

Evaluation Guidelines for TalTech Student Union Student Life Funding

I Implementing provisions

1. Implementation of the Student Life Funding Guidelines:

- 1.1. The chairman of the funding committee shall decide on matters not regulated by the guidelines;
- 1.2. The student union's audit committee shall oversee the actions of the chairman of the funding committee and compliance with the guidelines;
- 1.3. Amendments to the guidelines shall take effect once approved by the TalTech Student Union Board.

II Criteria

1. Small projects

| Criterion | | Max grade |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Involvement of TalTech students in the project team | 10 |
| 2 | Orientation of the project towards TalTech students | 10 |
| 3 | Visibility of the Student Body and the university in society | 10x0.5 |
| 4 | Justification of the link between the project budget and activities | 10x1.5 |
| 5 | Thoroughness and feasibility of the project | 10x1.5 |
| 6 | Existence of co-financing and ability to secure it | 10 |
| 7 | Project uniqueness / novelty over the year | 10x0.5 |
| 8 | Additional criterion approved by the Board of the Student Body | 10x0.5 |
| 9 | The accuracy of reporting on previous annual grants and project competitions* | 10x1.5 |
| 10 | Participation in the defence | 10 |
| TOTAL | | 100 |

***If the organisation has not previously submitted a report, the reporting of previous events is not taken into account as an evaluation criterion and it is evaluated at a maximum score of 10.**

2. Big projects and Board Reserve Fund

| Criterion | | Max grade |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Involvement of TalTech students in the project team | 10 |
| 2 | Providing added value to the TalTech student body | 10 |
| 3 | Visibility of the Student Body and the university in society | 10x0.5 |
| 4 | Justification of the link between the project budget and activities | 10x1.5 |
| 5 | Thoroughness and feasibility of the project | 10x1.5 |
| 6 | Existence of co-financing and ability to secure it | 10 |
| 7 | Project uniqueness / novelty over the year | 10x0.5 |
| 8 | Additional criterion approved by the Board of the Student Body | 10x0.5 |
| 9 | The accuracy of reporting on previous annual grants and project competitions* | 10x1.5 |
| 10 | Participation in the defence | 10 |
| TOTAL | | 100 |

*If the organisation has not previously submitted a report, the reporting of previous events is not taken into account as an evaluation criterion and it is evaluated at a maximum score of 10.

3. Annual grants

| Criterion | | Max grade |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Involvement of TalTech students in the organization | 10x2 |
| 2 | The organization's activities focus towards the TalTech student body | 10 |
| 3 | The necessity of the requested amounts, justification of the organization's budget | 10x3 |
| 4 | Organizational sustainability for the future | 10x1.5 |
| 5 | The accuracy of reporting on previous annual grants and project competitions* | 10x1.5 |
| 6 | Participation in the defence | 10 |
| TOTAL | | 100 |

*If the organisation has not previously submitted a report, the reporting of previous events is not taken into account as an evaluation criterion and it is evaluated at a maximum score of 10.

4. Mobility Competition

| Criterion | | Max grade |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Compliance of the programme with the established requirements | 10X1,5 |
| 2 | Substantive quality and relevance of the programme | 10X2 |
| 3 | Existence of co-financing and ability to secure it | 10x1 |
| 4 | Visibility of the Student Body and the university in society | 10x1 |
| 5 | Thoroughness and feasibility of the project | 10x1 |
| 6 | Justification of the link between the project budget and activities | 10X1,5 |
| 7 | The accuracy of reporting on previous annual grants and project competitions* | 10x1 |
| 8 | Participation in the defence | 10x1 |
| TOTAL | | 100 |

***If the organisation has not previously submitted a report, the reporting of previous events is not taken into account as an evaluation criterion and it is evaluated at a maximum score of 10.**

APPENDIX
Small projects

| Criterion | | Points explanation | | | | | |
|-----------|--|--------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | Points | 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 7-8 | 9-10 |
| 1 | Involvement of TalTech students in the project team | 10x1 | 0–24% of the project team members are TalTech students and there are at least 2 people in the project team. | 25-49% of the project team members are TalTech students and there are at least 2 people in the project team. | 50-74% of the project team members are TalTech students and there are at least 2 people in the project team. | 75-89% of the project team members are TalTech students and there are at least 2 people in the project team. | 90-100% of the project team members are TalTech students and there are at least 2 people in the project team. |
| 2 | Orientation of the project towards TalTech students | 10x1 | Activities involving the student body are not highlighted. | The activities involving the student body are only aimed at a specific group | The project is targeted partially to the student body. | The activity is aimed at student body (not including international students) | The activity is aimed at the entire student body (including international students) or is aimed at students of at least one college. |
| 3 | Visibility of the Student Body and the university in society | 10x0.5 | There is no effort to improve the visibility of the student body or the university. | There is a minimal effort to improve visibility. | Visibility is improved to a certain extent. | The activity receives greater coverage at the local level. | The activity is covered in a nationwide and/or international media channel or publication. |
| 4 | Justification of the link between the project budget and activities | 10x1.5 | Budget and activities implementation is not justified. | Budget and activities implementation is not justified and are absent connections activities and expense lines sometimes. | Budget and activity attachment is visible but not enough clear. | Budget and activity attachment is visible but not enough clear , but added additional materials as proof. | Budget and activities are consistent with each other and additional materials are included for proof. |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| 5 | Thoroughness and feasibility of the project | 10x1.5 | The project lacks clear objectives, and the choice of method is not justified. | The project's objectives or the choice of method are not sufficiently justified. | The activity plan has significant deficiencies. | The activities are mostly aligned with the objectives. | The project has clear objectives, and the choice of method is well justified. |
| 6 | Existence of co-financing and ability to secure it | 10x1 | Co-financing (including own financing) constitutes 0-9% of the total financing. | Co-financing (including own financing) constitutes 10-24% of the total financing. | Co-financing (including own financing) constitutes 25-49% of the total financing. | Co-financing (including own financing) constitutes 50-74% of the total financing. | Co-financing (including own financing) constitutes 75% of the total financing. |
| 7 | Project uniqueness / novelty over the year | 10x0.5 | Overlaps with multiple projects from other competitions. | Overlaps with one project from another competition. | Resembles another project from another competition to a small extent. | No similar project exists. | No similar project exists, and the project is continuously being developed. |
| 8 | Additional criterion approved by the Board of the Student Body | 10x0.5 | Does not meet the additional criteria at all. | Meets the additional criteria to a small extent. | Partially meets the additional criteria. | Largely meets the additional criteria. | Fully meets the additional criteria. |
| 9 | The accuracy of reporting on previous annual grants and project competitions* | 10x1.5 | At least one of the last five reports has not been submitted on time.** | All reports have been submitted, but there are deficiencies that have not been corrected. | At least 2-3 of the last five reports were submitted late. | One of the last five reports was submitted late.**** | All of the last five reports were submitted on time.***** |
| 10 | Participation in the defence | 10x1 | People did not show up to defend the project.** | People did not show up to defend the project, but there was a good reason for their absence. | People showed up to defend the project, but their answers were insufficient. | People showed up to defend the project and their answers were satisfactory. | People showed up to defend the project and their answers were specific, exhaustive, and helped to get a better overview of the project |

* Funding Committee analyzes budget at everyone expenses , but in particular they can support project to carry out essential expense lines . Applicants expense lines at watch out for that would be with costs , without without which project definitely to take place no can . For example not given by the funding committee usually support catering - , transport - , fixed asset investment (which remains to the student organization only) , gifts or awards to expense lines .

** The student body of the board by confirmed additional criteria : cooperation others TalTech student organizations and / or with student associations .

*** - 0 points

**** - 8 point

***** - 10 points

Big projects and Board Reserve Fund

| Criterion | | Points explanation | | | | | |
|-----------|---|--------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | Points | 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 7-8 | 9-10 |
| 1 | Involvement of TalTech students in the project team | 10x1 | 0–24% of the project team members are TalTech students and there are at least 2 people in the project team. | 25-49% of the project team members are TalTech students and there are at least 2 people in the project team. | 50-74% of the project team members are TalTech students and there are at least 2 people in the project team. | 75-89% of the project team members are TalTech students and there are at least 2 people in the project team. | 90-100% of the project team members are TalTech students and there are at least 2 people in the project team. |
| 2 | Providing added value to the TalTech student body | 10x1 | Activities involving the student body are not highlighted. | The activities involving the student body are only aimed at a specific group | The project is targeted partially to the student body. | The activity is aimed at student body (not including international students) | The activity is aimed at the entire student body (including international students) or is aimed at students of at least one college. |
| 3 | Visibility of the Student Body and the university in society | 10x0.5 | There is no effort to improve the visibility of the student body or the university. | There is a minimal effort to improve visibility. | Visibility is improved to a certain extent. | The activity receives greater coverage at the local level. | The activity is covered in a nationwide and/or international media channel or publication. |
| 4 | Justification of the link between the project budget and activities | 10x1.5 | Budget and activities implementation is not justified. | Budget and activities implementation is not justified and are absent connections activities and expense lines sometimes. | Budget and activity attachment is visible but not enough clear. | Budget and activity attachment is visible but not enough clear , but added additional materials as proof. | Budget and activities are consistent with each other and additional materials are included for proof. |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| 5 | Thoroughness and feasibility of the project | 10x1.5 | The project lacks clear objectives, and the choice of method is not justified. | The project's objectives or the choice of method are not sufficiently justified. | The activity plan has significant deficiencies. | The activities are mostly aligned with the objectives. | The project has clear objectives, and the choice of method is well justified. |
| 6 | Existence of co-financing and ability to secure it | 10x1 | Co-financing (including own financing) constitutes 0-9% of the total financing. | Co-financing (including own financing) constitutes 10-24% of the total financing. | Co-financing (including own financing) constitutes 25-49% of the total financing. | Co-financing (including own financing) constitutes 50-74% of the total financing. | Co-financing (including own financing) constitutes 75% of the total financing. |
| 7 | Project uniqueness / novelty over the year | 10x0.5 | Overlaps with multiple projects from other competitions. | Overlaps with one project from another competition. | Resembles another project from another competition to a small extent. | No similar project exists. | No similar project exists, and the project is continuously being developed. |
| 8 | Additional criterion approved by the Board of the Student Body | 10x0.5 | Does not meet the additional criteria at all. | Meets the additional criteria to a small extent. | Partially meets the additional criteria. | Largely meets the additional criteria. | Fully meets the additional criteria. |
| 9 | The accuracy of reporting on previous annual grants and project competitions* | 10x1.5 | At least one of the last five reports has not been submitted on time.*** | All reports have been submitted, but there are deficiencies that have not been corrected. | At least 2-3 of the last five reports were submitted late. | One of the last five reports was submitted late.**** | All of the last five reports were submitted on time.***** |
| 10 | Participation in the defence | 10x1 | People did not show up to defend the project.*** | People did not show up to defend the project, but there was a good reason for their absence. | People showed up to defend the project, but their answers were insufficient. | People showed up to defend the project and their answers were satisfactory. | People showed up to defend the project and their answers were specific, exhaustive, and helped to get a better overview of the project |

* Funding Committee analyzes budget at everyone expenses , but in particular they can support project to carry out essential expense lines . Applicants expense lines at watch out for that would be with costs , without without which project definitely to take place no can . For example not given by the funding committee usually support catering - , transport - , fixed asset investment (which remains to the student organization only) , gifts or awards to expense lines .

** The student body of the board by confirmed additional criteria : creation of educational / scientific / cultural content . Cultural for content is read for example concerts , exhibitions etc arrangement .

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| *** - 0 points | **** - 8 point | ***** - 10 points |
|----------------|----------------|-------------------|

Annual grants

| Criterion | | Points explanation | | | | | |
|-----------|---|--------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| | | Points | 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 7-8 | 9-10 |
| 1 | Involvement of TalTech students in the organization | 10x2 | 0-24% of the organization members are TalTech students. | 25-49% of the organization members are TalTech students. | 50-74% of the organization members are TalTech students. | 75-89% of the organization members are TalTech students. | 90-100% of the organization's members are TalTech students. |
| 2 | The organization's activities focus towards the TalTech student body | 10x1 | Activities involving the student body are not highlighted. | The activities involving the student body are only aimed at a specific group | The project is targeted partially to the student body. | The activity is aimed at student body (not including international students) | The activity is aimed at the entire student body (including international students) or is aimed at students of at least one college. |
| 3 | Justification of the organization's budget and annual strategy of activities | 10x3 | The implementation of the budget and annual strategy is not justified. | The budget and annual strategy are not justified and there are no connections between activities and expenditure lines. | The budget and annual strategy are visible but not clear enough. | The budget and annual strategy are visible but not clear enough, but an additional action plan is attached as proof. | Budget and year old the strategy is mutual in accordance and is added supplementary action plan as proof. |
| 4 | Organizational sustainability for the future | 10x1.5 | The implementation of projects and an annual strategy is not justified. | The implementation of the projects and the annual strategy is not justified and there are no connections between the projects and the action plan. | The connection between the projects and the annual strategy is visible but not clear enough. | The connection between the projects and the annual strategy is visible but not clear enough, but an additional action plan has been added as proof. | Projects and annual strategy are mutual in accordance and an additional action plan has been added as proof. |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------|--|--|--|---|--|
| 5 | The accuracy of reporting on previous annual grants and project competitions* | 10x1.5 | At least one of the last five reports has not been submitted on time.* | All reports have been submitted, but there are deficiencies that have not been corrected. | At least 2-3 of the last five reports were submitted late. | One of the last five reports was submitted late.** | All of the last five reports were submitted on time.*** |
| 6 | Participation in the defense | 10x1 | People did not show up to defend the project.* | People did not show up to defend the project, but there was a good reason for their absence. | People showed up to defend the project, but their answers were insufficient. | People showed up to defend the project and their answers were satisfactory. | People showed up to defend the project and their answers were specific, exhaustive, and helped to get a better overview of the project |

* - 0 points

** - 8 point

*** - 10 points

Mobility Competition

| Criterion | | Points explanation | | | | | |
|-----------|---|--------------------|---|--|---|---|---|
| | | Points | 0-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 7-8 | 9-10 |
| 1 | Compliance of the programme with the established requirements | 10x1,5 | The programme is missing or cannot be evaluated. | The programme is submitted but does not include the required minimum information (timeframe, activities, content). | The programme includes minimum information, but significant deficiencies are present. | The programme complies with the requirements but contains some ambiguities. | The programme fully complies with the requirements and includes a schedule, activities, and a detailed content description. |
| 2 | Substantive quality and relevance of the programme | 10x2 | The programme lacks educational or cultural-strategic activities. | The substantive activities do not form a significant part of the programme. | Substantive activities constitute at least half of the programme. | The majority of the programme is substantive. | The programme is fully substantive, and all activities are goal-oriented. |
| 3 | Existence of co-financing and ability to secure it | 10x1 | Co-financing (including own financing) constitutes 0-9% of the total financing. | Co-financing (including own financing) constitutes 10-24% of the total financing. | Co-financing (including own financing) constitutes 25-49% of the total financing. | Co-financing (including own financing) constitutes 50-74% of the total financing. | Co-financing (including own financing) constitutes 75% of the total financing. |
| 4 | Visibility of the Student Body and the university in society | 10x1 | There is no effort to improve the visibility of the student body or the university. | There is a minimal effort to improve visibility. | Visibility is improved to a certain extent. | The activity receives greater coverage at the local level. | The activity is covered in a nationwide and/or international media channel or publication. |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------|--|--|--|---|--|
| 5 | Thoroughness and feasibility of the project | 10x1 | The project lacks clear objectives, and the choice of method is not justified. | The project's objectives or the choice of method are not sufficiently justified. | The activity plan has significant deficiencies. | The activities are mostly aligned with the objectives. | The project has clear objectives, and the choice of method is well justified. |
| 6 | Justification of the link between the project budget and activities | 10x1,5 | Budget and activities implementation is not justified. | Budget and activities implementation is not justified and are absent connections activities and expense lines sometimes. | Budget and activity attachment is visible but not enough clear. | Budget and activity attachment is visible but not enough clear , but added additional materials as proof. | Budget and activities are consistent with each other and additional materials are included for proof. |
| 7 | The accuracy of reporting on previous annual grants and project competitions* | 10x1 | At least one of the last five reports has not been submitted on time.*** | All reports have been submitted, but there are deficiencies that have not been corrected. | At least 2-3 of the last five reports were submitted late. | One of the last five reports was submitted late.**** | All of the last five reports were submitted on time.***** |
| 8 | Participation in the defence | 10x1 | People did not show up to defend the project.*** | People did not show up to defend the project, but there was a good reason for their absence. | People showed up to defend the project, but their answers were insufficient. | People showed up to defend the project and their answers were satisfactory. | People showed up to defend the project and their answers were specific, exhaustive, and helped to get a better overview of the project |

* Funding Committee analyzes budget at everyone expenses , but in particular they can support project to carry out essential expense lines . Applicants expense lines at watch out for that would be with costs , without without which project definitely to take place no can .

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| *** - 0 points | **** - 8 point | ***** - 10 points |
|----------------|----------------|-------------------|