The combined Examination Committee for the old-style and new-style inter-departmental Master’s programs Automotive Technology, Sustainable Energy Technology and Systems and Control of Eindhoven University of Technology (TU/e) having regard to Article 7.12, 7.12.a, 7.12.b, 7.12c of the Higher Education and Scientific Research Act (WHW), the Program and Examination Regulations for the relevant programs, the TU/e Assessment Framework, adopted by the Executive Board on June 24, 2013, reviewed on October 23, 2014, the Departmental Assessment Policy, adopted by the Departmental Board on November 11th, 2014 and reviewed in August 2017, the TU/e Education Fraud Policy, adopted by the Executive Board on March 5, 2015, supplemented with Section 7 on April 9, 2015, The TU/e Graduate School Regulations, adopted by the Executive Board on April 3, 2014, supplemented by the decision of the Executive Board of April 28, 2016, the TU/e Central Examination Regulations, adopted by the Executive Board on December 4, 2014, and the Examination Committee Guide, a brochure adopted by the Executive Board on October 23, 2014. The ‘Gemeenschappelijke regeling’ for each of the master’s programs, adopted by all of the departments joining into the programs

Hereby adopts The Regulations for the Examination Committee 2017-2018 dated September 1st, 2017 which read as follows:

Preamble
The Examination Committee is a statutory body and is appointed by the Departmental Board. The Committee is independent and is the highest authority with regard to safeguarding the standard of the degree program, including matters such as testing and fraud and all other aspects that are necessary to ensure that students who are awarded a degree have attained the outcomes for the relevant programs.

The Examination Committee determines, in an objective and expert manner, whether students have fulfilled the conditions set out in the Program and Examination Regulations (OER) with regard to the knowledge, understanding, competences and skills that are necessary to obtain a degree.
In these Regulations, the Examination Committee sets out rules for the implementation of its duties and powers in accordance with the WHW, and the measures to be taken in the event of fraud. The Examination Committee acts in accordance with the WHW and the OER for the relevant programs, and also in accordance with the TU/e Assessment Framework, departmental assessment policy and the TU/e Education Fraud Policy.

The Examination Committee assumes that lecturers for academic degree programs are appointed with care, and regards them as having primary responsibility for assuring the quality of the examinations and final examinations on the basis of which the Examination Committee confers degrees. Nevertheless, it is the statutory task of the Examination Committee to ascertain whether the quality of assessment is actually assured, and it has the statutory power to issue guidelines and instructions that examiners must comply with when testing students. For this reason, the Examination Committee shall make every effort, within the bounds of its statutory powers, to provide lecturers with support in their work if possible, and to hold them to account when they do not act within the relevant frameworks. To this end, the Examination Committee shall assess the relevant Assessment Policies in terms of their feasibility and effectiveness, and suggest relevant amendments where necessary. The Committee shall also advise the program management concerning options for the further professionalization of lecturers/examiners.

The chair of the Examination Committee for Master’s Programs shall sit on the Advisory Committee for Master’s Examinations (AEM). The AEM shall carry out its duties in accordance with the TU/e Graduate School Regulations.

The statutory powers of the Examination Committee for a degree program apply in any case to all study components that are part of the curriculum of the student’s degree program.

1 General provisions

Art. 1.1 Definitions
In these regulations, the following terms shall be understood to mean:

WHW: de Wet op het hoger onderwijs en wetenschappelijk onderzoek (the Dutch Higher Education and Scientific Research Act)
OER: The Program and Examination Regulations of the degree program
ESA: Education and Student Affairs of the TU/e
response time: a period of four weeks within which the Examination Committee must reach a decision after receiving a request,
unless the request is received after the June meeting. Requests received after the June meeting will be dealt with in the August meeting.

*Graduation supervisor*: advises the “old style” students studying under the conditions of the OER 2017-2018 Master’s program as described in App. 1. Art. n.4 on all individual parts of the program. Where “Mentor” or “Thesis supervisor” are mentioned in this document, when referring to the Master’s program Old Style it should be read “Graduation supervisor.”

*Examination*: see the definition in the OER for Master’s programs.

See the Program and Examination Regulations of the individual programs for further definitions. Other terms used in these regulations shall have the meaning ascribed to them in the WHW.
Art. 1.2 Composition of the Examination Committee
1. The Departmental Board will appoint the following examination committee:
a combined examination committee for the Master’s programs on Automotive Technology, on Sustainable Energy Technology and on Systems and Control\(^1\), for all programs both in old style and new style (Graduate School).
The distribution of the members is such, that for each of the master’s programs, at least two members of the examination committee are relevant experts.
2. The composition of the Examination Committee is such that the required independence and expertise are guaranteed. The examination committee will be composed of seven members. One member is chair, another member is deputy chair. Six members of the committee are faculty members of one of the departments involved in the programs\(^2\). They contribute substantially to at least one of the master’s programs AT, S&C or SET. At least one of the members of the committee is a faculty member of the deputy department (Mechanical Engineering). One of the members is an external member, who does not have teaching duties in the degree programs for which the Examination Committee is responsible and is not employed by one of the involved departments.
3. Details about composition, appointment and tasks of the examination committee are established in the “faculteitsreglement” of the department of Mechanical Engineering and the “gemeenschappelijke regeling” for each master’s program.
4. The Examination Committee is supported by an official secretary.

Art. 1.3 Tasks and powers of the Examination Committee
1. The Examination Committee has the following statutory tasks/powers:
   a To appoint examiners (Article 7.12c of the WHW) based on the profile for examiners (see Annex 1).
   b To safeguard the quality of the examinations and final examinations (Article 7.12b, under a, of the WHW).
   c To establish procedures and instructions within the framework of the OER for assessing and determining the results of examinations (Article 7.12b, under b, of the WHW).
   d To grant permission to take an optional degree program (Article 7.12b, paragraph 1, under c, of the WHW).
   e To grant an exemption from taking one or more examinations (Article 7.12b, paragraph 1, under d, of the WHW).
   f To safeguard the quality of the organization and the procedure relating to examinations and final examinations (Article 7.12b, paragraph 1, under e, of the WHW).
   g To investigate cases of suspected fraud and, if the student concerned is guilty, to determine the sanction (Article 7.12b, paragraph 2, of the WHW).

---
\(^1\) Sometimes the masters’ programs’ names are abbreviated to AT (Automotive Technology), SET (Sustainable Energy Technology) and S&C (Systems and Control)\(^2\) Electrical engineering, Chemical Engineering, Industrial Design, Mathematics and Computer Science, Industrial Engineering and Innovation Sciences, Applied Physics, Built Environment, Mechanical Engineering
h To issue degree certificates to which is added the diploma supplement as proof that the final examination was completed successfully (Article 7.11 of the WHW).

i To delay the awarding of the degree certificate if the student has requested this with good reason (Article 7.11, paragraph 3, WHW in conjunction with Article 5.1, paragraph 5, OER Ma).

J To request information from examiners regarding the policy they have followed (Article 7.12c of the WHW).

K To compile an annual report (Article 7.12b, paragraph 5, of the WHW).

l To assess electives (Article 7.3d of the WHW).

2. General
   a To grant permission to include electives in the curriculum (Article 3.6, OER Ma).
   b To give advice on the (Departmental) Assessment Policy.
   c To give advice on curriculum content.
   d To give advice on the draft model OER.
   e To declare an examination invalid if there are serious irregularities ().
   f To advise the examiner in particular cases in connection with the correction of an already announced final grade in cases where this has consequences for attaining the academic degree
   g To determine a designation (Article 5.4, OER Ma).
   h To issue statements regarding study components passed.
   i To change the form of examination in exceptional cases (Article 4.1, paragraph 7, OER Ma).
   j To change the public nature of oral examination in exceptional cases (Article 4.2, paragraph 3, OER Ma).
   k To consult with other Examination Committees and the Departmental Board.
   l To exercise other powers as specified in the OER.

3. With regard to Master's programs:
   a To assess whether non-disciplinary study components can be included in a Master’s program (see Annex 3).
   b To grant permission for students to take, and sit examinations in, extra study components.
   c To grant approval for the choice of electives within the Master’s program.
   d To make a study progress decision for pre-Master’s students (Annex 2, art. 4 OER Ma).
   e To approve the composition of the evaluation committee for final projects (Art. 4.4, Regulations for the Examination Committee).
   f To approve the content of the international semester.
   g To approve proposals for the Master’s graduation project.
Art. 1.4 Examiners
1. An (external) examiner is an official who is responsible for an individual study component at TU/e and is appointed by the Examination Committee to assess students by organizing examinations for the study component and determining the results.
2. The appointments referred to in the previous paragraph are made each academic year for each study component, and are entered in a register of examiners that is kept by the secretary.
3. The examiners shall provide the Examination Committee with information if requested.
4. The quality of examiners is assured by monitoring and giving feedback on the quality of tests and assessments. The annual reports of the Examination Committees include an account of activities relating to the expertise of examiners.
Art. 1.5  Working method of the Examination Committee

1 The Examination Committee meets at least once a month, except in the month of July, preferably in the last week of the month. The dates upon which the Examination Committee meets, the deadline for examination registration and the deadline for submitting requests for a meeting shall be published on the website (the “Education guide” for each program). During the meeting the Examination Committee shall deal with all complete requests that were submitted before the given deadline. Requests submitted after the deadline shall be dealt with in the next examination committee meeting.

2 The Examination Committee may mandate certain tasks.

3 The Examination Committee has the following subcommittee:

- An assessment committee. The assessment committee advises the examination committee on matters that concern the safeguarding of the quality of examinations.

   The committee consists of at least three members, who are an expert in a field that concerns each of the master’s programs. External advisors can be added. The committee meets at least twice each year, and reports their findings to the examination committee and the educational director.

4 The meetings are not public.

5 Reports shall be made of the meetings. These reports are not public.

6 The Examination Committee decides by a simple majority of votes. In case of a tie, the chair’s vote shall be decisive.

7 The Examination Committee shall reach a decision within the response time, but can delay the decision by a reasonable period of time, having informed the student.

8 The Examination Committee reports its decisions immediately and in writing (or by e-mail) to the student administration of the program concerned and to the student and, if necessary, the lecturer concerned.

9 If a student submits a request or a complaint to an Examination Committee involving an examiner who is a member of that Examination Committee, then the examiner in question shall take no part in the deliberations on the request or complaint.

10 When stipulated by the OER, the Examination Committee shall consult with the academic advisor, the Central Committee on Personal Circumstances or the Central Advisory Committee on Examinations.

2 Safeguarding the quality of examinations and final examinations

3 See the TU/e Assessment Framework, adopted by the Executive Board on October 23, 2014.
Art. 2.1 The Examination Committee shall safeguard the quality of examinations and final examinations. It must perform this task in a proactive and reactive manner, such that it can form an independent opinion of the quality of examinations and final examinations in terms of reliability, validity, transparency and feasibility. This Article sets out how the Examination Committee checks, and thereby assures, that tests are compiled and set in accordance with the Departmental Assessment Policy. Examiners are assumed to have the relevant expertise.
1. The Examination Committee checks or orders checks, by means of random sampling, whether
   - an assessment plan is in place for each study component, and whether the plan has been published for students;
   - multiple lecturers were involved in the construction of each test and response model;
   - the tests are checked, before they are administered, by reviewers in terms of validity, reliability and transparency;
   - the tests are graded according to a procedure in which differences between assessors are kept to a minimum;
   - assessors adhere strictly to the response model;
   - on the basis of the initial experiences with the response model, the model has been or should be amended;
   - a second examiner or a subject specialist was present during a final oral test;
   - how often the grading deadline for examinations was exceeded;
   - Master’s theses were checked for plagiarism with plagiarism-detection software.
   - submitted work contains plagiarism, and, if this turns out not to be the case, the Examination Committee can use plagiarism
detection programs.

2. Study component evaluations are carried out by the offering departments. The Examination Committee is informed about this
   and takes action when necessary. This regular form of evaluation shall be supplemented by further investigation based on
   random samples and possibly in response to other information (e.g. specific complaints). If necessary, the Examination
   Committee will request the Program Director to take appropriate action. Activities shall be reported in the annual report.

3. The Examination Committee discusses the results of examinations, in part within the framework of the applicable assessment
   policy. When appropriate, the Committee shall perform further investigation and request the Program Director to take
   corrective measures where necessary.

4. The Examination Committee shall in any case investigate all study components with pass rates below 60% and above 90%.

5. The Examination Committee can investigate the pass rates of interim tests and final tests.

6. Students have the right to inspect the examination in question.

7. If necessary, the Examination Committee discusses the outcomes of random sampling and other investigations with the
   Program Director, the Departmental Board and/or the examiner.

8. During the examination meeting, the Examination Committee assesses the graduation proposals submitted. A graduation
   proposal can be approved or rejected: rejection of a graduation proposal must be accompanied with arguments from the
   Examination Committee. In the case of rejection an altered proposal must be put before the Examination Committee.

9. Biannually, the Examination Committee shall check, by means of random sampling, the quality of the final assessment of
   Master’s graduation reports.

---

Art. 2.2 Safeguarding the quality of organization and procedures relating to examinations and final examinations

1. The Examination Committee shall safeguard the quality of organization and procedures relating to examinations and final
   examinations in a proactive and reactive manner, so that it can form an independent opinion of the quality of the organization
and procedures. This article sets out how the Examination Committee checks this and ensures that the organization and procedures relating to examinations and final examinations meet the quality requirements.

2 The Examination Committee checks the quality of the organization and procedures surrounding examinations and the final examination by means of:

- the evaluations of examination procedures that are compiled by proctors after every examination period and made available to the Committee, which takes appropriate action where necessary;
- teachers’ evaluations of the proctors and examination procedures.

Art. 2.3 Rules relating to the flexible degree program
The Examination Committee shall process individual requests for study programs that deviate from regular programs. In this, the committee shall consider in its decision the coherence, quality of content and manageability of the proposed study program of the individual student.

The tailored Master’s program must form a coherent whole that comprises a total of 120 credits.

The Examination Committee shall only approve a flexible degree program if the content is essentially in agreement with the learning objectives of the regular curriculum.

Procedural regulations are set down in the OER.

Art. 2.4 Rules relating to granting exemptions
In principle exemptions shall only be granted for obligatory parts of the program of examinations. The agreements concerning the granting of exemptions can be found in Annex 3.

Art. 2.5 Elective study components
A student who wishes to alter his/her electives in connection with an exchange for example must provide the Examination Committee with an overview of the intended complete elective space, the number of credits that the (foreign) study components are worth (including a conversion to ECTS), and a motivation why he/she wishes to take these subjects and why there is no overlap with other subjects in the study program of the student. The coherence, the quality of the subject content and the manageability of the proposed education program of the individual student is weighed in the decision making. This request must be made before departure.

If necessary the Examination Committee assesses individual requests, in which attention is paid to the manageability and coherence of the program of electives.

Art. 2.6 Regulations in connection with granting a quarantined exam
If two exams are taken at the same time, students can appeal for a so-called ‘quarantine procedure’, in which a situation is created so that students can take exams consecutively in isolation.

In principle students have no right to make use of this procedure, but the Examination Committee can allow students to be eligible in exceptional individual cases.

In the decision making the Examination Committee shall consider whether earlier opportunities to take the exam were used in the same academic year and whether there are no other opportunities to take the study components later in that same academic year. See Annex 4.

Art. 2.7 Regulations in connection with permission to take Master’s study components during the Pre-Master’s Program

The examination committee for the MSc- Automotive Technology, Sustainable Energy Technology and Systems & Control authorizes the examination committee of the Bachelor’s Program for Mechanical Engineering for all cases with respect to OER, articles 2.2 and 4.3.2 concerning the Pre-MSc programs and the students in those programs.

Students can request the Examination Committee to add a maximum of 15 credits of Master’s study components to the regular pre-Master’s program.

This is only allowed if a student cannot complete the pre-Master’s program within six months of its commencement and therefore is at a demonstrable disadvantage due to scheduling, in which the additional requirement holds that a student must have completed a minimum of 15 credits of the pre-Master’s program at the time of the request.

As for the master’s courses approved of under OER article 2.2 and 4.3.2, and their approval as part of the master’s program, appendix 2, article 2.4 of the OER applies.

Fraud and measures to prevent fraud

Students of the TU/e are expected to conduct themselves in accordance with the values and standards of academic practice, as set out in documents including the TU/e Code of Conduct for Academic Practice and the TU/e Education Fraud Policy. Obviously this means that students must not, for example, commit any form of fraud, including data falsification/fabrication, plagiarism and deliberate attempts to influence the result of an examination.
Art 3.1  Fraud

1  Fraud in tests and in applications for exemptions and examinations comprises any action or failure to act on the part of a student that makes it partially or completely impossible for the examiner to form an accurate opinion of his or her knowledge, understanding and skills, and/or deliberate attempts on the part of a student to influence any part of the examination process for the purpose of influencing the results of the examination.

2  The following are examples of fraud:

   a  identity fraud, for example:
      - when a student offers his/her work to others with the aim, knowledge or expectation that this work be submitted it as their own work;
      - when a student (also) uses another person’s digital identity to participate (for example by using someone else’s clicker or login data) or collaborates in this;
      - using another person’s proof of identity;
      - when a student lends his/her proof of identity to someone else;

   b  uses (or has access to) unauthorized resources and/or aids during an examination, such as the internet, a mobile telephone or any other type of media-carrying device.
      During written or oral examinations, the following actions will in any case be deemed to constitute fraud or attempted fraud:
      - having a mobile telephone or any other type of media-carrying device on your desk or on your person;
      - using, or attempting to use, unauthorized resources and aids, such as the internet, a mobile telephone, a smart watch, or smart glasses, etc.;
      - having any paper at hand other than that provided by TU/e for the test, unless otherwise indicated;
      - visiting the toilet (leaving the exam room) without permission or supervision;
      - copying (in any form).

   c  fraud in research projects, graduation reports and project reports, in any case:
      - identity fraud;
      - falsification/fabrication of research data.
d) Plagiarism is a specific type of fraud. In these Regulations, plagiarism is taken to mean:
- using or copying another person’s texts, data or ideas without providing a full and correct source reference, such as the copying of work of other students or passing it off as your own, or handing in work that was acquired from a commercial institution or work that was written or produced by someone else whether or not for payment.
- the failure to indicate clearly in a text, for example by means of quotation marks or a specific format, that other works are quoted literally or almost literally, even if a correct source reference is provided;
- paraphrasing another person’s text without providing a proper source reference;
- copying other persons’ media files (or parts thereof) or other sources, software source codes, models and other diagrams, and passing them off, without source references, as one’s own work;
- submitting text that has been submitted before (or text that is similar to it) for assignments in.

Depending on the actual circumstances of the case, other conduct may be regarded as plagiarism.

e) When ascertaining whether serious fraud has been committed, the following aspects should be presented to the Examination Committee for evaluation:
   i. the frequency of the fraud: repeated fraud,
   ii. and/or the fraud was deliberate,
   iii. and/or a form of identity fraud was involved,
   iv. and/or fabricated or falsified research data were entered in a research project, project report, Master’s thesis or Bachelor’s final project,
   v. and/or the fraud was ‘complete’ plagiarism,
   vi. and/or repeated offenses involving:
      * fraud committed by entering fabricated or falsified research data in a research project, project report, Master’s thesis or Bachelor’s final project,
      * fraud during inspection,
      * identity fraud,
      * complete plagiarism.
   vii. or there is an incidence of a very exceptional form of fraud.

Art. 3.2 Comlicity
1 In cases of fraud, sanctions may be imposed not only on the perpetrator but also on others who are complicit in the fraud.
2 Students shall in any case be deemed complicit if they permit other students to copy their work, and/or cooperate in this.
3 If a joint author of a paper commits plagiarism, the other authors shall be deemed complicit if it can be reasonably assumed that they should or could have been aware of the plagiarism.
Art. 3.3  Plagiarism detection
The Examination Committee is authorized to check submitted work for plagiarism, and may use detection programs for that purpose. When plagiarism is confirmed, the Examination Committee can decide to check whether work previously submitted by the student contains plagiarism and, if this is the case, it can impose sanctions for previous plagiarism.

Art. 3.4  Powers of the Examination Committee/Executive Board
1 The Examination Committee of the program in which the student is enrolled may deny the student the right to take one or more examinations or final examinations during a period to be set by the Examination Committee, lasting for a maximum of one year. The Examination Committee can proceed with such action if it suspects that fraud has occurred.

2 In the event of serious fraud, the Examination Committee of the degree program in which the student is enrolled can request the Executive Board to terminate the student’s enrollment. The Executive Board can, on the basis of a proposal by the Examination Committee, definitively terminate the student’s enrollment.

Art. 3.5  Procedure
1 In the event that an examiner or proctor discovers or suspects fraud, either before, during or immediately after the examination, the examiner or proctor shall record this in writing and establish a file as soon as possible. If requested by the examiner or proctor, the student in question must present any evidence required. Refusal to do so has to be mentioned in the report. In any incidence of fraud, a completed examination will not be assessed/graded until the Examination Committee has made a judgment.

2 The student in question shall be given the opportunity to add written comments to the written report of the examiner/proctor.

3 The examiner will send the report to the Examination Committee of the program in which the student is enrolled and, where applicable, to the Examination Committee of the program to which the study component for which the examination in question was administered belongs, as soon as possible, together with the student’s written comments, if provided.

4 The Examination Committee shall carry out a fact-finding study if necessary, such as for example hearing teachers, students and proctors.

5 It will then be up to the Examination Committee of the program in which the student is enrolled to take any measures it considers appropriate in the case in question. In reaching a decision, the Examination Committee shall take account of the protocol for supra-departmental fraud (see Annex 5 of these Regulations).

6 The Examination Committee for the program in which the student is enrolled can then exercise its powers in accordance with Article 3.4 of these Regulations.

7 Before taking a decision based on paragraph 5, the Examination Committee shall give the student in question an opportunity to be heard.
For the implementation of this current Article, examinations also include practical exercises that are concluded with an examination.

4 Examinations and final examination: Guidelines and instructions

Art. 4.1 Questions and assignments

The purpose of examinations and final examinations is to evaluate the student’s knowledge of and skills in the relevant study component area. Questions in examinations and final examinations are formulated in accordance with the usual quality requirements relating to clarity and unequivocality.

Guidelines and instructions for content:

a The questions and assignments of the examination shall not exceed the bounds of the learning objectives that examination is related to. These learning objectives shall be announced prior to the course that prepares students for the examination.

b The questions and assignments of the examination shall not exceed the bounds of the learning objectives of the study component in question, as announced in advance, and shall be spread as evenly as possible across these learning objectives.

c The duration of the examination shall be sufficient to enable the student to answer, within a reasonable time, the questions and assignments formulated. For an oral examination, sufficient time must be taken to reach a proper assessment of the knowledge and ability of the student.

d The questions and assignments shall be clear and unequivocal, and formulated in such a way that the student is able to ascertain how extensive the answers should be.

e The difficulty of a final test/an examination will be maintained at a comparable level each time........................................

Procedural guidelines and instructions:

a The exact content of the material to be studied for the examination/final test and the aids the student may use during the examination will be made known no later than one month before the examination is to take place.

b The student may keep the questions and assignments at the end of the examination, unless the examiner objects to this and gives reasons. For an oral examination, a prior agreement must be made about whether written feedback shall be provided.

c Each final test/examination shall be compiled by at least two lecturers.
d  Final tests/examinations shall be prepared no later than one week before the day on which they are to be administered.

e  A response model shall be available for each final test/examination.

f  The final result of a final test/an examination shall have a pre-set cut-off score, which may not be adjusted unless analysis suggests that such an adjustment is necessary.

3  **Guidelines and instructions for checking**

   The Examination Committee may request that a final test/an examination be reviewed in advance by a testing expert.
Art. 4.2  Compensation and/or bonus arrangement
These programs have no compensation or bonus arrangements.

Art. 4.3  Graduation regulations
The departmental graduation regulations set out in Annex 6 apply to completion of the final project for the program. For the assessment of the final work, the thesis supervisor must fill in the form provided in Annex 8, which was adopted by the Examination Committee.

Final examination
The student must file a diploma request through the information system used by the TU/e (OSIRIS) before the closing date as indicated on the departmental website (http://studiegids.tue.nl). All examination components must be present before the deadline prior to the examination meeting if the student wishes to attain his/her degree on the date of examination meeting. The dates of the meetings and the deadlines will be published on the website.

Art 4.4  Traineeship regulations
For traineeships traineeship regulations apply that are set down in Annex 6.

Art 4.5  Approval of the program of examinations in the Master’s program
- Students are recommended to submit a program of examinations for approval by the Examination Committee halfway through their study program after attaining around 40 to 50 credits.
- This program of examinations must meet the requirements described in Annex 1 of the OER Ma.
- A form can be obtained from the website of the program administration with the format of the program of examinations that must be filled in.
- The form must be completed with the subjects of the program of examinations.
- The form must be signed by the student as well as by the intended graduation supervisor of the student.
- The signed form must be submitted to the program administration. A digital version of the form must be e-mailed to the program administration.
- The program administration shall forward the study components of the program of examinations to the Examination Committee for approval.
- The Examination Committee shall decide within four weeks of having received the form.
- The Secretary of the Examination Committee shall inform the student of the decision of the Examination Committee.
5 Final provisions

Art. 5.1 Appeals to the CBE
No later than six weeks after the decision has been made known to him or her, a student may lodge an appeal against a decision made by the Examination Committee or the examiners, based on these Regulations of the Examination Committee, with the Examination Appeals Board (CBE) as referred to in Article 7.60 of the WHW. The written appeal should be submitted to the relevant department via the following link: https://educationguide.tue.nl/organization/official-rules-and-regulations/complaints-and-disputes/
Art. 5.2  Complaint against an examiner
1 A student may submit a complaint against an examiner to the Examination Appeals Board via the website referred to in the previous article.
2 Complaints will not be taken into consideration if the same complaint has previously been submitted and processed, or if an objection or appeal procedure was in place.
3 General complaints about teaching or about the way in which policy or teaching are implemented will not be considered. If the complaint is part of a criminal process, the complaint will not be taken into consideration either.
4 If the interests of the complainant or the severity of the complaint are patently lacking, then the complaint does not have to be taken into consideration.

Art. 5.3  Amendments to the regulations
Amendments to these Regulations for the Examination Committee can only come into force in the current academic year if this does not, within reason, have a negative effect on the interests of the students.

Art. 5.4  Annual report
The Examination Committee shall compile a report of its activities each year and submit it to the Departmental Board and the Central Committee for Quality Care in Education (CCKO) in the established format. The CCKO shall issue a report to the Executive Board, based on the annual reports.

Art. 5.5  Effective date
These Regulations for the Examination Committee replace all previous versions and will come into effect on September 1st, 2017
Adopted by the Examination Committee for the master’s programs of Automotive Technology, Sustainable Energy Technology and Systems and Control on August 31, 2017.
Annex 1 to Article 1.3, paragraph a, of the Regulations of the Examination Committee 2017-2018

TU/e Examiner Profile

Legal framework

Article 7.12c of the Dutch Higher Education and Scientific Research Act (Wet op het Hoger onderwijs en Wetenschappelijk onderzoek, WHW) reads as follows:
1. The Examination Committee shall appoint examiners who are responsible for organizing examinations and determining the results.
2. The examiners shall provide the Examination Committee with information upon request.

Definition of an examiner at the TU/e
An examiner is an official who is responsible for an individual study component at the TU/e and has been appointed by the Examination Committee to assess students by organizing examinations on the study component and to determine their result.

Knowledge, skills and personal qualities
The examiner has knowledge of:
- an academic level of working and thinking;
- content knowledge of the study components he/she teachers and tests, as well as the required didactical skills.
- knowledge of the educational vision, level and overall content of the program the subject belongs to.
- the role of his/her study component within the curriculum and the contribution of the study component to the outcomes of the program;
- appropriate assessment methods (to be specified in the Examination Regulations by the Examination Committee, for example by means of a basic university teaching qualification (BKO) or module on testing DPO/Teach)
- the OER, the Examination Regulations and the (departmental) assessment policy, particularly with respect to any implications based on these documents that are relevant for him/her.

The examiner can:
- assess whether an examination (or other assessment tools) is representative for the study program and suitable for the subject regarding content and complexity.
- plan, prepare and organize oral and written exams (or other forms of assessment).
- assess student performance through examinations (or other appropriate assessment tools).
- optimize the assessment situation so that students perform optimally.
- justify the assessment outcome and report this verbally and in writing to involved parties (e.g. the Examination Committee, assessed students, commissioning bodies).
- if relevant, supervise students in connection with traineeships, graduation projects and theses, and assess their performance.
- trace (or supervise the tracing of) academic fraud and/or plagiarism.
- communicate in English in a correct manner, verbally and in writing.
- advise the Examination Committee.
- work together in a collegial manner with all involved persons while performing his/her duties as an examiner.
- adjust his/her activities based on self-reflection, feedback, criticism or changes in the educational vision.

**Procedure for the appointment of examiners**

- The Examination Committee maintains a public list of the examiners assigned by it for each study component.
- When this procedure enters into force, all employees who are then authorized to organize examinations shall be appointed as examiners for the study components taught by them and their names shall be added to this list of examiners.
- The Examination Committee must determine whether or not an employee meets the profile of an examiner. Arguments used to motivate this can be: holding a BKO certificate, (see 'TUe_Regulation_BKO_2011').
- The Examination Committee may deprive an employee of his/her authority to organize examinations and no longer appoint him/her as an examiner, if the employee no longer meets the profile of an examiner in the opinion of the Examination Committee.

*As determined on November 24, 2014 by the Chairs of the Examination Committees*
Annex 2 to Article 1.3, paragraph b,e, of the Regulations of the Examination Committee 2017-2018

When considering whether non-disciplinary study components can be included in a Master’s program, the Examination Committee shall take account of the following criteria:

- University-wide projects: only students who have taken part in projects approved by the Executive Board can be awarded credits. Students who have received a committee officer grant for this purpose are not entitled to credits in addition. There is a choice between funding or credits, but not both. Participation is assessed on examination criteria in the case of students who are awarded credits.
- Other activities, such as study trips: at the discretion of the Examination Committee.

Annex 3 to Article 2.4 of the Examination committee regulations
Memo for EC chairs meeting

Exemptions

On October 27, 2016, a small committee made up of Bert Snijder, Yvonne de Kort, Rik Kaasschieter, Jean Bernard Martens, Ludo van Meeuwen, Hanneke Schlejen and Riek Peters held an exploratory discussion on exemptions. It covered the following themes:

1. What is understood by exemption from a study component?
2. What is the procedure for applying for and granting exemptions?
3. What problems have there been with exemptions and how are these dealt with?

1. Exemption from a study component is understood to mean that a study component need not be taken as it has
already been achieved in some way. There are two types of exemption: exemption from specific TU/e study components, for example for those who have switched programs. These students can use study components that they have already taken in their new program; the study components are included in the new program with the same grade and examination date. The Examination Committee determines the requirements that students must meet to achieve a positive BSA at the end of the first year of the new program; in principle, 45 of the 60 ECTS\(^4\) that must be secured in the first year of the new program. The grade is also taken into account in the awarding of any special designation.

The second type is exemption from a course in the program because an equivalent study component at the same level has already been achieved elsewhere (at another university). In that case, the exempted study component is given the code VR in the list of study components and the relevant ECTS are awarded, but no grade. In the list of study components, the exempted study component is not replaced by the replacement study component. In principle, the study component is not taken into account when awarding any special designation. Compulsory study components and study components chosen as restricted electives can both be eligible for exemption. Final projects on both Bachelor’s and Master’s programs are not eligible for exemption.

2. Students who have previously completed an academic program fully or in part can apply for exemption from one or more study components.

In order to apply for exemption, the student must provide the following information:

- The study component for which exemption is being requested and the study component taken elsewhere that forms the basis for eligibility for exemption
- A study component description of the study component taken elsewhere, including content, outcomes, study load (in ECTS) and level
- If requested, a detailed comparison of the study component elsewhere with the TU/e study component and official proof that the study component was passed

\(^4\) Providing that a manageable program of 60 ECTS can be offered.
- If requested, study component materials from the study component elsewhere (e.g. textbook, syllabus, etc.)

Exemption is granted by the Examination Committee having taken advice from the lecturer for the study component for which exemption is being requested.

3. If the Examination Committee deems it appropriate\(^5\) to award a grade for a study component taken elsewhere, the following options apply:

- Issue the study component with a dynamic study component code (recognizable as not being a TU/e study component) and apply the grade achieved elsewhere

- Assess the study component/internship etc. and award it a grade

- If it is not a replacement study component and is not being used for the purposes of exemption, a study component obtained elsewhere can be included on the list of grades as an additional, separate study component.

If a study component worth 3 ECTS replaces a study component worth 5 ECTS or qualifies a student for exemption from it, the lecturer can impose an additional assignment/test.


\(^5\) A student cannot derive any rights from this.
Annex 4 related to Article 2.6 of the Regulations of the Examination Committee

Form after permission for a quarantine procedure
The Examination Committee decides whether a request for the quarantine procedure will be granted. Once this has been granted, the procedure below must be followed. Departments have the option to make their own provisions without calling upon the examination coordinator.

Up to the closing date prior to the exam period, the secretary of the Examination Committee may request support from the examination coordinator for quarantine: Done by the secretary of the Examination Committee

The student is informed that no subject specialist shall be present. The student shall complete both exams after each other in a separate space.

One envelope is made that contains the following:
- Two sets of assignments
- The name and ID-number noted on the envelope
- Subject codes, date, time and duration of the exams noted on the envelope
- Possible arrangements such as an extension on exam duration noted on the envelope
- Telephone number of subject specialists

The envelope must be delivered to the examination coordinator at least two days before the exams.

The envelopes are stored in a safe location until the day of use.

A location and proctors are arranged for all students making use of the quarantine procedure. The location is communicated to the party that requested quarantine. The proctors are given instruction concerning the procedure.

Students are informed of the location

After the exams are finished the completed work is safely stored until it can be collected. The completed work is collected.
Annex 5 to Article 3.5, paragraph 4, of the Regulations of the Examination Committee 2017-2018

Protocol for cases of fraud relating to study components that transcend individual study programs.

Due to the introduction of the Bachelor College and the Graduate School, there are several study components that transcend individual study programs. These include the basic subjects, USE components and electives. When students from different Bachelor’s or Master’s programs commit fraud in these study components, the matter is dealt with by several Examination Committees.

The protocol applies if students from different degree programs are suspected of fraud in one and the same study component.

Protocol:

1. Fraud is suspected.
2. The examiner or, in the event of a written examination, the proctor, writes a clear and concise report of the established fraud.
3. The examiner ensures that any reports of fraud are handed to the Examination Committee of the program that organized the examination.
4. Chaired by the Examination Committee of the organizing program, an ad-hoc committee will be formed, consisting, in principle, of one member of each Examination Committee involved.
5. This ad-hoc committee shall coordinate the fraud case and (if necessary) organize a hearing to hear all the students concerned. In principle, at least one member of each of the Examination Committees involved must attend the hearing. In the event that more than 10 students have committed fraud during the same study component, a hearing will only be held if a student requests it.
6. Following the hearing, the ad-hoc committee shall, in mutual consultation, reach a recommendation on the sanction to be imposed (where applicable) and shall inform the relevant Examination Committees accordingly.
7. In principle, the Examination Committees involved adopt the recommendation on the sanction to be imposed. If this is not the case, the ad-hoc committee and the Advisory Committee on Bachelor’s program examinations (AEB) must be informed, stating the reasons for not adopting the recommendation.
8. The sanction shall be imposed by the Examination Committee for the program in which the student who has committed the fraud is enrolled.
9. The aim is to complete this procedure no later than four weeks after the fraud has been reported to the Examination Committee.
Annex 6 of Article 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 of the Regulations of the Examination Committee 2017-2018

Article 1 Administrative requirements
1. At every stage of the master’s programs Automotive Technology, Sustainable Energy Technology and Systems and Control, students have to follow a number of administrative requirements. These administrative requirements are the execution of the regulations determined in the OER 2017-2018 art. 3.6, article 5.1.1 and 5.1.2. The administrative requirements have been listed in the program’s to do list.
2. The written request for approval of the curriculum chosen by the student as mentioned in OER article 3.6.3 has to be handed in to the examination committee using the form as stated in the ‘to do list’ (to be found in the Educationguide.tue.nl) of the relevant master’s program, signed by the mentor.
3. To deviate from this to do list, the student needs formal approval from the examination committee before the deviation takes place.
4. As long as students do not meet all the administrative requirements, no diploma can be awarded.
5. If students do not meet the administrative requirements before the deadlines mentioned in the to-do-lists, students cannot be guaranteed that they can graduate from the master’s programs without delay.
6. If a student or group of students is dependent on an international partner university to prove that he or she has met all the requirements, like in the case of SELECT students (see OER SET2017-2018 App.1a), a generic exemption can be made.

Article 2 Administrative requirements for the internship and/or graduation project.
1. The entrance requirements for the internship and the graduation project are defined in the OER 2017-2018 AT, SC and SET App. 1, art. b4 and b5.
2. The submission of the internship report and the graduation report are part of these program components. Therefore, the internship and graduation project are not finished until the (final) reports have been submitted.
3. A presentation of the graduation work and a defense session with the graduation committee are part of the graduation project. The presentation must be public. The defense can be secluded.
4. The presentation and the defense session cannot be scheduled until all other components of the program have been

6 http://educationguide.tue.nl “To-do list” of each masters’ program
finished, including handing in the final version of the graduation report, to the committee members and the Education Office

Article 3 Archiving of reports

A complete PDF-version of all reports (for internships and graduation projects), including confidential reports, is uploaded to the archive as indicated on the website.

1. The supervisor can file a “request for confidential reports”. In this case, the report is stored in a separate archive, where it is only available to the education management.
2. On request, the Education Management will disclose confidential reports to the examination committee.
3. Reports stored in this separate archive will not be checked for plagiarism by detection programs.

Article 4 Internship

1) The internship must be executed and assessed individually. A shared assignment is an option, but each student has to write an individual report. Students can ask the exam committee for an exemption to that rule, provided that the individual contributions to the report are visible and that the size of the report must be in ratio.

2) The first page of the internship report has to state the following information:
   - title of the report
   - student’s name
   - student IDNR
   - research group and department
   - name of the master’s program (Automotive Technology, Sustainable Energy Technology or Systems and Control)
   - names of the thesis supervisor and other supervisors
   - date

Article 5 Graduation report

The graduation report has to be a report of the graduation project with a clear description of:
The graduation report has to be written independently by the student, under the supervision of the TU/e thesis supervisor. No co-authors can be involved with the graduation report. That way the assessment of the individual work performed by the student can be secured.

The style of the report (e.g. a paper or report) is to be judged by the chair of the graduation committee, the TU/e-thesis supervisor of the student.

There are no restrictions with respect to the minimum or maximum length of the report.

The first page of the report has to state the following information:

- title of the report
- student’s name
- student IDNR
- research group and department
- name of the master’s program (Automotive Technology, Sustainable Energy Technology or Systems and Control)
- names of the thesis supervisor and other supervisors
- date

**Article 6  Graduation committee**

The graduation committee consists of:

- at least 3 members of faculty from a Dutch or foreign university.
- one of the members needs be from a department different from the one where the student graduates, that participates
in the master’s program. For Systems & Control, this may be from a different research group (instead of another department).

- Additional rules have been determined in the OER, App 1 b.5

**Article 7  Assessment criteria for the graduation project**

The graduation project is assessed by means of an assessment form. The form is included as an appendix. On the form, the following aspects are graded:

a) Approach and execution of the thesis work  
b) Autonomy of the student during the project  
c) Analytical ability of the student  
d) Inventive and creative abilities of the student  
e) Report quality  
f) Quality of the defense  
g) Quality of the presentation

The committee members will assess these seven aspects based on the report and the process of execution of the project. However, these seven aspects can also (instead or additionally) be clarified during the graduation process. The grades for each aspect must be explained in writing on the assessment form as well.

In the end, a final grade is awarded. The final grade of the graduation project is the average of the seven partial grades. The seven aspects may have a different weight. In that case, the weight of each aspect must be clarified on the assessment form.

Both the partial grades and the final grade will be determined based on the graduation process, the report, the presentation and the defense.

**Article 8  Internship and graduation projects abroad or in a company**

Students who want to perform their internship or their graduation project abroad or in a company, have to consult with their internship- or thesis supervisor on the possibilities within the research field of their specialization. There are additional conditions for students who, after approval of their internship- or thesis supervisor, decide to do their projects in a company and/or abroad:
During their stay outside the Eindhoven University of Technology, the contents, quality and supervision needs to be ensured by the TU/e internship- or thesis supervisor. The TU/e internship- or thesis supervisor must be actively involved.

The graduation committee (for graduation projects) or the TU/e internship supervisor (for internships) is responsible for the grading of the work.

In order to be able to do so, information about a-the supervision on the project and b-in which way the TU/e internship- or thesis supervisor is involved in the supervision on the location of the internship or the graduation project, needs to be provided to the examination committee by the TU/e-thesis supervisor upon demand.

In the case of a graduation project abroad, the student can only start the project after the research proposal has been approved by the examination committee. The research proposal has to contain the content of the project and the plan of coaching, in which the role of the TU/e supervisor is clarified.

**Article 9  Graduation under embargo.**

Graduation under embargo is not a desirable situation. If it can be avoided, it is important to do so.

If an embargo cannot be avoided, an arrangement needs to **at least** meet the following criteria:

1. It must be possible to evaluate the work according to the regular criteria (for example, the correct composition of a graduation committee, a presentation).

2. The report has to be uploaded, according to the regular procedure. It will be stored in the surroundings dedicated for reports under embargo. Those reports are not public, but they are available for accreditation aims. In order to do so, the student hands in the form ‘Request Confidential Report’ before uploading the report.

3. The members of the examination committee and members of the education accreditation committee, have the right to see the graduation work for purposes with regard to quality assurance and -analysis.

4. In case of a possible conflict-of-interest concerning the persons meant under point 3 and the contents of the graduation work, the examination committee will look for a suitable protocol to assure the quality of the work (for example by assigning another member of the committee who does not have a conflict-of-interest).

5. Reports that are submitted confidentially will NOT be checked by detection programs under any conditions.

6. No generic term for embargo will be proposed, since this is dependent on the project and the field it has been in.
**Annex 7 double degree.**

**Double Degree**

Students who are planning to combine an one of the master’s program within Automotive Technology, Sustainable Energy Technology or Systems and Control (the three of which together will further be referred to as IM) with another MSc-degree at TU/e with the intention to obtain both degrees may, after approval of the examinations committee of both MSc programs, follow a combined program of at least 165 EC and at most 195 EC.

*In case of a double degree the IM Master’s program contains the following components:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Credits (EC)</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IM Core</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>The program contains the IM core program as given in OER AT/SC/SET 1718, Appendix 1, b1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM Specialization</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>The program contains at least 15 EC in courses from the lists of SET specialization courses as given OER AT/SC/SET 1718, Appendix 1, b2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The program contains at least 45 EC in core and/or specialization courses that are exclusive for the MSc AT/SC/SET degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Electives</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>These 15 EC can be filled with courses from the other MSc program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>Minimum 15</td>
<td>The combined program contains an internship of at least 15 EC. The content of this internship can lie within the disciplines of the combined MSc programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation project*</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>The graduation project must be separately assessed for both programs. It is required that there is at least a graduation committee for the IM master’s program assessing the project according to the IM standards. The two graduation committees are chaired by staff members of different TU/e departments and at least 2 members of each committee are not a member of the other committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*In the situation the graduation project cannot result in a combined project, the student needs to set up an adjusted program in consultation with the academic advisor.

- These components are part of the total of 165 to 195 EC of the combined program.
- The full combined curriculum must be approved by the Examinations Committee of both programs.
- A request for approval of the double degree must be submitted before the start of the second year of enrollment.
- In special cases, the Examination Committees may deviate from these conditions.

**Appendix 8 Graduation form**

The graduation assessment form as referred to in Annex 6, art. 7, is the following form.
# Appendix 8

## Graduation assessment form for Master AT/S&C/SET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINAL PROJECT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name student</td>
<td>idnr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (tick where appropriate)</td>
<td>&lt;br&gt;○ NL  ○ Abroad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Marks

- approach and execution of the thesis work
- autonomy of the student during the project
- analytical ability of the student
- inventive and creative abilities of the student
- report quality
- quality of the defence
- quality of the presentation

#### Final score

---

**Graduation committee final project:**

______________________________  , chairman

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

---

**Advisors**

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

---

**Company/institute**

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

---

**Signature chairman graduation committee**
# Final project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>weighting %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>approach and execution of the thesis work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autonomy of the student during the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analytical ability of the student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inventive and creative abilities of the student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of the defence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of the presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final score (weighted average)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 %</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>