

Rules and Regulations for the bachelor's degree programme in Biomedical Sciences 2021-2022, 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 1 June 2021.

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 Guidance and assessment of the professional development	04
	Article 2.4 Determination and examination of the competence development	04
	Article 2.5 Course exams	04
	Article 2.6 Written assignments	05
	Article 2.7 Internship	05
	Article 2.8 Invalidation of exams	05
	Article 2.9 Time allowed for exams	05
	Article 2.10 Scheduling of course exams	05
	Article 2.11 Resits	05
	Article 2.12 Comment and Inspection procedures	06
§3	Registration	06
	Article 3.1 Marks and qualifications	06
	Article 3.2 Registration and determination of exam results	06
	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	09
	Article 4.1 Iudicium	09
	Article 4.2 Flexible programme	09
§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	09
	Article 6.4 Coming into force	10
	Appendix 1 General FHML/UM-Regulation for Fraud and Irregularities	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 2021-2022 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. 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 Board of Examiners
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 components 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:

- a. storage of relevant information and feedback on the student's competence development
- b. assessment of professional development, which has 3 components:
 - i. personal growth
 - ii. career reports
 - iii. 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 professional development, in preparation for mentor meetings;
 - Career reports
 - 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 professional development.

Article 2.3 Guidance and assessment of the professional development

1. Several actors are involved in supervising and assessing the student's professional development, and all have their own duties, responsibilities and authorisations: the mentor, the shadow mentor and the professional development advice committee (PAC).
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. Each mentor will be partnered with a shadow mentor, with whom the portfolio and specific cases of each student can be discussed. Mentor and shadow mentor meet twice a year to discuss the portfolio/student progress. Feedback of the shadow mentor of the intermediate meeting is added to the portfolio.
5. At the end of each course year of the bachelor's programme, the own mentor, in agreement with the shadow mentor, will perform the final assessment for each student. This assessment will be based on the mentor meetings and the performance of the student in the 3 components of professional development and will be formally registered on an assessment form.
6. The student will have the opportunity to add his or her view on this assessment.
7. The PAC is an independent committee that will follow-up and give advice to the mentor about 2 of the components (career reports and self-directed learning) to ensure a good alignment of the different portfolios. To do so, the PAC will evaluate, throughout the year, the portfolios of 3 students of each mentor and discusses potential inconsistencies with the student's own mentor
8. The PAC will formally assess professional development (four-eye principle) if there is a disagreement between the two mentors, or if the students disagrees with the assessment of the mentor.

Article 2.4 Determination and examination of the competence development

1. The level of competence development is determined at the end of every course year, as laid down in the course assessment plans, and C and P competence assessment plans.
2. In their annual transition meeting at the end of the academic year, the Board of Examiners checks the results of all students and may decide on exemption to the requirements and if so grant admission to the higher course year. The program management and the student advisors are consulted before or during the meeting on issues of students' competence 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 2.5 Course exams

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 2.6 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 Ouriginal or another plagiarism-screening program approved by the Board of Examiners.
3. The bachelor's thesis must be written on an individual basis.

Article 2.7 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 to the assessment criteria set by the Board of Examiners.

Article 2.8 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 2.9 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 2.10 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 2.11 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 resitting 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 results 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 results 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 2.12 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.
2. The comment and inspection procedure for multiple-choice exam differs from the procedure for open-question exams. Information on both procedures can be found in the document BMS comment and inspection procedures, published in the Student Portal.
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.

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
5.51 -> 5.5 and 6.59 -> 6.5
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 $\geq 4,5$ and $\leq 5,4$ 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/or 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. The rationale for this may include: results in preceding years and the perceived degree of difficulty of the course exam.
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 adjusted attendance requirements.
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 tutor, 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 ≥ 4.5 and ≤ 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.
5. The compensation rule can be requested by the student either at the end of Year 1, or at the time that all resit options for that course have taken place. An approved compensation request cannot be revoked. The original (compensated) mark remains unaltered and will be listed on the results sheet as 'compensated'.

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 examination

Article 4.1 Iudicium

The examination of the bachelor 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 a 7.7 on all course exams within the competences of 'Biomedical Expert' and 'Investigator and Scholar' of year 1, 2 and 3 (except minor courses), 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, 2 and 3 (total of at least 6 times Good)
- internship: at least score 8.00 before cut-off
- bachelor's thesis: at least 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*.

Article 4.2 Flexible programme

1. The student may formulate a flexible educational programme that deviates from the programme stated in Article 3.6 of the EER.
2. The Board of Examiners will determine whether the programme will lead to the required level of knowledge and skills to receive the degree in Biomedical Sciences.
3. The content of the flexible programme should be coherent.
4. The flexible programme must have a study load of 180 ECTS.
5. The flexible programme should contain 60 ECTS of the first year of the original programme
6. The flexible programme should contain at least 40 ECTS on year 2 level and at least 40 ECTS on year 3 level (thesis and internship not included).
7. The flexible programme should include an approved internship and thesis (20 ECTS)

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

Article 5.1 General

The General FHML/UM-Regulation for Fraud and Irregularities, 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 2021 and apply to the 2021-2022 academic year.

Appendix 1 The General UM/FHML Regulation for Fraud and Irregularities

In this Regulation, the chairpersons of the Boards of Examiners of the UM/ FHML further detail what is understood as fraud and what measures can be imposed by the Board of Examiners. Furthermore, it is explained what is meant by irregularities and what measure the Board of Examiners can impose. This regulation about fraud, including plagiarism, applies for the academic year 2021-2022 and the following academic years.

Article 1: Fraud including plagiarism and fabricating and/or falsifying research data

In this article - which is related to the article on Fraud in the EER - it is, in accordance with Article 7.12b(3) of the Act, explained how the Board of Examiners acts under Article 7.12b(2) of the Dutch Higher Education and Research Act [Wet op het hoger onderwijs en wetenschappelijk onderzoek].

1. The Board of Examiners may impose one of the disciplinary measures set down in paragraph 7 of this article if it establishes that a student, in any exam or exam component has committed fraud, including (among others):
 - a) has had any aids/devices, resources, text or notes at his or her disposal, or has 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) has communicated or attempted to communicate with another student 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 collaborated on a graded assignment, paper or practical, whereas this was not explicitly allowed;
 - e) has posed as someone else or let someone else pose as him/her;
 - f) has misled, or at least 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;
 - g) has used an obfuscation method in submitted work that is likely to have the effect that plagiarism checking tools do not work optimally;
 - h) has disregarded the instructions of the invigilator or the instructions for the exam (component) such that an unfair advantage might have been obtained;
 - i) has performed actions or omissions which make it impossible in whole or in part to properly evaluate his/her knowledge, understanding and/or skills.
2. The Board of Examiners may impose one of the disciplinary measures set down in paragraph 7 of this article if it establishes that a student has committed fraud, including (among others):
 - a) has falsified the information on mandatory attendance, participation, or effort obligation; or had someone else falsify that information; or has signed off on attendance, participation, or effort obligation when it was not (fully) met;
 - b) has falsified exam results;
 - c) has falsely obtained, or attempted to, access to an exam;
 - d) has misled an examiner relating to exam (components), registration, or grading;
 - e) has facilitated other students to engage in fraud;
 - f) has fabricated and/or falsified survey or interview answers or research data;
3. The Board of Examiners may impose one of the disciplinary measures set down in paragraph 7 of this article if it establishes that a student has committed plagiarism in any exam, part, or component, including (among others):
 - a) using or copying his/her personal or other people's texts (including code), data, ideas, other materials, or thoughts without adequate reference to the source;
 - b) presenting the structure or central body of thought from others without adequate reference to the source and thus passing it off as his/her own;
 - c) not clearly indicating in the text (including code), for example via quotation marks or a certain layout, that verbatim or nearly verbatim quotes have been used;

- d) paraphrasing the content of his/her own or other people's texts without adequate reference to the source;
 - e) copying video, audio or test material, software, and program codes from others without adequate reference to the source and thus passing them off as his/her own;
 - f) copying work from other students and thus passing it off as his/her own;
 - g) submitting a text that has previously been submitted for a different component/module, or is similar to a text that has previously been submitted by oneself or by others, unless explicitly allowed;
 - h) submitting work or assignments acquired from or written by a third party (whether or not for payment) and thus passing them off as his/her own.
4. During the exam inspection students are not allowed to have communication devices and/or other electronic devices at their disposal, neither to take the exam and answer key outside the room where the inspection takes place nor to copy these documents in any form. Also, students are not allowed to make any modifications to the exam. When the exam inspection is virtually it is not allowed to make screenshots or record the inspection. The Board of Examiners may impose one of the disciplinary measures set down in paragraph 7 of this article if it establishes that a student did not adhere to these rules.
 5. In case of fraud / plagiarism in group assignments, all students in the group are in principle responsible for fraud / plagiarism unless it is clear that specific students have committed fraud. In that case only the students in question will be penalized.
 6. In the event that the Board of Examiners suspects that a student has committed fraud in any way, the Board of Examiners shall be entitled to start the following procedure: the (acting) chair of the Board of Examiners opens an inquiry into the established facts and may call in an expert to do so. After this inquiry has been closed, but within 15 working days after fraud has been reported to the Board of Examiners by the examiner(s), the chair will inform the members of the Board of Examiners and invite the student and the examiner(s) the opportunity to each state their case. The student may have an adviser accompany him/her. If the Board of Examiners establishes that a student has committed fraud, the Board will declare the relevant exams/assessment and/or attendance registration null and void (label NG) and can impose a measure as set down in paragraph 7. The Board of Examiners will inform the student involved, the examiner and education office regarding this measure and the reason on which this measure is based. This procedure shall take place in accordance with Article 7.12b(3) of the Act.
 7. In the cases referred to in paragraphs 1 to 6 the Board of Examiners can declare the results of the relevant exam or part in question and/or the attendance registration invalid, as well as impose the following disciplinary measures:
 - a) a reprimand;
 - b) exclusion from participation or further participation in one or more exams in the programme for a period of at most one year;
 - c) in serious cases of fraud, the Board of Examiners can propose to the UM's Executive Board that the student(s) concerned be permanently deregistered from the programme.
 8. Repeat offences of fraud are considered an aggravating circumstance and may result in more severe sanctions. This also includes fraud in components/modules that were taken at other faculties or institutions of higher education. For this reason, UM Boards of Examiners can inform each other if fraud and/or plagiarism has been established in an exam (component) at another faculty.
 9. Before the Board of Examiners imposes an appropriate disciplinary measure, or makes a proposal to the Executive Board, the student in question is given the opportunity to be heard.
 10. If fraud is established, this is included in the student's dossier and, if applicable for the programme in question, a notice of unprofessional/reprehensible behaviour will be drawn up.

11. 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.
12. The Board of Examiners does not grant exemptions on the grounds of study results obtained elsewhere while the student was excluded from participating in the programme's exams because fraud was committed.
13. In cases where a student's exam has been declared invalid, or the student has been excluded from participation in exams for a period of time as a consequence of fraudulent behaviour, there is no possibility to appeal to an exceptional circumstance clause that would involve the creation of an additional opportunity to make the exam in question.

Article 2: Irregularity

If, according to the Board of Examiners, one or more exam components or an entire exam have not been taken in the prescribed manner or if an exam component has not been conducted properly, the Board of Examiners can declare the exam or the relevant component(s) invalid, even in cases when the student is not accountable, in order to secure its legal duty as stated in Article 7.12b (1)(a) of the Act.