Rules and Regulations for the bachelor’s degree programme in Biomedical Sciences 2019/2020, within the meaning of Section 7.12b of the Dutch Higher Education and Research Act.

These rules were adopted by the Board of Examiners of the Biomedical Sciences programme of Maastricht University on 5 June 2019.

Contents

§1 General provisions 02
Article 1.1 Applicability of the rules and regulations 02
Article 1.2 The Board of Examiners 02
Article 1.3 Examiners 02
Article 1.4 Rules of Procedure for Examinations (course exams) 03

§2 Assessment 03
Article 2.1 The portfolio as an instrument 03
Article 2.2 The content of the portfolio 03
Article 2.3 Portfolio Assessment Committee; Tasks and Responsibilities 04
Article 2.4 Guidance and assessment of portfolio 04
Article 2.5 Determination and examination of portfolio 05
Article 2.6 Course examination 05
Article 2.7 Written assignments 05
Article 2.8 Internship 05
Article 2.9 Invalidation of exams 05
Article 2.10 Time allowed for exams 05
Article 2.11 Scheduling of course exams 06
Article 2.12 Resits 06
Article 2.13 Comment and Inspection procedures 06

§3 Registration 06
Article 3.1 Marks and qualifications 06
Article 3.2 Registration and determination of exam results 07
Article 3.3 Attendance and best efforts obligation 07
Article 3.4 Compensation rules 07
Article 3.5 Exemption 07
Article 3.6 Minor 08
Article 3.7 Registration of internship 08
Article 3.8 Registration of bachelor’s thesis 08

§4 Final exam 08
Article 4.1 Iudicum 08

§5 Fraud and irregularities 09
Article 5.1 General 09

§6 Final clauses 09
Article 6.1 Correspondence from the Board of Examiners 09
Article 6.2 Unforeseen cases 09
Article 6.3 Hardship clause 10
Article 6.4 Coming into force 10

Appendix 1 Fraud policy 11
Section 1 General provisions

Article 1.1 Applicability of the rules and regulations

1. These rules and regulations apply to the education, assessments and final exam for the bachelor's degree programme in Biomedical Sciences.
2. The regulations relate to students who are enrolled in the programme in the 2019/2020 academic year. The replacement of regulations that previously applied to a student may not affect, to the students' detriment, a decision regarding the student that has been taken by the Board of Examiners pursuant to these regulations. Where such a decision would be to the student's detriment, the Board of Examiners will seek a solution.
3. Contrary to the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of this article, the curriculum and the associated exam components as set out in the Education and Examination Regulations that applied when the student commenced the programme will continue to apply to the student.
4. The rules and regulations are established by the Board of Examiners on an annual basis.

Article 1.2 Board of Examiners

1. According to the Higher Education and Scientific Research Act /Wet op het Hoger Onderwijs en Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (from here on referred to as the WHW) the Board of Examiners (Board of Examiners) is an independent and qualified committee within the higher educational institution.
2. The Board of Examiners is responsible for safeguarding the quality of the examination (including all intermediate tests/exams and final exam) as well as for warranting the BMS diploma (Article 7.12b of the WHW). Together with the programme management and the Faculty Board, the Board of Examiners co-defines and monitors the examinations quality assurance system that guarantees attainment of the programmes’ final qualifications.
3. The Board of Examiners has mandated the quality assurance of intermediate/regular assessment to the responsible examiners and the graduation procedure to the Exam Administration.

Article 1.3 Examiners

1. The Board of Examiners appoints examiners who are qualified to set examinations. Examiners are members of the academic staff at Maastricht University or Universiteit Hasselt. The Board of Examiners is authorised to allow for exceptions to this rule. Examiners must have obtained a Basic Teaching Qualification (BTQ) certificate or must officially participate in the trajectory towards this qualification.
2. All course coordinators will be appointed as examiner. The course examiner can without losing his/her full responsibility, have other members of the teaching staff perform tasks belonging to an examination component.
3. The Board of Examiners also appoints staff members as examiners of the master thesis. They should hold a PhD title and should hold BTQ or at least the certificate of the Training for examiners. The Board of Examiners is authorised to allow for exceptions to this rule.
4. When performing the tasks as stipulated in section 5, the examiners and members of the teaching staff must observe the Act, the regulations contained within or arising from the EER and the present rules and regulations.
5. The role of examiner is diverse and will entail either single tasks or a combination of these tasks (taken from the Act and RACI scheme):
   - Designing and implementing the assessment plan of the specific course/trajectory, and determining the course/trajectory specific assessment methods
   - Executing (elements of) the assessment organization (planning, coordination, monitoring) construction of assessment/exams
   - Marking/grading assessment
   - Setting the cut-off score
   - Determining measures for improvement assessments
   - Forwarding suspicion of plagiarism/ fraud to the BoE
6. Having heard the examiner, the Board of Examiners may suspend or revoke an examiner’s
appointment if the examiner fails to comply with laws and regulations of the Board of Examiners, or if the examiner’s competence in the examination field has repeatedly proved to be of insufficient quality.

Article 1.4 Rules of Procedure for Examinations (course exams) and exam components

1. Students must follow all procedural instructions before and during written exams (including computer based exams) and exam component as set out in Rules of Procedure for Examinations. The Rules of Procedure for Examinations have been published on the Student Portal.
2. If the student does not comply with the provisions under or pursuant to the first paragraph, the student's participation in the exam can be declared null and void by the Board of Examiners.

Section 2. Assessment

- The basis for assessment within the BMS bachelor's programme is the curriculum map and the learning outcomes and competences described therein. The curriculum map describes the following four competences:
  - Biomedical Expert
  - Investigator and Scholar
  - Communicator and Collaborator
  - Professional and Organiser
- Within the programme of assessment a variety of assessment and feedback instruments are used. Each exam provides specific information on aspects or sub-aspects of the competences. All assessment and feedback information is collected in the portfolio.
- Instructions concerning the content, format and assessment criteria of each exam component will be published in the assessment plan for that component. This assessment plan will be available in the Student Portal at the start of the exam component.

Article 2.1 The portfolio as an instrument

In the bachelor's programme, the portfolio is an instrument for:
- storage of relevant information and feedback on the student's competence development
- assessment of a student's learning process and competence development
- reflection and self-directed learning.

Article 2.2 The content of the portfolio

1. The portfolio must in any case contain:
  - All feedback, assessments and exam results (conforming at the least to the assessment plans of the exam components) and other documented feedback on the student's performance;
  - Analysis of the assessment and feedback information and reflections on competence development, in preparation for mentor meetings;
  - Reports of the progress meetings with the mentor;
2. The specific assessment plans for exam components can set additional requirements with regard to portfolio content.
3. All information contained in the portfolio will be used when providing advice and taking decisions on the student's competence development.
Article 2.3 Portfolio Assessment Committee; Tasks and Responsibilities

1. Main tasks and responsibilities of the Portfolio Assessment Committee (PAC) are:
   - Assessment of the student's professional development based on the requirements listed in the P-competence Assessment Plan. Before the assessment by the PAC an advice on the student's professional development is issued by the student's own mentor.
   - Assessment of remediation assignments for the P-(sub) competence professional development
   - Advisor to the Board of Examiners: In the annual transition meetings, the PAC can provide additional information on a student's professional development.

2. To assess the student's professional development the PAC randomly checks 3 portfolios per mentor. If the PAC agrees on the advice of the mentor for those 3 portfolios, the other advices of this mentor, being “meets expectations” or “performs above expectations”, will be adopted by the PAC. If the PAC does not agree with the advice on these 3 portfolios, the PAC will check all portfolios of this mentor. In addition, the PAC will also assess the portfolios and decide on the final qualification if:
   - the advice by the mentor is “falls short of expectations”
   - a student does not agree with the advice of his/her mentor and has indicated and substantiated with arguments as such on the designated EPASS form.

3. If assessment by the PAC is required, the following aspects will be examined:
   - The content of the mentor meeting cards.
   - Formative and narrative feedback provided in the feedback forms.
   - The advice on the student's professional development issued by the student's own mentor.

4. The PAC reserves the right to give a negative advice for the P-sub competence professional development to students who fail the remediation assignments within the communicated deadlines and/or that repeatedly do not respond to email correspondence or reminders within the response time defined by the PAC in the email. In order to reverse this decision, the student has the possibility to be heard by the PAC to settle on necessary actions.

Article 2.4 Guidance and assessment of the competency development

1. Several actors are involved in supervising and assessing the student's competence development, and all have their own duties, responsibilities and authorisations.
2. The mentor assists the student in compiling the portfolio. To this end, the mentor will have a start-of-year meeting and regular progress meetings with the student. During these meetings, the mentor will discuss the student's competence development in relation to the standard applicable at that time, on the basis of the information in the portfolio. Further information on the mentor's role can be found in the Student Portal.
3. In the event of any incompatibility of characters (“incompatibilité des humeurs”) between the mentor and the student, either one can request an alternative pairing. Such a request should be submitted to the mentor coordinator, who will issue a decision.
4. At the end of each course year of the bachelor's programme the mentor will provide assessment advice on the student's professional development to the Portfolio Assessment Committee. This assessment advice will be based on completeness and content of the portfolio and will be formally registered on an assessment form.
5. The student will have the opportunity to add his or her view on the assessment advice.
6. The Portfolio Assessment Committee will perform the final assessment of the student's professional development. It will do so based on the mentor's formal assessment advice and the portfolio as outlined in article 2.3.

Article 2.5 Determination and examination of the competence development

1. The level of competence development is determined at the end of every course year.
2. In their annual transition meeting at the end of the academic year, the Board of Examiners will decide whether a student can pass to the next course year. The PAC and the student advisors are consulted before or during the meeting on issues of students' professional development and/or special circumstances.
3. At the end of the programme, the student must demonstrate attainment of the learning outcomes or exit level as described in the curriculum map.

**Article 2.6 Course examination**

1. The form of course exams can vary and will be announced in the respective assessment plans, which will be available by the start of the courses in the Student Portal.
2. If the exam consists of multiple-choice questions, there will be at least three answers to choose from.
3. Where a course is assessed based on a variety of assessment formats, individual and/or collective, the student must obtain a passing mark for all the components; the weighted average of the assessments will determine the final grade for the course; exam components cannot be compensated with each other.
4. Where a course is assessed based on collective assessment or a collective assessment combined with an individual course exam assessment at least 50% of the course mark is determined on the basis of the individual course exam;
5. For courses lasting four weeks or fewer, the final mark can be made up of the collective assessment/project assessment alone;
6. Where a course assessment is partially based on peer assessment, the peer assessment will count for a maximum of 20% of the final mark;
7. In case of collective and/or peer assessment procedures must be in place to avoid students free-riding (e.g. scrum method).

**Article 2.7 Written assignments**

1. The requirements with regard to papers that are part of a course or the portfolio will be announced in the respective assessment plan in the Student Portal.
2. All written assignments must be checked for plagiarism using SafeAssign or another plagiarism-screening program approved by the Board of Examiners.
3. The bachelor's thesis must be written on an individual basis.

**Article 2.8 Internship**

The Programme management determines the rules and regulations that apply to the character and scientific contents of the internships. These rules are published in the Student Portal. The internship will be graded according the assessment criteria set by the Board of Examiners.

**Article 2.9 Invalidation of exams**

The Board of Examiners is authorised to declare exams/exam results null and void. It may do so if:
- there was an emergency while the exam was being held;
- there is evidence of widespread fraud in the exam;
- there have been demonstrable mistakes in the calculation of the exam results, or the calculation conflicted with the exam regulations.
- there are other unforeseen circumstances that make it impossible to determine whether the administration of the exams and/or calculation of marks was carried out correctly.

**Article 2.10 Time allowed for exams**

A maximum of three hours is allowed for the completion of a written course exam. This time may be extended by 25% to a maximum of 30 minutes on the grounds of an impairment. In special cases, the Board of Examiners is authorised to allow amendments to the time for a course exam.
**Article 2.11  Scheduling of course exams**

The times at which course exams and course exam resits will be held are announced at the start of the academic year in the Student Portal. If a resit is oral, the originally planned time of the resit will be taken into account as much as possible. Students who have to do an oral resit will be notified accordingly at least two weeks before the planned date.

**Article 2.12  Resits**

1. Each academic year there are two opportunities for the course exam, the regular sit and the resit. The examiner decides upon form of the resit in consultation with the Board of Examiners.
2. Each academic year a resit opportunity is offered for failed subtests and assignments. Such an opportunity can be offered in a different way as stated in the assessment plan.
3. For resiting course exams, subtests and assignments the following regulations hold:
   - Passed results cannot be resit unless the student is obliged to repeat a course.
   - in case the student is obliged to redo a course, passed assessments within that course will lose their validity and student needs to resit all, including MSF and notebook.
4. For resits of written papers that are not part of the C competence and for which feedback has been received, it may be determined that the maximum obtainable score is lower than 10. The examiner must state the maximum obtainable score for resits of written papers in the assessment plan.
5. In case the requirements for obtaining credits for the C- or P-competences of a course year are not met, the student has to remediate those components for which a score Fail was obtained. See article 2.3 and the documents Remediation Requirements for C and P competences in the Student Portal.

**Article 2.13  Comment and Inspection Procedures**

1. There are two points at which students may inspect an exam:
   - Within the context of the comment procedure.
   - Inspection of their own exam.
   The procedure for multiple-choice exams differs from the procedure for open-question exams.
2. Student comment procedure is a procedure for multiple-choice takes place for quality control purposes. The procedure takes place BEFORE the grades are published in the Student Portal. During a comment session, students can review/ have access to the exam questions and submit relevant comments. If their comments are valid, the adjustment will apply to ALL students.
3. The exam inspection procedure is a statutory right students have to inspect their own exam AFTER the grades have been published. They can at the inspection appeal to their grade. They do so on an individual basis; this means that if their appeal is successful, it applies only to the relevant student.
4. The procedure for multiple-choice exams differs The procedure for multiple-choice exams differs from the procedure for open-question. All information on both procedures can be found in the document BMS comment and inspection procedures, published in the Student Portal.

**Section 3.  Registration**

**Article 3.1  Marks and qualifications**

1. Exam components can be registered with a mark (1–10 point scale) or a qualification (Fail, Pass or Good).
2. Marks and final grade will be given up to one decimal figure only.
3. The first decimal figure is decisive for the cutoff.
   E.g :  5.41 -> 5.4 and 5.49 -> 5.4
4. The criteria for obtaining a final qualification of Pass or Good for the sub competencies of 'Communicator' and 'Professional' will be indicated in the relevant assessment plan per competence domain.

5. A label NG ('no grade”) can be assigned as a result of fraud/plagiarism or when assessment is incomplete and no result can be assigned. In case of a NG, no credits are awarded.

**Article 3.2 Determination and Registration of exam results**

1. Exam components will be registered and the associated credits granted if the requirements for the relevant components as stated in the applicable assessment plan have been fulfilled.

2. The following applies to the registration of courses within the competence domains of 'Biomedical Expert' and 'Investigator and Scholar':
   - the student must have a final grade of at least 5,5 for the course examination or a final grade of ≥ 4,5 and ≤ 5,4 that can be compensated (see Article 3.4); a paper or other assignment that is not part of the course assessment or final grade need not receive a passing mark in order to receive a registration for the course.

3. Marks of course exams with multiple-choice questions will be calculated using the Cohen-Schotanus method for determining the cut-off point:
   - The maximum obtainable score is equal to a mark of 10.
   - The threshold value for a mark of 5.5 is calculated as follows:
     a. if there are 100 or more students, it will be determined on the basis of 70% of the 95th percentile of the scores obtained;
     b. if there are 50 or more but fewer than 100 students, it will be determined on the basis of 70% of the average of the 10% best scores;
     c. if there are fewer than 50 students, it will be determined on the basis of 60% of the maximum obtainable score.

4. For an end of course exam with a mix of open and closed questions, in principle the Cohen method will be used. The decision for the use of Cohen in the case of a mix of open and closed questions will be made by the Board of Examiners guided by the blue-print of the course-exam, in consultation with the course coordinator.

5. Mark of course exams that consist solely of open questions, an absolute standard setting method will be used, with the cutoff value as indicated in paragraph 3.2.2

6. In resits, the cut-off point for a mark of 5.5 is equal to that for regular exams.

7. If the percentage of failing scores exceeds 40%, the course coordinator will consult with the Board of Examiners to determine whether there are grounds for adjusting the standards. The rationale for this may include: results in preceding years and the perceived degree of difficulty of the course exam.

8. If the percentage of passing scores exceeds 90%, and the median value of the marks obtained is an 8 or higher, the course coordinator will consult with the Board of Examiners to determine whether there are grounds for adjusting the standards.

9. The following applies to the registration of components within the competence domain 'Communicator and Collaborator' and 'Professional and Organiser': Students who have started their study in 2016 are awarded the full registration and the associated credits for the 'Communicator and Collaborator' competence (10 ECTS) and 'Professional and Organiser' (10 credits) competence of year 1 and 2 if they have sufficiently remediated failed (sub) competences.

10. From 2017 on registration and the associated credits for the components of the 'Communicator and Collaborator' and 'Professional and Organiser' competences will be awarded if the qualification is at least Pass for all subcompetencies, as stated in the assessment plans for C and P competence domains and, if applicable, failed components of the C- and P- competence are remediated in a higher course year.

**Article 3.3 Attendance and best efforts obligation**

1. For all the compulsory tutorial meetings there is a 100% attendance requirement.

2. Students who have been granted top-class athlete status are subject to a 50% attendance requirement.

3. Students who have a medical impairment may qualify for an adjusted attendance
requirement pursuant to the recommendation of the SSC-Disability Support.

4. Fulfilment of the best efforts obligation in tutorial meetings is assessed by the lecturer, fellow students and the student himself or herself on the basis of the MSF form and forms part of the assessment of the 'Professional and Organiser' competence.

Article 3.4 Compensation rules

1. Compensation is only possible for exam components of the first course year and only within the competence domain 'Biomedical Expert'.
2. Compensation is only possible for a final mark $\geq 4.5$ and $\leq 5.4$.
3. Compensation within the competence domains of 'Biomedical Expert' is only possible if the student has already obtained all of the credits in the other three competence domains.
4. The final mark of one course exam within the competence domain of 'Biomedical Expert' in the first course year can be compensated if the sum of the final marks obtained is at least 22 or higher.

Article 3.5 Exemption

1. Where a student is granted an exemption for a course, this course is immediately registered with an 'exemption'; in order to be eligible for a mark, the student must take the entire course, sit the exam and also fulfil all of the other course assessment requirements.
2. In the event that one or more exam components have been registered with an exemption, the student cannot graduate with a *cum laude* designation.
3. Exemptions are granted on a course level only.

Article 3.6 Minor

1. For a deferral from the content of the minor as indicated in EER Appendix 1, part B, a permission of the Board of Examiners is needed. The Board of Examiners may withhold the approval if, in its opinion, the proposed elective is in terms of content too similar to components taken previously or to be taken by the student and would result in duplication. The rules and requirements for minors are listed in a document 'Rules and requirements Minors Year 3' that is uploaded in the student portal.
2. Students, who need to repeat a course exam of the competences B or I from the third or fourth semester are advised to follow a minor within UM programmes. When choosing a minor outside UM/abroad it is student's own responsibility to participate in the regular resit opportunities for the failed course. No alternative date for the resit will be offered.
3. Students, who miss credits of sub competences C or P can follow a minor outside FHML. It is student’s own responsibility to remediate the failed competencies in the designated form and time as stated in the Remediation Requirements documents.

Article 3.7 Registration of internship

1. The internship is assessed on the aspects of practical work and presentation.
2. The supervisor gives feedback and a mark on the performance on the work floor and gives feedback and a qualification for the presentation (see assessment plan Internship and thesis Year 3).
3. An endorsement for the internship will be obtained if the responsible supervisor assesses the internship with at least a 6.0 and the presentation with at least a pass.
4. The requirements with regard to the internship are laid down in an internship agreement. This agreement is available on the Student Portal.
5. For students who started the third course year of the bachelor in or before 2017 the internship is assessed as indicated in the adapted Rules and Regulations 2017-2018.

Article 3.8 Registration of bachelor’s thesis

1. The bachelor's thesis is assessed by two assessors on the aspects of format and content,
with format determining 20% and content determining 80% of the final grade, as specified in the assessment plan internship and thesis Year 3).

2. The assessment criteria for the bachelor's thesis are included in the document 'Guidelines BMS bachelor's thesis' in the Student Portal.

3. For the bachelor's thesis, an endorsement is obtained when each of the two independent assessors assess the thesis with at least 6.0.

4. In the event of major differences between the two assessors (> 2 points), a student who feels that this is a significant disadvantage, may submit a request to the Board of Examiners for the appointment of a third assessor. If the Board of Examiners takes a positive decision on this matter, the final assessment of the three assessors will be averaged. This average mark is then the final mark for the thesis.

5. The requirements regarding the bachelor's thesis will be announced on the Student Portal at the beginning of each academic year.

Section 4. Final exam

Article 4.1 Iudicium

The bachelor's exam and the open bachelor's exam will be granted the iudicium (degree classification) *cum laude* if the following requirements have been met:
- a weighted (= credits (ECTS) x final course marks) average (before cut-off) score of at least an 7,7 on all course exams within the competences of 'Biomedical Expert' and 'Investigator and Scholar' of year 1 and 2 and, no score of 5 or lower
- at least 3 times a qualification Good on the competence 'Communicator and Collaborator' as well as at least 3 times a qualification Good for the competence 'Professional and Organiser' of year 1 and 2 (total of at least 6 times Good)
- internship: score 8.00 before cut-off
- bachelor's thesis: score 8.00 before cut-off.
- if one or more courses are endorsed with an 'exemption', the student cannot be granted the iudicium *cum laude*.
- If a penalty has been imposed for fraud/plagiarism, the student cannot be granted the iudicium *cum laude*.

Section 5. Fraud and irregularities, also understood to include plagiarism

Article 5.1 General

The FHML/UM uniform Fraud Regulations, drawn up by the Boards of Examiners, set out in greater detail what constitutes fraud and what measures the Board of Examiners may impose. These regulations have been added as Appendix 1 and are also available in the Student Portal.

Section 6. Final clauses

Article 6.1 Correspondence from the Board of Examiners

The Board of Examiners will only communicate with students via their official UM account.

Article 6.2 Unforeseen cases

The BMS Board of Examiners will decide in all cases that are not provided for in these regulations.
Article 6.3  Hardship clause

1. The Board of Examiners is authorised to derogate from these regulations in individual cases if it feels that in view of the exceptional circumstances their application in full would result in extreme unfairness towards an individual student.
2. In exceptional cases, a student can submit a request for an extra exam possibility. For granting such a request the following criteria apply:
   - It must be the final study result to be obtained before graduation
   - It must be a third year course examination and student must have taken part in the last two exam opportunities for the exam for which he/she is requested another assessment

   Request for an exceptional assessment can be submitted to the Board of Examiners once all other credits of the programme have been earned.

Article 6.4  Coming into force

The Rules and Regulations will come into force on 1 September 2019 and apply to the 2019/2020 academic year.
Appendix 1

The General FHML-Regulation for Fraud

In this Regulation, the chairpersons of the Boards of Examiners of the FHML further detail what is understood as fraud and what measures can be imposed by the Board of Examiners. This regulation about fraud, including plagiarism, applies for the academic year 2016-2017 and the following academic years.

1. If the Board of Examiners determines that, with respect to an exam or exam component, a student:
   a. has possessed impermissible resources, texts or notes or has utilised impermissible electronic resources and/or communications;
   b. has communicated or attempted to communicate with another student verbally or through gestures without permission from an invigilator, examiner or Board of Examiners member;
   c. has copied or attempted to copy from another student, or has provided the opportunity to copy;
   d. has posed as someone else or allowed this to occur;
   e. has deliberately misled, or at least attempted to mislead or provided the opportunity to mislead, the Board of Examiners, marker, examiner or invigilator with respect to the exam,

   the Board of Examiners may impose one of the disciplinary measures referred to in paragraph 6 of this Regulation.

2. If the Board of Examiners determines that a student has engaged in plagiarism with respect to an exam or exam component, including if the student:
   a. has used or copied from his/her own or someone else’s texts, information, ideas or thoughts without proper acknowledgment of sources;
   b. has presented the structure or main ideas from third-party sources as his/her own work or ideas;
   c. has not clearly indicated in the text, for example, through quotation marks or a specific design, that verbatim or nearly verbatim quotes have been used;
   d. has paraphrased the substance of his/her own or someone else’s texts without proper acknowledgment of sources;
   e. has copied visual, sound or test materials, software or program codes from others without proper acknowledgment of sources, thereby giving the impression that these are his/her own work;
   f. has copied work from other students and passed this off as his/her own work;
   g. has submitted work or papers which have been obtained from third parties or which have been written – for payment or not – by someone else, and has passed these off as his/her own work,

   the Board of Examiners may impose one of the disciplinary measures referred to in paragraph 6 of this Regulation.

3. If the Board of Examiners establishes that a student has fabricated and/or falsified research data, the Board of Examiners may impose one of the disciplinary measures referred to in paragraph 6 of this Regulation.

4. In case of fraud/plagiarism in group assignments the whole group is responsible for the fraud/plagiarism. In case of fraud/plagiarism in group assignments the Board of Examiners may impose one of the disciplinary measures referred to in paragraph 6 of this Regulation.

5. If the Board of Examiners determines that a student has otherwise committed fraud with respect to an exam or exam component, the Board of Examiners may impose one of the disciplinary measures referred to in paragraph 6 of this Regulation.

6. In the cases referred to under paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4 and/or 5 of this Regulation, the Board of Examiners may declare the result of the exam in question invalid, as well as impose the following disciplinary measures:
   - a reprimand;
   - barring the student from sitting for one or more exams for the programme for a period of at most one year.

   In case of fraud/plagiarism in group assignments these measures may differ per individual student if there is undisputed evidence of unequal contribution of these individuals to the committed fraud/plagiarism.

7. In serious cases of fraud, the Board of Examiners can propose to UM’s Executive Board that the student(s) concerned be permanently deregistered from the programme.

8. Before imposing an appropriate disciplinary measure, or making a proposal to the UM’s Executive Board, the Board of Examiners will give the student in question the opportunity to be heard.

9. The established fraud will be noted in the student’s dossier and, if applicable for the programme in question, a notice of unprofessional behaviour will be drawn up.

10. If, after investigation, it is ultimately determined that the student concerned did not commit fraud, the names will be removed from the correspondence about the alleged fraud and the correspondence will not be included in the student’s dossier.
11. The Board of Examiners does not grant any exemption based on study results attained outside the student’s own programme which were obtained during the period in which the student was barred from sitting for exams for the programme on account of the fraud committed.