all, a big round of applause for this extensive work. Let us proceed to adoption. Representative Council members, if you agree to adopt the election regulation at today's meeting, please raise your hands.

Agreed unanimously.

IT WAS DECIDED:

10.1 Approval of the new Election Rules

10.2 The decision takes effect upon adoption.

VOTING RESULT: 13 votes in favor.

Leana Jete Korb: Could we also hold a vote confirming that the Representative Council agrees that the 2026 elections will be conducted in accordance with the election regulations just adopted?

Maksim Dolinin: Should we add something similar to what is done in the Senate, an additional clause stating that it is applied this year?

Emili Järv: The implementing provisions state when it enters into force, and we specify that it enters into force immediately.

Leana Jete Korb: Is the Representative Council in agreement that the elections we are about to organise will be organised in accordance with the newly—

Emili Järv: —adopted election regulations?

Agreed unanimously.

Mark Toomsalu
Chair of the meeting

Kirke Piiskoppel
Secretary of the Meeting