Rules and Regulations for the Master of Science Programme Health Food Innovation Management 2025-2026 of the Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences, Maastricht University

These Rules have been determined by the Board of Examiners of the educational programme Health Food Innovation Management, Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences, Maastricht University on 25 March 2025.

Contents

Section 1 General provisions

Article 1.1 Applicability of the Rules

1. These rules and regulations apply to the education, assessments and final examination for the master degree programme in Health Food Innovation Management.
2. The regulations relate to students who are enrolled in the programme in the 2025-2026 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 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 the final examination) as well as for warranting the HFIM 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 which guarantees attainment of the programmes' final qualifications.
3. The Board of Examiners has mandated the graduation procedure to the Exam Administration.

Article 1.3 Examiners

1. The Board of Examiners appoints examiners. 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 University Teaching Qualification (UTQ) certificate or must officially participate in the trajectory towards this qualification.
2. Course coordinators will be appointed as examiner. The examiner can, without losing full responsibility, have other members of the teaching staff perform tasks belonging to an exam component.
3. The Board of Examiners appoints staff members as examiners of the internship and master thesis. They should hold a PhD title. Newly appointed thesis examiners (i.e. first appointment as a thesis examiner for the academic year) should hold the certificate of the Role specific training for thesis examiners. The Board of Examiners is authorised to allow for exceptions to this rule.
4. As part of quality assurance, the thesis coordinator will execute a feedback opportunity for all appointed thesis examiners in each academic year. This feedback is used by the thesis examiners to improve execution of their tasks.
5. The role of examiner is diverse and will entail either single tasks or a combination of these tasks, in concordance with the Act:
   - designing and implementing the assessment plan of the specific course and determining the course specific assessment methods;
   - executing assessment and exams according to the Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle;
   - executing (elements of) the assessment organization (planning, coordination, monitoring) construction of assessment/exams;
   - marking/ grading assessment;
   - setting the cut-off score (taking article 3.2 of the Rules and Regulations into account);
   - determining measures for improvement assessments;
   - forwarding suspicion of plagiarism/ fraud to the Board of Examiners;
   - executing the comment procedure and exam inspection.

6. When performing the tasks as stipulated in section 4, the examiners and members of the teaching staff must observe the Act, the regulations contained within or arising from the Education and Examination Regulations and the present rules and regulations.
7. Having heard the examiner, the Board of Examiners may suspend or revoke an examiner's appointment if the examiner fails to comply with the rules 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 (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 Exams. The Rules of Procedure for Exams will be published on the Student Portal.
2. The Rules of Procedure for (Course) Exams at Maastricht University apply to all types of exams (including written exams, collective or oral exams) and to all students, including students with special arrangements. Additional information on the conduct of exams (including digital exams) should also be consulted via the UM Library Resources.
3. If the student does not comply with the provisions under or pursuant to the first or second paragraph, the student's exam can be declared null and void by the Board of Examiners.

Article 1.5 Studying with a disability and/or chronic disease

If a student applies for an adjustment in education, the Board of Examiners decides on educational adjustments based on the advice of Disability Support and the subsequent binding advice of the head of the Education Office. If a student appeals against a decision on the relevant educational adjustment(s), the head of the Education Office is responsible for conducting a defence.

Section 2 Assessment

- The basis for assessment within the Health Food Innovation Management master programme are the final qualifications as described in Article 3.2 of the Education and Examination Regulations.
- Within the programme of assessment a variety of assessment and feedback instruments are used. Each exam (component) provides specific information on aspects or sub-aspects of the students' knowledge, insight and skills.
- 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 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. At least 30% of the exam should consist of new questions.
4. Where a course is assessed based on a variety of assessment formats, individual and/or group work, the student must obtain a passing mark for all the components; exam components cannot be compensated with each other; in case of a non-passing mark, the final grade for the course will be a No Grade; in case of all passing marks, the weighted average of the assessments will determine the final grade for the course.
5. Where a course is assessed based on assessment of a group project or an assessment of a group project, including peer assessment, combined with an individual course exam assessment at least 50% of the course mark is determined based on the individual course exam.
6. When a course is assessed based on group work, procedures must be in place to avoid

students free-riding. Students must sign for equal participation of all group members to be awarded the group grade.
7. For courses lasting four weeks or fewer, the final grade can be made up of group work assessment/project assessment alone.
8. Where a course assessment is partially based on peer assessment, the peer assessment will count for a maximum of 20% of the final mark.

Article 2.2 Time allowed for exams

A maximum of two hours is allowed for the completion of a written course exam. This time can be extended by 25% with 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 2.3 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 date of the resit will be considered 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 2.4 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 procedure for exams is organized before the calculation and publication of results. The outcome of the comment procedure is used for the result calculation of 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 comment and inspection procedures for closed question format exams differ from the procedure for open-question exams. Information on both procedures can be found in the document comment and inspection procedure, published in the Student Portal.

Article 2.5 Written assignments and master thesis

1. The requirements with regard to the thesis and to papers that are part of a course will be announced in the respective assessment plan in the Student Portal.
2. All written assignments must be checked for plagiarism using the UM plagiarism tool or another plagiarism-screening program approved by the Board of Examiners.
3. At least 30% of the assessment in a course must be full (student) identity proof.
4. In case the course assessment is based mainly on (a) (written) assignment(s), a representative sample of students will have an additional oral inquiry to assess insight and understanding and to ascertain that the assignment is students' own work. This oral inquiry takes place before publication of results and needs to be passed.
5. Students are required to upload the final version of their master thesis via fhmlweb.nl as well as via the Student Portal.
6. The master's thesis must be written on an individual basis and will be graded according the assessment criteria set by the Board of Examiners as indicated in article 3.6.

Article 2.6 Internship

1. The Programme management determines the rules and regulations that apply to the character and scientific contents of the internship. These rules are published in the Student Portal.
2. For the Master's programme, an internship coordinator is appointed. The internship coordinator is responsible for approving a proposed internship.
3. The internship coordinator appoints an examiner to be the supervisor for the internship (or the institutional supervisor in case of an external internship), who will also be the first examiner for the master's thesis.
4. The internship will be graded according to the assessment criteria set by the Board of Examiners, as indicated in article 3.5.
5. The process and monitoring of different stages of production of the thesis as being the students' own work is part of the thesis assessment, as indicated in article 3.6.2.
6. Participants of the programme (staff and students) are expected to operate within the principles of research integrity and the ensuing guidelines for good research practices as laid down in the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (see UM website). In case the student does not adhere to these rules the internship can be declared null and void by the Board of Examiners.

Article 2.7 Resits

1. A resit is defined as a subsequent assessment opportunity in which the student repeats failed exam components. A remediation, which is also considered a resit, is defined as a subsequent assessment opportunity after an insufficient or fail grade, in which the student can use feedback provided to hand-in adapted version of the assignment or exam component.
2. Each academic year there are two opportunities for the course exam and its exam components, being the regular sit and the resit. The examiner decides upon form of the resit in consultation with the Board of Examiners, as indicated in the assessment plans.
3. Each academic year a resit opportunity is offered for failed exam components and assignments. Such an opportunity can be offered in a different way as stated in the assessment plan, given that the intended learning outcomes are covered.
4. For resitting course exams, exam components and assignments the following regulations hold:
   - Passed results cannot be resit.
5. For remediations of written papers or other assignments, it may be determined that the maximum obtainable score is lower than 10 or the maximum obtainable score is a Pass. The examiner must state the maximum obtainable score for remediations of these assessments in the assessment plan.

Article 2.8 Extra assessment opportunity for final examination

1. In exceptional cases, a student can submit a request for an extra exam possibility to be eligible for the final examination. For granting such a request the following criteria apply:
   - it must be the final study result to be obtained before graduation;
   - the study delay, in case the exceptional assessment is not granted, must be at least one semester;
   - in principle, the student must have taken part in the last two exam opportunities for the exam for which the student is requesting another assessment.

   Request for an exceptional assessment can be submitted to the Board of Examiners as soon as applicable.

Article 2.9 Invalidation of exams

The Board of Examiners is authorised to declare exams/exam results null and void for groups and individual students.
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, or irregularities, that make it impossible to determine whether the administration of the exams and/or calculation of marks was carried out correctly.

Article 2.10 Determination and assessment of the level of the end-terms

1. The level of the end-terms 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 checks the results of all students and may decide on applying the hardship clause and, if so, grant conditional admission to the higher course year. The program management and the student advisors are consulted before or during the meeting on issues of students' personal/ professional development and/or special circumstances.
3. At the end of the programme, the student must demonstrate attainment of the intended learning outcomes or exit level as described in Article 3.2 of the Education and Examination Regulations.

Section 3 Administration

Article 3.1 Marks and qualifications

1. Exam components must be administered with a mark (1–10 point scale) or a qualification (Fail, Pass or Good).
2. Marks and final grades will be given up to one decimal place only. All marks that are used to calculate the final grade will be cut-off. The finale grade will be rounded off. An exception to this rule is the thesis, for the thesis all markers including the final grade will be cut-off.
3. The first decimal figure is decisive for the cut-off.
   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 are indicated in the relevant assessment plans.
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. A NG automatically constitutes a fail and no credits are awarded.

Article 3.2 Determination and administration of course exam results

1. Exam components will be administered 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 administration of courses:
   - the student must have a final grade of at least "5.5";
   - for receiving the associated credits of the internship and thesis the final grade must be at least 6.00.
3. Marks of course exams with closed 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 (pass) mark of 5.5 is calculated as follows:
     a. if there are 100 or more students, it will be determined based on 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 based on 70% of the average of the 10% best scores;
     c. if there are fewer than 50 students, it will be determined based on 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-Schotanus method will be used. The decision for the use of the Cohen-Schotanus method 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. The calculation method will be stated in the assessment plan.
5. Mark of course exams that consist solely of open questions, an absolute standard setting method will be used, the grade of 5.5 is equal to 55% of the maximum obtainable score.
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 8.0 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.

Article 3.3 Administration of skills training or practical

An administration for a skills training or practical will be granted when all requirements with regard to the training are met.
These requirements may include:

- a written exam testing the theoretical background of the topic studied;
- an evaluation of the practical “hands-on” skills with respect to pre-defined endpoints;
- compulsory attendance of 100%; an additional assignment will be introduced for each unattended exercise as long as the student attended at least 75% of that type of exercise; students must be referred to the Board of Examiners when they attended less than 75% of a particular type of exercise;
- sufficient participation;
- sufficient score for the report and/or presentation.

Article 3.4 Attendance and active participation

1. For compulsory meetings and/or activities there is an attendance and active participation requirement, which is assessed as indicated in the assessment plans.
2. Students who have been granted top-class athlete status may qualify for adjusted attendance and participation requirements upon recommendation of the student advisor.
3. Students who have a medical impairment may be eligible for an adjusted attendance and participation requirement pursuant to the recommendation of the SSC-Disability Support and/or student advisor.

Article 3.5 Administration of internship

1. The general requirements regarding the internship will be announced on the Student Portal at the beginning of each academic year.
2. The specific requirements regarding the internship must be laid down in an internship agreement. The format for the agreement is available on the Student Portal.
3. The supervisor, as appointed examiner, gives feedback and a mark on the performance on the work floor (see assessment plan Internship and thesis).
4. An endorsement for the internship will be obtained if the responsible supervisor assesses the internship with at least a 6.0.

Article 3.6 Administration of the master thesis

1. The requirements regarding the master thesis will be announced on the Student Portal at the beginning of each academic year.
2. As part of attaining that the thesis is students’ own work, a presentation and oral inquiry is performed. The outcome is administered and part of the thesis assessment.

3. The master thesis is assessed by two examiners as specified in the assessment plan internship and thesis.
4. The assessment criteria for the master thesis are included in the 'HFIM – Master Thesis Assessment Form' in the Student Portal.
5. For the master thesis, an endorsement is obtained when each of the two independent examiners assesses the thesis with at least 6.0, and when each of the two examiners assesses the oral inquiry with at least a 6.0.
6. In case of an assessment below 6.0, the thesis and/or oral inquiry needs to be remediated.
7. In the event of a difference between the two examiners for the thesis assessment (> 2 points), given that both examiners assess the thesis with at least 6.0, a student who feels that this is a significant disadvantage, may submit a request to the Board of Examiners for the appointment of, and assessment by a third examiner. If the Board of Examiners takes a positive decision on this matter, the final assessment of the three examiners will be averaged. This average mark is then the final mark for the thesis.

Article 3.7 Exemption

1. The option for exemption is indicated in Article 5.16 of the Education and Examination Regulations.
2. Where a student is granted an exemption for a course, this course is immediately administered with an 'exemption' and no grades are administered.
3. If one or more exam components have been administered with an exemption, the student cannot graduate with a *cum laude* designation.
4. Exemptions are granted on a course level only.
5. The Board of Examiners will not grant any exemption based on exams passed by a student outside the programme during the period in which the student was barred by the Board of Examiners from taking exams for the programme because of fraud.
6. The Board of Examiners will not grant exemption based on (an) exam (component(s)) passed by a student that is part of the MA-HFIM study programme itself and has been administered with ECTS.

Section 4 Examination

Article 4.1 Iudicium

1. The examination of the master will be granted the iudicium (degree classification) cum laude if the following requirements have been met:
   - A minimum weighted mean score of at least 'seven point seventy five' (7.75), before cut-off, of the final scores of all courses (internship and thesis not included);
   - A minimum mean score of at least 'eight' (8.00) for the internship (before cut-off);
   - A minimum mean score of at least 'eight' (8.00) for the Master's thesis and oral inquiry (before cut-off).
2. If one or more courses are endorsed with an 'exemption' the student cannot be granted the iudicium of *cum laude*. If the student wishes to apply for *cum laude*, the student should fulfil all requirements of the courses concerned.
3. If a penalty has been imposed for fraud/plagiarism, the student cannot be granted the iudicium of *cum laude*.

Article 4.2 Flexible programme

1. The student may formulate a flexible educational programme that deviates from the programme stated in Article 3.8 of the Education and Examination Regulations.
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 Health Food Innovation Management.
3. The content of the flexible programme should be coherent.

4. The flexible programme must have a study load of 120 ECTS.
5. The flexible programme should contain at least 40 ECTS of the original programme (the thesis and internship not included).
6. The flexible programme should include an approved internship and thesis (50 ECTS).

Section 5 Fraud and irregularities within the scope of exams and examination, also understood to include plagiarism and passing off work or assignments (partially) generated by artificial intelligence software, such as ChatGPT, as their own work

Article 5.1 General

The General FHML Regulation for Fraud, including plagiarism, 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 are 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 Board of Examiners will decide in all cases that are not provided for in these regulations.

Article 6.3 Hardship clause

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.

Article 6.4 Coming into force

The Rules and Regulations will come into force on 1 September 2025 and apply to the 2025-2026 academic year.