MINUTES OF MEETING OCTOBER 13th, 2015


Absent: P. Muellhaupt

Invited guests: Mr. Ph. Gillet, M. P. Vandergheynst et Mr. J. Chenal.

Meeting starts at 12:15pm – Room CO 216

1) Introducing the new members of the CCE

The newly elected members introduce themselves; everyone present stated their name, faculty in which they work and their scientific domain.

Mrs Billard is pleased with this election; the newly elected members are representative of the different sections and different teachers’ categories (chargés de cours, MER, assistant/associate/adjunct/full professors).

2) General information

Mrs Billard informs the audience of some ongoing activities carried over from the previous legislation, such as:

a) Interaction with the VPRI (EPFL management) regarding the situation of the Intermediate teaching staff. A workgroup was set up by the VPRI to discuss their situation and what happens to them when their lab stops its activity. Some staff was able to keep their jobs with an indefinite contract with a part-time activity to enable them to continue their teaching hours. However, there is no uniformed procedure for all the school and important variations between faculties have been observed. In SB, the Dean has stated that 100% of these teaching staff were able to have a new 100% contract and were therefore not dismissed. The CCE members have been invited to participate in this workgroup and Mr. Olivier Lévêque attended the first meeting. Mr. Lévêque’s memo is attached to this document. (.pdf)

A second workgroup was initiated by the VPAA to change the career pattern of this intermediate teaching staff. Mrs. Fontcumberta, CCE member, is part of this group and will inform the CCE of the progress of the discussions.
b) Interaction with CCE members and EPFL sections. Mrs Billard asks the CCE members to report to the CCE topics raised at the section meetings and conversely to transmit topics of discussion at the CCE to their sections, internal committees and faculty meetings.

3) Election of the President and members of the CCE
   a) Mme Billard is unanimously elected President of the CCE.
   b) The CCE office members are unanimously elected.
      The members are:
      • Mr. Olivier Burdet, ENAC
      • Mr. Olivier Lévêque, IC
      • Mr. Volker Gass, STI

4) Votation results for the CCE members
   Detailed results can be seen on the CCE website: [http://cce.epfl.ch/](http://cce.epfl.ch/)
   Mme Billard is pleased with the participation to the vote as between 42 and 45% of all teaching categories took part in the vote. The result is that there are members from different faculties and gender. There is a proper balance between the different teaching staff. This vote portrays a democratic vote and strengthens the CCE position.

5) Partial revision of the EPF laws
   Articles 16a et 16a(bis) are discussed. The CCE has submitted their opinion in writing and a copy of the letter is annexed to these minutes and is also available on the CCE website (.pdf).

6) Miscellaneous
   At a next meeting, Mrs Billard will give further explanations regarding the EPF Council to the CCE members.

Next CCE meeting:
   Tuesday October 13th, 2015 at 12:15pm in room BM 1 130

The meeting ends at 2pm

PV/S. Muller
Dear all,

On Friday, I was replacing Aude in the meeting of the VPRI on the closure of laboratories. Here is a summary of what was said there:

Andre Schneider has come up with a clear procedure for what should happen when a laboratory is closing. The process starts 6 years before the closure, so that people can get ready for this and that the best options can be considered. In particular, for the professor, two meetings are scheduled with the Dean and the HR, one at -6y, another one at -3y. Of course, if need be, the section in which his/her collaborators teaches should also be involved, and there can be many particular cases, depending for example whether the material of the lab is kept for other usage or not...

In brief, it is a complicated process, given all the possible particular cases that can happen.

The goal of Schneider in this meeting was to define "conditions cadres" (not sure how to translate this in english, sorry) that everyone would agree on, so as to make sure that people are treated in a fair manner across all EPFL.

Here are these "conditions cadres":

1. begin 6 years before the closure, think about carreer development of collaborators
2. consider the interest of both the collaborator and the institution
3. valorize (not sure this is the appropriate english word: the meeting was in french) the contribution to teaching of the collaborator
4. accept that an ideal solutions can unfortunately not always de found for everybody
5. distinguish the cases where a collaborator works for a platform / central service to those where the collaborator works for a lab.

Things that should NOT be done:

1. placement of the collaborator to another position inside EPFL in the case there is no satisfaction with this solution from either side (if I remember well...)
2. enforced reduction of the number of working hours per week

The reaction of the people present (AE, ACIDE, ACC, APEL, CCE) was essentially: all this is very nice, but what do we do with all the people whose laboratories are closing now, or worse, the ones who have already been fired, or whose work percentage has already been reduced without being asked?
A partial answer to this is that 2 people have been hired by the HR (one at 80%, one at 40%) as "talent managers" so as to facilitate the process and to help the people. One of them was there. His name is Eric Meurville, who apparently used to be working in a lab that has been closed recently.

Best greetings and see you tomorrow,

Olivier

PS: As you may have noticed, this meeting was NOT about the evolution of the status of the Corps Intermediire, which is led by a separate working group of the VPAA.
Jan Van Herle,
Président de l’Assemblée d’Ecole

EPFL, 13 octobre 2015

**** ENGLISH BELOW ****

Compte tenu de la composition bilingue des membres de la CCE, et des enseignants de l’EPFL, la CCE soumettra dorénavant ses prises de position dans les deux langues.

Concerne: Révision de la Loi sur les EPF

Monsieur le Président, cher Collègue,

Dans sa séance du 8 octobre 2015, la CCE a examiné le texte soumis en consultation le 11 septembre dernier concernant la révision partielle de la loi sur les EPF. La CCE s’est concentrée sur les articles 16a et 34d qui concernent l’enseignement.

Limitation des admissions

La CCE approuve le principe directeur sous-jacent à la proposition de modification de l’article 16a, soit de limiter le nombre d’admissions pour autant que ceci soit dûment justifié par un problème de capacité.

La CCE prend note que cette limite ne saurait s’appliquer aux étudiants au bénéfice d’un certificat d’accès aux études supérieures octroyé par une institution suisse.

Elle s’inquiète cependant des cas d’étudiants Suisses ou résidents permanents qui auraient obtenus un certificat à l’étranger, suite à un bref séjour hors sol Suisse, dû par exemple à une délocalisation professionnelle temporaire de leurs parents. La CCE espère que pour de tels cas des exceptions pourront être faites.
Modalités d’application de la limitation des admissions

Les modalités d’application de cette modification de la loi ne sont pas prescrites dans le texte et nécessiteront un règlement d’application interne. Seul le critère du mérite académique devrait participer à la sélection des admissions.

Finances d’inscription pour les étudiants Suisses et résidents en Suisse

La CCE s’inquiète de la latitude donnée au CEPF d’augmenter les finances d’inscription par un montant de « faible ampleur mais dépassant le renchérissement » comme le mentionne le texte explicatif, et se demande sur quelle base le montant « socialement acceptable » sera déterminé, si le renchérissement n’est pas un critère.

Le texte de loi ne précise pas si la finance d’inscription reste unique pour tous ou si elle sera différenciée afin de rester « socialement acceptable » selon le revenu. Les membres de la CCE souhaitent que cette contribution soit unique sans distinction entre étudiants.

Finances d’inscription pour les étudiants étrangers

Bien que les membres de la CCE aient exprimé des vues très divergentes sur ce thème, certains souhaitant tout simplement l’abolition de l’art. 342bis, un vote à main levée montra qu’une large majorité de la CCE se prononce en faveur de l’introduction d’une finance d’inscription plus élevée pour les étudiants étrangers.

Affectation des émoluments

Le texte de loi ne spécifie pas l’utilisation des revenus provenant de l’augmentation des finances d’inscription. La CCE enjoint la direction de s’assurer que, comme mentionné dans le rapport explicatif, « les recettes supplémentaires [soient] affectées [uniquement] aux bourses et autres mesures en faveur des étudiants ».

En vous remerciant pour l’attention que vous portez à ce courrier, veuillez agréer, cher collègue, l’expression de mes sentiments les meilleurs,

Aude Billard
Présidente CCE
Concern: Révision de la Loi sur les EPF

Mister President, dear Colleague,

During its 8 Octobre 2015 meeting, the members of the CCE have discussed the text submitted for consultation on Sept 11, regarding the revision of the law on the ETH-institutes. The CCE has focused its discussion around articles 16a and 34d that relate to teaching.

Limits of the admissions
The CCE approves the principle underlying the proposed modification of Art. 16a, i.e. to limit the number of admitted students, to the extent that this limit is justified by capacity limits.

The CCE takes note that the limit on the number of entering students does not apply to students who benefit from a certificate to enter higher education institutions that is delivered by a Swiss institution.

It is however concerned by the case of students who are Swiss nationals or residents and who would have earned a certificate in a foreign institution, following a very brief stay outside Switzerland, for instance following a temporary professional de-localization of their parents. The CCE hopes that exceptions could be considered for these cases.

Applications of the limits on the admissions
The text of law does not specify how the limits of the admissions will be performed on a daily basis. This will likely be done through an internal directive. Admissions should be judged solely based on academic merit.

Fees for Swiss nationals and Swiss residents
The CCE is surprised by the freedom left to the ETH-board to increase the fees by “a small amount that may however exceed the rise of cost of living”, as stated in the explanatory document. If rise in living cost is not a criterion, then what criterion will be used to determine what is deemed as a “socially acceptable” fee?

The text of law does not specify if the fee will remain unique for all or if there will be different fees according to what is deemed socially acceptable depending on the parents’ revenue. The CCE members request that the fee be unique without distinction across students.
**Fees for foreign students**

The members of the CCE were split on this topic, with a group of members wanting to abolish art. 34bis. However, an open vote resulted in a vast majority in favor of introducing a higher fee for foreign students.

**Usage of the fees**

The text of the law does not specify how the revenues generated by the increase of the fees will be used. The CCE asks the direction to make sure that, as mentioned in the explanatory document, the fees be used for scholarships and other actions that benefit students directly.

Sincerely yours,

Aude Billard
President CCE
RESULTATS DU VOTE DES CANDIDATS POUR 2015-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidat</th>
<th>Nombre total de voix</th>
<th>Nombre total de voix pondérées</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guillaume Anciaux, Civil Engineering</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aude Billard, MicroEngineering</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camille Bres, Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivier Burdet, Civil Engineering</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raphael Butté, Physics</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simone Deparis, Mathematics</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Dionne, Architecture</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drazen Dujic, Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georg Fantner, MicroEngineering</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Fontcumberta, Materials Science</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volker Gass, Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolf Gruetter, Physics</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlotta Guiducci, BioEngineering</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christof Holliger, Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephane Joost (Environmental Engineering),</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivier Leveque, Communication Systems</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivier Martin, Electrical Engineering and MicroEngineering</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas Monod, Mathematics</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippe Muehlhaupt, Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Muralt, Materials Science</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix Naef, Life Sciences</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans-Jorg Ruppen, Mathematics CMS</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamila Sam, Computer Science</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paule Souberyrand, Architecture</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Soutter, Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participation au vote par catégorie du corps enseignant, en % :

% of voters within each category
- PROF: 42%
- MER: 41%
- CDC: 44%

Voix par catégorie du corps enseignant, en % :

% voters per category
- PROF: 35%
- MER: 53%
- CDC: 12%