

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

Tallinn

January 13th, 2026 no 1

Start of the meeting at 18:01, end of the meeting 19:43

Chaired by Anna Suzdalev

Minutes secretary: Kirke Piiskoppel

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

Invited: Emili Järv (MS Teams), Kristin Liias, Kadri Jürissaar, Kristiina Vene, Leana Jete Korb, Karoline Orav

Absent: Arqum Shahid, Karoliina Perv

On the agenda:

I Approvals

1. Approval of the Student Union budget for 2026;
2. Approval of the Statute of the Supervisor of the Year Final Thesis Award;
3. Reading and approval of the Student Body Action Plan for 2026;
4. Approval of the dates of the regular elections of the Student Body Board;

II Reports

5. Report on the Student Union Action Plan for the 3rd period of 2025;

III Discussions

6. Introductory minutes by the Rectorate.

Tiit Land, Rector, and Ingrid Pappel, Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs, introduce the Rectorate to the Student Parliament and speak about their work as well as current topics at the university.

Anna Suzdalev: Before we move on to approving the agenda, is anyone opposed to me chairing the meeting?

Maksim Dolinin: We have to vote by a show of hands.

Anna Suzdalev: Is everyone in favor of me chairing today's meeting? Please raise your hands.

Everyone votes in favor of Board Member Anna Suzdalev chairing the Student Parliament meeting.

Anna Suzdalev: Is anyone opposed to approving the agenda in this form?

Maksim Dolinin: I am opposed to approving the Student Body action plan, and the discussion has already taken place, meaning it cannot be the final item. We cannot approve it.

Anna Suzdalev: It can still be put forward for approval, but you do not have to approve it.

Maksim Dolinin: No.

Anna Suzdalev: It can be put forward for approval; that does not mean you have to approve it.

Maksim Dolinin: It cannot. If we make more than two amendments, then we cannot approve it.

Anna Suzdalev: And that is fine, but it can still remain as an agenda item.

Maksim Dolinin: Officially, it was supposed to be reading and approval. It cannot be just approval. It has to be the second reading and approval.

Anna Suzdalev: Alright. And you want to remove the last item?

Maksim Dolinin: Yes.

Anna Suzdalev: In that case, are there any votes against it in this form?

Changed agenda:

I Approvals

- 1. Approval of the Student Union budget for 2026;**
- 2. Approval of the Statute of the Supervisor of the Year Final Thesis Award;**
- 3. II reading and approval of the Student Body Action Plan for 2026;**
- 4. Approval of the dates of the regular elections of the Student Body Board;**

II Reports

- 5. Report on the Student Union Action Plan for the 3rd period of 2025.**

The changed agenda was approved unanimously.

1. Approval of the Student Union budget for 2026

Kristiina Vene: Hello from me as well. In fact, you have already seen this even three times. I have introduced it to you very thoroughly. For the most part it is unchanged, but I will go over the changes that occurred between the previous and the current meeting. First of all, last time we had a discussion, mainly in cooperation with the Audit Committee, about whether increasing scholarships and board remuneration is appropriate or not. We have now made a decision together with the Board that scholarships and board remuneration will not increase. The reason is very simple. As a manager, I have simply been in the role for too short a time. I would like to be in the position longer to see how remuneration and workload correspond. With more experience, better decisions can be made, because increasing remuneration is considerably easier than reducing it. Last time, additional

payments or bonuses were also discussed here; this goes in the same category as reducing remuneration. That would require regulations to avoid a situation where one person receives an increase, and another does not. This creates discrepancies and conflicts within the organization. In short, it does not support organizational culture in any way. Since scholarships and board remuneration did not increase, but we received full funding from the university that I initially requested from them, we were left with 8,150 euros, which has been added to the general expenses line of the 01CV budget. Why is it actually there? When I look at the funding from the university databases and my own budget, they physically have to match. It is difficult to distinguish between the two. If my budget is smaller while the university budget is in the full amount that I submitted to them. Why is it on the reserve line? I find that the budget was actually compiled well. By now I have also seen that the autumn budgets were somewhat optimistic, for example the lecturers' gala – it did not cost nearly as much money as we received from the rector's reserve. Perhaps around 5,000 euros remained unused, if I remember correctly. In short, the reserve line was created so as not to create a situation where we add money to some line where it is not actually needed. Because, as Tiit also mentioned, even though this year we received full funding, there were quite a few units at the university that did not receive full funding, and we must be grateful. The reserve line does not mean that we have to use it up. If it remains unused... and if, for example, next year we do not receive full funding, then I can go and talk to the finance manager that we have a balance, and whether we can use it. So it is a kind of small backup for the next year. Since this is taxpayers' money, I do not want to create a situation where we allocate a lot of money to certain budget lines just because we want to. That is not right, and I do not want the Student Union to gain such a reputation. Thirdly, there is the topic of student formula teams. I also wrote a fairly long explanation in the explanatory memorandum, but to clarify, five larger student organizations: Formula Student, Student Satellite, Solaride, and two others – for their funding, the university wants to create a central fund/model, but this is still under development. I initially included this funding (25,000 euros) in our budget; the actual support is even larger, but the current situation is that it will be moved away from our source. When? I do not know. For now, I left it in and did not start changing the planned budget. But discussions have been held with the rector's chief of staff and the finance manager, and it will be moved out from under us. According to current information, starting next year we will no longer deal with the funding of such large organizations. All other expenses are the same. Nothing else has changed. Are there any questions?

Hanna Savolainen: Is the board remuneration considered salary?

Kristiina Vene: Board members work under contracts for services, but it is still considered salary, since it is remuneration taxed with labor taxes.

Anna Suzdalev: If there are no questions, is anyone opposed to approving the Student Body budget for 2026?

IT WAS DECIDED:

- 1.1 Approval of the Student Union budget for 2026
- 1.2 The decision takes effect upon adoption.

VOTING RESULT: 13 votes in favor.

2. Approval of the Statute of the Supervisor of the Year Final Thesis Award

Karoliine Orav: I highlighted in yellow all the points that changed substantively, so they would be easy to see. In the Supervisor of the Year competition, a total of three thesis supervisors are recognised; initially this number was not specified. In fact, the university regulations state that three are recognised, and I added this to our statute as well. Nomination of candidates (point five) – I added evaluation criteria, because this survey will work differently: when a student nominates a candidate, they themselves evaluate on a 0–2 point scale whether the criteria are met: partially or fully. This reduces our workload somewhat. Under point six, we removed the pre-committee, because they did not really have much work; they were simply an intermediary. It felt like a bit of a waste of time. Since the student can submit and evaluate themselves, basically only the competition manager checks that everything is correct and that the student has evaluated properly, and the main committee makes the selection. Well, you did the work of the pre-committee yourselves, so you know roughly what it was like. Lastly, we changed the committee meetings and the decision must be made six weeks before the announcement of the laureates. Previously December was written there. This year we did not manage to do it in December, and proactively, looking to the future, I set it so that it would be done six weeks in advance. This is roughly the time when the academic affairs department also wants to know the names, so it is fine to decide this in January as well. Finally, instead of half of the points, we set it so that based on the evaluation system, a non-negative score must be obtained in at least half of the criteria. I also slightly changed the evaluation cluster and made a separate example. Are there any questions?

Maksim Dolinin: The first question is about point 5.4. The numbering there is incorrect. It should be 5.3.1 and the following ones accordingly. About the six weeks – is it possible to set the date before TURKOM sets the event date when the diplomas are awarded? Because TURKOM does not set the date six weeks in advance.

Karoliine Orav: At the moment, the agreement with the academic affairs department is that we inform them on 15 January. I assumed that this is roughly the timeframe of how much in advance it should be communicated.

Kadri Jürissaar: I will clarify the six weeks. TURKOM does not officially announce it, but they have known the date for a long time, and if someone asks, it is disclosed. And it is awarded at the anniversary ceremony anyway, so it is around 24 February, one day earlier or later. I think it does not make a big difference.

Maksim Dolinin: The wording of “committee” and “main committee” – would it be possible to align this to use a single term? At times it is “committee” and at times “main committee”. If there is no pre-committee, then simply “committee” is sufficient; there is no need for “main committee”.

Markus Käpp: Point 7.7 – does a situation arise where no one can be awarded, because no one has received more than half of the points?

Karoliine Orav: To be among the top five, a certain level must be reached. Most likely those who have negative scores... those who do not reach the required point score will not be submitted at all.

Sander Roosimäe: I will also ask about point 7.7. Technically, there is no negative score. Is 0 considered a negative score?

Karoliine Orav: Yes.

Kadri Jürissaar: For example, greater than zero then? That is probably more accurate.

Emili Järv: Karoliine, first I would like to apologise – during the meeting we realised that I should have sent our feedback, but I did not do so. I will present it here on the spot. This is related to the removal of the pre-committee. I understand that it is removed, so the technical committee's work is carried out by the competition manager alone. We see two concerns here. If the competition manager does not wish to behave very properly, then they have full power to do so and there is no control over it. If you want to do it this way, then we propose to include a control function; otherwise all nominees are in the hands of one person, and they essentially compile the top five themselves. The second concern: we know that it is possible that according to the scoring, all students give maximum points and there are more than five of them – what happens then? Are they all forwarded to the main committee? The competition manager cannot assess this themselves. Here it again seems that the matter becomes very subjective, based on the view of one person. There must be some mechanism for how the statute proceeds in such a situation, when there are more than five candidates with maximum points.

Karoliine Orav: If everyone gets the same number of points, then the top five is larger than just five. That is, all of them are forwarded to the main committee for review and consideration. The main committee makes the decision based on the justification and the points.

Emili Järv: We must not forget that if we allow nominators to assess candidates themselves, then their assessment is inherently highly subjective. If they nominate their supervisors for an award, they naturally believe that their supervisor deserves the award. In our view, the points they give are not decisive; yes, they are taken into account as additional input, but the main focus should be on the comments, because the points given are not objective.

Karoliine Orav: Returning to the first point, should we write the revision control function into the statute? What is the revision committee's proposal?

Emili Järv: Yes, for example, to state that the multiple-eyes principle applies.

Karoliine Orav: Where?

Kadri Jürissaar: 12. Implementation and supervision.

Maksim Dolinin: The same point that is also in the statute of decorations, that the revision committee exercises supervision over the competition process.

Kristin Liias: Over the implementation? Section 12.2 already exists, doesn't it?

Maksim Dolinin: Even though the recognition event project manager is part of the committee. Because they chair the committee.

Emili Järv: At that stage, they are not part of the committee. If there is no longer a pre-committee, then they are simply one person compiling the Excel file.

Maksim Dolinin: If we look at it that way, then the person who nominates is also part of the committee, because they also perform certain actions.

Emili Järv: If they are not part of the committee, then at that moment the competition manager is also not part of the committee.

Kadri Jürissaar: The competition manager is sort of in two roles: first as a single person carrying out the technical check, and then as part of the evaluation committee.

Maksim Dolinin: I have a question about the first and second level. Is there any structure defined, whether there are two per first level or one per level, or any number in total?

Karoliine Orav: Any number.

Anna Suzdalev: If we add the revision committee to the competition, is that acceptable for you?

Emili Järv: Yes, I think that resolves the first issue. We need to remember not to create a situation ourselves where one person handles the process single-handedly, and to keep the control aspect in mind. In my opinion, the second issue is bigger. What happens if there are more people with maximum points? How does the statute proceed then – are they all sent to the main committee, which would create a heavy workload for the main committee?

Maksim Dolinin: This has also been resolved in some statute. In the Dedicated Lecturer statute, that range is lowered to the next level, something like that.

Karoliine Orav: I remember that as well.

Emili Järv: What range?

Kadri Jürissaar: How to formally word it so that the top five becomes, for example, a top eight? That sentence already existed somewhere else.

Emili Järv: Does it then go on indefinitely? Or a top 20, and then the main committee has to review an enormous number of applications.

Karoliine Orav: Most likely such a situation will not occur.

Maksim Dolinin: In the statute I referred to, the range is lowered to the next score point, meaning that if the next one is 4.8, then that is also taken into account.

Emili Järv: Yes, but here it is the opposite situation, if we want to expand the top five. But yes, the idea is the same, just slightly the other way around. Here it is not defined what the number is, only that it is the top five. It is also an adequate answer if you say that we are seeing a wolf where there is no wolf, that it is not actually a real problem. It is possible, but an alternative situation is also possible, and if that happens, then the statute is stuck with itself.

Hanna Savolainen: I agree that we have to take into account that a student wants to give their supervisor the best possible score. When we did the work of the pre-committee, we tried to look at things critically, but it is inherently very subjectively assessed. I cannot offer a solution, but I agree that a workload issue may arise; then the comments are the most important part, and there are quite a lot of them.

Karoliine Orav: What if we add a clause stating that “if several candidates with the same score appear in the ranking, the range is extended up to the result of the next score point”?

Kadri Jürissaar: Yes, but the wording has to be checked so that it aligns properly.

Kristiina Vene: There has been talk here about the committee’s workload, but isn’t it somewhat normal that during the evaluation period the workload is higher? That comes with it. Is it difficult? Yes. Does it have to be extremely easy? No. Maybe this is being overthought a bit? This is for a greater purpose. You do have to read and evaluate these things— is it terribly bad? Is it a problem that needs solving?

Anna Suzdalev: This is a good point where, when electing a new Student Parliament, we can better manage expectations and say that one part of the role is committee work, so people can anticipate these aspects better.

Kristiina Vene: This is part of the job. It comes with it. Of course, if there were a hundred applications and each one four pages long, that would be a different matter. That would not be reasonable. It is important to explain to people from the beginning what to expect. Every role has faster and slower periods, just like any other job.

Hanna Savolainen: The question is that previously there was a pre-committee, and we did the evaluation; now there are five members in the main committee, and the pre-committee has been removed, which means the workload of the main committee has increased accordingly.

Karoliine Orav: That work is transferred to the competition manager. If the student has already done the evaluation, then it is much easier to review. The main committee selects the person from there; they no longer verify things.

Kadri Jürissaar: Actually, the same sentence was already present in 7.3. However, the revision committee will allow us to wrap this up, so that we resolve it with a “yes” or “no” answer. At the moment, it is up to five applications from each faculty, a maximum of 25 applications to the main committee.

Maksim Dolinin: No, all together. It is not per faculty.

Kadri Jürissaar: First level up to five applications and second level up to five applications.

Maksim Dolinin: No, absolutely all together.

Anna Suzdalev: For the first and second level combined.

Kadri Jürissaar: Calculate for me how many applications the main committee can receive at most with a top five.

Anna Suzdalev: 50.

Kadri Jürissaar: Quite a sizeable stack.

Anna Suzdalev: But that is only if it all comes together.

Karoliine Orav: There are overlaps as well.

Kadri Jürissaar: Do you yourselves think the main committee will survive?

Anna Suzdalev: Is anyone opposed to approving the Supervisor of the Year Final Thesis statute in this form? Please raise your hand if you are opposed.

IT WAS DECIDED:

1.3 Approval of the Statute of the Supervisor of the Year Final Thesis Award

1.4 The decision takes effect upon adoption.

VOTING RESULT: 13 votes in favor.

3. II reading and approval of the Student Body Action Plan for 2026

Anna Suzdalev: I received input from the Student Life Committee that you were promised this document would be sent to you by 31 December. You did not receive it. You did not have the time to review it as promised. Do I understand correctly that from your perspective, it is not going to approval today? How many approvals are needed? More than half? At the moment there are two. So that I can understand what your current sense of this is. At the moment, three people are against it.

Maris Kortel: Now, during the exam period, in addition to studying, I would have to start working through it, and that bothers me.

Kristiina Vene: Please freely raise your hands if you feel that it should not be adopted today.

Anna Suzdalev: My proposal today would be that if we do not approve it today and have not had time to fully review it, then we leave it for next time together with your comments. We submit it in due time, 10 calendar days in advance, you have 5 calendar days to review it. We as the Board have 5 calendar days to review the comments, and in February we would come back with a clean version. If it is not going to approval today anyway, then for the sake of saving time there is no point in starting to go through only Maksim's comments.

Emili Järv: I wanted to add that according to the action plan, the revision committee has to give its assessment of the document, and we could give it today; we only have a few comments. These can already be taken into account when preparing the clean version.

Anna Suzdalev: Okay, but if there are already thoughts now, I know that a couple of bigger question marks came from the Student Life Committee. Do you want to discuss them or leave them as comments and we will resolve them ourselves? For example, the preservation of organizational memory — there was a bigger discussion about that, about how we get those three alumni, what the

incentive is? Maybe the rest of the Board can expand on this a bit. Do you know the background, Kristiina?

Kristiina Vene: Actually, to be honest, I am not one hundred percent up to speed. The name is preservation of organizational memory, this sustainability, so that it would not be the passing on of experience per position, but also the continuation of the organization's vision and mission. So that it would not be that a new board and new staff members come in (permanent staff change less frequently anyway), but that there would be a shared rhythm, like a song festival. Alumni would be the ones who support and speak; as also mentioned here, a mentoring system. Innovations are always welcome and members do have to change, that is how an organization can grow, but certain things could remain as they are, because they work. From what the Chair said, I understood that we have a mentoring system with long-term alumni; for example, a good example is Anna. She knows how things have been done. As Executive Manager, I can also, for example, ask how the previous Executive Manager handled things. So that a new person does not come in, even with good ideas, and start completely from scratch. I know that in student organizations this exists; in some it works, in others it does not. But it definitely needs to be thought through. The direction is something like that. More of a mentoring system, internal sustainability of the organization, so that the idea and reputation of the Student Union would continue better.

Anna Suzdalev: The second point, I can refer to the revision committee. Maksim, can you say that the revision committee supervises the action plan?

Maksim Dolinin: Yes, the Board validates the work of the Audit Committee, but the Audit Committee supervises the Board. Then I have several knots...

Emili Järv: In the Audit Committee's view, this cannot be the Audit Committee, it has to be the Board.

Maksim Dolinin: Does the Board supervise the Audit Committee's work? And the Audit Committee supervises the Board's work?

Emili Järv: No. The Board does not supervise the Audit Committee's work; the Audit Committee does supervise the Board's work. Who supervises the Board's work? You do. And who supervises the Audit Committee's work? You do, dear Student Parliament. Maksim, don't forget yourself.

Maksim Dolinin: My question is that if we designate the Board as the responsible party, then the responsible party should control what the implementer has done.

Emili Järv: Here the implementer has been defined incorrectly. The implementer should also be the Board; this is not the Audit Committee's personal tip line. This is a Student Union project. According to the statutes, the Audit Committee is not an organ of the Student Union, so I think something has gone a bit wrong here; the implementer should also be the Board. Similarly, when we talk about where this will be published, the Audit Committee does not have its own channels or anything like that. This is clearly a Student Union matter. Like any other project, the Board is responsible, but yes, in this case the Audit Committee is more of an implementer than in some other matters, because we process it and will probably also help to develop the system, but once it is functioning, it is essentially the processing of tips. This would be the same as someone sending us something by email. Later we will

present you with a summary, with the aim that if more systematic problems emerge at the university, then the Board and other Student Union members, we can provide input on how to address those problems. The packaging is a bit different, but the content is the same as it has always been. It has never been written down in this form here.

Anna Suzdalev: Otherwise, are there things you would like immediate information about?

Maksim Dolinin: A question about line 63. I do not understand what it is.

Karoliine Orav: For that you have to wait until February.

Anna Suzdalev: What remains unclear?

Maksim Dolinin: Everything. Mostly the last part.

Anna Suzdalev: Initially, this item was intended only for the funding platform, but now we increasingly see a need to involve the IT coordinator in other projects as well. But in the view of the Chair and myself, there is no need for a separate action plan item for every small thing; instead, all IT developments and digital solutions should be combined into one item, where the IT coordinator can write in each reporting period what they have done. All IT developments and digital solutions fall under this. To make it as general as possible, so that as much as possible can be included there.

Maksim Dolinin: Will an additional platform then be created?

Anna Suzdalev: The idea is to work both on the funding platform; there has also been discussion of a student organizations platform. Likewise, a common channel for all students where they could receive information, for example Discord. We have tried to include all digital information channels and platforms under one item. Any more questions? Do you need more input before you can give your own input? It seems not.

Karoliine Orav: If we do not approve this now and approve it in February, does the reporting period remain the same? We will start working according to it...

Anna Suzdalev: If they approve it in February, they can still write for that reporting period. It should not hinder things in the bigger picture.

Maksim Dolinin: A question about line 43. What is a bar crawl and whose project is it? Is it a Student Union project?

Anna Suzdalev: I would like to remove this last item myself. Earlier there was Margi's proposal that the cruise and the campus bar crawl are two separate action plan items. In my view, this is restrictive. It means that the Student Union has to deal with these two things every year. I have already slightly modified this item; the objective is student engagement, and then there are, for example, these events, which is why I used the word "for example." So that in the future they know what fell under this item: all events with at least 300 participating students. Such new initiatives that the Student Union would like to undertake, but which we have not written down anywhere, but which would then force us to write them down as well. Yes, Emili?

Emili Järv: Two questions. The first question is that there are new projects here that also entail financial costs. In our view, it is not apparent that these costs have been taken into account in the budget. That is, when you prepare the clean version of the action plan, then...

Anna Suzdalev: You dropped out. Emili, we cannot hear you. Can the Audit Committee present it further on site? Emili, wait. You dropped out.

Kadri Jürissaar: You started asking about money, whether it is budgeted...

Emili Järv: Ah, I dropped out. I had such a nice speech. When you prepare the clean version, to think about the fact that there are new activities here that involve money, but which we do not see as having been budgeted. We now have some kind of reserve; whether and how that money should be used in connection with these items.

Anna Suzdalev: We will think about it.

Emili Järv: Because for that there also needs to be some kind of plan, if you do not have one.

Anna Suzdalev: To my knowledge, no Student Union funds have been allocated for those two projects, if I am not mistaken.

Kristiina Vene: There is no separate budget line for the cruise; there were some individual expenses, around 100–150 euros. One was Juulius's ticket and some prizes for games. Since the cruise funding is not that wildly large, I found that it was not worth listing it separately. It is also the kind of expense that may or may not occur. I try to be detailed, but I will not go into micro-level detail. This bar crawl... it was difficult to get in contact with the previous board member. I have to say that there were certain points where cooperation with me was lacking. I would not include very large projects that require a lot of money in the budget. A reserve exists, but I would not place it there. From what I have heard, no large sums are allocated under the bar crawl. My hopes are on the new board member, that we can put a realistic plan in place and that it will also be reflected in the budget.

Emili Järv: Thank you! Yes, I completely understand. Actually, we were not referring so much to that line as to some other lines here, for example line 102, where it says "various events have been organised." I understand that it is intentionally vague and that it is not only our project, but does this item even belong in our action plan if it is an EÜL project and we are merely participants? To think a bit about whether these things involve expenses that need to be budgeted separately.

Hanna Savolainen: Since I also went to speak at the University of Tartu, the idea was that, as Tiit Land also mentioned, we do not know how secure higher education funding will be in the coming years. Now the plan is to start engaging more; this is a joint project of several schools, it may also fall under travel expenses if people go to schools to speak. At the moment it is very complicated and it is not known what will come of it, and it is likely a process lasting several years. In my opinion, this item should not be removed.

Emili Järv: I also wanted to point out the alumni topic, line 103. There will be an event, but again, what exactly is it? I understand that there are no concrete plans yet, but to consider that there may be potentially larger expenses involved here. But thank you, the rest we will put in as comments.

Anna Suzdalev: Thank you all! Are there any further questions? Does it seem that overall we are moving towards a point where we can approve it next time? I will make a new agreement with you that the Board will submit the action plan in clean form 10 calendar days before the February meeting. You will then have 5 calendar days to provide your input. We will have 5 calendar days to respond to them, and at the February meeting we will present the clean version, already taking your input into account. Raise your hands, everyone who is against approving this action plan.

Everyone is in favour of not approving it.

4. Approval of the dates of the regular elections of the Student Body Board

Anna Suzdalev: We would like to bring two Board member positions to you in March – the position of Chair of the Board for two years and the position of Board Member for Student Life for two years. Candidates must submit a motivation letter together with planned activities and a CV. The elections will take place on 9 March. Are there any questions?

Karoliine Orav: An important note is that for the elections we will organise an extraordinary meeting, so that it would not take place on the same day as your last meeting, because the last meeting always has many topics and would otherwise become very long.

Anna Suzdalev: Is anyone opposed to approving the dates of the regular Board elections?

IT WAS DECIDED:

- 1.5 Approval of the dates of the regular elections of the Student Body Board
- 1.6 The decision takes effect upon adoption.

VOTING RESULT: 13 votes in favor.

5. Report on the Student Union Action Plan for the 3rd period of 2025

Anna Suzdalev: Did any of the activities raise questions for you where you feel that the Student Union has done too much or too little?

Maksim Dolinin: Two questions – line 67, the activity of the marketing coordinator. There it should at least be mentioned next time how many organisations were contacted, rather than stating that nothing took place. There should be at least some activity reflected there. The second concerns the activity of the internal and external relations coordinator. For the previous period it is written that nothing was done, and then in the next one it likewise says that activities continued in the same way as in the previous period. Nothing was done, continued in the same way (line 79).

Anna Suzdalev: So either more information or an explanation of why nothing was done?

Maksim Dolinin: Yes.

Anna Suzdalev: Okay. Are there any further proposals or criticism?

Kadri Jürissaar: I want to clarify line 35, the IT coordinator line. "Alternatives to UNI-ID SSO login were explored..." What do these alternatives mean? In my opinion, it is not possible to bypass SSO and Azure is already in place.

Anna Suzdalev: As far as I know, the issue is rather with one specific platform: they want to increase our fees, because we are technically an NGO and we use it more than they would like an NGO to use it. They are exploring whether it would make sense for us to continue there or move elsewhere. In terms of the funding platform, this does not change anything. It only changes how we manage things internally.

Kadri Jürissaar: But the login will still remain as prescribed by the university?

Anna Suzdalev: At the moment, I am not aware of any changes.

Hanna Savolainen: The lecturers' gala – in my view, the lecturers' gala took place during this period. In my opinion, there is very little information about it, especially considering that it is a bit strange that we as a committee were not invited there, we as the pre-committee. There could be more information than just stating that the organisation of the gala was smooth.

Karoliine Orav: I agree as well. Not to make excuses for why there is so little text there, but unfortunately with project managers it is sometimes difficult – once the project is over, they disappear. I added something there myself, and I do not know the details that thoroughly.

Kristiina Vene: Supporting the board member, it was also difficult for me to get in touch. If a manager writes from a TalTech email and does not get a response, it really does get frustrating. It was very difficult to get in contact with a specific person. Next time, if someone feels left alone and cannot reach a person, you can also turn to the manager, so that together we can put out something more substantial for the Student Parliament.

Hanna Savolainen: But then can we claim that the organisation was smooth if we cannot reach the project manager? Yes, on site everything was fine, but if the person disappears afterwards, then everything is not fine.

Karoliine Orav: That point is specifically related to the event itself, and in that regard everything was fine.

Anna Suzdalev: But we can take this into account, to write more honestly about the organisation of the project. There is an attempt to write everything very nicely, but it should be input both for us and for you, to reflect what the real situation is. This is something we can then think through together with the Board and the back office, what the best approach is.

Emili Järv: If we talk about lines where there could have been more information – line 79. The same thing has been copy-pasted for the last two reporting periods. If the Student Parliament wanted input, they would not get it from here.

Anna Suzdalev: Thank you, Emili!

Kristin Lias: If the content of the HKT project is changed, what does that mean for the faculty student councils?

Karoliine Orav: At the moment it continues in the same way. But we are working on changing it in the future.

Hanna Savolainen: I really like it when numerical indicators are brought out; in my opinion it is much better for us to read. I understand that it cannot be done for every point. And rather also include it when something went badly – then there is transparency.

Anna Suzdalev: Thank you! And this is also a proposal to the Board and the back office to make it more precise, whether comparisons are made with the previous reporting period or with the previous year's event, to create some kind of statistics. There should be a unified logic.

Kristiina Vene: I completely agree with you, Anna. Since I am responsible for coordinating this, which is at times very complicated. I dare say that this whole process can be much better, from adhering to deadlines to the content itself. This is something I can certainly improve, together with the heads of fields, to draw a line somewhere. In my opinion, in the case of projects, giving feedback and completing reports is part of your project and part of your position. People need to understand that this is important and necessary, that they are not completing it for me as Executive Manager, but for you. From our side, we will definitely try to improve this.

Hanna Savolainen: When I worked with Kristiina last year, it came as a big surprise to her that we hold feedback meetings – how typical is it in the Student Union to hold feedback meetings after projects?

Anna Suzdalev: This has changed over the years and depends on the head of the field, on what value they see in it. If they see value, they have done it; if they do not see value, they have not. There is no unified position. We have tried to implement it so that there would be a meeting before the start of a project and after it.

Hanna Savolainen: Karoliine, can you also comment on this?

Karoliine Orav: I have personally tried to do this. I see that it is necessary and I have tried to do it; now with the lecturers' gala I did not, but with other projects I have, for example HKT. But yes, it very much depends on the head of the field and how much time there is, etc.

Anna Suzdalev: The new action plan could ensure that some kind of feedback survey and summary are carried out. Does anyone else want to comment? If not, are there any additional topics? There are no additional topics; I declare the meeting closed.

Anna Suzdalev
Chair of the meeting

Kirke Piiskoppel
Secretary of the Meeting