

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

Tallinn

March 10th 2026, no 3

Start of the meeting 18.03, end of the meeting 19.35

Chaired by Alexander Rein Robas

Minutes secretary: Kirke Piiskoppel

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

Absent: Arqum Shahid, Trevon Peek.

Invited: Karoliine Orav, Kristin Liias, Emili Järv, Kadri Jürissaar, Anna Suzdalev.

On the agenda:

I Discussions

1. Summary of the Audit Committee survey;
2. Summary of the Board's work;
3. Procedure for Student Parliament absences.

Changed agenda:

I Discussions

1. Summary of the Audit Committee survey;
2. Summary of the Board's work;
3. Procedure for Student Parliament absences;

II Approvals

4. Appointment of a substitute for the Chairman of the Student Body Board.

The changed agenda was approved unanimously.

1. Summary of the Audit Committee survey;

Kristin Liias: A total of 12 responses were received, of which one was not included in the evaluation. We assessed 5 from the academic field and 6 from student life. The overall evaluation is “satisfied” or “rather satisfied”, meaning positive. Work organisation was generally considered understandable and transparent. It was mainly appreciated that meeting times were known in advance. The chairing of meetings was satisfactory. You gained significantly more knowledge about the university.

Problem areas – the volume of documents, their late delivery, and the long duration of meetings. You had many extensive documents.

Alexander Rein Robas: This year was a difficult year.

Kristin Liias: Yes, you had many core documents.

Emili Järv: “Did the content of the work meet expectations?” Most responded “yes” or “rather yes”. Some also responded that it met expectations “partially”. A positive aspect was that you were able to be part of these topics and discussions and felt that the discussions were substantive and that you were able to make real decisions. Some expected that they would be able to represent their school or participate more in practical activities or represent at events. In reality, the work involved more document analysis than you might have expected.

Kristin Liias: The workload remained as expected. Typical observations – preparation of materials was extensive, but at the same time flexible. Some expected more and some less. Opinions varied widely on this. The workload also depended on your own level of personal activity.

Emili Järv: Regarding committee chairs, the overall evaluation was that members were satisfied with them. The chairs were active and well-prepared and took members’ opinions into account. The issue concerned student life meetings, where times were set at the last minute, which caused some problems, but this was the only recurring negative assessment regarding committee work. We will also include, in your defence, that committee meetings should be announced, for example, three weeks in advance.

Kristin Liias: From the substantive perspective, responses were positive, topics were interesting, and the Academic Affairs Committee was particularly praised – (Karoliine) was very passionate about her field. And of course, Anna came in and brought order, which made the workflow more stable. Committee meetings were helpful and supported preparation before general meetings, helping to think things through in advance and understand the expected outcomes.

On the other hand, for some it seemed that committee work was not strongly connected to what you actually do, but rather repeated what you encounter in general meetings. The Academic Affairs Committee pointed out that more specific academic issues were expected, but none were brought forward to you.

Emili Järv: Now regarding the evaluation you gave yourselves. You described your contribution as active: you participated in meetings, asked questions, analysed documents and sometimes initiated new topics. Some described themselves as active or moderately active. No one described their own performance as poor, which is also very positive.

Kristin Liias: Team spirit was generally positive; there were a few deviations, but that was because the composition of the Student Parliament was constantly changing. It was a composition with ups and downs. Some had more time to settle in and get to know each other, while others had less. A positive aspect was that there was a sense of team spirit and that motivation events were appreciated. You also made new acquaintances or friendships. There were also opinions that there could be more motivation events; some members either could not attend or simply did not participate in them.

Emili Järv: There was also a set of statements that you had to evaluate. Regarding conflicts of interest – whether there were any or not. Generally, there were none, but it was noted that there were individuals who were both members of the Student Union and the Student Parliament at the same time; when scholarships were discussed, this created a somewhat questionable situation, and the member themselves assessed that it was questionable. Regarding training, perceptions were average – some felt it was sufficient, while others felt it was not. Most of you felt that you could freely express your opinions, which is very positive. The relevance of topics received a very positive evaluation. The majority felt that your input was taken into account. You perceived your work as meaningful and important, which is very encouraging. Where there was divergence was the question: “Were you able to represent the interests of your school?” Some felt that they were able to, while others felt they were not. For example, in some cases you did not even know what the interests of your school were, or you did not receive input. There were also discussions that did not concern your school, meaning that again you could not represent its interests because no input was requested or it was not relevant in that context.

Kristin Liias: The top three takeaways. In terms of knowledge – the structure of the university, how decision-making processes work, how to analyse documents. Skills – critical thinking, teamwork, ability to compromise, drafting documents. Social values – networking and friendships. Would you apply again? The options were “yes”, “maybe”, “no”. You know what you answered yourselves. There were also a few conditional responses, such as if it were not a graduation year, or if someone answered “no”, it was due to decreased motivation or because this type of work was not suitable for them.

Emili Järv: Those who have studied marketing know what a recommendation index is. We also asked you what the Student Parliament recommendation index is. I am very pleased to say that it was very high – around 9, which is indeed very high on the recommendation scale. I hope you answered honestly and reflected your real feelings. I would like to encourage you – Kirke is here taking notes – if you have comments, please voice them. Say what could be improved in the work of the Student Parliament. To create more value for the student body and for your school, express these points and we will record them. Until they are addressed, they can be referred back to, since they are documented in the minutes. Thank you very much for the pleasant cooperation.

Sten Unt: A personal opinion – I think you are a very pleasant group, and I am grateful that I was able to be part of the Student Parliament with you.

Maksim Dolinin: I have a practical question – will the graduating composition be given the opportunity to record their thoughts about the Student Parliament in the Student Parliament ABC document? If so, this could be done soon.

Kristin Liias: That would be logical, because the new Student Parliament would not have anything to add there yet.

Maksim Dolinin: Before we forget everything and before the trip takes place. To provide them with the document in advance so that they can act based on it.

Karolina Perv: This may not come up again in the future, but to be honest, my motivation to participate in the Student Parliament decreased somewhat after the Arqum topic. In the future, such topics could be avoided. At times it felt like one person did not understand what we are doing here. The Student Parliament is not a place to get personal, and it created a negative feeling about attending meetings after that. But otherwise it has been really great.

Hanna Savolainen: If internal groups emerge, then it should be established that people respect each other and that certain topics may create conflicts, such as political or religious issues. It would be better to focus on academic matters.

Alexander Rein Robas: No to segregation and polarisation.

Karolina Perv: That aside, there should be a general understanding that people who come to the Student Parliament also understand what they are doing here. For example, in the case of Annette's recall, we should avoid meetings becoming excessively long, adhere to time limits, and respect others' time. The matters we discuss in Student Parliament meetings are not directed personally at anyone, but are related to responsibilities and work tasks. You understand what I mean.

Ander Mägi: There could be more emphasis placed on Student Council boards and education managers to better enable Student Parliament promotion at their general meetings – or not even promotion, but simply sharing more about what is happening here. Meetings are public, minutes exist, so general meetings could include more than just what is happening within the Student Council itself. In the autumn I had to push quite hard to get time, there was some imbalance.

Alexander Rein Robas: I will consider this agenda item concluded.

2. Summary of the Board's work

Karoliine Orav: Let's discuss in more detail what we did in February. I will go through activities by members. The Coordinator of Recognition Events completed the announcement of the Best of the Year, which was selected by the student life committee. These were awarded at the Independence Day ceremony. The Student of the Year was a student from the Tartu College, the Act of the Year was TipiLan, and the Organisation of the Year was the Student Council of the School of Information Technologies. Currently, the scholarship competition is ongoing, and the Student Union is also offering three scholarships within the Development Fund competition; this is currently in progress. For the Student Parliament Coordinator, the Student Parliament elections are currently taking place. Jete met with the candidates and explained what lies ahead. Work is ongoing on Student Parliament marketing more broadly, and this year we also slightly updated the visual design. Jete, together with the IT department, helped to integrate the ElectionBuddy system into the Student Portal. The organisation of the appreciation evening is ongoing. Coordinator of the Mental Health Project – currently it is Sleep Week; students can attend massage sessions, which has been organised by them. One request/need that came directly from students is to address mental health topics more actively, for example the idea of an ADHD support group was raised. Anna is coordinating with Monika from the Student Counselling Office, who is actually a career counsellor and works with tutors. Discussions are ongoing about how to approach this, whether to implement it, and whether there is sufficient interest. As part of this, an event on this topic is planned for April. Work is ongoing to possibly collaborate with Peaasi.ee and to make the event available more broadly to all students, not only TalTech students, potentially in the form of a panel discussion. This is currently under consideration. A mental health survey is also in progress. Anna and I discussed that we will conduct it this year. It will be submitted to the ethics committee in March, as this is a sensitive topic. The last time this survey was conducted, various issues

arose, so it will first go through the ethics committee before collecting student feedback. Based on this, the Student Parliament can also adopt new positions. This point is also included in the action plan. The Education Quality Coordinator has formed the working group for the spring semester and is cooperating with the Department of Academic Affairs. The department also wanted additional feedback from students. Those interested can collaborate with the Academic Affairs Committee. What will change regarding the Quality of Education Working Group? We will conduct more interviews and produce fewer but more in-depth reports, using both feedback from the Study Information System and interviews. Other activities include Board meetings, Academic Affairs Committee meetings, 1:1 meetings with team members when needed, motivation events, development of cooperation, and regular meetings with the Academic Affairs Committee and the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs. I am still participating in the NOP programme. Currently, we are contributing to the development of the e-exam system. I have also been more actively involved in education marketing. There was a meeting with the Development Fund; the education manager at the Estonian Maritime Academy, Hugo, pointed out that there were no scholarships available there. Therefore, we discussed this with the Development Fund, and the situation has now improved, with significantly more scholarships available this semester. I was invited to the external web steering committee, which deals with all matters related to the development of the external website. We attended Student Council general meetings to promote the work of the Board and the Student Parliament. Together with Anna and the Audit Committee, we met with internal audit to discuss the whistleblowing line – how students could submit reports and how to increase awareness of this channel. I also participated in the Student March to Toompea and the Independence Day ceremony. Participation in decision-making bodies includes the education policy working group of the Federation of Estonian Student Unions, the Academic Affairs Committee, and the Senate. What did not go according to plan? Honestly, I cannot point anything out, because I have been so excellent.

Anna Suzdalev: I will also go through it by fields. From the side of sports coordinators, preparations for the Summer Games have already started. TalTech had 450 tickets, 140 were reserved, meaning they did not go on official sale but are held for the rectorate, organisers and sports representatives. 330 tickets went on sale and all were sold out within 15 minutes. In February, one inter-university football championship took place, and we achieved first place. Training evenings took place – salsa and bachata, there was high interest and more than 30 people attended. This is actually a good result, considering that our training evenings are essentially zero-cost events. Work is ongoing on the student tournament and the inter-network tournament. Together with the Coordinator of Internal and External Relations, we made a summary after the meeting of boards. We reviewed what we will continue working on and set the next steps. We also offered organisations meetings with the Student Union, but there was no interest in this. We also asked all organisations to provide us with information if they wish to update their information on the website. At the same time, they are working on creating a Discord server for student organisations, collecting registry information, conducting office inspections, and external communication has also become very active. The Coordinator of Events had two very large events – Student Cap Day and the Student March to Toompea. At Student Cap Day, 66 student caps were sold in 4 hours. A very good result, thank you Ander, who was a great salesperson there! At the Student March to Toompea there were approximately 250 participants, which should be about the same as last year. Students won against the management in the drinking competition 3:0. At the same time, work is ongoing on the Student Union + Student Parliament trip, and more information will be available soon. Work has also already begun on the Student Body's birthday, which will take place in October. The Chairman of the Funding Committee has updated the files, making them more detailed and improved. In January, the big projects competition took place, with 30,000 euros available for distribution. Approximately 17,000 were distributed. The March small projects

competition has also started, and work has been done on issues related to the funding platform. We are also working on establishing the Board reserve fund and developing additional competitions. My own activities have included managing the field, conducting 1:1 meetings with everyone, and compiling summaries. Currently, discussions are ongoing with three potential student organisations – the Drone Club, the Golf Club, and Mäering. Mäering has previously operated as an organisation and wants to become one again. The Drone Club and the Golf Club are potential new organisations. Hopefully in the coming months it will become clear whether any of them will be approved. The meeting of boards generated quite a lot of activities that we are already working on, such as storage spaces, communication with the real estate department, and how to organise student life information sessions at the beginning of the year. The organisation of the Student Life Fair took a significant amount of my time. As well as cooperation with units and the Board. What did not go according to plan? In event organisation, things never go entirely according to plan. Regarding sports, I am very, very satisfied; if I had to find something to criticise, then tickets sold out 13 minutes slower than last year, but we are working on improving the result next year. Internal and external relations – I think the lack of interest in meeting with us was because the invitation was placed at the end of the email. We see that we need to provide specific time slots in advance so that they can register via Forms or similar tools. No one wants to reply by email that they would like to meet. We need to rethink this slightly. We have many ideas for what to do, but the resources for this position are limited. We see that there has been little cooperation between the Chairman of the Funding Committee and the Coordinator of Internal and External Relations, but there was a meeting today, so progress has already been made. The location for the Student Parliament + Student Union trip was still being determined, but is now decided, and regarding the Student March to Toompea there were also observations on what could have gone better, but we have already made a summary and documented everything to avoid these issues in the future. Regarding the Student Life Fair, better work could have been done with electrical connections and cooperation with the event centre, but the event was completed, and in the morning there was simply more stress than desired. Are there any questions?

Alexander Rein Robas: Largely, activities overlap, I have supported the Board with events and elections. Day-to-day approval rounds, Board meetings, development and refinement of the development plan. The main activity has been organising the Board elections. Work on the ÜHIS index. I represented and helped at the Student March to Toompea, delivering the final push for the students' victory in the drinking competition. I have started the handover process, communicated with Rain, and the handover will begin around April. Together with Sirely, Anna and the IT department, we have been working on a Discord server. Of course, also Student Parliament meetings, and a camera has been purchased, we are waiting for it to arrive. You will not see it, but future members will.

Anna Suzdalev: I will also provide a summary of the Executive Manager's field. I have been dealing with budgets, reviewing the reports of Student Councils from last year and checking them. Supporting other units that want to start centralised funding. We want to transfer merchandise to the souvenir shop, have developed a strategy for how recruitment will take place, for example the timeline, in cooperation with the Head of Human Resources. We will also begin updating the internal work organisation document of the Student Union. Participation in the work of the election committee for Board elections and all other ongoing tasks. Regarding marketing and communication, as always January is a slightly quieter month, then February starts at full pace. A very large amount of resources has gone into the Student March to Toompea and Student Cap Day, Board elections and Sleep Week. Every year we also update the TalTech websites managed by the Student Union, we reviewed and checked that everything is up to date, both Estonian and English pages. Juulius Blog posts, newsletters, reviewing social media. We also obtained the paid version of CapCut. Through sponsorship we received

Takis and Nick's ice cream for the Student Life Fair, which was a very good added value for that day. What did not go according to plan from the two Kristiinas – the simultaneous occurrence of many projects reduced the ability to focus on one specific task. From the design perspective it was also very difficult, many events at the same time and Terke was constantly working at the computer to complete them. The early departure of the Coordinator of Social Media from the position. Anitra decided to move on, and the search for a new person is currently ongoing. Due to this, recruitment is also taking place outside the usual schedule, earlier than usual. Cooperation with the Head of Human Resources was at times difficult due to communication issues, which affected deadlines. Internal tensions within the Board made cooperation at times difficult and challenging.

3. Procedure for Student Parliament absences

Emili Järv: After a long discussion, we adopted the statutes. I also believe you remember that you are not satisfied with the current absence policy and want to change it. What has now happened with these two matters is that we cannot send the finalised statutes to Tiit, because if we want to change the absence policy, then the old version is also still written there. In order to finalise the statutes draft, you would need to decide what you want to do with the absence policy. I understand that you discussed this in the committees, but had differing opinions. In summary, one committee believes that all absences should be unexcused, meaning absences cannot be justified, while the other committee wanted to leave the option open for absences to be justified in some way. The numerical limits also need to be agreed upon. My proposal – ideally, we would agree on the wording of the statutes and adopt them again and send them to Tiit. Unfortunately, if you cannot formulate that sentence very quickly now, then we cannot do that, but what I would like you to do is to agree among yourselves what you want. And when the new Student Parliament comes, we go to them and say that the previous Student Parliament wanted it this way, adopt it and do not overthink it, and we proceed with the statutes draft. The floor is yours. From the student life committee, there is precise information that they want three absences of each type, meaning either committee meetings or Student Parliament meetings, or alternatively four consecutive absences – is my information correct? Very good. From the education side, there is no numerical information. Did you reach any agreement?

Karoliine Orav: No, we did not, because time was taken to think about it.

Anna Suzdalev: I will then advocate for the student life committee's idea. We were all in agreement. The proposal is that it does not matter whether the absence is justified or unjustified. At the moment, together with the Board, we see that we cannot be the ones deciding whether an absence is justified or not – if someone is travelling, we cannot assess whether they could attend online. If they have a cold or cough, we cannot evaluate that. Looking at the numbers, you have a total of 11 Student Parliament meetings and 11 committee meetings. Our proposal is that one Student Parliament member may be absent from three Student Parliament meetings and three committee meetings

Emili Järv: Not "and"?

Anna Suzdalev: Yes, "and" or "or".

Alexander Rein Robas: No, is it "and" or "or"? Is it absence from three Student Parliament meetings and three committee meetings, or...

Emili Järv: No, the difference is whether I am absent from three meetings here and three committee meetings and then I am removed, or if I am absent from three consecutive committee meetings, then I am removed.

Maksim Dolinin: In total four.

Emili Järv: No, in total four, but if we are talking about only one type of absence. Is it “and” – that I am absent from three meetings and three meetings, or I am absent from one type of meeting three times...

Anna Suzdalev: Either three Student Parliament meetings or three committee meetings. In that case, the person is removed. Or if they are absent four times consecutively – meaning Student Parliament, committee, Student Parliament, committee – meaning they have been absent from Student Parliament work for two months. Then they are removed. You have a total of 11 months, Student Parliament meetings are known in advance, and we can also include a provision to protect you, that committee meetings must also be scheduled at least three weeks in advance, so that no one informs you only one week before and you are absent because of that. But we added an additional condition that if you have academic obligations that you can prove occur at the same time as the meeting, then this will not be counted as an absence.

Emili Järv: Does this suit us – that we have a person who has a class at the same time as Student Parliament meetings for half a year? They never attend. Is that a dignified representative for us?

Maksim Dolinin: No.

Anna Suzdalev: But if they participate in committee work, then they can still pass on the information.

Emili Järv: I am just asking, I am not arguing against it.

Karoliine Orav: So far it has been that if you know you have academic obligations at the same time, we recommend stepping down and giving your position to someone else. It is not sustainable.

Emili Järv: My question was whether you want to make an exception for academic obligations? Or should that also not be an exception.

Anna Suzdalev: We thought we would leave that option open for now, because we do not want to restrict it. That was one side, and we can review it again next year.

Emili Järv: Then I would suggest that we do not include this exception in the statutes. We include it in the rules of procedure instead.

Anna Suzdalev: But yes, we concluded that it does not matter why you are absent, because you are still absent.

Maksim Dolinin: In total, you should still be involved with the Student Parliament for at least 75% of the time.

Emili Järv: Okay Anna, thank you. What is your temperature check? Does this generally seem acceptable to you or not?

Sten Unt: It is always possible to make absence more inconvenient, for example requiring a digital or physical signature.

Alexander Rein Robas: Preferably not.

Emili Järv: My personal opinion is that it would not change anything, people would still be absent, but would simply submit a signed document. It does not actually solve the problem.

Alexander Rein Robas: Sander, would you have bothered to sign your justified lateness?

Sander Roosimäe: Yes.

Maksim Dolinin: What constitutes lateness? We also need to define that. Because currently it is stated that even if you arrive one minute before the end of the meeting, it counts as lateness, not absence.

Alexander Rein Robas: I would say 15 minutes. That then raises the question of whether it is justified or unjustified.

Emili Järv: I would also suggest a simple solution – that more than 15 minutes of lateness counts as absence. Or you can decide yourselves. We can also define how many instances of lateness equal one absence.

Maksim Dolinin: I think that is already defined.

Emili Järv: Mhm.

Maksim Dolinin: That four instances of lateness equal one absence.

Emili Järv: Maybe it was even three. But I think this is a secondary issue. First, let us resolve the absence policy. Who would more or less agree with what the student life committee proposed? I see all hands here. What is happening in Teams?

Alexander Rein Robas: In Teams, Hanna, Karolina, Annemari and Markus have raised their hands.

Emili Järv: Excellent. Then I would say we have resolved this issue.

Alexander Rein Robas: So the final version was...

Emili Järv: Either three committee absences or three Student Parliament absences or four consecutive absences.

Alexander Rein Robas: Great!

Emili Järv: And nothing can be justified, except academic obligations. Now regarding lateness.

Karolina Perv: Do you want to include the academic obligations clause, I did not fully understand in the end, or do you not want to include it in the statutes?

Emili Järv: Let us conduct a separate vote – who wants there to be a rule that academic obligations exempt a person from Student Parliament or committee meetings? Raise your hand if you support this. I see two hands in the room, what about Teams?

Alexander Rein Robas: Three.

Emili Järv: Then it seems to me that we will not include this clause at all.

Karolina Perv: Because I had a situation like this one semester, as I am in a master's programme and all classes are in the evenings. I prioritised Student Parliament meetings over my studies. If a person ultimately cannot participate in Student Parliament meetings for an entire semester due to academic obligations, the meetings are known well in advance and studies are also important, we should not dismiss that. But in the end, the question is whether we need that person in the Student Parliament if they are not contributing because they are engaged in academic work.

Emili Järv: Personally, I agree that if they cannot participate half of the time, then they are not representing a voice if they are not here. Alright, there were three hands.

Karolina Perv: I agree!

Emili Järv: Only three people raised their hand to say they agree.

Alexander Rein Robas: Maybe after Karolina's context, opinions have changed?

Maris Kortel: My idea for this is that not for the entire semester, but if you have already been absent two times for other reasons, for example genuinely being ill, and then the third time you actually have an exam and must attend it, then that should not be a reason to be removed from the Student Parliament.

Karolina Perv: I agree with that.

Alexander Rein Robas: Another option is that you write down your reasons and at the beginning of the Student Parliament meeting, you decide among yourselves.

Maris Kortel: Because this is over the whole year. I do not know what might happen, where you have to decide whether I complete this course or get removed from the Student Parliament.

Emili Järv: I agree. And if you have read the current rules of procedure, it actually states that if it cannot be determined whether an absence is justified or not, then the Student Parliament votes. So in that sense, we could keep something similar, but we need to think about how to formulate it. If you truly have an exceptional case, but otherwise you would have to start voting on someone's personal reasons.

Maris Kortel: That is exactly the point – we leave that window open. It is very unlikely to occur, but if it does, then a genuinely reasonable Student Parliament member should not be removed for such a reason.

Emili Järv: Agreed, we can formulate it in such a way that academic obligations are an exception, but exemption is granted only by a decision of the Student Parliament through voting.

Maris Kortel: For example.

Emili Järv: So that is the exception. Alright, with this additional clause I will do another temperature check.

Maksim Dolinin: But if we start deciding whether another person's absence counts as an absence...

Emili Järv: Only for academic obligations.

Maksim Dolinin: In general, if we start deciding whether a person remains, some vote against – are we not creating division within the Student Parliament?

Emili Järv: Then we can do an anonymous vote.

Maksim Dolinin: That is also logical.

Emili Järv: Then you do not have to dislike each other.

Alexander Rein Robas: If the reason reaches me, then we use Election Buddy and proceed.

Maksim Dolinin: And similarly, how many hours before a Student Parliament meeting must one notify?

Alexander Rein Robas: 24.

Emili Järv: But in that sense, absence is still an absence.

Maksim Dolinin: Not absence, but lateness... wait.

Emili Järv: But there are no more justifications. Meaning that if you want to receive that exception, then it should definitely be 24 hours in advance, I think. In other cases, it is polite to notify, but since we do not assess justifications, it does not make a difference for us. We simply record that the person was not present. So, any more thoughts or comments?

Ander Mägi: Regarding academic obligations, I would add that every Student Parliament member, if they have a class during the meeting time, can also discuss it with the lecturer and explain that they will be absent from that class because they are an elected student representative and have an obligation to attend once a month. Personally, I find that it should not be impossible to be absent four or five times during a semester.

Alexander Rein Robas: Of course, it also depends on the lecturer you have.

Ander Mägi: But generally, it is possible.

Karolina Perv: In my case, it was fine.

Emili Järv: Regarding this topic, have we reached a common understanding? Raise your hand if you feel that we have not or if something remains unclear.

Alexander Rein Robas: Perhaps we should briefly go over what our common understanding was?

Emili Järv: Okay, let us go over it. We have either three absences from committee meetings and you are removed, or three absences from Student Parliament meetings and you are removed, or four consecutive absences (regardless of whether you start with a Student Parliament or committee absence) and you are removed. There is one exception. The exception is related to academic obligations. It is intended for force majeure use, but the statutes do not include usage guidelines, meaning that this understanding must be carried by members themselves. This exception applies if you have notified at least 24 hours in advance of your situation, and the Student Parliament must vote on the reason either at the next meeting or at the meeting where you are absent. Did we agree on anything else? We have not yet addressed lateness.

Maksim Dolinin: Can it be for any reason?

Emili Järv: We just discussed that it is for academic obligations. Only proven academic obligations are the sole exception. We are not going to vote on whether a grandmother's birthday is a sufficient reason.

Maksim Dolinin: Who verifies that it is an academic obligation?

Emili Järv: That is the difficult part – once we start allowing exceptions, it can become increasingly complex.

Kadri Jürissaar: I propose that if you have a lecture, practical session, or seminar according to your timetable, then it qualifies. But if it is homework, then you can choose when to do it, and it should not qualify.

Emili Järv: Or if it is an exam, which may not appear in the timetable, but you can prove it, for example with an email from the lecturer or an extract from the Study Information System.

Maksim Dolinin: What if it is a mandatory visit?

Emili Järv: A mandatory visit outside the timetable?

Maksim Dolinin: Yes. Welcome to the School of Engineering.

Kadri Jürissaar: If it is such an academic visit, then it is likely possible to prove it with an email or similar documentation.

Emili Järv: Yes, agreed.

Sander Roosimäe: If someone has a practical session at that time, then technically they have an academic justification every month. At what point does the Student Parliament start considering this?

Emili Järv: I agree. As I said earlier, since the statutes do not include explanatory guidelines, we cannot specify that this exception is intended to be used in a limited way. Therefore, I fully agree that if we adopt this and include it as discussed, it could very easily lead to the same situation we are trying to avoid – that someone has evening classes and ends up being absent for half a year.

Sten Unt: But if all people vote that it is acceptable.

Emili Järv: Agreed.

Sten Unt: Then it is not that likely in my opinion.

Emili Järv: Agreed.

Alexander Rein Robas: Then it can be discussed.

Emili Järv: I agree, and what I am saying is that you carry this understanding you have decided on with you. And when such situations arise, you must explain to the next Student Parliament that this is intended for force majeure situations. At least, the legislator did not intend this situation in a way where someone is absent for half a year. That was not the purpose of this exception.

Maksim Dolinin: Where do we then include this clause?

Emili Järv: Honestly, my personal opinion is that I would include this exception only in the rules of procedure and not in the statutes. Because from the rules of procedure we can easily remove it if something goes very wrong. But the rest of the provisions should go into the statutes. Is there anyone who disagrees with this? No. Very good. Lateness and early departure. How many minutes of lateness count as an absence, and the question is also, conversely, whether early departure should also count as an absence?

Maksim Dolinin: How can we predict the end? If you leave half an hour earlier, how do you know when the meeting will end? We do not have any fixed limit.

Emili Järv: Agreed. I was thinking that if we have nothing defined for this, then I could be a member, come in, sit down for five minutes, and theoretically I was present, then leave, and everything is technically fine. Nothing says that this behaviour is not allowed. I am just proposing different options.

Hanna Savolainen: If a meeting lasts, for example, five hours and a person has to leave at 20:00, then at least they have contributed to a few agenda points.

Emili Järv: Yes, I agree. We have had meetings here that last past 22:00. Maybe I live far away and need to catch a bus, otherwise I cannot get home. Then I have to leave.

Hanna Savolainen: We do not have to think about hypothetical situations. If a person has applied and is elected as a member, why did they make that decision if they are only present for five minutes?

Emili Järv: Hanna, I agree with you, but this whole discussion comes from the fact that people do not take responsibility and currently we cannot remove them for their behaviour.

Maris Kortel: I do not think we should take drastic measures regarding leaving early, because it has not caused problems. If it does, then we will deal with it. I do not see the need to be overly strict.

Ander Mägi: If we create some kind of threshold, then it might also happen that if I feel I have been present for 51% of the meeting, I might just leave.

Emili Järv: I agree, let us not give people ideas. How many minutes of lateness count as an absence?

Alexander Rein Robas: 15.

Emili Järv: Alright, 15. Is there anyone who thinks it should be a different number?

Sander Roosimäe: 15 minutes is quite a large margin, but again, to bring in an extreme case, at six o'clock there can be complete traffic jams and you never know if there has been a multi-car accident somewhere.

Maris Kortel: Turn on Teams.

Maksim Dolinin: From when does the 15 minutes start counting? From the official meeting start or the de facto start?

Emili Järv: It should still be from the time when the meeting actually starts.

Maksim Dolinin: So we refer to the minutes. We assign an additional condition to the minute-taker that they must monitor this.

Emili Järv: No, not that, but... most of the time the meeting also starts at six, and that should be the goal – that the meeting starts at the agreed time.

Alexander Rein Robas: Kirke, are you currently recording this, or for example today, did you record that Sander arrived at a certain time?

Kirke Piiskoppel: I did not record the time now, so I did not notice. But otherwise I do.

Alexander Rein Robas: From your perspective, would it be possible that if someone arrives late, you would record separately what time they arrived?

Kirke Piiskoppel: It is possible, but honestly, I am so focused on the minutes that I might not notice when someone arrives. It is easier to notice when someone leaves.

Emili Järv: In this case, I think the chair of the meeting can indicate it. They will notice.

Maris Kortel: We have a signature sheet, we could add an extra column there.

Maksim Dolinin: Everyone writes what time they arrived.

Maris Kortel: On trust.

Emili Järv: Based on Sander's comment, I understand the concern, but we again reach the point where we would have to start justifying justifications, which we actually do not want to do. But I hope that chain collisions do not occur every week on Tallinn roads causing unreasonable delays.

Sten Unt: If someone is 15 minutes late, then there is a quick vote on whether it is justified or not.

Maksim Dolinin: Then we create additional bureaucracy.

Emili Järv: I would not introduce something like that every time – what counts as a valid justification, whether a three-car accident is enough or it has to be four cars – I think we do not want to go there.

Maksim Dolinin: But pre-notified lateness due to academic obligations.

Emili Järv: In that sense, academic obligations... but then again, how much?

Maksim Dolinin: That is the concern.

Alexander Rein Robas: I would not leave that option at all.

Emili Järv: Yes, the system would become extremely complicated and essentially just as unclear as it is now.

Maksim Dolinin: If we say that it is an extraordinary exam or visit, then you say you have an absence due to academic obligations, meaning you are late, you still attend but it is recorded as an absence, even though you are eventually present. Can you then still participate in decisions?

Emili Järv: There are two scenarios here, one where the person does not apply for the exception and another where they do. If you do not apply for the exception, then you are absent. I do not know how to record the situation where you are absent but still vote. The second option: you are late, you receive an absence, you state that you had an exceptional case, you were in an exam and were late because of that. You present it, vote on granting the exemption... But you still cannot be marked as present. Well, then it is simply unfortunate. You are not here.

Sten Unt: If it is more than 15 minutes, then it is lateness, and if there are multiple instances of lateness, then it becomes an absence?

Emili Järv: No, my understanding was that if lateness exceeds 15 minutes, then you are marked as absent, not late. And if it is less than 15 minutes, then you are late.

Iiris Aljes: A theoretical question, for example someone from the Maritime Academy has a lecture that ends at 17:45, would it be acceptable that at the beginning of the meeting they join via Teams until they arrive here? And once they arrive, they are considered present.

Emili Järv: Yes, those are considered equivalent.

Ketter Aljes: You cannot join via Teams, but you are on your way here, so the travel time should count within the lateness period. If the person has planned it and intends to arrive.

Alexander Rein Robas: So a separate clause for lateness and absence justified by academic obligations?

Emili Järv: No, I think we are making this too complicated. We will not be able to manage this system.

Maris Kortel: How do we distinguish between lateness and absence if they are essentially the same once it exceeds 15 minutes? For example, I arrived at 18:02, am I late?

Emili Järv: The meeting had not officially started yet.

Maris Kortel: But if it had?

Emili Järv: Then you would be late. But to be removed due to lateness, you would need nine instances of lateness. That is such a high number that it is relatively impossible.

Alexander Rein Robas: And if you are late to 9 out of 11 meetings, then you have already made your contribution and that is that.

Emili Järv: It seems to me that we are starting to go in circles here. I understand that the lateness issue is confusing, but do we feel that we can somehow package this for the new Student Parliament?

Maris Kortel: I think there is no need if the problem does not arise. As long as it does not occur, there is no need to solve it. Right now, it is very difficult to assess other people's lateness. We would be setting very strict rules for others.

Emili Järv: It is recorded that you agree with this, but it is not an official decision. At the next meeting, I would happily present to the new Student Parliament that you agreed with this. We just need to conclude this discussion somewhere. Any final thoughts? My opinion – after 15 minutes you are absent, no additional rules. It becomes too complicated, we will not be able to manage it.

Maksim Dolinin: If you are late by 16 minutes, then you are marked as absent and cannot take part in decisions?

Emili Järv: Yes. Then that is simply how it is. Be on Teams beforehand. I would conclude this discussion here.

4. Appointment of a substitute for the Chairman of the Student Body Board

Alexander Rein Robas: I would also like to inform you that this is my last Student Parliament meeting. I am stepping down from my position earlier for the well-being of the organisation. I do not wish to comment on this further, but you are welcome to come and ask me if you wish. My responsibilities will be taken over by my fellow Board members, who will also be responsible for the Student Parliament and will transfer the mandate to Rain.

Maksim Dolinin: According to the regulations, does the Board not have to make a proposal to the Student Parliament?

Emili Järv: Yes, it does. You must make a proposal for appointing a substitute. But you should make that proposal now and then approve it.

Anna Suzdalev: We already have a proposal.

Alexander Rein Robas: Yes, but which one of you?

Anna Suzdalev: Orav.

Alexander Rein Robas: Do you agree that Karoliine will replace me?

Maksim Dolinin: Then we need to amend the agenda. Should there not also be a date, from when to when? Until the end of the mandate?

Alexander Rein Robas: We have not yet agreed on that.

Maksim Dolinin: I mean what is the end date. Until the new Chairman takes office? Or how is it planned? They cannot start before 1 July.

Alexander Rein Robas: Yes.

Maksim Dolinin: So until 1 July.

Alexander Rein Robas: Yes, meaning 30 June.

Anna Suzdalev: I will add that Orav is the legal substitute, but we will divide the responsibilities among ourselves.

IT WAS DECIDED:

4.1 The position of the Chairman of the Student Body Board will be filled by Karoliine Orav during 01.04.2026-30.06.2026

4.2 The decision takes effect upon adoption.

VOTING RESULT: 13 votes in favor.

Alexander Rein Robas
Chairman

Kirke Piiskoppel
Minutes secretary