

Rules and Regulations

Master of Science Programmes

Artificial Intelligence

Data Science for Decision Making

Responsible Data Science

2026-2027

Maastricht, 28 August 2026

Faculty of Science and Engineering
Department of Advanced Computing Sciences

MSc Artificial Intelligence

MSc Data Science for Decision Making

MSc Responsible Data Science

Table of contents

Section 1	General Provisions.....	4
Article 1.1	Applicability of the rules and regulations.....	4
Article 1.2	Definitions	4
Article 1.3	Appointment and composition of the Board of Examiners.....	4
Article 1.4	Board of Examiners: decision process.....	5
Article 1.5	Examiners	5
Article 1.6	Assessment Committee	5
Article 1.7	Assessment plan.....	6
Article 1.8	Communication	6
Section 2	Exams/grading, overall assessment.....	6
Article 2.1	Assessments	6
Article 2.2	Grade descriptors	7
Article 2.3	Master's examination	7
Article 2.4	Resits.....	8
Article 2.5	Assessment in exceptional cases.....	8
Article 2.6	Exemption from exams/assessments.....	9
Article 2.7	Exam results: amendment.....	9
Article 2.8	Exam inspection	9
Article 2.9	GPA	9
Article 2.10	Certificate.....	10
Article 2.11	Assessment by committees	10
Article 2.12	Electives.....	10
Article 2.13	Study Abroad	11
Article 2.14	Flexible curriculum.....	11
Article 2.15	Extracurricular components.....	12
Section 3	Procedures	12
Article 3.1	Exams.....	12
Article 3.2	Quoting and copying code.....	13
Article 3.3	Use of generative artificial intelligence.....	14
Article 3.4	Fraud including plagiarism and fabricating and/or falsifying research data.....	14
Article 3.5	Irregularity	16
Article 3.6	Participation.....	16
Article 3.7	Hardship.....	17
Article 3.8	Registration for students that are not students of the programme.....	17
Section 4	Closing provisions	18
Article 4.1	Amendments.....	18

Article 4.2	Entry into force	18
Section 5	Research Project regulations.....	19
Article 5.1	Applicability of the rules and regulations.....	19
Article 5.2	Definitions	19
Article 5.3	Organization	19
Article 5.4	Attendance and participation	20
Article 5.5	Examiners	20
Article 5.6	Project grade	21
Article 5.7	Project results: written motivation	22
Article 5.8	Resits.....	22
Article 5.9	Hardship.....	22
Section 6	Internship regulations.....	23
Article 6.1	Applicability of the rules and regulations.....	23
Article 6.2	Objective	23
Article 6.3	Approval of internship	23
Article 6.4	Internship examiner: appointment.....	23
Article 6.5	Internship plan.....	24
Article 6.6	Daily supervisor.....	24
Article 6.7	Internship examiner: tasks	24
Article 6.8	Assessment.....	24
Article 6.9	Internship report	24
Section 7	Thesis regulations	25
Article 7.1	Applicability of the rules and regulations.....	25
Article 7.2	Thesis examiner: appointment	25
Article 7.3	Thesis in the form of an internship.....	25
Article 7.4	Thesis plan	25
Article 7.5	Thesis examiners: tasks	25
Article 7.6	Thesis supervisor: tasks	26
Article 7.7	Thesis manuscript.....	26
Article 7.8	Thesis assessment.....	26
Article 7.9	Start of thesis after approval of thesis plan	26

Rules and Regulations governing the examination for the Master's programme in Artificial Intelligence, the Master's programme in Data Science for Decision Making and the Master's programme in Responsible Data Science. These Rules and Regulations take effect on 31 August 2026.

Section 1 General Provisions

ARTICLE 1.1 APPLICABILITY OF THE RULES AND REGULATIONS

1. These rules and regulations apply to the education, exams and examinations for the full-time Master's programmes in Artificial Intelligence, Data Science for Decision Making and *Responsible Data Science*, as further defined in the Education and Examination Regulations of the Master's programmes in Artificial Intelligence, Data Science for Decision Making and Responsible Data Science of the Faculty of Science and Engineering, at Maastricht University hereinafter referred to as EER.
2. The Rules and Regulations apply to all students who are registered for the abovementioned master's programmes and to students from other programmes, faculties or institutions of higher education as well as contract students, insofar as they follow components of the programmes to which these Rules and Regulations apply.
3. The Rules and Regulations are each year adjusted and enacted by the Board of Examiners in consultation with the programme management.

ARTICLE 1.2 DEFINITIONS

The definitions used in these rules and regulations are the same as those used in the EER, with the following changes/additions:

- | | |
|------------------------|---|
| • Academic staff | Staff members at the level of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Full Professor and lecturers (docent) with a PhD degree. |
| • Assessment committee | Committee tasked with providing expert advice on assessment |
| • Assessment plan | Plan describing the assessment of a component |
| • DACS | Department of Advanced Computing Sciences |
| • Exam component | Part of the exam of a component/course. This can also be a practical or an assignment. |
| • Force majeure | events and associated consequences that are abnormal, beyond the control of the student, and where the student had no way of preventing the negative consequences nor were the events and consequences within the sphere of risk of the student |
| • Student portal | The electronic environment for providing information to students including intranet and Canvas |
| • Teaching team | All persons involved in teaching the component |

ARTICLE 1.3 APPOINTMENT AND COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS

1. The Dean installs the Board of Examiners and appoints its members on the basis of their expertise in the field of the three programmes. At least one member is a lecturer in one of the programmes.

2. The Board of Examiners contains one external member, who is not connected to the Faculty of Science and Engineering.
3. The Board of Examiners appoints a chair from among its members. An external member cannot be the chair.

ARTICLE 1.4 BOARD OF EXAMINERS: DECISION PROCESS

1. The Board of Examiners approves decisions on the basis of a majority vote. The quorum for a meeting is two members. In the event of a tie, the (acting) chair's vote will be the deciding vote, provided that there are at least three members involved in the discussion.
2. If a conflict of interest might arise if a member of the Board of Examiners is also an examiner in an inquiry into fraud or into an exam, that member will recuse themselves from that inquiry and abstain from voting.
3. If a conflict of interest might arise for a member of the Board of Examiners, if granting a request to a student would have a negative effect for that member, that member will abstain from voting.
4. The Board of Examiners can delegate decision powers to individual members.

ARTICLE 1.5 EXAMINERS

1. The Board of Examiners appoints at least one responsible examiner per component for administering exams, assessments and/or practicals. This examiner provides the Board of Examiners with the information requested.
2. Examiners must have a University Teaching Qualification (UTQ), unless the Board of Examiners decides otherwise.
3. The examiners are responsible for the following tasks:
 - a. defining the assessment plan (see Article 1.7);
 - b. preparing the exam, assessment and/or practical;
 - c. assessing and determining the results of exams, assessments and/or practicals taken by students;
 - d. providing the administration office with all the necessary information to award the exam, assessment and/or practical results;
 - e. determining the time(s) and place(s) for exam/assessment inspection by the student of the assessment of written exams or the notes on oral exams;
4. The examiner can, without losing their full responsibility, have other members of the teaching team perform tasks belonging to an examination component.
5. When performing the tasks for the relevant components as stipulated in paragraph 3, the examiners and members of the teaching teams must observe the Act, the regulations contained within or arising from the EER, and the present Rules and Regulations.
6. The examiners are responsible for providing study information including information on the form of the exam, assessment and/or practical to the students, through the Student Portal in a timely fashion, and at the start of a study component.
7. Examiners are obliged to report fraud or a suspicion of fraud to the Board of Examiners.
8. The Board of Examiners can revoke the appointment of an examiner at any time.

ARTICLE 1.6 ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

The Assessment Committee provides examiners with expert advice on assessment, checks the quality of exams and assessments and checks constructive alignment of courses/components and their assessment. The Assessment Committee reports to the Board of Examiners in all matters regarding quality of assessment.

ARTICLE 1.7 ASSESSMENT PLAN

The assessment of each course is described in an assessment plan. This plan describes the intended learning outcomes of each course in terms of Dublin descriptors and how they are aligned with the examination. It also describes the assessment procedure for the regular exam and the resit and how the final grade of a course is calculated. If the assessment is different from or additional to a written exam, the assessment plan also indicates how fraud is prevented and detected. Each year the assessment plan needs to be submitted to the Assessment Committee. Minor changes will be approved by the Assessment Committee, major changes by the Director of Studies and the Chair of the Board of Examiners with advice from the Assessment Committee and the Chair of the Programme Committee. In expediting circumstances, the Board of Examiners can approve changes without consulting others.

The parts of the assessment plan deemed relevant for students are communicated to the students by the examiner.

ARTICLE 1.8 COMMUNICATION

1. The Student Portal (including Canvas and UM Intranet), email through UM addresses, and formal letters are the only official forms of communication with students.
2. All course/component information, including course descriptions and exam methods, will be available on the Student Portal from the start of each block (cf. Article 1.5.6).
3. Changes to the course/component information will be posted as announcements in the Student Portal in a timely fashion.
4. Students must regularly check and maintain the Student Portal, UM Intranet and their UM email account. Links given in the Student Portal and UM Intranet to web pages outside the Student Portal do not count as information postings. Forwarding an email to another email address does not count as maintaining the UM email.

Section 2 Exams/grading, overall assessment

ARTICLE 2.1 ASSESSMENTS

1. Assessments of the components (including skills training, projects and internships) shall be in accordance with section 5 of the EER.
2. The assessment is communicated to students through student portal (see Article 1.7).
3. At the start of each component, the students are informed (through the Student Portal and/or email) of the assessment criteria, insofar as these are not contained within or arise from the EER, the present rules and regulations, or the Study Guide.
4. Each exam of a component may contain one item covering material from a previous component, that is not part of the course itself (i.e. a review question). This points earned may be worth a maximum of 10% of the grade.
5. For regular courses, bonus assignments can be given with a maximum of 10% of the grade.
6. Group assignments outside research projects can be given with a maximum of 30% of the grade.
7. Assessment of components can be non-linear.
8. For multiple-choice assessments, correction for guessing may be applied.

ARTICLE 2.2 GRADE DESCRIPTORS

The exam/assessment results of study components (including courses and projects) and the thesis are assigned on a 10-point scale, where a result of at least a 6.0/10 represents a pass. Whole grades are awarded to exams (courses). Both half and whole grades can be awarded for study components of at least 10 ECTS as well as for research projects.

10-points	Descriptor	UK	US
10	Outstanding	A*	A+
9.5		A*	A+
9	Very Good	A*	A+
8.5		A*	A+
8	Good	A	A
7.5		A-	A
7	More than satisfactory	B	B+
6.5		C	B
6	Satisfactory	D	C
5.5		E	D
5	Almost satisfactory	F	F
4	Unsatisfactory	F	F
3	Very unsatisfactory	F	F
2	Poor	F	F
1	Very Poor	F	F

A label NG ("no grade") can be assigned when an assessment is incomplete and no result can be assigned or as a consequence of plagiarism or academic dishonesty. Exams that students have not timely deregistered on the Student Portal, will be regarded as an incomplete assessment. An NG automatically constitutes a fail and no credit is awarded.

Examiners are instructed to grade in accordance with the Dutch grading culture.

ARTICLE 2.3 MASTER'S EXAMINATION

1. After all examination components have been administered, the results of the examination will be determined by the Board of Examiners.
2. To pass the master examination, the student must:
 - a. Receive a grade of 6.0/10 or higher for all exams/assessments.
 - b. Receive a grade of 6.0/10 or higher for the master's thesis.
3. If a student has studied for a period longer than six years or when doubts are raised by examiners or project coordinators whether the student has achieved certain intended learning outcomes, the Board of Examiners can launch an investigation into whether the

student has mastered all intended learning outcomes, and if not, deny finalizing examination.

ARTICLE 2.4 RESITS

1. For each written exam there is a resit opportunity.
2. For students that have not been able to participate in the regular examination of exam types other than written exams due to force majeure (Article 3.7 is applicable), the Board of Examiners can grant a replacement opportunity.
3. For project resits there are separate regulations, which are included in Article 5.8.
4. In case of a resit the highest grade obtained counts.
5. Once a student successfully passes an exam they cannot re-sit the exam.
6. For resitting separate sub-tests (i.e. written / oral exams) and assignments within a failed exam the following guidelines hold:
 - a. Sub-tests and assignments that were passed within an exam, which was not passed, will lose their validity at the end of the academic year in which they were passed (See Article 5.13 of the EER).
 - b. The examiner decides upon content and form of the resit, replacement or repair opportunity.
 - c. Only a single resit, replacement or repair opportunity can be offered per academic year, withstanding Article 5.8 of the EER.
 - d. In case subtests/assignments are offered as a resit separately, passed sub-tests and assignments (i.e. 6.0/10 or higher) cannot be resit.
 - e. When computing the grade for the full exam, the highest graded valid opportunity of each sub-test / assignment is taken into account.
 - f. A repair opportunity should always be offered for failed subtests and assignments for which at least a 40% score is obtained, and the student has an overall failing grade. Such an opportunity can be offered in a different way than the original one.
 - g. An examiner can decide to unconditionally offer a single repair opportunity per academic year in an approved assessment plan.
 - h. Resits, replacement and repair opportunities are not offered for bonus assignments.
 - i. The examiner can choose to limit the maximum grade of a repair opportunity. If nothing is specified, the default is that the maximum grade that can be obtained for a repair opportunity is 6.0/10.

ARTICLE 2.5 ASSESSMENT IN EXCEPTIONAL CASES

1. The assessment in exceptional cases as meant in Article 5.8 of the EER will take place during semester 2 for courses from semester 1 and in the last week of the academic year for courses from semester 2. The exact moment of this assessment is determined by the Board of Examiners.
2. Requests for this assessment must be filed by the student to the Board of Examiners within two weeks after becoming eligible for making such request, but no later than the first of July. Given this deadline, it is also possible that the student makes a conditional request in case the student expects to become eligible but has not received their results for all study components yet.
3. Withstanding the minimal requirements in Article 5.8 of the EER, students must argue in their request that they have a reasonable chance of passing this assessment without retaking the course (or have scored a 5 at the last opportunity), and argue that they have taken all possible efforts to pass the component at hand. This involves showing that both exam opportunities have been fully made, including showing that a fair attempt has been made for all exam components such as assignments, essays, etc; or show force majeure for all missed exam components.

4. Components that are offered by other programmes are not eligible for this assessment, and students that are from a different programme are not eligible for this assessment.
5. Assessment in exceptional cases does not apply to projects.
6. Assessment in exceptional cases is only offered once per program.
7. Assessment in exceptional cases does not apply if the delay is caused by invalidation or exclusion of exam (results) due to fraud either directly or indirectly.

ARTICLE 2.6 EXEMPTION FROM EXAMS/ASSESSMENTS

1. A request for exemption must be submitted in writing with the reason stated to the Board of Examiners. A request must be accompanied with as much written information and evidence regarding the relevant study programme/courses elsewhere or work experience such that the Board of Examiners can judge whether the full components indeed have been obtained at, at least, the same level.
2. The Board of Examiners may consult the relevant examiners before making their decision regarding the request.
3. Exemptions cannot be granted for components for which already a result has been issued, irrespective of whether this is a passing, an NG or a failing grade; nor can exemptions be issued for components where the student has been sanctioned for fraud.

ARTICLE 2.7 EXAM RESULTS: AMENDMENT

Examiners may amend grades once by one grade step (i.e. for courses a single grade point). In special cases, the Board of Examiners may approve additional or larger amendments of the results of an exam determined by one or more examiners.

ARTICLE 2.8 EXAM INSPECTION

1. The student has, in accordance with Article 5.12 of the EER the right to inspect their evaluated work. The examiner can choose either to:
 - a. organize a collective inspection hour or
 - b. have the students request an appointment within 10 working days after the announcement of the exam results.
2. Exam inspections in principle take place onsite.
3. In the case of a collective inspection hour, there must be room for interaction. In case of a pressing ground for not being able to attend the collective inspection hour (e.g. overlapping classes or pressing medical appointments, but NOT work or holiday), an individual appointment can be requested within the timeframe as stipulated under paragraph 1.b. Collective inspection hours are announced at least 5 days in advance on Student Portal.

ARTICLE 2.9 GPA

The GPA is computed as the weighted average score over all exams that are listed as part of the programme and have been originally marked with a Dutch grade on a ten-point scale, taking into account that

1. an exam for which a failing grade is obtained is also included in the GPA, although no credits are listed on the Student Portal;
2. if more than one grade is listed for an exam, the highest grade is taken into account for the calculation;

3. the GPA computed in the system is in three significant digits and rounded downwards. In each case the GPA is converted to or compared with fewer significant digits, the GPA is rounded downwards;
4. grades for group projects are excluded from the GPA;
5. extracurricular courses are not included in the GPA;
6. after graduation, a student may request the Board of Examiners to exclude elective courses for which a failing grade was obtained from the GPA by having these courses designated as extracurricular components.

ARTICLE 2.10 CERTIFICATE

1. Students shall be awarded a certificate/diploma for all examinations that they complete successfully, as stipulated in the Higher Education and Research Act.
2. The following predicates may be added to the certificate by the Board of Examiners:
 - a. "cum laude", if the student has passed all exams of the master's overall assessment (included in the GPA computation) at first opportunity, has received a minimum grade of 8.0 for the thesis at first opportunity and has a GPA of 8.00 or higher, and if the overall exams organized by the programme together represent a minimum of 60 ECTS.
 - b. "summa cum laude", if the student has passed all exams of the master's overall assessment (included in the GPA computation) at first opportunity, has received a minimum grade of 9.0 for the thesis at first opportunity and has a GPA of 9.00 or higher, and if the overall exams organized by the programme together represent a minimum of 60 ECTS.
3. These predicates can, in special cases, also be awarded at the discretion of the Board of Examiners.
4. Students who committed fraud and/or plagiarism and whose exam, or part thereof, is declared invalid or who have been excluded from exams, are excluded from the (Summa) Cum Laude predicates.
5. First exam opportunity in sub 2 means that all exams must be taken in the year of enrolment that corresponds to the course/component year of the exam, and that no earlier exam result exists. The thesis must be defended within the second year of enrolment. As a leniency arrangement for students that have started in February, the thesis must be defended before 1 March, i.e., 25 months after the start.

ARTICLE 2.11 ASSESSMENT BY COMMITTEES

For components that are in principle graded by committees on basis of consensus the following holds if consensus within the committee is not possible:

1. If there is consensus amongst the DACS staff members/examiners, that consensus determines the grade.
2. If the grade of DACS staff members/examiners differs by no more than 1 grade point, the average of the grade determines the grade of the component.
3. If the grade of DACS staff members/examiners differs by more than 1 grade point, the median of the grade determines the grade of the component. For this, at least three examiners must be part of the committee. If this is not yet the case, the examiner(s) must contact the Board of Examiners to add an additional examiner to the committee.

ARTICLE 2.12 ELECTIVES

1. Electives outside the programme, including study abroad, and internships are subject to approval by this Board of Examiners

2. The Board of Examiners will take into account when considering requests for electives
 - a) whether the proposed elective plan is feasible
 - b) whether the proposed electives contribute to the learning goals/qualifications of the programme
 - c) the level of the proposed electives
 - d) Whether the proposed electives overlap with other components
 - e) the study progress of the student
 - f) the motivation letter.
3. The Board of Examiners only determines whether it will recognize the credits taken elsewhere and whether the student is allowed to take components outside the programme, not whether the receiving program will accept the student.
4. The deadline for requests for electives are:
 - a. for study abroad in the spring semester: a date in July of the preceding academic year, to be published on intranet.
 - b. for study abroad in the fall semester: a date in January of the preceding academic year, to be published on intranet.
 - c. for other courses/components outside the programme in the fall semester: the first of May of the preceding academic year
 - d. for other courses/components outside the programme in the spring semester: the first of December of the preceding academic year
5. The Board of Examiners can put requests on hold or conditionally approve them, when students do not (yet) meet the requirements as stated in Article 5.3 of the EER. If an elective is conditionally approved and the student does not meet the requirements before the start of the academic year or the date at which they must definitively register for the elective - whichever comes first - the student must cancel the registration.

ARTICLE 2.13 STUDY ABROAD

1. Due to the fact that arrangements for study abroad have to be made in an earlier stage, there must be a high probability that the inclusion requirement from Article 5.3 of the EER, will be met at the end of the academic year. Therefore, to be considered for exchange:
 - a. after block 3 of year 1, students wanting to go on exchange should have already obtained 22 ECTS from year 1
 - b. The Research Project from the student's first semester must be successfully completed with credit points being awarded at first opportunity
 - c. The Board of Examiners can deviate from sub a in cases that a student has applied for a university that is an Erasmus partner.
2. The Board of Examiners selects the students to be nominated for exchange from the pool of applicants. The Board of Examiners selects students based on the criteria stated in Article 2.12 and on past academic and non-academic conduct, study progress and GPA.
3. Any allocation of exchange partners is conditional on the requirements in this article and Article 5.3 of the EER and meeting those conditions is the responsibility of the student.

ARTICLE 2.14 FLEXIBLE CURRICULUM

For the flexible curriculum, students must apply prior to the start of their studies, in accordance with Article 3.9 of the EER. The flexible curriculum is a conscious choice before starting the programme, not a way to avoid study delays. Further it holds that:

1. Courses for which either a passing or failing grade has been obtained, cannot be removed from the flexible curriculum
2. The deadline for applying for the flexible curriculum for students starting in the fall semester is 1 August of the preceding year
3. The deadline for applying for the flexible curriculum for students starting in the spring semester is 16 December of the preceding year

ARTICLE 2.15 EXTRACURRICULAR COMPONENTS

1. Only the components that fit the nominal study of 120 ECTS are curricular.
2. Whether or not to allow extracurricular components is a decision of the education management. If extracurricular components are allowed and taken, it should be made clear to the Board of Examiners beforehand that they will be extracurricular.
3. In case it has not been indicated what the extracurricular components are, and the student has more than 120 ECTS, the chronologically, first components obtained that constitute a valid program are considered the curricular components, the other component(s) the extracurricular ones. If a component can be removed from the program (last first) and while resulting in a valid programme of at least 120 ECTS, that component is considered extracurricular.

Section 3 Procedures

ARTICLE 3.1 EXAMS

1. Students must register in time for their education, exams and re-sits. If they miss the deadline, they cannot participate in the exam. If exceptional circumstances prevented registering, they are eligible for dispensation from the registration deadline. See also Article 3.7 on Hardship.
2. Students must adhere to the booking instructions for registering and adhere to the booking deadlines.
3. Students can only sit a single exam at a time.
4. In principle all exams (including the thesis defence) are onsite.
5. The programme shall ensure that there is at least one invigilator present during written exams.
6. During written exams, the rules specified by "the Rules of Procedure for Examinations" / "Rules of Procedure for Course Examinations at Maastricht University" apply, in addition to these Rules and Regulations.
7. A student who is denied entrance to the exam (location) will not be awarded any results for the exam in question and therefore receives an NG.
8. The student must follow any instructions given by the Board of Examiners, the examiner and the invigilator at all times.
9. The check whether a student is admissible to the exam, may be performed afterwards. If in that case the student turns out to be inadmissible, the exam is invalidated and remains ungraded.
10. Students will not be admitted to the exam location after the official start of the exam. As soon as a student has left the exam location, she/he/they will not be allowed to re-enter the exam location.
11. Students may only participate in an exam if they can provide a valid and undamaged proof of identity, which must be placed on the table so that it is clearly visible. If a student cannot provide proof of identity during the exam, the student can be refused entry and the Board of Examiners will be informed who may declare the student's exam null and void (i.e. label NG).
12. Instructions on how to fill in answer forms of the exam are given on the answer forms, in the exam booklet, or beforehand on student portal. The forms cannot be processed if students ignore these instructions, use different writing devices than instructed, change the details printed on the forms or make notes elsewhere on the answer form. The consequences of not following the instructions are entirely the student's own responsibility. If students suspect that there are inaccuracies, they are to indicate this to the examiner, if present, and otherwise state this on the exam.

13. Students may not use red pens nor pencils for writing text, and must ensure that exams are scannable which also means that they may not attach stickers to exams and may not tear pages.
14. Unless the Board of Examiners has specified elsewhere, the student may not bring any aids into the exam hall and/or use these during the exam. A student who has written permission from the Board of Examiners to use aids must inform the examiner or invigilator present before the start of each exam and must always be able to provide a copy of this document. As an exception to this rule are the aids that are specifically mentioned on the cover sheet and a blue or black pen.
15. Maastricht University is expressly exempt from any liability regarding damage to or loss of aids that have been confiscated.
16. In the event of irregularities and/or fraud, the invigilator informs the student and reports the irregularities and/or fraud in written form. The Board of Examiners will be informed after the exam of any irregularities and violations that took place before, during or after the exam. The Board of Examiners may decide to take further sanctions and/or measures.
17. In the event of irregularities that hinder further proper examining, the invigilator is authorised to confiscate the exam materials including any answer forms and exclude the student from further participation in the exam. The Board of Examiners will be informed after the exam of any irregularities and violations that took place before, during or after the exam. The Board of Examiners may decide to take further sanctions and/or measures.
18. In the case of online proctored exams, it is the responsibility of the student to make the exam in the way it is instructed. Failure to do so is an irregularity and means the exam will be invalid. If it is not possible to adequately supervise the student during (part of) the exam, the exam is declared invalid. Other than in paragraph 16, with online proctored exams the student may be informed later about the irregularities that have occurred.
19. Written exams in paper form consist of a booklet with questions and answer space. The booklet provided contains at least one extra page for answers. Separate extra pages handed in are not taken into consideration when grading.
20. The booklet must be handed in by the official end of the exam or as indicated by the invigilator. Refusal to comply is considered fraud and will, apart from possible sanctions, render the student ineligible for (summa) cum laude predicates.
21. After students have handed in their answer form, they must leave the exam location as quickly and quietly as possible.
22. For online proctored exams and take-home exams, additional rules may be imposed, including conditions when the exam is considered to be (in)valid such as possible oral follow-ups.

ARTICLE 3.2 QUOTING AND COPYING CODE

1. Unless it is clearly specified to the contrary in the assignment/project, it is not allowed to use source code from others (including code generated by artificial intelligence), other sources, or one's own source code from other components.
2. In the case it was explicitly permitted to use code from other sources, one must both
 - a. Indicate using block marking that the code was copied, ensuring that this block marking can be clearly distinguished from other block markings;
 - b. Add clearly and unambiguously in the report and/or in the accompanying submission notes which parts of the code contain copied parts and indicate the source as well as the percentage of the code in the file that was copied, such that the examiner is aware that this is not the students work and can decide not to award credit for it.
3. In case that software packages or libraries have been used in a project or in thesis research, these must be clearly indicated in the report or thesis.

4. Do not share your solutions with others nor post them on the internet. If you do, your actions could be considered facilitating fraud and as such fraud in itself (see Article 3.4(1)(c) and Article 3.4(2)(e)).

ARTICLE 3.3 USE OF GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

1. According to the 'FSE policy framework for the use of generative AI in education' the use of generative artificial intelligence including, but not limited to GPT-x, ChatGPT (Plus) and BARD, in education and examination is allowed, unless otherwise specified in the course syllabus/manual or on the Student Portal.
2. By executing this policy, course coordinators have the following options:
 - a. Generative AI is allowed
 - b. Generative AI is allowed only where specified
 - c. Generative AI is not allowed for assessed work
3. For each component of the course examination, the coordinator must select one of the options from paragraph 2. This information, including the requirements for disclosing the use of generative AI (transparency statement), must be explicitly stated in the course syllabus/manual or on the Student Portal.

ARTICLE 3.4 FRAUD INCLUDING PLAGIARISM AND FABRICATING AND/OR FALSIFYING RESEARCH DATA

In this article – which is related to Article 5.16 of 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 Act.

1. The Board of Examiners may impose one of the disciplinary measures set down in paragraph 8 of this article if it establishes that one or more students, in any exam or exam component have committed fraud, including:
 - a. have had any aids/devices, resources, text, software or notes at their 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. have communicated or tried 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 have provided the opportunity to copy;
 - d. have collaborated on a graded assignment, paper or practical, whereas this was not explicitly allowed;
 - e. have posed as someone else or let someone else pose as them;
 - f. have 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. have used an obfuscation method in submitted work that is likely to have the effect that plagiarism checking tools do not work optimally;
 - h. have disregarded the instructions of the invigilator or the instructions for the exam (component) such that an unfair advantage might have been obtained;
 - i. have performed actions or omissions which make it impossible in whole or in part to properly evaluate their knowledge, understanding and/or skills.
2. The Board of Examiners may impose one of the disciplinary measures set down in paragraph 8 of this article if it establishes that one or more students have committed fraud, including:

- a. have 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. have falsified exam results;
 - c. have falsely obtained, or attempted to, access to an exam;
 - d. have mislead an examiner relating to exam (components), registration, or grading;
 - e. have facilitated other students to engage in fraud;
 - f. have fabricated and/or falsified survey or interview answers or research data;
 - g. have breached or attempted to breach the security measures around exams.
3. The Board of Examiners may impose one of the disciplinary measures set down in paragraph 8 of this article if it establishes that one or more students have committed plagiarism in any exam, part or component, including:
 - a. using or copying their personal or others' 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 their 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 their own or others' 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 their own;
 - f. copying work from other students and thus passing it off as their own;
 - g. submitting a text that has been previously been submitted for an different component/module, or is similar to a text that has been 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 their own.
 - i. where in all of these provisions "others" and "third party" does not only refer to people but also to generative artificial intelligence such as GPT-x, ChatGPT (Plus) or BARD. If the use of artificial intelligence is allowed and/or does not have to be disclosed for a specific use, this is explicitly mentioned in the course materials.
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 8 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.
6. In the event that a student is suspected of having violated the applicable regulations on the use of generative AI, the examiner must assess whether the submitted work allows them to accurately assess the student's own knowledge, understanding, and skills. If there is reasonable doubt, the examiner may require a verification interview to establish whether the student has attained the knowledge, understanding, and skills as defined in the ILOs. This verification interview is conducted by the examiner prior to reporting the suspected fraud to the Board of Examiners, unless the available evidence already provides sufficient grounds to report the suspected fraud directly. If there is insufficient evidence to establish, beyond reasonable doubt, that the student has committed fraud, but an irregularity remains that prevents the student's knowledge, understanding, and skills from being accurately assessed, the Board of Examiners may declare the relevant assessment or assessment component invalid in accordance with Article 3.5.
7. 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. Students may have an adviser accompany them. 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 8. 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 of the Act.

8. In the cases referred to in paragraphs 1 to 7 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.
9. Repeat offenses 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 program.
10. 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.
11. If fraud is established, this is included in the student's dossier and, if applicable for the programme in question, a notice of unprofessional behaviour will be drawn up.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. A student who was excluded from participation in exams, or whose exam was declared invalid for a component/module due to fraud, is not eligible for assessment in exceptional cases for those components/modules.

ARTICLE 3.5 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.

ARTICLE 3.6 PARTICIPATION

1. Events that are considered practicals as defined in Article 7.13(2)(t) of the Act may require active participation. Students are assessed for this element of the practical (assignments) in terms of pass/fail.

2. For participation in an on-line setting, it is required that students are visible on camera, such that participation can be verified.

ARTICLE 3.7 HARDSHIP

In cases where the application of the regulations would lead to manifestly unreasonable results (Article 8.3(2) of the EER), due to personal circumstances, the following applies:

1. The Board of Examiners decides whether circumstances are hardship or not. When students make a request for hardship the student must properly motivate this request and provide proof for the circumstances that have occurred. The request must be filed as soon as possible, but no later than two weeks after the event occurred.
 - a. Without proper proof the claim cannot be taken into consideration. To be clear: An email claiming illness is not considered proof.
 - b. If it is possible to avoid a problem from occurring by e.g. requesting to reschedule a meeting, the student is obliged to do so.
2. For the Board of Examiners to take a hardship request into consideration, the student must show force majeure for all opportunities. Examples that might be considered as hardship:
 - a. Acute medical care that made it impossible to participate and there was no alternative available
 - b. Death of a family member in the first degree that made it impossible to participate and there was no alternative available
3. Examples that are not considered hardship:
 - a. Plannable medical care
 - b. Seeking medical care, available in the Netherlands, abroad
 - c. Motivation
 - d. Study delay or financial issues
 - e. Exchange
 - f. Consequences of fraud
 - g. Travel
4. In cases of personal circumstances students are obliged to be proactive and seek help from the student counsellor and actively try to mitigate the possible effects.
5. Written exams are organised twice per year, which does not imply that the student has the right to have two exam attempts per year. As such, the choice of not taking the first opportunity is to be avoided and bears additional risk.

ARTICLE 3.8 REGISTRATION FOR STUDENTS THAT ARE NOT STUDENTS OF THE PROGRAMME

1. Students that are not students of the programme, i.e. not students of the Master of Science in Artificial Intelligence, the Master of Science in Data Science for Decision Making or the Master of Science in Responsible Data Science, must have received clearance from the Board of Examiners of the Master of Science in Artificial Intelligence/the Master of Science in Data Science for Decision Making/the Master of Science in Responsible Data Science on the prerequisites before the registration deadline and as such, apply for that ultimately six weeks before the registration deadline.
2. The registration of students that are not students of the programme is subject to approval by the Board of Examiners of the programme.
3. Students not of the programme are not admissible to research projects.
4. Master courses are not open to bachelor students.
5. Withstanding Article 4.2(3) of the EER, for students that are not of the programme, an additional requirement for following year 1 courses is that they are admissible to the programme.
6. There is a limited capacity for students that are not students of the programme.

Section 4 Closing provisions

ARTICLE 4.1 AMENDMENTS

1. Amendments to these rules and regulations shall be determined by the Board of Examiners by means of a separate decision.
2. Amendments will in principle not be made to the current academic year, unless it may reasonably be assumed that the interests of the students are not harmed as a result, or when they are necessary to ensure the quality of the exams.

ARTICLE 4.2 ENTRY INTO FORCE

These rules and regulations shall enter into force as of 31 August 2026 and hold for an academic year or until new Rules and Regulations are published, whichever comes first.

Section 5 Research Project regulations

Research Project regulations for the Master's programme in Artificial Intelligence, the Master's Programme in Data Science for Decision Making and the Master's Programme in Responsible Data Science of the Department of Advanced Computing Sciences in the Faculty of Science and Engineering at Maastricht University, approved by the Board of Examiners.

ARTICLE 5.1 APPLICABILITY OF THE RULES AND REGULATIONS

This section describes the rules and regulations specific to the projects of the Master's programme in Artificial Intelligence, the Master's programme in Data Science for Decision Making and the Master's programme in Responsible Data Science, withstanding the Education and Examination Regulations, hereinafter referred to as EER. These research project regulations apply only for a research project, not for group assignments within a course.

ARTICLE 5.2 DEFINITIONS

The definitions stated in Article 1.2 of the EER, and in Article 1.2 of these Rules and Regulations apply. In addition, the following definitions apply:

- a. *Project content examiner(s)*: the person(s) who sets the requirements for the different aspects of the project, assesses the content of the project including product, presentation, report and process, and provides content-based supervision during the projects;
- b. *(research) project*: an education component, as defined in Article 7.13(2)(t) of the Act, where students work in small groups on complex and challenging assignments in order to develop a variety of skills. A project spreads out over one semester (or multiple blocks). They are usually group projects, but individual projects may also occur.
- c. *project group*: a small group of students that jointly work on a project. Project groups can also consist of a single member.
- d. *Main project coordinator*: the person responsible for the daily management of a project semester as a whole, and acts as an examiner as the coordinator awards the results within the legal framework;
- e. *Project coordinator*: the person responsible for the daily management of a project group in a certain semester or certain block during a semester;
- f. *project manual*: study resource for the project. The project manual contains the project assignment.
- g. *project meeting*: an educational activity, as defined in Article 7.13(2)(t) of the Act; a scheduled meeting between the project coordinator and the project group aimed at learning project management.
- h. *skills training*: an educational activity, as defined in Article 7.13(2)(t) of the Act; skills training that is part of the project as referred to as "project skill" in the EER.

ARTICLE 5.3 ORGANIZATION

1. The main project coordinator is responsible for the daily management of the project; regularly communicates and coordinates the project examiners; is responsible for the attendance and participation registration for the compulsory project meetings (which are indicated in the project manual or in these regulations); manages the project coordinators, administers assessment, ensures that the students are given feedback and coordinates with the project content examiners the composition of the project manual and distributes information at the start of the project.

2. The project coordinator(s) supervise the students using a process-based approach and, if necessary and expertise permitting, also a content-based approach. Students regularly report back to the project coordinator(s) during the project meetings. The project coordinator(s) track the attendance and participation of students during project meetings.
3. Projects are group work and all students are expected to actively participate. Students whose behaviour is still detrimental after receiving a formal warning can be expelled from the research project and receive an NG. They are not allowed to take a project resit.
4. Students that have failed or have been expelled from a particular semester research project in at least two different years, can be placed in special project groups at the discretion of the Director of Studies, while abiding to the learning outcomes.
5. It is up to the examiners to decide which student will present what in the project presentations, and this decision can be communicated by the examiners last-minute. The interim presentations are in principle non-public (unless the examiners decide otherwise), the final presentation is a public presentation.

ARTICLE 5.4 ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION

1. On-campus attendance and participation in the project meetings and project skills trainings, is mandatory, see Article 4.4 of the EER. Missing a meeting/training in this article means failure to be present during part of or the complete meeting/training, inadequate participation or inadequately completing the assignments. For project meetings the project coordinator or main project coordinator decides whether a student missed it or not, and for the skill trainings the lecturer or the main project coordinator.
2. All project meetings are mandatory. One project meeting may be missed each block of the three blocks of a semester, without consequences, as an arrangement to cover force majeure and may only be used as such. If two or more meetings are missed in the first or second block of the semester, the student will not have access to the exam of that project phase and that phase will count as grade zero. If two meetings are missed in the third block of the semester, the student will automatically receive a lowered individual grade. If three or more meetings are missed in the third block of the semester, the student will not have access to the exam of that project phase and that phase will count as grade zero.
3. Participation in project skill trainings is taken into account in the final grading. If a student has missed three or more skills trainings, the student will not be able to participate in the final examination of the project, meaning that an NG is given for the project. This NG will also be awarded if after the final examination it turns out that a student that was ineligible still participated.

The arrangements that offer the possibility to miss project meetings and skill classes should not be taken lightly and only be used in a case of clear force majeure.

ARTICLE 5.5 EXAMINERS

The Board of Examiners appoints at least two project content examiners and a project coordinator, where the role of project content examiner and coordinator can be combined. The project content examiners determine the grade according to a pre-agreed procedure and set extra assignments when needed. The main project coordinator adjusts the individual grades as described in Article 5.4 and Article 5.6 and hands the final grades in to the exam administration.

ARTICLE 5.6 PROJECT GRADE

1. For students of the AI an DSDM master's program, the research project is graded on three occasions by the examiners. The first grade is based on the research project proposal and accounts for 15% of the final grade. The second grade is based on the presentation and layman's text in the second phase and accounts for 15% of the final grade. The third grade, which is based on the final report, product and presentation, is issued after the final assessment at the end of the third block and accounts for 70% of the grade. These grades are then rescaled in Paragraph 5 to a range 0 to 9.
For students of the RDS master's program, the research is graded on two occasions by the examiners. The first grade is based on the research project proposal and accounts for 20% of the final grade. The second grade, which is based on the final report, product and presentation, is issued after the final assessment at the end of the third block and accounts for 80% of the grade. These grades are then rescaled in Paragraph 6 to a range 0 to 9. The second phase presentation and the layman's social media text are mandatory but will not be graded.
2. The skill trainings are graded on a scale from 0 to 1.
 - a. If a student has participated fully in all skill classes, where the student also has a passing grade for all assignments, the student will receive the grade of 1 for the skill trainings.
 - b. If a student has participated fully in all but one skill trainings, where fully participating includes that the student has a passing grade for all assignments, the student will receive a grade of 0.5 for the skill classes.
 - c. If the student fully participated in all but two skill trainings, the student will receive a grade of 0.0 for the skill trainings.
 - d. If the student did not participate fully in three or more skill trainings, the student will not be able to participate in the final examination of the project, meaning that an NG is given for the project.
3. As indicated in paragraph 1, for each project there are a number of on-campus assessment moments that may include, but are not limited to: the presentation second phase and the final presentation. Failure to participate in the presentation second phase has the consequence that the student concerned cannot be assessed for that particular phase and the grade for that phase will count as 0. Failure to participate in the final project presentation means that the student cannot be graded for the presentation and the grade for the rubrics concerning the presentation will count as 0. If a student misses in total two of the aforementioned assessment moments, there is insufficient bases for assessing the individual contribution of the student, with the consequence that an NG is awarded for the overall project of the student involved.
4. The final assessment will be determined at the end of each project. Each project will be assessed separately and will be based on the following aspects:
 - a. the project report;
 - b. the project product;
 - c. the project presentation;
 - d. participation;
 - e. project management and cooperation;
 - f. the grades from earlier project phases.The requirements for the project product, report and presentations are determined separately for each project and will be listed in the project manual on the Student Portal or provided by the project content examiners.
5. The project grade is on a scale from 0 to 10, where the grade consists for 90% of the grade from paragraph 1, to which the skill class grade is added.
6. The project grade is a group grade, which applies to all members of the group. The project examiners may deviate (positively or negatively) from the group grade and issue an

individual grade for students, if participation and cooperation within a group has not been homogeneous.

7. Examiners can choose to use peer assessment for adjusting individual grades.
8. For students who have not met the project requirements by insufficient participation in project meetings, skill trainings, project presentations, and any other mandatory meetings, the modification to the student's grade as indicated in Article 5.4 and in Article 5.6.3 will be applied after the individual grading of the student.

ARTICLE 5.7 PROJECT RESULTS: WRITTEN MOTIVATION

The research project assessment will be motivated by a rubric that provides an overview of the project report, product and presentations and shows to what degree the results fulfil the final requirements for the project.

ARTICLE 5.8 RESITS

The resit is a repair opportunity, and the method shall be determined by the examiners. Repair opportunities can be individual or on a group level, where changes will be permitted to the composition of the original project group. Students who were expelled from the project or did not receive a grade in the current academic year are not allowed to take the project resit. Hence, if a student receives an NG (for example due to missing too many project meetings or skills classes), the student is ineligible for a resit. The student(s) will receive the resit assignment from the examiners within 2 working days after failing the project. This additional assignment must be handed in within 10 working days.

ARTICLE 5.9 HARDSHIP

The Board of Examiners can excuse students from the participation in project meetings in individual cases due to personal circumstances and can offer repair opportunities for the project as a whole. The student must in such cases prove force majeure for all mandatory meeting that the student missed, see also Article 3.7 of the Rules and Regulations. Deviation from the group grade is possible in such cases. The Board of Examiners can also grant resits for projects in special circumstances. Since the project is an onsite group activity, students must be within commuting distance from Maastricht during each project activity.

Section 6 Internship regulations

Internship regulations for the Master's programme in Artificial Intelligence, the Master's Programme in Data Science for Decision Making and the Master's Programme in Responsible Data Science of the Department of Advanced Computing Sciences in the Faculty of Science and Engineering at Maastricht University, approved by the Board of Examiners.

ARTICLE 6.1 APPLICABILITY OF THE RULES AND REGULATIONS

These rules and regulations apply to the Internship for the Master's programmes in Artificial Intelligence, Data Science for Decision Making and Responsible Data Science as further defined in the Education and Examination Regulations, hereinafter referred to as EER.

ARTICLE 6.2 OBJECTIVE

MSc Artificial Intelligence and Data Science for Decision Making

In the second year of the Master's programmes, students may do an elective internship as part of their orientation towards the professional field of decision making, artificial intelligence and data science research. This internship can take the form of an individual professional internship within a company or non-profit organisation, or as an individual research internship at DACS, at another department at the UM or at another research university (or in special cases at a research institute). In accordance with UM policy, professional internship must take place for at least 75% onsite at the internship organization. The internship has a minimal size of 10 ECTS.

MSc Responsible Data Science

In the second year of the Master's programme, students do a mandatory internship. This internship can take the form of an individual professional internship within a company or non-profit organisation, or as an individual research internship at DACS, at another department at the UM or at another research university (or in special cases at a research institute). In accordance with UM policy, professional internship must take place for at least 75% onsite at the internship organization. The internship has a size of 18 ECTS.

ARTICLE 6.3 APPROVAL OF INTERNSHIP

A student may present a proposal for an internship to the Board of Examiners for approval after she/he/they has consent from the intended internship examiner. Students can only do a single internship. The internship agreement must be of the UM standard model, or approval of legal affairs must be obtained.

ARTICLE 6.4 INTERNSHIP EXAMINER: APPOINTMENT

The student shall propose an internship examiner in the internship plan. The internship examiner must be a member of the academic staff of the programme and DACS and must have obtained a PhD degree. In case of an internship outside DACS, the internship examiner is not allowed to be employed at the internship organization. The examiner takes the role of internship adviser. The internship examiner will be formally appointed by the Board of Examiners.

ARTICLE 6.5 INTERNSHIP PLAN

Before the student starts the internship, the student has to set up a written internship plan in consultation with the internship examiner and the internship organization.

The most recent form provided by the Board of Examiners is mandatory. The internship plan needs approval of the Board of Examiners before the internship starts. For the period of the internship before approval has been given, no ECTS credits can be awarded.

Students of the Master's programme in Responsible Data Science must adhere to the deadline for the submission of the internship plan communicated via the Student Portal.

ARTICLE 6.6 DAILY SUPERVISOR

The daily supervisor at the internship organisation cannot be a student of FSE or a family member. If the daily supervisor is an alumnus of FSE, s/he must have graduated more than two years ago. Supervision cannot be done by a third party.

ARTICLE 6.7 INTERNSHIP EXAMINER: TASKS

The tasks of the internship examiner include the following:

1. approving the internship plan and verifying its validity (including its alignment with the programme objectives and the required academic level);
2. advising the student during the internship about internship activities and products;
3. maintaining contact with the internship organisation;
4. composing an ad hoc assessment committee;
5. grading the internship based on consensus in the assessment committee;
6. completing and signing an assessment form, providing specific feedback on positive and negative points.

ARTICLE 6.8 ASSESSMENT

Assessment of the internship is done in accordance with the internship plan by an ad hoc committee, which consists of at least two members of the academic staff of the programme holding a PhD degree, one of whom is the DACS internship examiner/supervisor. Grading is performed by the DACS internship examiner/supervisor on the basis of consensus reached within the ad hoc assessment committee (see Article 2.11 of these Rules and Regulations), after receiving the advice of the daily supervisor at the internship organisation. The assessment form is handed in by the examiner to the education office within 15 working days after submission of the internship report by the student.

ARTICLE 6.9 INTERNSHIP REPORT

The internship report must demonstrate the experience gained during the internship and an in-depth review of specific problems related to the programme that were dealt with during the internship. The student is responsible for handing in the internship report and products included in the internship plan to the internship examiner within 30 days of the end of the internship. The internship had a page limit of 10 pages for internships of 18 ECTS or fewer and a page limit of 18 pages for internship of more than 18 ECTS. The internship report may only be made public with permission from the internship organisation.

Section 7 Thesis regulations

Thesis regulations for the Master's programme in Artificial Intelligence, Data Science for Decision Making and Responsible Data Science of Maastricht University, approved by the Board of Examiners.

ARTICLE 7.1 APPLICABILITY OF THE RULES AND REGULATIONS

This section describes the rules and regulations specific to the Master's thesis for the Master's programmes in Artificial Intelligence, Data Science for Decision Making and Responsible Data Science, withstanding the Education and Examination Regulations, hereinafter referred to as EER.

ARTICLE 7.2 THESIS EXAMINER: APPOINTMENT

The Board of Examiners shall appoint two thesis examiners for every student, in consultation with the student and the proposed thesis examiners. One of these thesis examiners takes the role of thesis supervisor. The thesis examiners must be members of the academic staff of the programme and DACS and must hold a doctoral degree in a field relevant for the objectives of the programme and adhere to the conditions in Article 1.5. The Board of Examiners can appoint a postdoctoral researcher as a second examiner as part of a training programme, subject to conditions including the absence of hierarchical or supervisory dependency between the examiners.

ARTICLE 7.3 THESIS IN THE FORM OF AN INTERNSHIP

1. The thesis can take the form of an internship, but with clearly defined research questions.
2. If the student previously did an elective or mandatory internship, the thesis must be clearly distinct from the internship.
3. In case the thesis has the form of an internship, the UM policy of being 75% onsite must in principle be followed.

ARTICLE 7.4 THESIS PLAN

1. Before the student starts his/her/their thesis, the student must set up a written thesis plan, using the appropriate form, in consultation with and consent from the thesis examiners. The use of the most recent form provided by the Board of Examiners is mandatory.
2. The thesis plan requires approval of the Board of Examiners before the thesis work can start.
3. The student must qualify according to the requirements in Article 5.3 of the EER at the time of submission of the plan.
4. In principle there should be no confidentiality agreement covering the thesis or thesis work, and any confidentiality agreement that might be there in very exceptional circumstances, is subject to approval by the legal department, the program director and the Board of Examiners, and must be signed by an authorized person.

ARTICLE 7.5 THESIS EXAMINERS: TASKS

The thesis examiners are responsible for checking the validity of the thesis plan, ensuring it is aligned with the objectives of the programme and establishing that the required academic level is obtained. The examiners are responsible for composing an ad hoc assessment committee as

described in Article 7.8, grading the thesis, and for filling out an assessment form. The examiners are also responsible for conducting a plagiarism check on the final version of the thesis.

ARTICLE 7.6 THESIS SUPERVISOR: TASKS

The thesis supervisor is responsible for advising the student while she/he/they is working on the thesis about thesis activities and products and for establishing that the required academic level is obtained. If the thesis is conducted as an internship at an external organisation, the thesis supervisor needs to maintain contact with the daily supervisor at the internship organisation. Supervision cannot be done by a third party.

ARTICLE 7.7 THESIS MANUSCRIPT

The program will publish guidelines and requirements for the thesis manuscript to which the student must adhere. The thesis is an individual work.

ARTICLE 7.8 THESIS ASSESSMENT

1. Assessment of the master's thesis is done on-campus, during the public thesis defence. It must be done by an ad hoc committee, which consists of at least the thesis examiners. If the thesis is conducted in an external collaboration, the assessment committee also includes the daily supervisor from the internship organisation.
2. The date of the defence is scheduled by the examiners in consultation with the student.
3. The student must be physically present on campus for the thesis defence.
4. Grading is done by the examiners on the basis of consensus reached in the ad hoc assessment committee (See Article 2.11 of the Rules and Regulations). The assessment form is handed in by the examiners to the education office within 15 working days after the thesis defence.
5. It is required that both the thesis and the defence is of a passing level to receive an overall passing grade.

ARTICLE 7.9 START OF THESIS AFTER APPROVAL OF THESIS PLAN

1. The student must wait until the Board of Examiners has approved the written thesis plan as referred to in Article 7.4 before starting the thesis. A thesis plan must be approved by the thesis examiners before it is offered to the Board of Examiners. The Board of Examiners assesses the plan on the formal requirements and on the basis of the academic level of the research proposal, feasibility and whether it is in line with the learning goals of the programme (if applicable, after seeking advice from staff members with relevant expertise).
2. Approval of the thesis plan is in principle valid for one year. If the thesis is not finished within this period, the student receives an NG for his/her thesis. An extension of up to 6 months is possible. To obtain this extension the student must request approval from the Board of Examiners. The request must be supported by the examiner and must state the reason(s) of the delay and a motivation how the student will finish within 6 months. If this extension is not granted, the student must submit a new thesis plan with a new topic and a new supervisor.
3. If a student has started without prior approval of the Board of Examiners, the thesis research can be nullified and the student will have to start a new thesis on another topic in the semester thereafter.

4. During periods where the student is suspended from all exams due to fraud, the thesis is put on hold and there shall be no thesis supervision during said period.