

Regulations and Guidelines

as referred to in Article 7.12b, paragraph 1, sub-section b of the Higher Education and Scientific Research Act (*Wet op het Hoger Onderwijs en Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek*, WHW) for the 2025/26 academic year,

applicable to all programmes

adopted by the Board of Examiners of the Faculty of Law of Maastricht University.

Part I: General provisions

Article 1: Definitions

- a) Education- and Examination Regulations (EER): the Education and Examination Regulations 2025/26 for the Bachelor programme European Law School (revised) as adopted by the Faculty Board of the Faculty of Law of Maastricht University;
- b) Board of Examiners: the committee installed by the Faculty Board according to art. 7.12 WHW;
- c) Director of Studies: the person defined in art. 1 sub h EER;
- d) Year coordinator: the staff member assigned to co-ordinate a specific year in the bachelor curriculum;
- e) Examiner: the staff member, who on the basis of the *Regeling Aanwijzing Examinatoren* is assigned as such by the Board of Examiners who is responsible for all aspects of examination of a given education unit;
- f) Regulations: the provisions laid down in this document which primarily regard the relation between student and Board of Examiners;
- g) Guidelines: the provisions laid down in this document which primarily aim to regulate relations between the examiner and the Board of Examiners;
- h) Education unit: a part of the curriculum defined in the WHW, the completion of which leads to EC being earned;
- i) Assessment (component): an assessment that examines skills and/ or knowledge regarding the ILO's of a certain education unit;
- j) Exam co-ordination: the staff members in charge of planning and organisation of exams;
- k) Exam administration: the staff members in charge of processing and publishing grades;

Article 2: Competences

1. The Board of Examiners is competent with regard to all issues assigned to it in the Act on Higher Education (WHW), in particular art. 7.11, 7.12b and 7.12c.
2. The Board of Examiners is competent in all matters assigned to it in the EER.
3. The Board of Examiners develops and designs policies concerning the implementation of its competences in order to ensure transparent and fair conditions.

Article 3: Working method

1. The Board of Examiners communicates exclusively with the student directly involved, unless that student authorises another person in writing to communicate on their behalf. Communications involving more than one student are treated as an individual case for the student who initiated the contact with the Board of Examiners.
2. Communication takes place via the student email account.
3. The Board of Examiners may ask a student for proof if deemed necessary in order to correctly process a request made by said student. The Board of Examiners decides on the basis of the information in its possession
4. The Board of Examiners may mandate tasks to the chair, vice chair or any other member. Concerning standard decisions where written policy exist, the secretaries may be mandated as well.

Part II: Regulations

The part “Regulations” contains the rules that mainly concern relations between the Board of Examiners and students.

Article 4: Right to participate in exams / exam components

1. A student registered for an education unit has the right to participate in assessment according to art. 23 EER.
2. Paragraph 1 may not apply to all assessment components in case of late registration and does not apply in case a student is excluded from taking an assessment component under art. 11-15 of these Regulations and Guidelines.
3. In specific cases, access to assessment (in particular, but not limited to resits) can be given ‘onder couvert’. This may be the case if e.g. more information is needed in case of a financial hold of in case a case involving plagiarism / fraud is still pending. Access to assessment onder couvert then allows the student to sit the assessment, while the validity of that assessment depends on the outcome of the procedure that is still pending.

4. An “*assessment only*” booking for education units is possible if the education unit does not require presence and / or participation. This means that the student has access to all course materials and may take part in all assessment components not related to teaching activities. Presentations, group assessment and similar exam components are not available. This may entail that an *assessment only booking* leads to a potential maximum score of less than 10 on the grading scale.

Article 5: Dates and times

1. Written assessment (components) planned at a central location (e.g. MECC) take place at the date and time specified in the exam schedule. This exam schedule is published at least four weeks before the exam. Being at the right place at the right time for an exam is the students’ responsibility.
2. Exam coordination prevents as much as reasonably possible that exams overlap. In case of overlap, students may request quarantine.¹ Registration for several programmes and the overlap resulting from that is for the student’s own risk.
3. If an examiner makes use of different exam components during the course, these components take place at a date and in a form specified by the examiner and communicated at least two weeks before the exam date via Canvas and, if the examiner wishes, by other means.
4. Oral exams, other than in-course oral assessment, take place during the exam week. In case these are non-regular exam opportunities (see art. 8), these exams are scheduled at a date and at a time to be determined by the examiner after authorisation from the Board of Examiners. The examiner takes part in these oral exams as well as in oral exams replacing a written exam (e.g. resit with very few students).

Article 6: Exams and assessment components

1. Exams are constructed by the examiner appointed by the Board of Examiners.
2. During the time of the assessment, the examiner can be contacted by phone / teams / mail.
3. During exams at a central location (e.g. MECC), the Rules of Procedure (*Reglement van Orde*) are applicable. Invigilators at and around the exam location shall ensure the proper course of the exam.

¹ <https://intranet.maastrichtuniversity.nl/nl/faculty-law-studenten/toetsroosters-en-toetsafname/gang-van-zaken-tijdens-toetsen>

Article 7: Special exam arrangements (SPAR)

1. Students who, due to permanent or long-term / chronic impairments need special exam arrangements, may request the Board of Examiners to grant special arrangements. The Board of Examiners does not decide on this request unless the request is substantiated by the advice to the student from Disability Support Office (DSO).
2. In order to be processed and organised in time, these requests, including all documentation from DSO must be submitted to the Board of Examiners at the latest three weeks before the start of the exam week for which the arrangements are requested. Requests made after the time limit will be taken into account for the following exam period, requests that are not substantiated by a DSO advice will not be processed.
3. In case of short-term impairments, students will be directed to the resit first. If this policy leads to grave hardship in the sense of art. 8 and 32 of these Regulations and Guidelines, or if the request concerns a resit, the student may request a deviation from said policy. The hardship and the causal link must be established by the student. The mere fact that an education unit is a prerequisite for a following education unit as such does not constitute hardship, as this is foreseen in the EER.

Art. 8: Personal circumstances, study delay

1. Students who experience hardship in the sense of unforeseen, unforeseeable and unplanned serious personal circumstances (e.g. sudden, serious issues in private life, severe (mental) health issues etc.) which lead to substantial study delays, may request special exam arrangements. The arrangements requested must present a (partial) solution to the hardship and must be necessary and proportionate for all parties involved, both requirements need to be proved by the student.
2. The mere fact that personal circumstances are present, does not in itself constitute hardship. Hardship does not concern the existence of the personal circumstances, but their consequences for the study progress. The consequences must be such that they could not have been considered or envisaged by the BoE. If the delays are a consequence of a factual situation, a decision or a regulation / rule or are a foreseeable or foreseen consequence, no hardship exists.
3. The personal circumstances taken into account for section 1 are:
4. a) the circumstances mentioned in art. 2.1 'Uitvoeringsbesluit WHW'
5. b) registered topsport student

6. other unforeseen circumstances outside the student's sphere of control which may lead to unreasonable study delays.²
7. The student must prove the hardship as well as the causal link between hardship and study delay.
8. The hardship has to be communicated in a timely manner, meaning the circumstances must have been communicated to one of the study advisors within two weeks of the moment a study delay was reasonably foreseeable.
9. There is no hardship if there is no study delay without special arrangements, in case the circumstances are foreseeable / known or if the request is done at such a late stage that reasonable doubts may rise as to the causal link between the hardship and the request.
10. Hardship is not deemed present, if the study delay is the result of invalidation of assessment components or exclusion from assessment due to fraud / plagiarism.

Art. 9: Additional exam opportunities

1. Students may request the Board of Examiners to grant a third exam opportunity for a given education unit in the same academic year.
2. This request is approved if the following **cumulative** criteria are met:
 - The student has used both exam opportunities of the academic year, assessment history in previous years will also be taken into account to assess the reasonableness of the request;
 - The student scored a 5,0 as a final grade on one occasion;
 - The education unit is the last exam component before graduating / starting a master; this means that the final legal challenge / master thesis has been assessed with a passing grade also;
 - The education unit is not regularly scheduled within a reasonable time frame (i.e. 1 semester, different rules apply in the summer, where graduation before 31 august is the relevant criterion).
3. In case the student does not meet the criteria laid down in subparagraph 2 of this provision, the request must contain a motivation (with proof if necessary) as to why the criteria have not been met and an additional exam chance should still be granted.
4. Requests in the sense of paragraph 1 must be made on July 20th 2026 at the latest in order to be processed and scheduled before the end of the academic year. Additional exam opportunities are likely to be scheduled in the last week before the new academic year, depending on the availability of the examiner in question.

² The highest administrative court competent in these matters (Council of State, Raad van State) holds that a delay of one semester is not unreasonably burdensome.

5. Financial issues, housing difficulties, traveling time, holiday arrangements that are the student's choice, as well as a non-faculty sponsored internship or exchange are insufficient justification to grant students' requests concerning different ways of (re)examination or earlier resits or exams than the regular exam or resit.
6. In case a student is absent at an exam opportunity for which no resit is available due to a faculty-sponsored exchange or internship, the student may request the Board of Examiners to grant a different assessment moment.
7. Students doing an exchange at Maastricht University are expected to be present for resits, the mere fact that the education is finished and the student went back to the home university is not a reason to offer online assessment opportunities. Due to issues with AI and prompting in combination with the prohibition of proctoring, exams will be held at Maastricht University.
8. Paragraph 1 also applies to requests concerning an earlier assessment for the last education unit to be completed in a new academic year.
9. In principle, no extra exam opportunities will be granted, if the student requesting the exam has been banned from taking one or more exams or exam components due to art. 12 or 13 and 15 of these Regulations and Guidelines or if an exam (component) was declared invalid due to art. 11-15.
10. Art. 9 is not applicable to students from the Premaster programme, they need to direct their queries to the Board of Admission.
11. Art. 9 is not applicable to the final essay/challenge/thesis and to skills courses due to the nature of the courses and the assessment involved.

Article 10: Force Majeure

1. In case of force majeure (e.g. internet breakdown, TestVision breakdown, electricity issues, calamity) that prevents an exam at a central location from being conducted in an orderly manner, the Board of Examiners decides if, and to what extent the (partial) results can be considered valid or whether a new exam needs to be scheduled. When deciding, the Board of Examiners takes into account the time of the Force Majeure and the measure in which the event could reasonably impact the students' ability to perform.
2. Problems with (public) transport, strikes, traffic jams or being at the wrong location are not considered force majeure.

Irregularities, Fraud and Plagiarism

Article 11: Irregularity

1. An **irregularity** is any unauthorised conduct or behaviour that is against the rules.

Article 12: Fraud

- a) Fraud** is a conduct or behaviour by the student that prevents the proper examination of their knowledge and skills. Intent is not part of the definition of fraud. Non-exhaustive examples of fraud include:
- a) having had any aids, devices, resources, text, software or notes at their disposal, or have used aids and/or (communication) devices that were not explicitly allowed, or that were explicitly forbidden in the exam instructions and/or Rules of Procedures for Exams;
 - b) having communicated or tried to communicate with another student without permission from an invigilator, examiner, or Board of Examiners member. This may also be the case if documents have been exchanged and commented on in such a way as to make it impossible to determine which knowledge originates from which person. In doing so, the Board of Examiners takes into account the instructions provided by the examiner with regard to completing the assignment and the degree of cooperation and consultation that is permitted;
 - c) having copied or attempted to copy from another student, or have provided the opportunity to copy;
 - d) having collaborated on an individual exam (component) whereas this was not explicitly allowed. This may also be the case if documents have been exchanged and commented on in such a way as to make it impossible to determine which knowledge originates from which person. In doing so, the Board of Examiners takes into account the instructions provided by the examiner with regard to completing the assignment and the degree of cooperation and consultation that is permitted;
 - e) having posed as someone else or let someone else pose as themselves;
 - f) having misled, or attempted to mislead or provided the opportunity to mislead an invigilator, an examiner, a corrector or the Board of Examiners with respect to the exam (component);
 - g) having used an obfuscation method in submitted work that is likely to have the effect that plagiarism checking tools do not work optimally;
 - h) having disregarded the instructions of the invigilator or the instructions for the exam (component) such that an unfair advantage might have been obtained;
 - i) having performed actions or omissions which make it impossible in whole or in part to properly evaluate their knowledge, understanding and/or skills;
 - j) having falsely obtained, or attempted to, access to an exam;
 - k) having misled an examiner relating to exam (components), registration, or grading;
 - l) having breached or attempted to breach the security measures around exams.

2. In all of the above provisions “others” and “third party” does not only refer to people but also to generative artificial intelligence such as GPT-x, ChatGPT (Plus), BARD. If the use of artificial intelligence is allowed and/or does not have to be disclosed for a specific use, this is explicitly mentioned in the course materials.
3. In case of fraud or plagiarism in group assignments, all students in the group are in principle held responsible.³ If it is unambiguously clear that only specific students have committed fraud, differentiation in sanctioning will take place.⁴

Article 13: Plagiarism

1. **Plagiarism** is a special type of fraud. Plagiarism exists if it cannot be sufficiently established whether texts, thoughts, structure, or arguments originate from the student themselves. Plagiarism exists, for example, if the student:
 - a) uses or copies texts (including code), data, ideas, other materials or thoughts without adequate reference to the source;
 - b) presents the structure or central body of thought from others without adequate reference to the source and thus passing it off as their own;
 - c) does not indicate clearly in the text (including code), for example via quotation marks or a certain layout, that verbatim or nearly verbatim quotes have been used;
 - d) paraphrases the content of their own or others’ texts without adequate reference to the source;
 - e) copies video, audio or test material, software and program codes from others without adequate reference to the source and thus passes them off as their own;
 - f) copies work from other students and thus passing it off as their own;
 - g) submits own work that has been previously been submitted and graded in a different module without substantially rewriting and / or elaborating, unless explicitly allowed;
 - h) submits work acquired from or written by a third party (whether or not for payment) and thus passing it off as their own;
2. Article 12 subparagraphs 2 and 3 apply.

Article 14: Insufficiently independent work

If an assessment (component) submitted for assessment consists to a large extent of paraphrases from documents or excerpts copied (almost verbatim) with the correct citation

³ CBHO (precursor of RvS) decision 2014/217

⁴ In conformity with CBHO 2019/060.5 and CBHO 2020/089

of sources, or of large quotes that are correctly marked as such, there is no question of plagiarism. However, it is a question of insufficient own work, which the examiner may take into account in grading.⁵ When distinguishing between plagiarism and insufficiently individualised work, the instructions given by an examiner in the syllabus or in the assignment itself with regard to the citation method of compulsory and available literature are decisive.

Art. 15 Sanctions

1. As of academic year 2025/26, the BoE only imposes reparatory sanctions.⁶
2. In case of an irregularity, the situation must be repaired, hence, the standard sanction is annulment of the assessment component in question. The BoE can decide to lower the sanction to a formal warning. This warning is kept in the (confidential) student file and will only be accessible to UM services such as the BoE or the BSA committee. A warning may play a role in any further contact for fraud /plagiarism with the BoE (see below).
3. In case fraud or plagiarism is established, the Board of Examiners imposes a sanction. The **standard** sanction is invalidation of the assessment component and invalidation of c.q. exclusion from the other assessment components in that sit of the education unit in which the fraud occurred. A formal warning will also be issued.
4. In addition to the standard sanction referred to in paragraph 1 and 3 of this provision, the Board of Examiners may decide to impose one or more of the following sanctions if the actions and / or circumstances justify a **further** sanction. Potential further sanctions include:
 - a) exclusion from the next exam opportunity / opportunities of the course in which the fraud or plagiarism was found to have occurred;
 - b) exclusion from examination in more than one education unit (including resits) for a period of no more than one calendar year;
 - c) submission of a proposal to the Dean and the Executive Board for the termination of the enrolment of the student.
5. Factors justifying more severe sanctions include:
 - a) intent concerning the fraudulent behaviour and / or;
 - b) the scale /extent / severity of the fraudulent conduct and / or;
 - c) repeated cases of fraud / plagiarism; this may also apply to cases in other programmes at Maastricht University whether the student has previously been found to have acted fraudulently. For this reason, UM Boards of Examiners may request information as to

⁵ Factually, this kind of mistake could come under the definition of fraud, as it is difficult to establish the student's knowledge, but in the BoE's view, this should be seen as a possibility to educate students rather than punish them.

⁶ RvS 23 april 2025, ECLI:NL:RVS:2025:1831

whether fraud and/or plagiarism has been established in an exam (component) at another programme.

6. If it is established that the student concerned did not commit fraud, the names will be removed from the correspondence about the alleged fraud and the correspondence will be anonymised and used exclusively for the annual report of the Board of Examiners' work.

Article 16: Inspection and Feedback

In accordance with the UM *vision on assessment*, students are entitled to receive feedback on the results of assessment (components) and the assessment thereof. This feedback shall be provided in an appropriate manner, for instance by means of an assessment rubric, grading information, a collective explanation meeting or other appropriate means.

Article 17: Disagreement concerning the assessment

1. The grade given by the examiner is in principle final, barring mistakes or errors. The possibility of inspection and feedback is not an invitation to negotiate about the grade received.
2. A disagreement regarding the content of the assessment should in first instance be taken up with the examiner involved, as neither the Board of Examiners nor the CBE enters into a substantive reassessment of the exam (component). The student must indicate clearly on which point and why the assessment is incorrect, using the possibilities provided by means of inspection and feedback.
3. A student may appeal against (the manner of) an assessment or any (alleged) error in the process to the Examination Appeals Board (CBE). During the appeal process, the Board of Examiners will be requested to hold a conciliatory meeting to look into possibilities for an amicable settlement.
4. The conciliatory meeting does not have to result in a settlement. A settlement will only be offered if there are reasonable grounds for this. Conciliatory hearings are not meant to offer another option to discuss the substance matter of the exam, as the BoE is not competent to overrule the assessment by the examiner. The BoE can and will merely check whether all procedural rules and prerequisites have been followed to a sufficient degree and no obvious mistakes have occurred.
5. If the student's appeal against the assessment before the CBE contains no new substantive objections compared to what has already been discussed between student and examiner, the CBE may be requested to omit a conciliatory meeting (art. 6 paragraph 3 CBE Rules of

Procedure). The absence of (new) objections can also be brought forward by the examiner to dispute the admissibility or the merits of the appeal.

Article 18: Other procedural rules

7. A student may be requested by or on behalf of the Board of Examiners to attend a meeting with the Board of Examiners. The student is obliged to comply with this request.
8. The invitation carries an acceptance term. If acceptance does not take place within this term or if no request is made (with good reason) to move the interview and the student does not attend, the Board of Examiners will decide on the basis of the available information.
9. The Board of Examiners issues a formal warning if the student does not appear without prior notification.

Article 19: Exemption

1. The BoE is competent – within the limits of the applicable EER – to grant exemptions for education units, if a comparable module has been followed elsewhere at university level.
2. An exemption as referred to in the EER is registered if a student requests that studying results gained elsewhere be recognised as an equivalent for a specified education unit at Maastricht University. For the purpose of assessing this request, the student shall submit the information regarding the institution where the unit was taken, a description of the unit taken, showing its contents, time investment and examination methods, a certified copy of the result obtained and a clear description of the education unit (with code) of the FdR for which exemption is requested.
3. Exemptions are also registered if the course taken is largely equivalent to the education unit for which exemption is requested, but the examiner considers an additional assignment necessary to cover all learning objectives. The exemption is processed the moment it is clear that the student has fulfilled the additional requirement(s).
4. Equivalent examination components shall be deemed present if:
 - The time investment (number of EC) for the course followed is identical or higher than for module for which exemption is requested;
 - The place in the curriculum (Bachelor introductory, standard, advanced; Master) is identical and
 - The courses cover the same learning objectives. The Board of Examiners seeks the advice of the examiner of the FdR before deciding on the request.
10. In accordance with the applicable EER's, no exemption is granted:
 - For bachelor modules based on master modules and vice versa;

- If the result from elsewhere has been obtained more than six years ago;
- For the final research paper / Legal Challenge / Essay;
- For education units taken during a period in which the student was excluded from participating in examinations at the FdR in accordance with article 11-15.

Article 20: Double use of EC

It is possible, within the restrictions formulated in the EER, to register the same education unit in different programmes. The EER determines the registration of results and influence on GPA / Cum Laude.

Article 21: Registration of results obtained elsewhere, electives

1. Results obtained abroad as elective courses are registered as they are at the institution where this course was taken.
2. The results obtained will not be converted to Dutch grading.
3. With regard to courses taken elsewhere, the rules in force locally shall apply.

Article 22: Cum laude and summa cum laude

1. If the student has demonstrated exceptional competence during the bachelor's phase, this shall be stated on the certificate.
2. Evidence of such exceptional competence is exclusively restricted to the following cases:

(a) Cum Laude

- The student has, without needing to resit an education unit, obtained an average of at least a full eight (8.0) for all components of the Bachelor's examination as mentioned in the EER and no final grade lower than seven; or
- The student has, without having to resit an education unit, obtained an average of at least a full eight and a half (8.5) for all components of the bachelor's exam as mentioned in the EER, whereby one mark may be obtained below seven, but no lower than one full six.

b) Summa cum Laude

The student has obtained an average of at least a full nine (9.0) and no final grade lower than seven without having to resit an education unit.

When calculating the average, the relative weight of the various bachelor exam components is not taken into account.

3. Notwithstanding paragraph 2, the designation Cum Laude or Summa Cum Laude is not awarded if exam (components) have been declared invalid by the Board of Examiners in application of article 11-13 and 15.
4. Results obtained abroad do not count towards the calculation.
5. The Hardship Clause does not apply.
6. This provision does not apply to the Premaster programme.

Part III Guidelines

This part concerns further instructions from the Board of Examiners to examiners and mainly relate to exam organisation, conditions with regard to the exam environment and quality assurance.

Article 23: Examiner

The appointed examiner (see *regeling aanwijzing Examinatoren*) is responsible for the examination of the education unit concerned. To guarantee the appropriate exercise of this authority and the quality of examination, the Board of Examiners of Examiners establishes rules with regard to the construction of the exam (component), the correction process as well as calculation and publication of the results.

Article 24: Requirements for the construction of the assessment (component)

1. The assessment (component) takes place in one of the forms approved in the EER / assessment plan.
2. With regard to the assessment (component), a description exists from which at least the elements included in the *Quality Assurance Regulations* appear.
3. The questions and assignments of the assessment (component) are clear; insofar as necessary it is clear from the phrasing of the question and the (intended) scoring how detailed the answer must be.
4. By way of internal quality control (four-eye principle) an assessment (component), including the answer model and intended grading, is submitted to and assessed by a second member of staff familiar with the course and the subject matter (the referent). This referent assesses at least the correctness of the formulation of the assessment (component), the correctness of the content of the questions, the distribution of the questions over the course content, the relation between easy, average and difficult questions and the feasibility of the expected detail in the available time.
5. In case of an oral assessment (component), the requirements of paragraph 4 apply accordingly. The questions/statements/cases that may be raised during the oral

examination are prepared in advance. A summary grading information is agreed in advance with the second examiner present at the oral examination. In any case, the designated examiner will participate in oral exams which replace written exams (remedial with few students) and final oral exams.

6. Paragraph 5 last sentence, does not apply to in-class oral assessment components such as presentations or debates.

Article 24a: Take home assessment

In case use is made of assessment components that take place outside a controlled environment, the examiner decides and communicates whether, and if yes, which forms of (generative) AI may be used. If the examiner suspects that these rules have not been followed, they invite the student in question for a meeting. If, during this meeting, the suspicions are not cleared, the examiner involves the BoE. They hand over all evidence (e.g. findings of control programmes, other indicators) as well as the report of the meeting which includes the student's reaction. If the student wishes, they may hand over an individual statement to the BoE.

Article 24aa suspicion of fraud / plagiarism

In case of reasonable doubts concerning the (intellectual) authorship of an assessment component taken outside a controlled environment, the examiner may organise an oral examination concerning the work. Significant differences in knowledge and / or skills suggest that the student in question did not write the work alone and are sufficient reason to refer the case to the BoE.⁷

Art. 24b: Oral assessment

1. Oral assessments take place at the faculty.
2. Unless specified otherwise, an oral exam takes no longer than 60 minutes. In case this assessment is the only assessment component, the examiner of the education unit is present. This type of oral exam is scheduled as detailed in the assessment plan/ exam schedule. In case the student timely requests a rescheduling and offers reasons (with proof) for this request and rescheduling is reasonably still possible, the examiner shall agree to the rescheduling.

Article 25: Requirements for the organisation of the grading procedure

⁷ RvS 26 juli 2023, ECLI:NL:RVS:2023:2874

If the designated examiner delegates the actual correction work to teaching staff, the examiner must ensure that the correction procedure is set up in such a way that arbitrariness and differences between correctors are excluded as much as possible. The *Quality Assurance Regulation* contains suggestions in this regard.

Article 25a: Grades & calculation (applicable in ELS and all master programmes)

1. Final results for education units / modules are given as full grades on a scale of 0-10. A calculated grade of .5 and above is rounded to the next full grade, e.g. a 6.5 becomes a 7.
2. The final grade is calculated as laid down in the assessment plan. The module is completed successfully if the final rounded grade is a 6.0 or more.
3. Results for assessment components are calculated as indicated in the assessment plan. Grades are given on a scale of 0-10 and are truncated after the first decimal; e.g. a 6,47 becomes a 6,4. The component is successfully passed if the truncated grade is 5,5 or more.
4. Notwithstanding subparagraph 1, modules may be assessed with a pass/ fail.
5. Subparagraph 1 does not fully apply to the final legal challenge / thesis. The thesis / challenge is graded on a scale of 0-10, but the grade 5,5 is not awarded. This means that the lowest passing grade for a thesis / final challenge is a 6.0. The respective regulations including rubrics and conversion tables apply.
6. If a student participates in an assessment component of a module, a final result for this module will be registered. This is calculated by adding the grade 0 to the missing components. The reason for not taking part in the missing component is irrelevant. If a component is declared invalid, this will also lead to a calculation value of 0 for a final grade.
7. If a student does not take part in any assessment for a module, an NG will be registered.

Art. 25b: Vaststelling beoordeling (Nederlandstalige bachelors, Premaster)⁸

1. Resultaten voor onderwijsseenheden zijn eindcijfers op een schaal van 0 tot 10. Het eindcijfer is een geheel getal. Voor eindcijfers geldt dat vanaf ,5 naar boven wordt afgerond, e.g. een 6,5 wordt een 7.
2. Het eindcijfer wordt berekend zoals in het toetsplan is vastgelegd. De onderwijsseenheid is met een voldoende afgesloten als het afgerond eindcijfer minimaal een 6 is.
3. Resultaten van deeltaetsen worden berekend aan de hand van de totaalscore van de deeltaets die op een vooraf bekendgemaakte wijze wordt omgerekend naar een cijfer. Dit deeltcijfer ligt op een schaal van 0-10 en wordt afgekapt na het eerste decimaal (een 5,27

⁸ Deze regeling is dit jaar voor het laatst van kracht, in verband met de nog geldige deelresultaten die in 2023/34 zijn behaald. Vanaf academisch jaar 2026/27 vervalt deze regeling en geldt voor iedereen de beoordeling zoals vervat in art. 25a.

wordt een 5,2, geen 5,3). De deelttoets is met goed gevolg afgelegd bij een afgekapt cijfer van minimaal 5,5.

4. In afwijking van het bepaalde in lid 1 kunnen onderwijseenheden met de kwalificatie 'voldoende' of 'onvoldoende' beoordeeld worden.
5. In afwijking van het in lid 1 bepaalde, wordt het afsluitende werkstuk beoordeeld op halve cijfers op een schaal van 0 tot 10, met uitzondering van het cijfer 5,5. In afwijking van lid 2 geldt dus dat het eindcijfer een volle 6 moet zijn. De in de Regeling Eindwerkstuk neergelegde rubric en de aldaar vastgelegde berekening van cijfers is van toepassing.
6. Indien een toetsmoment van een onderwijseenheid niet wordt afgelegd of ongeldig wordt verklaard, dan wel de student van deelname wordt uitgesloten, wordt voor die onderwijseenheid een NG als eindresultaat geregistreerd.

Article 26: Amendment of the assessment

8. If, during the correction of the assessment (component), it appears that the intended grading would lead to an unreliable test result, for example because a foreseen element is structurally and consistently not mentioned, the examiner can, within the margins of what is indicated in the exam about the grading per (partial) question, adjust the assessment. The examiner consults the director of studies.
9. If the examiner is of the opinion that - for example because of the analysis from Test-Vision - a question is insufficiently reliable or valid, or lacks distinctiveness, the examiner submits the findings to the Board of Examiners. The Board of Examiners may decide to have the question in question examined by another staff member familiar with the content. It is not permitted without prior consultation with the Board of Examiners and the examination expert (*toetsdeskundige*) to remove a question / part from the examination or to adjust the grading outside what is specified in the (sub)question.

Article 27: Announcement and registration of the results of assessment (components)

1. The examiner provides Exam Administration with the final grades for the education unit within four weeks after the last assessment component of the education unit.
2. In case of a mistake or error, the examiner must correct the results of the assessment (component) without delay. Errors must be corrected, the grade must reflect the real skills / knowledge of the student. Whether or not a student could in good faith have believed to have been awarded the erroneous grade, must be established for each case taking into account possibilities for inspection and feedback.⁹

⁹ Generally, the Faculty's overriding interest in correction of mistakes has been accepted by the Raad van State.

Article 28: Assessment criteria & feedback

1. After the announcement of the results of an assessment (component), the examiner provides insight into assessment criteria, scoring and other aspects of the assessment, so that the student can take note of the assessment criteria and evaluate their own work using the criteria.
2. The examiner will provide the student(s) with access to the assessment (components), including feedback on the answers given by the student, if requested within the designated period. This feedback may consist of a reference to a model answer, rubric or collective review or any other form of access to the assessment criteria and their application.
3. If the student has substantive questions regarding the assessment, the examiner will discuss these with the student or respond in writing. The reaction may consist of a (concrete) reference to the written feedback, the rubric, or a collective explanatory meeting, if in the opinion of the examiner this allows the questions to be answered. The explanation provided in the framework of the feedback may be brought in by the examiner in the framework of a possible appeal procedure, especially when it concerns the added value of a settlement meeting, all this in accordance with Art. 6 paragraph 3 of the CBE's Rules of Procedure.
4. Detected fraud does not interfere with the right to inspection, however, an examiner is not obliged to assess or provide individual feedback on papers in which fraud has been detected.

Article 29: Further quality assurance

The Board of Examiners can, in view of its safeguarding task with regard to assessment quality, subject any assessment (component) to further examination. The manner in which the Board of Examiners uses this power is elaborated in the regulation Quality assurance testing.

Article 30: Assessment of the final legal challenge / thesis

The final legal challenge c.q. the master thesis is graded in accordance with the applicable regulation.

Art. 31: Assessment of internships

Internships that are faculty sponsored are assessed with a pass/fail.

Part IV: Other Provisions

Article 32: Hardship, discretionary power

1. The Board of Examiners may deviate from the provisions in or pursuant to these Regulations and Guidelines at the request of a student due to hardship of an overriding nature (hardship). This concerns exceptional events or exceptional consequences of an event for the student concerned.
2. There is a hardship of an overriding nature if the full application of the regulation leads to consequences that were not foreseen by the Board of Examiners **and** that are so disadvantageous for the student involved that they could never have been intended by the Board of Examiners.
3. Any such request for a deviation from the rules due to hardship must meet the following criteria:
 - The request must be clear, at least explicitly indicating the rule(s) from which derogation is sought;
 - The request must be reasoned, the hardship must be demonstrated as well as the causal link between the hardship and the rule from which derogation is sought;
 - Evidence must be offered (if necessary) of the circumstances giving rise to the hardship;
 - The requested derogation must resolve the problem (appropriateness and necessity of the provision).
4. Foreseen or foreseeable circumstances, normal life events as well as decisions that leave the student with a choice are not hardship.
5. Financial reasons, exchange, housing and the like are not in themselves considered hardship.

Article 33: Lacunae

If these regulations and Guidelines do not provide for a particular situation, the Board of Examiners will determine, if necessary, in coordination with Faculty Board and/or Programme Management.

Part V Transitional and Final Provisions

Article 34: Amendments

Amendments to the Guidelines and Directions applicable to the current academic year will not take place unless it can be reasonably assumed that the interests of students will not be harmed as a result.

Article 35: Entry into force

These Regulations and Guidelines shall enter into force on September 1, 2025 and cease to apply as of the start of the academic year 2026/27.

Duly approved and adopted by the Board of Examiners of the Faculty of Law of Maastricht University on 29 August 2025.