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We look back on a productive year with many inspiring meetings, most of which were on campus again. It was wonderful to be able to see each other in real life again and have our retreat in Huize Bergen in Vught. We are happy with the recognition we received for the UTQ advice which was presented in September 2021, our involvement in the discussion on Recognition & Rewards and recently, the section model.

In September 2022 Oana and Yoeri will step down as board members. We have found two great new board members in Max Birk and Karin Smolders. Secretary to EYAE Rozemarijn Schalkx will leave TU/e as of September. We are very grateful her for her significant contributions to EYAE and wish her all the best.

Finally, the founding group of EYAE members who started in 2018 will leave as of September 2022. We would like to thank them for their pioneering work in the last four years. A citation by one of these founding members illustrates what EYAE is all about:

„It has been a real pleasure to be part of the academy. I really enjoyed the time I spent there. I made connections that otherwise I would have never made. I met people, brilliant people, that otherwise I would have never met. I am sure all this will help us (me and the TU/e) in the coming years to build a better university in the broadest possible sense. I hope that the EYEA stays around for many, many years to come.”

We can only echo that sentiment and are certain that the productive and inspiring culture of EYAE that the first-generation members helped create will last.

Yoeri van de Burgt, chair of the board (2021-2022)
Sandra Loerakker, vice-chair of the board
Oana Druta, member of the board
Roy van der Meel, member of the board
Rozemarijn Schalkx, secretary to EYAE
Members

New members 2021 and mutations

In May 2021 the application for new members opened. Deans and current EYAE members were specifically asked to ask suitable colleagues to apply. The call was also put on twitter and the website.

After summer, Yoeri van de Burgt, Daniël Lakens and KNAW-member Carlijn Bouten interviewed all candidates, supported by Rozemarijn Schalkx.

6 Candidates were accepted as members:

- Karin Smolders (Industrial Engineering & Innovation Sciences)
- Diletta Giuntini (Mechanical Engineering)
- Francesca Grisoni (Biomedical Engineering)
- Max Birk (Industrial Design)
- Pim van der Hoorn (Mathematics & Computer Science)
- Maryam Razavian (Industrial Engineering & Innovation Sciences)

They joined 2020 members

- Federica Eduati (Biomedical Engineering)
- Bob Walrave (Industrial Engineering & Innovation Sciences)
- Johanna Höffken (Industrial Engineering & Innovation Sciences)
- Matias Duran Matute (Applied Physics)
- Danqing Liu (Chemical Engineering & Chemistry)
- Roy van der Meel (Biomedical Engineering)
- Antoni Forner Cuenca (Chemical Engineering and Chemistry)

2020 members
2019 Members

- Yoeri van de Burgt (Mechanical Engineering)
- Tugce Martagan (Industrial Engineering & Innovation Sciences)
- Yali Tang (Mechanical Engineering)
- Sandra Loerakker (Biomedical Engineering)
- Oana Druta (Built Environment)
- Daniël Tetteroo (Industrial Design)
- Sofie Haesaert (Electrical Engineering)

And honorary member

- Liesbeth Janssen (Applied Physics - member De Jonge Akademie)

Board

Yoeri van de Burgt became chair of EYAE in September 2021. Other board members were Oana Druta and Sandra Loerakker who had joined the board in September 2020. Sandra Loerakker was vice-chair. Roy van der Meel joined as board member in September 2021.

2018 Members

- Mathias Funk (Industrial Design)
- Emanuela Bosco (Built Environment)
- Jim Portegies (Mathematics & Computer Science)
- Kevin Verbeek (Mathematics & Computer Science)
- Patty Stabile (Electrical Engineering)
- Alex Alvarado (Electrical Engineering)
- Tom de Greef (Biomedical Engineering)
- Sandra Hofmann (Biomedical Engineering)
- Rong-Hao Liang (Industrial Design)
- Job Beckers (Applied Physics)
- Hanneke Gelderblom (Applied Physics)
- Ilja Voets (Chemical Engineering & Chemistry)
- Tom Oomen (Mechanical Engineering)
- Daniël Lakens (Industrial Engineering & Innovation Sciences)
- Patricia Dankers (Biomedical Engineering)
Almost all Dutch universities now have young academies. A few times a year, meetings of the young academies in The Netherlands take place. Yoeri van de Burgt and Oana Druta attended these Local Young Academies meetings. Some of the topics that were discussed throughout the year included, the new labor agreement, social safety, research funding, climate action and possible compensation for being in a young academy.

**DJA**

Tom de Greef and Liesbeth Janssen are members of DJA and have served as a liaison between DJA and EYAE. From 2022 onwards Jim Portegies has joined them as a DJA member. Tom de Greef is part of a project group within DJA called “Veni, Vidi, Foetsie”. They are studying why doctoral candidates do or do not want to pursue a career in science, extending earlier research done on this topic by EYAE to include doctoral candidates from the humanities and social sciences.

**Challenging future generations**

Finally, EYAE is a partner within the alliance of TU/e, Utrecht University (UU), University Medical Center Utrecht (UMCU) and Wageningen University & Research (WUR): ‘Challenging future generations’ (https://ewuu.nl/nl/). The Young Academies of the four institutions have been tasked to find ways to address pressing societal challenges. This has resulted in the foundation of the Centre for Unusual Collaborations (CUCo, www.unusualcollaborations.com).
EYAE is supported by the executive board who provides a secretary (in-kind) and funds for organizing events and meetings. Total expenses for the period July 2021-July 2022 were 8982,- euro. The money was mostly spent on the retreat and catering costs for meetings.
Each year we report on the contributions we have made with regard to these aims.

#1 Being a platform for young academics for open discussion

In 2021/2022 we had 9 regular meetings, an inaugural dinner on October 7th with Frank Baaijens and one retreat in November 2021. Regular meetings usually lasted 1.5-2 hours. Some meetings were held completely via Teams because of Covid-19, but when the measures eased our meetings became hybrid. Although hybrid meetings are not ideal for those who are following the discussions from home, it enables more members to attend so we will keep this setup for now.

We discussed a variety of topics, sometimes with guests. Examples are:

- Dealing with the implications of Covid-19 and coming back to campus
- Social safety
- Mental health of students
- The field-weighted citation impact and visibility of TU/e internationally
- How finances within TU/e work – with Ruud van de Donk (F&C)
- The redesign of the bachelor college
- Abuse of copyrighted material by commercial platforms such as Stuvia, Studeersnel and Athena Studies
- Improving the visibility EYAE
- Recognition and Rewards (twice)
- The findings of the prizes committee
- The impact of the war in Ukraine
- The first TU/e research day / nominating someone for the TU/e young researcher of the year award
- Research support
- Academic culture with Remco Tuinier
- The benefits of a writing retreat
- Outstanding support staff (‘the unicorn’): finding and keeping them

Our retreat in November 2021 was dedicated to discussing workload with external advisor Maarten de Winter, ways to support early career staff and also offered time for working groups to work on their topics.

>>>
#2 Providing support for early career researchers at TU/e

Yoeri van de Burgt and Toni Forner Cuenca have written a welcome document that can help new early career researchers find their way within TU/e. Also the impact of Covid-19 on early career researchers (specifically parents of young children) was discussed extensively.

#3 Fostering interdisciplinary cooperation and research

The executive boards of TU/e, UU, UMCU and WUR have invited their respective young academies to work together to address societal challenges as a working group within the Strategic Alliance between the four partner institutions. Sandra Hofmann, Daniël Lakens and Daniël Tetteroo have been involved as representatives from the EYAE in the foundation and development of the Centre for Unusual Collaborations that facilitates and fosters Unusual Collaborations to address societal challenges with a physical center. The physical location of CUCo officially opened on September 16, 2021 at the Vening Meineszgebouw in Utrecht. More details on www.unusualcollaborations.com

CUCo has awarded 6 unusual collaborations grants. EYAE-members are active in 4 of them. Yoeri van de Burgt is part of the team Defeating Chronic Pain. Yali Tang and Toní Forner-Cuenca are part of the team The Fair-Battery Challenge. Yali Tang is member of the team All in the same boat: unusual solutions for cleaner water. Daniël Lakens is part of the team The Power of One. Daniël Lakens was interviewed on CUCo in September 2021.

#4 Fostering excellence in education

Jim Portegies, Alex Alvarado and Job Beckers organized a survey on the University Teaching Qualification. Over one hundred faculty who had taken the course in the last ten years took part in the survey. A draft analysis of the findings was discussed in June of 2021. The document with results and recommendations (appendix 1) was discussed in the executive board meeting of 30 September 2021 with members Alex Alvarado and Jim Portegies, Rachelle Kamp (HR) and Ines Lopez Arteaga (Dean Bachelor College). The findings will be used in future policies regarding the UTQ.

#5 Contributing to valorization (knowledge transfer) and outreach

This academic year EYAE itself did not contribute to valorization or outreach of science. However, our members made active individual contributions. For instance Oana Druta, Yoeri van de Burgt, Ilja Voets, Liesbeth Janssen, Patricia Dankers, Max Birk and Roy van der Meel have all made lectures for Universiteit van Nederland.

This year the focus was on outreach to make EYAE better known within TU/e. This was done by organizing open drinks in May 2022 at De Zwarte Doos for anyone with an interest in EYAE, and specifically to attract new members. We were also active in TU/e media. We reacted to the proposal of De Jonge Akademie on shortening the academic year in Cursor in September 2021. Jim Portegies was interviewed by Cursor on EYAE and his membership of DJA in December 2021. In February 2022 Yoeri van der Burgt and Sandra Loerakker were interviewed by Barry Fitzgerald for a TU/e news story on EYAE. Yali Tang was interviewed on research support. Liesbeth Janssen, Tom de Greef and Jim Portegies spoke about being part of De Jonge Akademie and EYAE in an extensive interview in March 2022.
EYAE has its own website and twitter account, accessible for all members. The twitter account has 453 followers (July 2022) (was 339 in July 2021) and is mostly used by the EYAE secretary to communicate about events and news about our members and to keep in contact with other young academies.

**#6 Advising on policies regarding scientific research, education, valorization, outreach and impact both inside and outside TU/e**

EYAE is seen as an important representation of young researchers. Members are often asked to join committees to improve policies.

- Yali Tang and Emanuela Bosco were part of the advisory committee for the Research Life Cycle evaluation.
- Sandra Hofmann and Yoeri van de Burgt were part of the taskforce Recognition & Rewards chaired by Frank Baaijens.
- Sofie Haesaert was part of the Prizes and Awards committee from September 2021 until July 2022. Daniël Lakens was an ambassador for the committee.

In July 2022 EYAE Frank Baaijens invited EYAE to discuss further development of the section model, an organizational model that was introduced a few years ago to strengthen to position of early career scientists. A group of members will continue working on this topic the coming months.
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Welcome document
A Survey on the University Teaching Qualification (UTQ) Program at TU/e

TU/e Young Academy of Engineering
A. Alvarado, J. Beckers, and J. Portegies
{a.alvarado,j.beckers,j.w.portegies}@tue.nl

September 2, 2021

Executive Summary

In 2019, TU/e’s Eindhoven Young Academy of Engineering (EYAE) was asked by the Executive board to think about characterizations of excellent teaching, which led to a working group on teaching excellence. Yet in the opinion of this working group, much more important than the existence of individual examples of excellent teaching is that teaching at TU/e is generically of good quality. One of the mechanisms in place at TU/e to ensure a basic level of teaching quality is the University Teaching Quality (UTQ) program. Since signals kept coming to the EYAE working group that showed large dissatisfaction with this UTQ process, the EYAE decided to investigate the background of these signals, and conducted a survey among more than 100 TU/e employees who have obtained their UTQ within the last 10 years, or who were in the process of obtaining it. This document summarizes the findings of the survey and also proposes ways to improve the UTQ program. More specifically, the working group has identified two areas of improvement: (i) change the program focus to directly improve teaching quality and (ii) considerably reduce the program workload.

Main Findings of the Survey

While the respondents recognize certain strong points for the UTQ program, there is a significant group that is dissatisfied with it, content-wise and/or process-wise. On a scale from 1-10, the average grade the respondents gave the UTQ program was a 5.8. Of the 97 persons who graded the UTQ program, 36 (37%) graded it as insufficient (grade 5 or lower). The survey included possibilities to write open comments, which is where a lot of dissatisfaction for the process was shown. At the same time, these open comments provided valuable information that could be used for improvement purposes. The recommendations included in this document are indeed partially inspired by those comments.

Some common strong aspects recognized for the UTQ program are the possibility to meet fellow teachers and the nice interactions with teachers of the different modules that are part of the overall UTQ program. Having the possibility of reflecting on their own teaching and obtaining necessary skills and tools to start teaching was also positively perceived. Many respondents also indicated that the UTQ program helped them with the organization of their teaching and setting up a structure for it. Furthermore, the UTQ program gave them good insights in educational theory providing them with a formal teaching background.

On the negative side, the results of the survey show that many respondents share certain specific points of criticism regarding the UTQ program. Common weak aspects found from the results of the survey include for example (1) the lack of flexibility of the UTQ program to adapt to the needs of individual participants, (2) the low quality of the modules (low level, low pace, overlap with other modules, low information density), (3) the high workload and the transformation of the whole UTQ process into a bureaucratic activity to obtain a certificate required for tenure/promotion, and (4) the portfolio not being the best way to achieve learning goals.

1Distribution: TU/e Executive Board, Ines Lopez Arteaga (Responsible for UTQ at TU/e), UTQ Departmental Dossier Committee members (via their UTQ coordinators), Rachelle J. A. Kamp (Team leader TEACH Program at TU/e).
Proposal for Improvement

We believe that the UTQ program in its current form can—and should be—improved considerably. We have identified two Areas of improvement, and give specific Suggestions below.

A1: Change of program focus. We suggest to shift the focus from portfolio writing towards activities that more directly improve teaching quality.

A2: Reduce program workload. We advice to considerably reduce the time expected to be spent on the UTQ program.

For A1, we suggest to replace part of the modules and on-the-job coaching by:

S1.1: Peer supervision (intervision) groups, in which teachers from different departments exchange ideas and experiences and help each other to resolve issues.

S1.2: A coaching program in which experienced teachers come to lectures and give feedback to the UTQ teacher.2

For A2, we suggest to reduce the program workload by:

S2.1: Limiting the size of the portfolio and time spent writing it by (i) providing a rigid template that includes all the required parts in the right format, (ii) limiting the amount of deliverables, (iii) setting a deadline for submitting the portfolio a certain number of months after the intake interview, and (iv) removing the requirement of submitting letters.

S2.2: Compacting the amount of module hours by at least 50% without losing too much content. This can be achieved by (i) increasing the information density on the offered courses as well as by removing most of the overlap between the UTQ modules, and (ii) by creating high-quality online material and allowing teachers to study asynchronously. Compacting the module hours can also be accomplished by offering the UTQ program in a single week, offered at least 4 times per year.

---

2This of course relies on the willingness of experienced teachers to coach junior staff members.
1 Survey general information

In the beginning of 2021 the EYAE conducted an online survey among staff members who completed their UTQ at some point in the last ten years or were in the process of obtaining it. These staff members were contacted by e-mail. More than 100 staff members fully completed the survey. The data was made anonymous. Quantitative data is aggregated and shown below. We have summarized the open comments by paraphrasing comments that were repeated among multiple responses.

2 Survey results

2.1 Motivation for doing UTQ

![Figure 1: Motivation for obtaining UTQ.]

2.2 On the intake

Some participants describe the intake procedure as efficient, effective and clear. Others indicate that insufficient attention is given to previous teaching experience. This leads to suggested learning activities that do not match the individual needs of the participants.

![Figure 2: Intake procedure.]

2.3 On the modules

Figure 3 shows quantitative results on the modules.

The pace of the modules is generally perceived as low. On average, the courses score 2.5/5, which is halfway between “somewhat slow” and “exactly right”. There are almost no participants
that feel the courses are too fast, and there is a large group of participants that feels the courses are very slow.

The quality of the modules, and whether they have contributed to making the participants better teachers, are all rated between 3 and 3.5 out of 5. The average rating of the teachers of the separate modules is a bit higher and ranges between 3.6 and 4 out of 5.

There is overlap between the modules. For instance the module Teaching and Learning in Higher Education becomes much less valuable when the module Teaching Skills is taken first.

![Graphs showing the results of the modules](image)

**Figure 3:** Results on modules: Made me a better teacher (top-left), good pace (top-right), good quality (bottom-left), and overall grade (bottom-right).

### 2.3.1 Remarks on the modules

**Remarks regarding module: Teaching and learning in higher education**

Common responses:
- Content can be condensed
- Too much theory/self-study
- Best part is learning from and discussing with peers
- Only useful if you do it at the beginning (not after other modules)
- Good, interactive, inspiring
- Doesn’t connect to practical teaching constraints (such as efficiency constraints)

**Remarks regarding module: Teaching Skills**

Common responses:
- Overlap with other modules
• Good
• Pace too low
• Pace too high
• Doesn’t connect well with teaching practice

Remarks regarding module: Assessment
Common responses:
• Slow pace, low information density
• Bad quality learning materials
• Seemed to have suffered a bit from transition to online
• Good/useful

Remarks regarding module: Evaluation
Common response:
• slow

Remarks regarding module: Designing courses and projects
Common responses:
• Inspirational
• Slow
• Online version fast

2.4 On-the-job coaching

Figure 4 gives an impression on the evaluation of the on-the-job coaching.

2.4.1 Remarks about on-the-job-coaching

• Different speeds in the group
• Writing of the Portfolio not useful/waste of time
• Discussions with peers useful
• Many people (who did the UTQ longer time ago) did not have an on-the-job coach
• More feedback would have been appreciated
Figure 4: On-the-job coaching. From top to bottom: Made me a better teacher, useful feedback from coach, useful feedback from peers, useful feedback from UTQ committee, time spent.
2.5 The whole process

Figure 5 gives an impression of the evaluation of the whole process.

2.5.1 Remarks about the whole process

Common responses:
- Take into account existing skills of teachers
- UTQ did not contribute much to teaching quality
- Coaching, direct feedback and peer supervision/intervision would be more useful
- UTQ has become a bureaucratic activity
- Large workload
Figure 5: The whole process. From top to bottom: duration, organization, better teacher by sharing experiences with colleagues, better teacher by the reflections, more feedback, and more theory.
2.6 Further UTQ-like courses

Figure 6 summarizes whether survey participants would be interested in attending more UTQ-like modules.

Please elaborate on why you would or would not like to follow more UTQ-like courses  Common responses:
- Not with current quality of the courses
- Depending on the topics, yes
- Concrete suggestions for topics
- No, it would be more efficient to educate myself on what I need

2.7 Overall grade

Figure 7 shows the distribution of the overall grade for the UTQ. Figure 8 gives an impression of the grade distribution taking into account the starting year. This grade distribution does not show a particular trend.

The grade distribution of grades with respect to starting year does not show any particular trend.

2.8 What people liked

Common responses:
- Meeting fellow teachers
- Reflection
Figure 8: Overall grade
• Gave necessary skills
• Helped with the organization, with structuring
• Good insights into educational theory
• Nice interaction with teachers
• Gives formal background

2.9 Points of improvement

Common responses:
• More differentiation, adjust to needs of participants
• Portfolio is not best way to achieve the learning goals
• Reduce workload
• Higher content density
• Less overlap
• Put emphasis on actual visiting lectures
• Level too low
• Part of the assessment in the UTQ process also takes too much time for scientific staff
Welcome to TU/e!
Easy quickstart to find your way around
Welcome aboard!

With this onboarding document, the Eindhoven Young Academy of Engineering (EYAE) aims to give you relevant information on your tenure track with tips and tricks from members to quickly find your way in our community. Although carefully written, this information should only be seen as a well-intended guide. An online version—with working links—of this document can be found on our website.

Teaching

Teaching is an essential part of your job. To ensure high-quality education, Dutch universities offer a program to obtain the “University Teaching Qualification” (UTQ, or BKO in Dutch). You will need to obtain this certificate to obtain tenure and get promoted. HR will automatically invite you to start this process. Important is that you find a course to design (or redesign) to be able to prove your teaching abilities. Right after you start you can already discuss this with your supervisor and department. For more information see here. The EYAE has also recently written policy advice on implementing the UTQ in our university which will be available on our website.

Tenure and promotion

The regulations for promotion will be updated to create more room for diverse career tracks. We expect that the new regulations will be adopted as of 2023. In September - December 2022 a pilot will start in Mechanical Engineering (ME), Applied Physics (AP), and Industrial Engineering & Innovation Science (IE&IS). In short: there are three tracks that you can be promoted on: Research, Education, and Impact. Although you are expected to perform well in all aspects, you can excel (and be promoted on) in one track. In other words, if you choose education as your development track you should work on the other aspects one level below the one you are aspiring to in education (e.g. Full professor in Education means you are working on the level of associate professor for Research and Impact).

Many of you will be promoted in the Research track, but if you feel that education and educational innovation is something you can bring about change and impact, this is also a possibility. You always discuss your plan with your supervisor and dean so that the chosen track aligns well with the needs of your department. Finally, there should always be the possibility to switch tracks during your career, but you are responsible for your own track and eventual promotions. It is therefore advisable to be pro-active with regards to your own career. You can always discuss with your supervisor if you think you are ready for the next step.

There are six layers of scientific staff (in order of promotion): assistant professor 2 (tenure track), assistant professor 1 (commonly with ius promovendi), associate professor 2 (commonly with ius promovendi), associate professor 1, (full) professor 2, (full) professor 1. For more information see our current career policy Excellent people attract excellent people and Recognition and Rewards.

Each promotion layer will be evaluated by a BAC (in Dutch: Benoemings-Advies Commissie) to which you will hand a package that contains a CV, research and teaching statements and all other relevant documents to support your application for promotion. During the meeting with the BAC committee, you present and discuss your case and vision for the future with the committee.

Let us guide you to find your way in the TU/e community!
Visibility and independence

Scientific research has become highly competitive and heavily relies on obtaining (personal) grants to develop long-lasting careers. This is particularly true for early career researchers who must perform original and groundbreaking research right from the start and need to attract competitive funding to grow the group and be able to develop such ideas. In that scenario, independence and visibility are a must. Independence is one of the most important criteria for grant reviewers at the Dutch and EU level and necessary for promotion to more senior roles in academia. Visibility is also critical to spread the scientific vision of the early career researcher, disseminate science, demonstrate leadership, build networks across the globe, and attract invitations to seminars and publications.

In this context, early career researchers need operational freedom (i.e., scientific, financial, and administrative) to be able to fulfill these ambitious goals. We strongly believe this can be achieved while actively collaborating with the research group, but there also needs to be room to develop the foundations of a future independent research group.

If you choose the path of developing your own group and becoming a principal investigator (PI), you will commonly do so as part of a larger “section”, “division” or “cluster” in your department. This section will normally be led by a full professor (or chair), and you often share lab and teaching duties, including master and bachelor student projects. Contrarily to what some people believe on our campus, it is always encouraged to start thinking about your own, independent, research direction and theme. Of course, this can (and sometimes should) be well-aligned with the general theme and goals of the section/division you are operating in. However, it is important to demonstrate your ability to independently coordinate and execute your own innovative and original research theme and projects.

And though not everyone might agree, it can be very helpful to have a personal (group) webpage (other than the TU/e one) and a (group) Twitter or LinkedIn account. Eventually you should try to stand out from your supervisor, particularly if you have similar or overlapping research interests. An independent online presence can help you achieve this among other things like finding new collaborations or keeping up to date with the latest research in your field.

It will be very helpful to have clear agreements on teaching and supervision duties within your section/division and with your supervisor. Some professors are keen on having assistant professors (and tenure trackers) in their groups take over most supervision or teaching duties. However, this is not advisable to start your own independent career. It usually takes up a lot of time which you cannot spend on starting your independent career/group.

The EYAE has recently written advice about strengthening the position of early career scientists in a changing funding landscape.

Funding

Obtaining funding is an essential part of research. Naturally, a start-up period is expected, in which you can find your way in the funding landscape but eventually (typically from associate professor level) you are expected to—sustainably—obtain your own funding. It is highly recommended to do this, particularly as you are expected to develop your own independent career path. Though it is possible to remain in the “group/section” of your supervisor/team and keep working and co-supervising staff within this group, this is certainly not compulsory and it is still recommended to obtain your own funding.

Fortunately, there is abundant support for funding and grants, see here (personal grants) and here (general research support), and here for a flyer with more information.

Relevant contact information and people:

- General Research Support (researchsupport@tue.nl)
- National Grants | Rianne Pas (r.pas@tue.nl)
- Regional Grants | Karen Luijten (k.luijten.hoffman@tue.nl)
- European Grants | Wilfried Reincke (w.t.h.reincke@tue.nl)
- Personal Grants | Maartje Koppelman, Laura Panders, Karoline Duijvesz (personalgrants@tue.nl)
- Budgets | Cézar Chang Chang (cchangchang@tue.nl), Irene Damen (i.m.m.damen@tue.nl)
- General budget office (budgets.RFSO.DFEZ@tue.nl)

Awards

To strengthen your track record, it might be helpful to win awards. The TU/e has recently started to actively promote and suggest candidates for awards and prizes. You are encouraged to keep track of prizes in your field and to actively promote yourself and your (TU/e) colleagues when possible. Please contact Rianne Pas (r.pas@tue.nl) for more information.
Collaborations

It is recommended to establish collaborations with colleagues at TU/e or externally. There are many ways of initiating these collaborations, from shared master/internship projects to internal funding from, for instance, one of the 4 institutes (see next point), and through regular “match-making” events. And although frequently visiting symposia and conferences around the world is becoming more difficult to align with our sustainable goals, it can be very useful and important to meet your peers, interact and set up collaborations.

Institutes

There are 4 cross-disciplinary institutes on our campus:

- **ICMS** (Institute for Complex Molecular Systems)
- **EIRES** (Eindhoven Institute for Renewable Energy Systems)
- **EAISI** (Eindhoven A.I. Systems Institute)
- **EHCI** (Eindhoven Hendrik Casimir Institute)

These institutes organize many interesting events and are breeding places for collaborations. Find out whether you are already part of one of the institutes, and if not whether you are doing research that is related to one of them. You can always apply to be a part of one of the institutes, which they usually encourage.

Personal development

All departments have their own team of HR advisors and HR Service employees. Reach out to your HR advisor for further information on tenure and promotion in your department, for questions on professional development, mentoring, social safety, etc. Reach out to HR Services for administrative matters and TU/e regulations, such as commuting reimbursements, subsidized bikes, etc. For more information on HR see here.

Eindhoven Young Academy of Engineering

The Eindhoven Young Academy of Engineering (EYAE) is a network of enthusiastic, ambitious and outstanding early career scientists, designers and engineers with a broad interest and view on science and engineering in general.

We aim to provide a platform for young academics for open discussion and support for early career researchers. We actively contribute to valorization and outreach and give advice on policies regarding scientific research, education, valorization, outreach, and impact both inside and outside TU/e.

Every year we elect new members to our academy, with a call that opens in May.

Other interesting resources

- Beginner guide to Dutch Academia by De Jonge Akademie
- Labour agreement Dutch Universities
- Conditions of employment TU/e

And finally...

We are very glad you have decided to join the TU/e and wish you all the best in your academic career here in Eindhoven. Please feel free to contact us with any suggestions or comments regarding any of these topics or any important topics or issues we might have overlooked, at eya@tue.nl or contact one of the members in your department directly. You can find all current (board) members on our website.

Welcome at TU/e and good luck!
About us
TU Eindhoven Young Academy of Engineering (EYAE) is a network of enthusiastic, ambitious and outstanding early career scientists, designers and engineers with a broad interest and view on science and engineering in general.

Our aims
- Being a platform for young academics for open discussion
- Providing support for early career researchers at TU/e
- Fostering interdisciplinary cooperation and research
- Fostering excellence in education
- Contributing to valorization (knowledge transfer) and outreach
- Advising on policies regarding scientific research, education, valorization, outreach and impact both inside and outside TU/e

More information
You can find more information on our website or you can send a mail to eya@tue.nl.

Although carefully written, this information should only be seen as a well-intended guide.