

Rules and Regulations

2026-2027

International Joint Master of Research in Work and Organizational Psychology

Rules and Regulations for the Examination.....	3
Article 1 Scope of the Rules and Regulations	3
Article 2 Relation between the local and Joint Board of Examiners	3
Article 3 Determining and publishing results	3
Article 4 Right of review	4
Article 5 Retention period of exams	4
Article 6 Right of appeal	5
Article 7 Degree completion “With Distinction”	5
Article 8 Re-sits	5
Article 8.1 Written assignment resits	5
Article 9 Fraud, including plagiarism and fabricating and/or falsifying survey or interview answers or research data	5
Article 10 Implementation and date of taking effect.....	6
Appendices to Rules and Regulations for the Examination	7
Appendix A Regulations for the master’s thesis project	7
Article 1 Preparing master’s thesis project	7
Article 2 Research proposal.....	7
Article 3 Master’s thesis project.....	7
Article 4 Research project.....	7
Article 5 Master’s thesis	8
Appendix B Regulations for communicating grades.....	9

RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE EXAMINATION

Article 1 Scope of the Rules and Regulations

1. These regulations are applicable to the curriculum and examinations of the International Joint Master of Research in Work and Organizational Psychology (IJMRWOP) programme, offered by the IJMRWOP Consortium, consisting of Maastricht University, Leuphana University, and the University of Valencia.
2. Joint Education and Examination Regulations have been established for this programme.
3. The Joint Board of Examiners will decide on all situations for which the general and the additional provisions do not provide.
4. The R&R are each year adjusted and enacted by the Joint Board of Examiners.

Article 2 Relation between the local and Joint Board of Examiners

1. The Joint Board of Examiners consists of one representative from each of the three Partner Universities.
2. The representative in the Joint Board of Examiners is closely collaborating with the local Board of Examiners or a member of the local Board of Examiners.
3. The three representatives of the Joint Board of Examiners are responsible for monitoring and assuring the quality of assessment according to local regulations and laws.

Article 3 Determining and publishing results

Maastricht University	1. The Joint Board of Examiners determines the norms for the exam of each part of the examination. 2. The examiner determines the result of a written exam within 15 working days after the day on which the exam took place, and provides the education office with the information needed for publishing the result to the student. 3. When the result of a written exam is announced, it will be indicated on Student Portal / Student Intranet how the student can review the exam and file an appeal as referred to in Articles 4 and 6. 4. With respect to an exam that has been administered in a different way than in writing, the Joint Board of Examiners determines the way and period in which the result will be announced.
Leuphana University	1. The Joint Board of Examiners determines the norms for the exam of each part of the examination. 2. The examiner determines the result of a written exam within 30 days after the day on which the exam took place, and provides the education office with the information needed for publishing the result to the student. 3. When the result of a written exam is announced, it will be indicated on myStudy / myCampus how the student can review the exam and file an appeal as referred to in Articles 4 and 6. 4. With respect to an exam that has been administered in a different way than in writing, the Joint Board of Examiners determines the way and period in which the result will be announced.
University of Valencia	1. The Joint Board of Examiners determines the norms for the exam of each part of the examination. 2. The examiner determines the result of a written exam within 15 working days after the day on which the exam took place, and provides the education office with the information needed for publishing the result to the student. 3. When the result of a written exam is announced, it will be indicated on Aula Virtual how the student can review the exam and file an appeal as referred to in Articles 4 and 6. 4. With respect to an exam that has been administered in a different way than in writing, the Joint Board of Examiners determines the way and period in which the result will be announced.

Article 4 Right of review

Maastricht University	1. Within 10 working days after the latest publication date of the exam results, including a computer-based exam, students may review their exam. 2. Within 10 working days after the latest publication date of the exam results, including a computer-based exam, interested students are allowed to review their own exam results and may, upon request, inspect the questions and assignments for a written exam and, if possible, the standards based on which the exam was assessed.
Leuphana University	1. Within one month of the date on which the result of a written exam, including a computer-based exam, is announced, students may review their exam. 2. Within one month, of the date on which the result of a written exam, including a computer-based exam, is announced, interested students are allowed to review their own exam results and may, upon a written request, inspect the questions and assignments for a written exam and, if possible, the standards based on which the exam was assessed.
University of Valencia	1. Within 15 working days of the date on which the result of a written exam, including a computer-based exam, is announced, students may review their exam. 2. Within 15 working days, of the date on which the result of a written exam, including a computer-based exam, is announced, interested students are allowed to review their own exam results and may, upon request, inspect the questions and assignments for a written exam and, if possible, the standards based on which the exam was assessed.

Article 5 Retention period of exams

Maastricht University	1. Assignments, results and assessments of written exams will be saved 2 years after the exam results have been determined. 2. Theses and the assessment of theses will be saved at least 7 years after the thesis has been assessed. 3. The diploma and the list of examination components will be saved for 50 years.
Leuphana University	1. Assignments, results and assessments of written exams will be saved 3 years after the exam results have been determined. 2. Theses and the assessment of theses will be saved at least 3 years after the thesis has been assessed. 3. The diploma and the list of examination components will be saved by the Coordinating University for 50 years.
University of Valencia	1. Assignments, results and assessments of written exams will be saved 2 years after the exam results have been determined. 2. Theses and the assessment of theses will be saved at least 7 years after the thesis has been assessed. 3. The diploma and the list of examination components will be saved by the Coordinating University for 50 years.

Article 6 Right of appeal

1. After following regular procedures at the Partner University where the student follows courses (such as exam inspection, consultation of the examiner and/or the Joint Board of Examiners) and in line with Article 7.61 of the Dutch Higher Education and Research Act (WHW), students have the right to appeal against a decision of an examiner or the Joint Board of Examiners within 6 weeks after publication of such a decision.
2. The appeal must be submitted to the Complaints Service Point (CSP) of Maastricht University, Student Services Centre. The appeal needs to be signed and dated and must include the name and address of the appellant, as well as the grounds for appeal and, if possible, a copy of the decision against which the appeal is lodged.
3. The appeal will subsequently be forwarded to the Board of Appeal for Examinations (CBE), which will make the final decision.

Article 7 Degree completion “With Distinction”

Degree completion “With Distinction” is attached to the examination, if each of the following requirements has been met:

1. A weighted grade point average (GPA) of at least 8.5 for all examination components that are assessed on a ten-point scale. Furthermore, all assessments must be passed on the first attempt.
2. Weighting of course grades occurs according to the credits obtained in each course.
3. Master’s thesis project: a score of at least 8.0.
4. All courses need to be passed within two years after the student started the programme. The Joint Board of Examiners can, in exceptional circumstances, deviate from this requirement.

Article 8 Re-sits

The following re-sit arrangement applies to students who, in the first instance, have not passed a component of the master’s examination.

1. For every type of assessment there will be one opportunity per academic year to re-sit the assessment (detailed assessment plans are depicted in the respective course manuals). In the case of a re-sit, the highest grade counts.
2. There is a maximum of six attempts allowed for each examination component.

Article 8.1 Written assignment resits

1. Students may do a resit for each written assignment, including the research proposal related to the master’s thesis, once per academic year.
2. A resit will consist of rewriting the originally submitted assignment, or completing an alternative assignment when deemed appropriate by the assessor.
3. If the written assignment was not submitted before the deadline of the first sit, the assignment will not be assessed and the student will receive a No Grade (NG). The student is allowed a resit.
4. If the first-sit assignment did not comply with all submission guidelines, the student will receive a failing grade and is not entitled to feedback. The student is allowed a resit.
5. If the written assignment is part of an assessment composed of different components that may compensate for each other, not submitting the assignment before the deadline may be weighted when computing the final grade.
6. Depending on the original submission date of the master’s thesis, the resit may take place in a following academic year. In such cases, the student must re-register for the programme in the next academic year.

Article 9 Fraud, including plagiarism and fabricating and/or falsifying survey or interview answers or research data

1. The Joint Board of Examiners may impose one of the disciplinary measures set down in Article 9.5 if it establishes that a student, in any exam or exam component:
 - a. has had any unauthorised aids/devices at the student’s disposal, or has used unauthorised aids and/or (communication) devices as mentioned in the Rules of Procedure for Exams.
 - b. has communicated or tried to communicate with another student, either verbally or through gesture, without permission from an invigilator, examiner, or Joint 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 let someone else pose as from the student's;
 - e. has deliberately misled or at least attempted to mislead, provided the opportunity to mislead an invigilator, an examiner, a corrector or the Joint Board of Examiners with respect to the exam.
 - f. has used artificial intelligence software, such as ChatGPT, when not explicitly allowed to do so in the exam instructions, course manual and/or Rules of Procedure for Exams.
2. The Joint Board of Examiners may impose one or several disciplinary measures set down in Article 9.5 if it establishes that a student has committed plagiarism in any exam, or exam component, including, but not limited to:
 - a. using or copying the student's personal or other people's texts (including programming code), data, ideas 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 the student's own;
 - c. not clearly indicating in the text (including programming code), for example via quotation marks or a certain layout, that verbatim or nearly verbatim quotes have been used;
 - d. paraphrasing the content of the student's own or other people's texts without adequate reference to the source;
 - e. copying video, audio or exam material, software and programme codes from others without adequate reference to the source and thus passing it off as the student's own;
 - f. copying work from other students and thus passing it off as the student's own;
 - g. submitting work or assignments acquired from or written by a third party (whether or not for payment) and thus passing them off as the student's own.
 - h. submitting work or assignments acquired from or written by a third party and thus passing them off as the student's own.
 - i. where in all of these provisions "others" and "third party" do 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 exam instructions, course manual and/or Rules of Procedure for Exams.
 3. The Joint Board of Examiners may impose one of the disciplinary measures set down in Article 9.5 if it establishes that a student has fabricated and/or falsified survey or interview answers or research data.
 4. If the Joint Board of Examiners establishes that a student has committed fraud in any other way in any exam or exam component, it can impose a measure set down in Article 9.5.
 5. In the cases referred to in Article 9.1, 9.2, 9.3 and 9.4 the Joint Board of Examiners can declare the results of the relevant exam or exam component in question invalid, as well as impose the following disciplinary measures: - a reprimand; - exclusion from participation or further participation in one or more exams in the programme for a period of at most one year.
 6. In serious cases of fraud, the Joint Board of Examiners can propose to Executive Board of the Coordinating University that the student(s) concerned be permanently deregistered from the programme.
 7. Before the Joint 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.
 8. If fraud is established, this is included in the student's dossier.
 9. If, after investigation, it is ultimately determined that the student concerned did not commit fraud, no disciplinary measures will be imposed, their name will be removed from the correspondence about the alleged fraud and the correspondence will not be included in the student's dossier.

Article 10 Implementation and date of taking effect

1. The Joint Board of Examiners makes decisions in all cases that have not been foreseen by the Rules and Regulations.
2. These Rules and Regulations take effect in the academic year 2026/2027.

Thus enacted by the Joint Board of Examiners at its meeting of 22 June 2026.

APPENDICES TO RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE EXAMINATION

Appendix A Regulations for the master's thesis project

Article 1 Preparing master's thesis project

1. The master's thesis project is preceded by the course 'Preparing of the master's thesis project' in semester 3. During this course, students write and finalise their research proposal for their master's thesis project.

Article 2 Research proposal

1. A research proposal is an individually written proposal concerning research that the student intends to conduct during the student's research project.
2. The research proposal consists of the following parts:
 - a brief theoretical background of the research;
 - the question posed by the research;
 - a description of the research plan;
 - a description of the research methods that will be applied;
 - a description of the techniques that will be used for processing and analysing the data;
 - a timetable.
3. Guidelines for the format and length of the research proposal can be found in the IJMRWOP program manual.
4. The assessment is done by two supervisors who are senior staff members from different Partner Universities. If a research project is conducted outside the university, the student will also be supervised by an external supervisor. The external supervisor does not have a formal assessor role.
5. The research proposal will be assessed as 'pass' or 'fail' by both supervisors as part of the course Preparing master's thesis project in semester 3. The proposal needs to be approved by both supervisors as 'pass' in order to be able to commence with the master's thesis project.
6. Before the student can commence research activities, also formal permission for the study must have been obtained from the ethics review committee/research committee of the respective university (or school) of the first supervisor.

Article 3 Master's thesis project

1. A student is required to do a master's thesis project at the conclusion of the student's study programme. The master's thesis project consists of two parts, the research project itself (i.e., the practical part; doing the research) and writing the master's thesis. The master's thesis project is assessed on several criteria. The final grade for the master's thesis project, based on these criteria, needs to be at least sufficient. The grading of the master's thesis project consists of the grades given by the first and second supervisor (after conversion). The first supervisor grades both the master's thesis and the research project (i.e., the practical part). The second supervisor only grades the master's thesis. 75% of the final grade of the master's thesis project is determined by the grade for the master's thesis (see Article 5) and 25% is determined by the grade for the research project (see Article 4).

Article 4 Research project

1. The student must notify the Education Office about the research project at least one month before the start of the research project by means of a research project application form as outlined in the procedure described in the information letter that will be sent out in January. The Joint Board of Examiners checks whether the student has complied with the requirements in Article 3.8 of the Education and Examination Regulations.
2. Once, a student has fulfilled the requirements listed in Article 3.8 of the Education and Examination Regulations, the student will be informed by means of a letter about the obligations, guidelines and legal aspects connected to the research project.
3. The student will be supervised during the research project by a first and a second supervisor. The two supervisors are from different Partner Universities. An external supervisor can be involved but does not have a formal

assessor role. The task of the first supervisor consists of advising the student about the content of the research project, the research activities and the reporting of the research project in a master's thesis (see Article 3).

4. If the project is conducted at an external institution, the first supervisor from one of the Partner Universities is the contact person for the external supervisor.
5. The research project is assessed by the first supervisor via Collent on several criteria which can be found in the IJMRWOP program manual.
6. The final grade for the research project needs to be at least sufficient (cf. Article 4.1).

Article 5 Master's thesis

1. A master's thesis is an individually written piece of work on the research that has been conducted during the master's thesis project.
2. Guidelines for the format and length of the master's thesis, as well as assessment criteria, can be found in the IJMRWOP program manual.
3. The master's thesis is assessed by the first and second supervisor based on an oral inquiry and the written master's thesis. To pass, both supervisors need to assess the oral inquiry as 'pass' and the written master's thesis as at least sufficient. In the event that a supervisor requires replacement, the Joint Board of Examiners member of the Partner University to which the assessor belongs is entitled to appoint a substitute from that university.
4. The oral inquiry includes a presentation of the master's thesis project by the student followed by questions by the first and second supervisor. Following the oral inquiry, the supervisors jointly determine the pass/fail outcome and are required to submit the assessment form as soon as possible, but at the latest within 15 working days. If the oral inquiry is assessed as 'fail', a re-sit must be taken, which will be assessed by both supervisors (see Article 8 of the Rules and Regulations on re-sits).
5. The final version of the master's thesis must be submitted in Collent. The assessment form for the master's thesis must be filled in by both supervisors, and must be submitted within 15 working days.
6. The master's thesis is graded by averaging the grades given by the first and the second supervisor. Both grades must be at least 6.0 and the difference between them may not exceed 2.0 points. If either grade is lower than 6.0, the student must submit a re-sit version of the master's thesis, which will be assessed by both supervisors. If the difference between the two grades exceeds 2.0 points, the supervisors will discuss the grading and agree on a new grade based on their exchanged arguments. This agreed grade will be the final grade. If one of the grades for the master's thesis, either given by the first or second supervisor is less than a 6.0, a re-sit must be taken, which will be assessed by both supervisors (see Article 8 of the Rules and Regulations on re-sits).

Appendix B Regulations for communicating grades

In the course manual, the course planning group describes the different components of which the course assessment is composed, how they are weighted in determining the final grade, and what the resit for each of these assessment components entails. The tables below show how the final course grade is communicated to the Exam Administration and students in different situations.

Situation A: All grades for the different assessment components must be sufficient

For this example, we use three components (A, B and C), all of which must be sufficient and carry equal weight.

A	B	C	Weighted average	Final grade	
6.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	Having received three sufficient grades, the final grade is the rounded weighted average
P	7.0	8.0	7.5	7.5	Having one pass assessment and two sufficient grades, the final grade is the rounded weighted average of the two grades
6.0	4.5	8.0	6.2	4.5	Having received one or more insufficient grades, the final grade is equal to the lowest rounded grade: in this example 4.5.
6.0	F	8.0	7.0	5.0	Having received one or more fails in combination with sufficient grades, the final grade is 5.0
NG	4.5	8.0	6.3	4.5	Having received one or more insufficient grades, the final grade is equal to the lowest rounded grade: in this example 4.5
NG	F	8.0	8.0	5.0	Having received one or more fails in combination with sufficient grades, the final grade is 5.0
NG	F	4.5	4.5	4.5	Having received one or more fails in combination with insufficient grades, the final grade is equal to the lowest rounded grade: in this example 4.5
NG	7.0	8.0	7.5	NG	Having received one or more NGs in combination with sufficient grades, the final grade is NG
NG	P	8.0	8.0	NG	Having received one or more NGs in combination with a pass and a sufficient grade, the final grade is NG
0.0	7.0	8.0	7.5	0.0	The Board having detected fraud in at least one component, the final grade is 0.0

Colour explanations

If all partial grades are sufficient (≥ 6.0 or pass), the final grade is the weighted average rounded to the nearest whole number or half point.

If at least one partial grade is insufficient (< 6.0 or fail), the lowest grade will be the final grade or a 5.0 in case of a fail.

If at least one partial grade is NG and the other partial results are sufficient, NG is given.

Situation B: The grades for the different assessment components do not have to be sufficient, as long as the final grade is

For this example, we use three components (A, B and C), all of which carry equal weight, but they do not have to be sufficient, as long as the final grade is.

A	B	C	Weighted average	Final grade	
6.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	The weighted rounded grade is sufficient
P	7.0	8.0	7.5	7.5	The weighted rounded grade is sufficient
5.0	6.0	8.0	6.3	6.5	The weighted rounded grade is sufficient, as the insufficient partial grade is compensated
2.0	6.0	8.0	5.3	2.0	The weighted grade is insufficient (being 5.3) and the final grade is equal to the lowest rounded grade: in this example 2.0
6.0	F	8.0	7.0	5.0	Having received one or more fails in combination with sufficient grades, the final grade is 5.0
1.6	F	8.0	4.8	1.5	Having received one or more fails in combination with insufficient grades, the final grade is equal to the lowest rounded grade: in this example 1.5
NG	F	8.0	8.0	5.0	Having received one or more fails in combination with sufficient grades, the final grade is 5.0
NG	1.6	8.0	4.8	1.5	The weighted grade is insufficient (being 4.8) and the final grade is equal to the lowest rounded grade: in this example 1.5
NG	5.0	8.0	6.5	NG	Having received at least one NG in combination with a sufficient weighted grade, the final grade is NG is given
NG	7.0	8.0	7.5	NG	Having received at least one NG in combination with a sufficient weighted grade, the final grade is NG is given
NG	P	8.0	8.0	NG	Having received at least one NG in combination with a sufficient weighted grade, the final grade is NG is given
0.0	7.0	8.0	7.5	0.0	The Board having detected fraud in at least one component, the final grade is 0.0

Colour explanations

If the weighted average is sufficient (≥ 6.0 or pass), the final grade is the weighted average rounded to the nearest whole number or half point.

If the weighted average is insufficient (< 6.0 or or fail), the lowest grade will be the final grade or a 5.0 in case of a fail.

If at least one partial grade is NG and the weighted grade is sufficient, an NG is given.