TALLINNA TEHNIKAÜLIKOOL

MINUTES OF THE IRREGULAR MEETING

Tallinn September 22, 2026 no 2

Start of the meeting 18.01, end of the meeting 19.10

Chaired by Rain Samarüütel
Minutes secretary: Kirke Piiskoppel
14 out of 15 were present: Emma Pallase, Mirtel Migur, Maria Fedulova, Andris Taal, Joonas Teder, Michel Viana Smykalla, Dumitru Ciobanu, Emma Arabella Jõgeva, Kert Kaarel Veskus, Elis Ulla, Roosi-Mari Kivi, Pert Salundi (MS Teams), Nils Erik Eisen (MS Teams), Hanelle Kaugerand (MS Teams).
Absent: Mari Kiviselg.
Invited: Kristiina Vene, Renee Maripuu, Ronaldo Ollo, Karoliine Orav, Hanna Savolainen, Kristin Liias, Maksim Dolinin, Emili Järv.

Agenda

I Discussions

1. First reading of the Student Union's 2027 budget.

Rain Samarüütel: Does anyone wish to make any changes to the agenda?

Maksim Dolinin: The Audit Committee wishes to add an item concerning the removal of a Board member, as the Audit Committee has received 5 applications. According to the Rules of Procedure, we must take this into account. Please add this item to the agenda.

Amended agenda

I Discussions

1. First reading of the Student Union's 2027 budget;

II Voting

2. Removal of the Board Member in the Field of Student Life.

The amended agenda was approved unanimously.

Amended agenda no 2

I Discussions

1. First reading of the Student Union's 2027 budget;

II Voting

2. Removal of the Board Member in the Field of Student Life.

III Approval

3. Announcement of extraordinary elections

The amended agenda no 2 was approved unanimously.

1. First reading of the Student Union's 2027 budget

Kristiina Vene: As you can see, we have reached the first reading of next year's budget. I hope you have familiarised yourselves with the explanatory memorandum, so I will not go through everything in detail. I will cover the new information compared to the previous meeting. The planned expenditure and revenue from both funding sources amount to €557,069. Compared to the 2026 budget, the budget is planned to increase by €4,868. I will first go through 01CV. Planned expenditure and revenue amount to €366,069. Of this, €500 is own-source revenue from the sale of services, namely printing services. This consists of invoices issued to organisations at the end of December for the printing services they have used throughout the year. Everything else comes from the university, as the Student Union is one of the university's units. Some projects are increasing, while others are decreasing. Personnel costs and scholarships are increasing, while general expenses are decreasing. These are the usual expenses – administrative costs, purchases for staff meetings, and fixed-asset investments. Regarding fixed-asset investments, the Board would like to purchase new tables for the Student Union office, as the existing ones have depreciated. However, it is also possible that we will receive them from the university as a gift, since the anniversary of the student body is coming up. If we receive them as a gift, this will not be reflected in fixed assets, and the allocated amount will remain unused. The €3,500 has been budgeted for this purpose, but it does not all have to be spent. IT expenses, the Board's reserve, and a new budget line for Stebby, as university employees can now use Stebby services. This was an unexpected expense this year. However, I have included it as an expense for next year, which will allow us to manage the budget better. Another major change is that, previously, we had a line for unforeseen expenses. These are difficult to predict, but I have allocated €900 just in case we encounter expenses that are very difficult to categorise. My aim is to categorise the budget as well as possible, while avoiding overcategorising it. General overhead allocation – I must say that I have not fully understood the system myself, including how it is calculated, so I will not dwell on it for too long. Fringe benefit tax – for example, if an organisation orders food for a meeting and three employees or three Board members eat it, fringe benefit tax must be paid on their behalf. Fringe benefit taxes related to projects, such as off-site events, are already included in the respective project budgets. The

summary may have raised some questions: general expenses are planned to be €11,880 lower next year than in the previous year. This resulted from an erroneous overestimation in the budget, as I had only recently taken up the position and the budget was prepared somewhat hastily. The budget we submitted to the university was subsequently revised as well.

Andris Taal: Stebby – €929 has been allocated. I calculated it and got a total of €1,108.40. That is €2 more.

Kristiina Vene: Okay, I will double-check that; perhaps there was a typo. Thank you for pointing it out. As I mentioned last time, one area that was still subject to change was personnel costs, as we did not yet have the necessary information. One of next year's major goals is to bring the salaries of two employees – the Marketing and Communications Specialist and the Executive Director – to a fair level, particularly in comparison with the university as a whole. Looking at the budget, it may seem like a very large amount, but it actually is not. To analyse this, I spoke with the Chancellor, who is essentially the university's chief administrative officer and is also responsible for human resources, and obtained salary analytics from them. The matter was also discussed with the Rector. In terms of the process, this information came from the university before I discussed it with the Board. The university's position was that, although we are the Student Union, we have one foot in the Student Union and the other in the university. The name of our unit should not be an obstacle to fair remuneration, because that would be unfair when the work itself is essentially the same. Responsibilities, the scope of duties, and reporting relationships all matter. It is also planned to increase Board members' remuneration and scholarships. The planned increase in Board members' remuneration is €200 per person. This was not increased last year. This year, the increase is planned, and the Rector has approved it. The responsibilities of Board positions are changing, and more is expected of them; the university expects more. It would not be fair for remuneration to remain at the same level. The university has also made it clear that the work of our younger colleagues must be fairly remunerated, regardless of the type of contract they have. The same applies to scholarships: we have adjusted and reviewed them. They were not increased last year. If we have the opportunity to thank our members, to recognise their time, dedication and contribution, I believe it is fair to do so. We actually ask quite a lot of them, as the Student Union's activities are also expanding and increasing.

Emma Pallase: Am I understanding correctly that, since you are the HR manager, you do not receive this as a separate payment? It is one salary.

Kristiina Vene: It is included in the base salary. Since last month, a small additional component has been included this year, but from next year the base salary will change. The amount allocated to committees is €5,640; I allocated slightly less for translation. The amount for translation may seem large, but it also includes funding for written translation, which was previously under general expenses. Overall, the amount is lower; the funding has simply been transferred from one area to another. The total for salaries and scholarships is €37,859.

Mirtel Migur: Regarding scholarships, compared with the previous time when this was presented to us, the scholarships have increased further. Where did this come from?

Kristiina Vene: This came from the discussions about salaries. We did not want a situation in which employees' salaries increased but scholarships did not. The Board wanted scholarships to be increased as well, if possible. Last time, we increased some scholarships but not others, in coordination with the

relevant area managers. However, we made further changes after the salary negotiations had also taken place.

Mirtel Migur: One more question about the permanent employees. I see that the difference in gross salary is €1,100. Where does such a large difference come from?

Kristiina Vene: Whose salaries do you mean?

Mirtel Migur: The Executive Director earns €3,100 and the Secretary-Assistant to the Director earns €1,995.

Kristiina Vene: These are completely different positions in terms of their scope and impact. Their duties and areas of responsibility are entirely different. There are a lot of projects. Compared to the previous version, I removed the recruitment expense line. The idea had been to allocate money there in case we wanted to organise, for example, an open day in the spring. However, as this is an uncertain concept, it does not really make sense to set aside money for it. The branding line has also changed. Previously, that line included the purchase of student welcome bags. They did not arrive on time this year, but next year we will not need to purchase bags, as we can use the existing ones, so the expense will be lower. Overall, the budget decreases by €4,110. This is mainly due to a change in the concept for the Student Council's off-site event and a reduction in the budget for the lecturers' gala. Are there any questions? Next is SCV2, the budget for supporting student organisations. We provide funding through project funding competitions. There are two major competitions and three smaller competitions. We also support faculty student councils. €60,000 is allocated for annual grants and €70,000 for project competitions. With regard to the latter amount, the Chair of the Funding Committee can decide how much to allocate to the smaller competitions and how much to the larger ones. In addition, there is a new competition – the mobility competition. The budget for one competition is €5,000. It takes place twice a year. However, we are not requesting this funding from the university; a reserve fund has accumulated over the years and can now be used for this purpose. Previously, there were questions about the base funding for faculty student councils, so I have now included those amounts as well. This year, we will allocate €61,000 to this area, with base funding of €3,700 per faculty student council. The remaining amount will be calculated based on student numbers as of 1 January 2027.

Mirtel Migur: Last year, the budget was overestimated, but at the same time, no surplus has been accounted for. Is that correct?

Kristiina Vene: Surpluses do not remain with us; they are taken back from us. This is how the university's reserve is built up. A surplus may arise, but it does not remain with us. Any further questions or thoughts?

Emili Järv: This concerns the Internal and External Relations Coordinator. Their duties are being redistributed to some extent, so why is their scholarship increasing?

Kristiina Vene: The Board would like to make the position more strategic. Universities would like to cooperate more with one another, and we want to make use of this position for that purpose as well. There would be one central External Relations Coordinator. It has not yet been decided whether the workload will remain the same or increase. Once the redistribution of duties has been finalised, we can review it again.

Emili Järv: Regarding the Administrative Manager position, when we asked about it last time, the scope and duties of the role were unclear. Have the duties been defined more precisely, and does the funding allocated for it justify itself?

Kristiina Vene: I believe the funding is justified. We have an area manager who has the largest number of people to manage, and this position makes their work much easier. In my view, simply relieving a manager of administrative tasks already adds value. The duties are certainly not yet fully defined. The Events Coordinator is already receiving a lot of help. They recently contacted me about quotations, and from my perspective, it would be excellent to have someone who could be trained and guided in organising mini-competitions and procurement procedures. In certain areas, we have framework agreements, for example for catering. We must request quotations from specific suppliers. If there is no existing partner, we have to organise the competition ourselves. It would be very useful to have one person who knows how to do this. My aim is for this person to be a central figure. The job description also needs to be finalised, as currently there is no job description at all.

Emili Järv: The budget for the Juulius Tipikas mascot was €100. The explanatory memorandum stated €50. We would like to point out that there is an error in one of the documents.

Kristiina Vene: Yes, €100 is correct. I have also discussed this with the Marketing and Communications Specialist, and we do need to wash the mascot more often.

Emili Järv: As the Audit Committee, we are also very pleased to hear this. We have previously pointed out that the mascot should be washed more often.

Kristiina Vene: Are there any further questions? If not, thank you.

2. Removal of the Board Member in the Field of Student Life

Emili Järv: Hello! The Audit Committee attended both committee meetings to explain why this item is on the agenda. We identified a discrepancy in our election procedure. According to the procedure, Renee should not have been elected, as one vote was missing. Therefore, in order to reverse this process and conduct the election in the correct democratic manner, we have concluded that the Representative Council should remove Renee from office, after which we will hold a new election in which a person who receives sufficient votes under the Statutes will be elected, meaning 8 votes from among you. To initiate the removal process, you had to submit an application bearing the signatures of at least five members of the Representative Council. We have received the application. The removal process will now proceed in accordance with the Rules of Procedure. Since the removal procedure is usually intended for other situations, such as when someone fails to perform their duties properly and is removed for that reason, we need to follow the prescribed procedure today. You will notice that several people need to speak. We will simply go through the process and make sure that we do not violate any rules. You can understand from the context that, in this particular situation, the statements made by everyone who speaks here are not as well-founded as they might be in another situation. Nevertheless, we will follow the procedure as required. Rain will conduct the process. If you feel that Rain is a Board member and that removing a Board member creates a conflict of interest, you have the right to elect someone else to chair the meeting. Since we all know why we are here, we assume that there is no conflict of interest.

Rain Samarüütel: I will read out the general provisions on removal (Sections 9.1–9.2.1.7 of the Rules of Procedure of the Student Body). I will now read out the removal application: In accordance with Section 9.1.1 of the Rules of Procedure of the Student Body, I hereby submit an application for the removal of Renee Maripuu, the Board member responsible for Student Life. The application is based on Section 3.1.0 of the 2018 Statutes of the Student Body, which states the following: “Bodies shall adopt decisions by a simple majority of their members, unless the Statutes or the rules of procedure of the body stipulate a requirement for a higher majority.” According to the minutes of the extraordinary meeting of the Representative Council held on 9 March 2026, Renee Maripuu received seven votes in favour in the election for the Board member responsible for Student Life. Of the 15 members of the Representative Council, 13 were present; the other candidate received two votes, and four members present were recorded as abstaining. Under the aforementioned provision of the Statutes, Renee Maripuu should have received eight votes in favour. Based on the above, I wish to remove Renee Maripuu from office, as at the time of her election she did not receive sufficient votes in favour under the Statutes. Now, Section 9.2.1.2.

Emma Pallase: Based on the above, we wish to remove Renee Maripuu from office through a decision of the Representative Council. I would also like to add that the document was signed by five people on our side. That is all from me, thank you!

Renee Maripuu: Hello! An unfortunate situation has occurred, and my wish is to resolve it as painlessly as possible and in accordance with the procedure. We hope to get through this period without any issues and ensure that none of the parties involved have any further reason to identify problems in the future. Thank you!

Rain Samarüütel: Questions and answers.

Emma Pallase: Do you intend to run again?

Renee Maripuu: I intend to run again and hope to receive eight votes in favour.

Andris Taal: A question about the procedure: technically, is it possible for us to decide in the final vote not to remove her from office, meaning she would remain in office? Is that technically possible?

Emili Järv: The Audit Committee has found that the Statutes have been violated. We have brought the matter to your attention and are trying to ensure that this violation is rectified. If you now decide that you do not wish to correct the violation of the Statutes, we would have to approach the Rector and ask them to dissolve the Representative Council, which would mean holding extraordinary elections for the Representative Council. My personal opinion is that I ask you to remove Renee from office; otherwise, this situation will become even more complicated.

Mirtel Migur: Will the fact that a Board member was elected in a disputed manner affect the decisions made throughout this entire period? Are those decisions still valid?

Emili Järv: It is up to you to decide whether you want to reverse anything. However, that would be very difficult to do.

Mirtel Migur: So everything remains valid?

Emili Järv: Yes, we are trying to put things right from the moment we discovered the problem.

Andris Taal: During the period when Renee is not in office, will she technically be excluded and removed from everything?

Rain Samarüütel: In theory.

Joonas Teder: Should the Rules of Procedure be amended to bring them into line with the Statutes? Will that happen alongside the elections?

Emili Järv: We certainly will not be able to do that in time for the elections. It is a longer process. In making these decisions, we will follow the Statutes.

Rain Samarüütel: We will now hear the final statement from the person whose removal is being considered.

Renee Maripuu: Thank you!

Rain Samarüütel: We can now proceed to the vote.

Emma Pallase, Elis Ulla and Roosi-Mari Kivi form the election committee.

Emma Pallase: At extraordinary meeting No. 2 of the Student Union of Tallinn University of Technology, concerning the removal of the TalTech Student Body Board member responsible for Student Life, the following committee was elected to count the votes: Emma Pallase, Elis Ulla and Roosi-Mari Kivi. The 15-member composition of the TalTech Student Union was confirmed by Rector's Directive No. 1-8/11 of 24 March 2026. Fourteen Student Union members were present. Eleven Student Union members received a ballot paper. There were 11 ballot papers in the ballot box. In the vote on the removal of Renee Maripuu, the TalTech Student Body Board member responsible for Student Life, Renee Maripuu received 11 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 0 abstentions. The Chair of the Vote Counting Committee was Emma Pallase. Confirmed with signatures.

Rain Samarüütel: Does anyone object to the confirmation?

IT WAS DECIDED:

2.1 To remove Renee Maripuu, the Student Body Board member responsible for Student Life, from office. 2.2 The decision takes effect upon adoption.
VOTING RESULT: 11 votes in favor.

Joonas Teder: If we had not voted just now, we would not have removed her from office. Isn't it rather the case that if we do not vote in a certain way, we will simply be dissolved?

Emili Järv: In that sense, I agree that it feels like a threat to you. You were democratically elected as student representatives, and you have the same obligation to comply with the Statutes and the election procedure. In this case, you would have decided that the violation did not concern you and

would have knowingly violated the Statutes, not by choosing someone yourselves, since you did not make the original choice, but by deciding to uphold that election result.

Karoliine Orav: I would like to add the announcement of extraordinary elections to the agenda.

Rain Samarüütel: Does anyone object to the approval of the agenda? No objections.

Amended agenda No. 2 was adopted unanimously.

Karoliine Orav: Since Renee is no longer in office, we need to appoint a replacement. Our Board proposes appointing Rain to replace the Head of Student Life for the period during which we do not have a Board member responsible for Student Life.

Rain Samarüütel: Does anyone object? No objections.

IT WAS DECIDED:

2.3 As of 22 September 2026, Rain Samarüütel shall fill the position of the Student Body Board member responsible for Student Life. 2.4 The decision takes effect upon adoption.
VOTING RESULT: 14 votes in favor.

3. Announcement of extraordinary elections

Karoliine Orav: We propose announcing elections for the Board member responsible for Student Life. The Board proposes that the term of office continue from where it was interrupted. We calculated the earliest possible date for holding the elections, which is 15 October. The elections would therefore take place on 15 October, and we would hold the third extraordinary meeting for this purpose. The deadline for submitting documents is 6 October, after which the documents will be forwarded to the Election Committee. The elections will take place on 15 October, and the term of office will continue from 16 October.

Andris Taal: Will these elections receive the usual promotion?

Karoliine Orav: As usual.

Maria Fedulova: Will the election of the Board member take place online?

Karoliine Orav: We hope Rain will get ElectionBuddy working.

Rain Samarüütel: Does anyone object to the approval?

IT WAS DECIDED:

3.1 To announce extraordinary elections for a Board member. 3.2 The decision takes effect upon adoption.

VOTING RESULT: 14 votes in favor.

Karoliine Orav: Finally, we still need to approve the Election Committee. I have kept the same members as last time: Karoliine Orav, Kristiina Vene and Kirke Piiskoppel.

Rain Samarüütel: Does anyone object to the approval? No objections. It is therefore approved.

IT WAS DECIDED:

3.3 T o approve the Election Committee for the extraordinary elections. 3.4 The decision takes effect upon adoption.
VOTING RESULT: 14 votes in favor.

Joonas Teder: During this period, will the scholarship allocated to the Head of Student Life go to Rain? Or how will that work?

Karoliine Orav: I would also like to clarify that, legally, Rain is a replacement, but we will try to divide the duties among ourselves as much as possible.

Kristiina Vene: I cannot say for certain at the moment. We will discuss it.

Andris Taal: How was this situation handled at the end of last year?

Kristiina Vene: At that time, it was divided almost equally.

Rain Samarüütel Chairman of the meeting	Kirke Piiskoppel Minutes secretary