



Consultation in regards to modifications to LEX 1.1.1

Date: 12.05.2026

In the following, “ELSA” refers to all three entities ELSA, PolyDoc and EPDA. This document is the joint position of these three entities.

ELSA would first like to thank the organizers of the consultation for the translations of the proposed LEX in English. Also, ELSA thanks the School Assembly for organizing this consultation.

We understand the idea behind the restructuration of EPFL's hierarchy.

One effect from it we can see happening, which we have already started to preemptively feel, is a stronger and more direct link between VPH and the intermediate body, which is greatly appreciated.

We are not conceptually against a stronger structural division between AVP-R and AVP-DLE, but this would mean more coordination work on the side of the roles of doctoral students. Therefore: **how is the coordination between VPE and VPS thought out when it comes to doctoral students specifically?**

Another concern is the removal of the explicit list of Associate VPs in the LEX. Article 10 used to contain a list of these AVPs, and this list has been removed from the LEX in order to increase flexibility, from the point of view of the Direction. Observe that any change to the LEX has to pass by a school-wide consultation, as per LEX 1.1.2 article 1.1, guaranteeing some minimum threshold of prior discussion and feedback. It is surprising if not worrying that the Direction wants to completely remove the *need* for prior discussion / feedback before making structural changes as significant as adding/removing an Associate VP role. AVP-R and AVP-DLE are integral roles when it comes to the management of the intermediate body, and it would be detrimental to see those roles disappear, especially without any mandatory discussions. Hence, **ELSA would be in favor of bringing back the explicit list of AVPs in the LEX.**

The apparent suppression of AVP-E also would indicate that most of their responsibilities would fall on VPE, on top of some of the responsibilities of VPA. AVP-Education has been the point of contact for all time sensitive matters of education since the creation of the role, and part of his time has also been devoted to the strategic thinking and implementation of rules and regulations regarding education. Adding this to the agenda of a replacement role for VPA seems unmanageable, and we are concerned that the responsibilities linked to the intermediate body



which VPE would have to oversee, will be overlooked as a result of the amount of day-to-day work needed for the student body issues.

Articles 7 and 8: The president is taking on even more responsibilities, particularly in the areas of professorial affairs, student associations and philanthropy. We are concerned that this would reduce the interactions between the different bodies impacted by potential changes which could be proposed, as well as introduce delays on non-urgent projects. Most universities have a second person next to the president to shoulder the decision-making process as provost or rector. We then ask **why is such a role not deemed necessary at EPFL anymore?** We do recognize the advantages of efficiency and impact on resolving issues this change could mean.

Finally, we would like to point out the absence of preemptive internal discussions with the rest of the community before the formal proposed LEX change, especially concerning the removal of such a previously crucial role as the one of VPA, and want to emphasize again the need for more direct discussions when it comes to decisions impacting so strongly the intermediate body.