



Universiteit Leiden

2023-2024

Leiden University Medical Center

Rules and Regulations of the Board of Examiners of the Master's degree programme in Biomedical Sciences

pursuant to Article 7.12b(3) of the Higher Education and Research Act (*WHW*)

Adopted on September 1th, 2023

Chapter 1 General provisions

Article 1.1 Scope

These Rules and Regulations apply to the examinations (*tentamens*) and final examinations (*examens*) of the degree programme(s) Biomedical Sciences, hereafter referred to as: the degree programme. The programme is instituted by the Leiden University Medical Center, hereafter referred to as: the LUMC.

Article 1.2 Definition

Act	Higher Education and Research Act (<i>WHW</i>)
AI Software	Artificial or artificial intelligence (AI) is the ability of a machine to exhibit human-like skills such as reasoning, learning, planning and creativity. ¹ Forms of AI software include virtual assistance, image analysis software, search engines, voice and facial recognition systems, chatbots such as ChatGPT.
Constituent examination (<i>deeltentamen</i>):	a test which, in addition to one or more other mid-term examinations or practical assignments (as defined in OER 1.2 under 1 as practical), forms part of an examination (<i>tentamen</i>) and contributes to the final grade (<i>eindcijfer</i>) of the examination. The relative weighting of the constituent examinations is laid down in the Course and Examination Regulations (OER) and in the Prospectus.
First assessor:	the first examiner, who supervises, reads and assesses the thesis/final assignment/graduation report.
Invigilator:	a person who is charged by or on behalf of the Faculty Board with ensuring that order is maintained during an examination, whether this is on campus or online, by making use of proctoring, for example.
Laboratory practical:	a practical assignment in which experiments are performed using apparatus and/or biological or chemical materials, usually in a room equipped as a laboratory.
Master Internship Committee:	the independent reviewers of the Master Internship Committee are appointed by the Board of Examiners to coordinate the approval, evaluation and assessment of the individual internships and reports of JRP-I, JRP-II and the Scientific Review.
OER	the Course and Examination Regulations (<i>Onderwijs- en examenregeling</i>) of the degree programme, as adopted by the Executive Board of the LUMC.
Practical assignment:	a practical assignment as (a component of) an examination, as provided for in Article 7.13(2d) of the Act, which takes one of the following forms: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- writing a thesis/final paper/ final report,- writing a paper or creating an artistic work,- carrying out a research assignment,- participation in fieldwork or an excursion,- completing an internship, or- participating in another educational activity aimed at acquiring particular skills.

¹ https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/nl/headlines/society/20200827STO85804/wat-is-artificiele-intelligentie-en-hoe-wordt-het-gebruikt?at_campaign=20234-Digital&at_medium=Google_Ads&at_platform=Search&at_creation=DSA&at_goal=TR_G&at_audience=&at_topic=Artificial_Intelligence&gclid=Cj0KCQjw7uSkBhDGARIsAMCZNjtvMvZiYs2g9giVER1E3cc7On7XCNWrWQZ9kIC5kZVhru7tURs uBfsaAqqpEALw_wcB

Second assessor: the second examiner appointed by the Board of Examiners, who reads and assesses the thesis/final assignment/graduation report independently of the first examiner.

Third assessor a third examiner is appointed by the Board of Examiners in the event that the first and second examiners are unable to reach agreement on the assessment of the thesis/final paper/final report.

Other terms have the meaning assigned to them in the Act or the OER.

Chapter 2 Duties and procedures of the Board of Examiners

Article 2.1 Appointment of the chair and secretary

- 2.1.1 The Board of Examiners has a chair and a deputy chair.
- 2.1.2 An official secretary may be assigned to the Board of Examiners.
- 2.1.3 The Board of Examiners has an external member.
- 2.1.4 The appointment of the chair and the members of the Board of Examiners by the Executive Board of the LUMC occurs according to article 2.4.5 of the Regulations of the Faculty of Medicine .

Article 2.2 Duties and powers of the Board of Examiners

2.2.1 The Board of Examiners is the body charged with objectively and competently determining whether a student fulfils the conditions laid down in the OER regarding the knowledge, understanding and skills required for obtaining a degree.

2.2.2 Without prejudice to the Act and the regulations based thereon, the Board of Examiners is in any event also responsible for:

I General tasks

- a. assuring the quality of the examinations and final examinations;
- b. assuring the quality of the organisation and procedures relating to examinations and final examinations;
- c. establishing guidelines and instructions within the framework of the OER to assess and determine the results of examinations and final examinations, including the pass/fail regulation;
- d. compiling an annual report of its activities for the Executive Board of the LUMC

II Degree programme and examinations

- e. granting permission, given by the most appropriate Board of Examiners, for a student to compile and follow an individual curriculum, as referred to in Article 7.3j of the Act, the final examination of which leads to obtaining a degree. The Board of Examiners will also indicate to which of the institution's degree programmes this curriculum is deemed to belong for the application of the Act;
- f. granting exemption from taking one or more examinations on one of the grounds specified in the OER;
- g. where applicable, extending the period of validity of pass results for examinations, as specified in the OER;
- h. in exceptional cases, deciding whether an examination must be taken orally, in written form or in another way, notwithstanding the provisions of the OER;
- i. in exceptional cases, deciding whether an examination must be held in public, contrary to the provisions of the OER;
- j. granting exemption from the obligation to participate in practical assignments required for admission to the examination concerned, possibly with the imposition of alternative requirements;
- k. in individual cases, approving the choice of course components included in the degree programme;
- l. at the student's request, and subject to the relevant provisions of the OER, allowing the student to take one or more components of the final examination before passing the requirements described in OER 4.2.1;
- m. verifying, insofar as this is stipulated by the Executive Board of the LUMC as a condition for taking final examinations in the specializations Education and Health or components thereof, that evidence of an adequate command of the Dutch language for successful participation in the courses has been provided by students who have been granted exemption from the prior education requirement as referred to in Article 7.24 of the Act on the ground of having a diploma awarded outside the Netherlands.
<Not applicable>
- n. presenting the student with a degree certificate and supplement as referred to in Article 7.11(4) of the Act, as evidence of having passed the final examination;
- o. in the case of a student who has passed more than one examination but cannot be awarded a degree certificate as referred to in n. above, issuing a statement showing at least the examinations that he/she has passed;
- p. taking appropriate measures and imposing sanctions if a student or external examination candidate

(*extraneus*) is found to have committed fraud;

- q. to set special arrangements in relation to final or interim examinations for individual students confronted with *force majeure*, or with specific (personal) study circumstances. For these decisions the advice of Fenestra (*Plexus, studentendecanen*) is leading.

Article 2.3 Procedures

2.3.1 The Board of Examiners decides by simple majority of votes. If there is an equal division of votes, the chair has the casting vote.

2.3.2 The Board of Examiners can mandate its members, or other parties whose position qualifies them to do this, in writing to take certain decisions. The Board of Examiners can provide the mandated member(s)/parties with instructions on how to exercise the mandated power.

2.3.3 Mandated members/parties take decisions on the basis of the OER, the present Rules and Regulations and additionally formulated policy, and render account for their actions. The method of rendering account will be established in advance. Where there is any divergence from previously formulated policy, the full Board of Examiners will decide.

2.3.4 The Board of Examiners has in any case established the following:

- a. the composition of the Board of Examiners;
- b. the duties, powers and responsibilities of the chair, deputy chair, other members and official secretary;
- c. the duties that are mandated to the various members and to whom these duties have been mandated, including the method of rendering account for decision-making;
- d. the frequency of meetings, public access and confidentiality;
- e. the method of reporting and archiving of meetings and decisions
- f. internal procedures relating to:
 - the appointment of examiners;
 - assuring the quality of examinations;
 - requests for exemption;
 - fraud;
 - the recording of the members' signatures.

Chapter 3 Appointment of examiners

3.1.1 Before the start of each academic year, and further as often as necessary, the Board of Examiners will appoint examiners for conducting examinations and determining the results of those examinations, and will inform the examiners of this in writing.

3.1.2 An examiner must have the necessary expertise in terms of subject matter and assessment skills, in accordance with the requirements specified in Article 4.2.

3.1.3 The Board of Examiners may appoint more than one examiner for any examination.

3.1.4 The Board of Examiners may appoint external examiners. The Board will ascertain that these examiners meet the established quality requirements. The external examiners will receive a letter of appointment from the Board of Examiners, stating that they have been appointed as an external examiner, and for which examination they have been appointed.

3.1.5 The Board of Examiners will inform the students and relevant staff regarding the examiners who have been appointed. This information will be published on the website of the programme in question.

3.1.6 The Board of Examiners can rescind the appointment if there are serious grounds for doing so.

3.1.7 The examiners will provide the Board of Examiners with all information as requested.

Chapter 4 Examinations

Article 4.1 Format of the examinations

4.1.1 The format of the examinations is laid down in the OER and/or Prospectus. In exceptional cases, the Board of Examiners may decide, in consultation with the examiner, that an examination will be held in a

format other than that stated in the OER. On behalf of the Board of Examiners, the examiner will announce the format in which the examination will be held at latest at the start of the educational component the form in which the examination will be held and whether books, readers, notes etcetera may be consulted during the examination.

4.1.2 The Board of Examiners may agree to an alternative method of examination than that laid down in the OER and in the Prospectus, if the student submits a reasoned request to this effect. The Board of Examiners will decide on this, after consultation with the examiner, within 30 working days after receipt of the request.

4.1.3 Further provisions for constituent examinations are as follows:

- a. For constituent examinations the rules for examinations as described in the OER (Chapter 4) or announced as described in 4.1.1 are applicable;
- b. Students may resit one examination that they passed, under the conditions stipulated in the Course and Examination Regulations (art. 4.1.8).. Constituent examinations that have not been successfully completed must be retaken as long as the final mark is not yet sufficient.
- c. The examiner can require a minimum mark for a constituent examination;
- d. The final mark for the examination is determined by the weighted average of the constituent examinations. For this purpose each constituent examination is given a mark, also when the constituent examination consists of a practical;
- e. The contribution of each constituent examination to the final mark must be published in the Prospectus or arranged according to 4.1.1.
- f. The student can participate in each constituent examination at least twice a year except for partial examinations consisting of a laboratory practical or a practical assignment which is part of a FOS course. All cases for which this article does not provide will be decided by the Board of Examiners.

Article 4.2 Quality assurance of examinations

4.2.1 Each examination will comprise an assessment of the student's knowledge, understanding and skills, and also the evaluation of the outcome of that assessment.

4.2.2 The questions and assignments of an examination will be clear and unambiguous, and will contain sufficient instructions on the detail required in the answers.

4.2.3 The examination will be appropriate and will serve exclusively to assess whether the student has developed the qualities that were determined in advance as the learning objectives of the course component concerned, and were laid down in the OER/Prospectus.

4.2.4 The examination will be so specific that only those students who have a sufficient command of the material will be able to provide adequate answers. The examination will correspond to the level of the course component.

4.2.5 The questions and assignments of the examination will be distributed as evenly as possible over the prescribed reading material.

4.2.6 The questions and assignments of the examination will relate only to the material announced in advance as prescribed examination material. It will be clear to students in advance how they will be assessed, and on what they will be assessed.

4.2.7 The questions and assignments of an exam should be devised by at least two examiners (the four eyes principle).

4.2.8 The duration of each examination will be such that the student may reasonably be expected to have sufficient time to answer the questions and/or complete the assignments.

4.2.9 Written or online tests will be assessed on the basis of pre-determined, written criteria.

4.2.10 The procedures relating to the quality assurance of examinations will have been established by the Board of Examiners.

4.2.11 The Board of Examiners will evaluate the validity, reliability and usability of the examinations. The outcome of this evaluation will be discussed with the examiner(s) concerned.

4.2.12 The Board of Examiners can also conduct an investigation into the validity, reliability and

usability of the examination, if evaluations or results give cause for this.

4.2.13 In completing the evaluation referred to in 4.2.11 and 4.2.12, the Board of Examiners can request the assistance of experts.

4.2.14 The Board of Examiners will guarantee the quality of the way of invigilation is carried out, both on campus and online, and will pay particular attention to the following aspects:

- Whether sufficient measures are taken to prevent fraud during the examination;
- Whether the identity of the student taking the examination can be verified;
- Whether it can be confirmed that the examination has been completed within the time set.

4.2.15 Examiners of taught modules within the programme are requested to draw up an assessment plan using the provided format, which provides information on at least the following topics:

- The relationship between the assessment(s) and the final attainment levels, competences and learning objectives;
- The form(s) of assessment, the accompanying assessment criteria, and, if applicable rubric answers;
- The way the grades are fixed.

4.2.16 Examiners are requested to make the assessment plan available to the students well in advance to the assessment(s).

Article 4.3 Admission requirements for examinations and practical assignments

4.3.1 The examiner will ascertain that the student fulfils the conditions for admission to the examination, as laid down in the OER and/or Prospectus or ensuing from the Act or University regulations.

4.3.2 A request as referred to in Article 4.2.2 of the OER will only be processed if it is accompanied by a study plan and, if applicable, a list of subsidiary activities recognised by the Executive Board in which the student has participated or is intending to participate.

4.3.3 The degree programme sets certain conditions for participation in resits. These conditions are laid down in the OER and the Prospectus and mentioned in Article 4.1.3.

4.3.4 The degree programme sets certain conditions for participation in and/or assessment of research internships. These are laid down in the OER and the Prospectus.

4.3.5 The degree programme has additional conditions regarding prior knowledge for participation in course components, examinations or practical assignments. These are laid down in the OER and the Prospectus.

Article 4.4 Dates of the examinations

4.4.1 Unless otherwise stipulated in the OER and the Prospectus, the dates on which written or online examinations will be held will be determined and announced on behalf of the Board of Examiners no later than one month before the start of the academic year. In cases of *force majeure*, the date should be announced at least five days in advance. In case of modules (e.g. Frontiers of Science Courses, Appendix III of the OER) for which assessment is mainly based on partial examinations other than a written examination, the announcement will be restricted to the dates of the modules, while details of assessment will be announced as described in 4.1.1.

4.4.2 There may be variation from the provisions of 4.4.1 in the event of *force majeure*, after advice has been given by the Department Teaching Committee and if it can reasonably be expected not to harm the interests of the students.

4.4.3 The dates for oral examinations will be determined by the examiner, if possible in consultation with the students.

4.4.4 The provisions of 4.4.3 will as far as possible apply equally to tests other than written or oral tests.

Article 4.5 Registration for and withdrawal from examinations

4.5.1 An examination can only be taken, and its result assessed, after the student has registered for participation in a manner that has been determined and announced by the Executive Board of the LUMC. For Frontiers of Science (FOS) courses this means registration for the course at latest two months before the start of the course, except for courses starting in September, for which registration not later than one month before

the start of the course is required.

4.5.2 In exceptional cases, the Board of Examiners may permit variation from the provisions of 4.5.1 regarding the latest date and the manner of registration.

4.5.3 During the period in which it is possible to register for an examination or FOS-course, withdrawal is also permitted, by the same means.

4.5.4 Withdrawal from an examination or FOS-course during the period between the registration deadline and the start of the examination will only be possible in the event of *force majeure*, to be decided at the discretion of the Board of Examiners.

4.5.5 If a student who has registered for a FOS-course and does not appear or cancels registration not according to article 4.5.3. the Board of Examiners can decide that registrations for further FOS-courses will be cancelled.

4.5.6 If a student who has registered for a FOS-course and has not withdrawn from an examination and does not take that examination, the examination will nevertheless be deemed to have been taken, except in the event of *force majeure*, to be decided at the discretion of the Board of Examiners.

Article 4.6 Conducting examinations and orderly conduct during an examination

4.6.1 The Executive Board of the LUMC will arrange that for written or online examinations, if necessary, invigilators are appointed to ensure that order is maintained during the examination. The invigilators other than the examiner will perform their duties under the responsibility and instruction of the examiner / invigilator.

4.6.2 A student must provide proof of identity, in the form of a student ID card and legally valid ID, when so requested by or on behalf of the examiner.

4.6.3 Students will only be admitted to the room where the examination is being held up to 45 minutes after the specified starting time (30 minutes in case of examinations remotely online), and may not leave the room earlier than 60 minutes after the specified starting time of the examination.

4.6.4 For online assessments, students are admitted to the (digital) room, in case of login problems, the student immediately contacts the Digital Assessment Office.

4.6.5 If an examination is taken online or digitally and a (technical) failure occurs, which means that the examination cannot be continued, the Board of Examiners will decide whether and when a new examination can be scheduled.

4.6.6 A student can refuse to take part in an online examination using proctoring on the grounds of serious privacy objections. The student must inform the Board of Examiners accordingly as soon as possible. The student can ask the Board of Examiners for an alternative assessment. The Board of Examiners can decide to allow an alternative assessment or decide that the student must wait until the examination can be taken in another form.

4.6.7 Data storage- and communication devices, including mobile telephones, smartwatches and smartphones must be switched off and put away in a closed bag while the examination takes place. Other electronic equipment may not be used, except with the permission of the examiner.

4.6.8 Students are required to comply with all instructions of the Board of Examiners or the examiner that were published before the start of the examination, and all instructions that are given during and immediately after the examination.

4.6.9 Any student who creates a disturbance will receive a warning. If the student continues to create a disturbance, the examiner or invigilator can ask the student to leave the room. The examiner will then write an official report, and will inform the student concerned that the examination will not be assessed until the Board of Examiners has reached a decision.

4.6.10 The examiner will immediately inform the Board of Examiners in writing of any measure taken pursuant to the provisions of 4.6.9

Article 4.7 Examinations using proctoring

4.7.1 Students will be informed via Brightspace at least 10 working days in advance of the relevant

conditions for taking an examination using proctoring and of the maximum length of the examination.

4.7.2 By taking part in the examination the student agrees to the recording and collection of data by the proctoring system.

4.7.3 If the examiner is unable to verify that all the conditions mentioned in this article have been met, the examiner cannot determine whether the examination has been taken in correctly. The examination can then be declared invalid.

ExaminerExaminerExaminerExaminerexaminerexaminer

Article 4.8 Effective provisions for examinees with a functional disability

4.8.1 A student who has a functional disability as referred to in the Equal Treatment Act is entitled to effective modifications – as much as is reasonably possible – when taking an examination.

4.8.2 The Board of Examiners will decide on a request for effective modifications, considering the legal rules and the Leiden University protocol on studying with a functional disability.

4.8.3 A request for an effective modification will be submitted to the student dean or the study adviser.

Article 4.9 Orderly conduct during a laboratory practical

4.9.1 The supervisor(s) of the practical will arrange that for the practical experiments, if necessary, laboratory assistants are appointed to ensure that order is maintained during the practical.

4.9.2 A student must provide proof of identity, in the form of a student ID card and legally valid ID, when so requested by or on behalf of the examiner.

4.9.3 Students are required to immediately comply with all instructions given by the practical supervisor(s) before or during the practical.

4.9.4 Any student who creates a disturbance will receive a warning. If the student continues to create a disturbance, the examiner can ask the student to leave the practical room. The examiner will then write an official report, and will inform the student concerned that the practical will not be assessed until the Board of Examiners has reached a decision. The examiner will immediately inform the Board of Examiners of this measure.

Article 4.10 Oral examinations

4.10.1 Oral examinations are preferably conducted by two members of teaching staff, at least one of whom must be an authorised examiner. If this is the case, then one of the two members of teaching staff will take brief notes during the examination, i.e. will write down point-by-point what topics are covered and will indicate whether the student has sufficient understanding of these topics. If only one authorised examiner is present at the oral examination, then both written notes and an audio recording will be made.

4.10.2 The Board of Examiners may decide that a specific oral examination will be taken by several students together, if the students who are to be examined agree to this.

Article 4.11 Assessment of final paper, JRP-I, JRP-II and Scientific Review

4.11.1 The Board of Examiners establishes the criteria for the assessment of all final written reports, the procedure for the appointment of the first and second examiner/reviewer, the assessment form and the division of responsibilities between the first and second examiner and the check for plagiarism/fraud. The final paper will always be assessed independently by two examiners/reviewers.

4.11.2 The assessment of papers, presentations, research reports or other products will be based on the individual contribution (s) made by the student.

4.11.3 The final reports of JRP-I, JRP-II and the Scientific Review will always be assessed by the supervisor and an independent examiner/reviewer appointed by the Master's Internship Committee. The final grade will be determined by an examiner of the Master's Internship Committee. In case of an insufficient grade or a large discrepancy of the judgments of supervisor and reviewer, the Master's Internship Committee will follow the procedure as described in Appendix 1.

Article 4.12 Period of validity of examinations

At the request of the student, and after consultation with the examiner concerned, the Board of Examiners may extend the period of validity of pass results for examinations, as laid down in the OER, by a maximum of one year each time, provided that this is justified by personal circumstances and there have been no radical changes to the learning objectives of the course component. If the student receives a financial allowance from the Profiling Fund in connection with exceptional individual circumstances, as referred to in Article 7.51(2) of the Act, the Board of Examiners can extend the period of validity in individual cases for the duration of the financial allowance.

Article 4.13 Inspection and evaluative discussion

4.13.1 During the period stated in the OER, the questions and assignments of the examination concerned are available for inspection, together with the criteria that were used in making the assessment. The questions and assignments can be viewed on a single occasion, at a location to be specified by the Board of Examiners.

4.13.2 Students are not permitted to make copies of, distribute or publish the questions and assignments or marking keys in any manner whatsoever.

4.13.3 If ten or more candidates have taken a written or online examination at the same time, the examiner will hold a collective evaluative discussion at a time and place to be specified by the examiner.

Article 4.14 Exemption from examinations and practical assignments

4.14.1 Students may submit to the Board of Examiners a reasoned, written request for exemption from taking one or more examinations or from the obligation to participate in one or more practical assignments, as referred to in the OER.

4.14.2 The Board of Examiners will reach a reasoned decision within thirty working days after the submission of the request. If the Board of Examiners is considering refusing the request, the student may be given the opportunity to state his/her case.

Article 4.15 Retention periods

4.15.1 The examination and model answers will be retained for a period of at least seven years. The work carried out in the context of an examination will be retained for at least two years.

4.15.2 A student's paper of JRP-I, JRP-II and Scientific Review, including the assessment form, will be retained for a period of at least seven years.

4.15.3 The decisions of the Board of Examiners and the results of all (final) examinations taken will be carefully recorded. Access to the recorded information will be restricted to persons who have been given such permission by the Board of Examiners.

Article 4.16 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)

The Board of Examiners of the LUMC think highly of a proper application of the GDPR and following the policy of Leiden University. In this exceptional situation, the possibilities are limited. Online proctoring is currently the most suitable way to allow testing to proceed as much as possible. The student is not obliged to take the assessments through Online Proctoring. However, consequences that may arise from not participating in assessments via Online Proctoring, such as study delay, are at the student's risk.

Chapter 5 Final examinations and degree certificates

Article 5.1 Taking the final examination

5.1.1. The master's final examination can be taken if a pass grade has been attained for all examinations and work placements of the two academic years (at least 120 credits) of the master's programme in Biomedical Sciences, as referred to in Article 3.1 and Appendix II of the OER.

5.1.2. Notwithstanding 5.1.1. and pursuant to Article 4.10.2 of the OER, the Board of Examiners can decide

that the final examination will include an additional test, as referred to in 4.2.1, which it will conduct itself.

Article 5.2 Compensation

Not applicable.

Article 5.3 Approval of individual curricula for final examinations

A reasoned, written request for approval of an individual curriculum for a final examination, as referred to in Article 7.3j of the Act, must be submitted to the Board of Examiners before taking part in the subjects. The Board of Examiners will decide within thirty working days after receipt of the request.

Article 5.4 Degree certificate and diploma supplement

5.4.1 After the Executive Board has declared that the procedural requirements for issuing a degree certificate have been fulfilled, the Board of Examiners will present a degree certificate, as evidence that the student has passed the final examination. This degree certificate will show the information stipulated in Article 7.11(2), of the Act.

5.4.2 The degree certificate will be drawn up in English, and as well as in Latin. The degree certificate will be signed with a wet signature by at least one of the members of the Board of Examiners.²

5.4.3 The Board of Examiners will add a diploma supplement to the certificate stating that the student has passed the final examination. The aim of the supplement is to provide insight into the nature and content of the completed degree programme, also with a view to international recognition of degree programmes. The Leiden University diploma supplement conforms with the standard European diploma supplement. The final page of the diploma supplement will be signed with a wet signature by at least one of the members of the Board of Examiners.

5.4.4 A student who has passed one or more examinations but cannot be awarded a degree certificate, as referred to in 5.4.1, will on request be given a statement issued by the Board of Examiners, showing at least the examinations that the student has passed.

Article 5.5 Final examination grade

5.5.1 The Board of Examiners may award the examination candidate a final grade (*judicium*) for his/her work in the context of the final examination. This final grade is based on the average of the grades achieved for the course components covered by the final examination, weighted according to course load. The components that are given a description such as 'satisfactory' or 'good', or for which an exemption is granted, are not taken into consideration.

5.5.2 The Board of Examiners will grant the designation cum laude or summa cum laude in accordance with the relevant provisions of the OER.

5.5.3 In following of the cum laude rule change per 01-09-2022; students who started the BMS Master's degree program before this date may be granted the designation "cum laude" if all components of the master's programme were passed at the first attempt with a grade of 7.3 or higher.

Article 5.6 Retention periods

The results of the final examinations are disclosed (in the public register of Leiden University). The registers containing the results of the examinations will be retained indefinitely.

Article 5.7 Exclusion from the degree programme or certain of its components

5.7.1 If, in accordance with Article 7.42a of the Act, a student has demonstrated by behaviour or remarks that the student is unfit to practise one or more of the professions for which the student is being trained in the degree programme that the student is following, or is unsuited to engage in practical preparation for professional practice, the Board of Examiners will, on request, issue advice to the Executive Board regarding the refusal or termination of that student's enrolment in the degree programme.

5.7.2 If the student referred to in Article 5.7.1 is enrolled in another degree programme, with courses of a specialisation similar to or, in terms of the practical preparation for professional practice, related to the BMS degree programme for which the enrolment has been terminated pursuant to Article 7.42a(1) of the

² A wet signature is a signature with lightfast ink.

Act, the Board of Examiners will, on request, issue advice to the Executive Board regarding whether the student can be permitted to follow this specialisation or other components of this degree programme.

5.7.3 The Board of Examiners will issue advice as referred to in 5.7.1 or 5.7.2 within ten working days after this request has been made by the Executive Board.

Chapter 6 Fraud, irregularities and plagiarism

Article 6.1 Fraud

6.1.1 Fraud is understood to mean:

any action or omission that makes it completely or partly impossible to form a proper assessment of an individual's knowledge, insights, skills, professional attitude or reflection, including in any event:

- a. during an examination, including an online examination, or practical assignment, having unauthorised access to communication devices, software such as unauthorised AI software or documents;
- b. during an online or other examination or a written assignment, having available unauthorised notes (crib sheets) in the permitted material;
- c. during an online or other examination or a practical assignment, completely or partly copying the answers of another person, or through software such as unauthorised AI software;
- d. during an online or other examination or a practical assignment, exchanging information with another person;
- e. during an online or other examination or a practical assignment, impersonating another person;
- f. plagiarism, this being conduct that contravenes the Leiden University Code of Conduct on Plagiarism (Appendix 2);
- g. modifying the submitted examination (digital or otherwise) at the inspection;

6.1.2 Fraud is also taken to mean gaining access or attempting to gain access on improper grounds to the programme, or a constituent examination, practical assignment or examination.

6.1.3 Other behaviour which the examination committee, on the basis of the rules laid down and communicated within the faculty or programme, considers to be fraud.

Article 6.2 Documents brought into the examination by students

6.2.1 If a student is permitted to use a document that he/she has personally brought into the examination, this document must not contain any notes. The examiner decides which texts a student is permitted to use during the examination.

6.2.2 For the purposes of the previous paragraph, notes are not understood to mean:

- underlining, highlighting and marking with fluorescent felt pen;

6.2.3 Not applicable

Article 6.3 Disciplinary measures to be taken by the Examiner in the event of irregularities of fraud

6.3.1 In the event of observation or serious suspicion of any irregularity or fraud during the examination, the examiner will notify the student of this immediately. The student will be permitted to finish the examination. After the examination, the examiner and the student will fill in the official report form. This official report form will be submitted immediately to the Board of Examiners, and the student will also receive a copy. The examiner may confiscate any items in the possession of the student that could be relevant in assessing the irregularity or fraud.

6.3.2 If the examiner requests this, a student is obliged to surrender to the examiner any items in the student's possession that could be relevant in assessing an irregularity or act of fraud, for the purpose of that evaluation. The confiscated items will be returned to the student within a reasonable period of time after the examination.

6.3.3 The examiner will give the items that the examiner has confiscated to the Board of Examiners. In the case of notes in a legislative text or other compendium of texts, the availability of aids that the examiner had not permitted (such as a book), and suchlike, the examiner can provide the Board of Examiners with photocopies of the confiscated items, instead of the actual items. In all cases, the examiner can provide the Board of Examiners with an official report of the observed irregularity or fraud, signed by two examiners / invigilators, instead of confiscated items or the said photocopies.

6.3.4 If an invigilator observes an irregularity, act of fraud or disturbance during the examination, he/she must notify the examiner immediately.

6.3.5 The student's name and student number and the nature of the irregularity are recorded on the official report form. The student preferably signs the form as 'seen', below the description of the irregularity.

6.3.6 When suspicion of sub i to ix of art. 6.1b is noticed, this will be immediately reported by the Digital Assessment Office to the relevant Board of Examiners. Violation of sub iii to ix of art. 6.1b can lead to the Board of Examiners declaring the assessment invalid. If the student does not agree with this decision, the student can submit a reasoned request within 5 working days to the Board of Examiners to consider the matter. All suspicions that fall under i to ii of art. 6.1b and all other behaviors that can be considered irregular are reported by the Digital Assessment Office to the relevant Board of Examiners, after which the Board of Examiners will institute an investigation and, where necessary, determine a sanction.

Article 6.4 Disciplinary measures to be taken by the Board of Examiners in the event of irregularities or fraud

6.4.1 In the event of any irregularity or fraud during an examination or practical assignment, the Board of Examiners can interview the examiner, student, invigilators and other persons.

6.4.2 The Board of Examiners will decide on the basis of the official report and the findings from the interviews whether a sanction should be imposed and, if so, what the appropriate sanction is. The examination will only be assessed, as referred to in 6.3.1, after the Board of Examiners has reached a decision in which the examination is released for assessment.

6.4.3 The disciplinary measures that can be imposed by the Board of Examiners are:

declaring the results of the examination invalid and awarding a grade of 1 for the examination (this is a remedial sanction aimed at removing the consequences of the offence)

- a. excluding the student from participation in the examination regarding which the irregularity or fraud was observed for a maximum period of one year;
- b. excluding the student from participation in one or more other examinations for the maximum period of one year;
- c. excluding the student from participation in examinations and the final examination of one or more degree programmes provided by the LUMC for a maximum period of one year;
- d. examinations of another faculty or higher education institution that are passed during the exclusion period, also including assignments, papers and theses, cannot be included in the final examination of the MSc Biomedical Sciences degree programme in any way whatsoever.
- e. if the decision is made to impose a sanction and the student has previously committed fraud, this circumstance can also be taken into consideration.

6.4.4 In the event of serious fraud, the Executive Board may decide to definitively terminate the programme of the student in question, in view of Article 7.42(3) of the Act.

Article 6.5 Disciplinary measures to be taken as a result of plagiarism

6.5.1 If the examiner detects plagiarism in an assignment, paper, thesis or research project, the examiner will notify the Board of Examiners of this as soon as possible. The procedure for plagiarism detection has been described in Appendix 2.

6.5.2 The examiner will provide the Board of Examiners with the relevant work and if available the report generated by the plagiarism detection programme, accompanied by his/her own findings. In the event of suspected plagiarism, the Board of Examiners may interview the examiner, the lecturer, the student and

others.

6.5.3 The disciplinary measures that may be imposed by the Board of Examiners are

- a. giving an official warning and include this in the student file;
- b. declaring the (constituent) examination, essay, paper, thesis or research assignment to be invalid or to mark the result of the (constituent) examination a 1.0;
- c. for a maximum period of one year, refusing to accept from the student concerned any assignment, paper, thesis or research project of the kind regarding which plagiarism was detected, including assignments etc. from another faculty or higher education institution that are completed with a pass result, and excluding the student concerned from participation in preparing or conducting such assignments, papers, theses or research projects;
- d. and/or excluding the student from participation in one or more examinations for a maximum period of one year, and/or excluding the student from participation in examinations and the final examination of one or more degree programmes provided by the Faculty for a maximum period of one year. Examinations of another faculty or higher education institution that are passed during the exclusion period cannot be included in the final examination of the degree programme in any way whatsoever.
- e. In the case of serious fraud, the Executive Board may, at the proposal of the Board of Examiners, definitively terminate the student's enrolment in the degree programme, in accordance with Article 7.42(3) of the Act.

Article 6.6 Irregularities

If there are serious irregularities (or reasonable grounds to suspect irregularities) regarding fraud prior to or during an examination but it is not possible to identify the individual students to which this relates, the Board of Examiners may declare the examination in question invalid for all students. In such an instance, the examination will need to be conducted again. The Board of Examiners will set a new examination date as soon as possible. In this respect, irregularities can also be taken to mean technical faults, for instance in the case of digital examinations, and the Board of Examiners may declare the examination invalid on these grounds.

Chapter 7 The binding study advice

Not applicable

Chapter 8 Complaints and appeals

Article 8.1 Lodging a complaint or appeal

8.1.1 A student who wishes to lodge a complaint or administrative appeal, as referred to in Article 7.61(1) of the Act, regarding a decision taken by the Board of Examiners or by one or more of the examiners appointed by the Board of Examiners, should lodge this complaint or appeal with the Examination Appeals Board.

8.1.2 The time limit for lodging a written administrative appeal, as referred to in 8.1.1, is six weeks after the written notification of the decision that is the subject of the administrative appeal.

Article 8.2 Handling of complaints

Complaints are handled in accordance with the current procedures laid down in the Regulations relating to the Ombudsperson, the Regulation on Other Complaints, the Regulations of the Examination Appeals Board and the General Administrative Law Act (Awb).

Article 8.3 Handling of appeals

Administrative appeals are dealt with in accordance with the current procedures. These are laid down in the Regulations of the Examination Appeals Board and the Student Charter.

Chapter 9 Annual report

Article 9.1 Reporting

9.1.1 Each year, the Board of Examiners will produce a report of its activities, and will submit this report to the Executive Board of the LUMC.

The report will comply with the requirements set by the Executive Board and will in any case contain the most important decisions of the Board of Examiners and a description of how the Board of Examiners has fulfilled its duty with respect to the quality assurance of examinations, as referred to in Article 4.2.

Chapter 10 Final provisions

Article 10.1 Exceptional circumstances

10.1.1 All cases for which these Rules and Regulations do not provide will be decided by the Board of Examiners.

10.1.2 If, in exceptional cases, the strict application of the provisions of these Rules and Regulations would result in evident unfairness, the Board of Examiners is authorised to reach an alternative decision.

Article 10.2 Changes

10.2.1 If changes to these Rules and Regulations relate to the current academic year, or have serious consequences for students who were already enrolled in the degree programme, every possible effort will be made to prevent the interests of the students concerned being harmed in any way.

Article 10.3 Effective date

These Rules and Regulations will enter into effect on September 1st, 2023

Appendices

Appendix 1

Protocol for an insufficient grade for an internship report or a large discrepancy between grading by project coordinator and reviewer (2 points or more)

This protocol applies to the following conditions:

(1) Insufficient grade by CIS examiner

- An insufficient ('*O-onvoldoende*') will be registered in USIS.
- Student will get a resit; student discusses the report with CIS and will rewrite the report. After these corrections, the new grade by CIS will not be higher than 7.
- Grade for the original report by project coordinator and reviewer will be maintained.
- Final grade will be determined by an examiner of the MIC.

(2) Insufficient grade by reviewer, whereas the project coordinator has given a sufficient grade

In this case, an examiner from the MIC will contact the project coordinator and the reviewer to get more detailed arguments for the respective grades. Based on these arguments, the examiner will decide whether there can be consensus.

- When the consensus is a sufficient grade – this will be the final grade
- When the consensus is an insufficient grade – this will be registered in USIS ('*O-onvoldoende*'). The examiner will initiate the procedure for improvement, preferentially guided by the project coordinator and possibly by CIS. After improvement, the original grade of the project coordinator remains and the grade for the reviewer will be determined as a 6. The final grade is determined by an examiner of the MIC.
- When there is no consensus, the examiner of the MIC invites a third person for the review process. The grade of this reviewer will be decisive for sufficiency: when insufficient, the procedure above will be followed and when sufficient, the final grade will be the median (middle value) of the three grades.

(3) 2 points (or more) difference between the grades given by project coordinator and reviewer.

In this case, an examiner from the MIC will contact the project coordinator and the reviewer to get more detailed arguments for the respective grades. Based on these arguments the examiner will decide whether there can be consensus.

- When there is a consensus – this will be the final grade
- When there is no consensus - the examiner of the MIC invites a third person for the review process. The final grade will be the median (middle value) of the three grades. In this way there will be more weight to the grades which are close to each other.

Examiner

Appendix 2

Procedure for plagiarism detection in written assignments in courses (FOS, compulsory or elective), Junior Research Project 1, Junior Research Project 2, and Scientific Review

Written proposal/assignment in a course (FOS, compulsory or elective)

- The student hands in his/her written assignment to the supervisor via e-mail;
- All corrections (both by the student and by the supervisor) will be made with track changes until the final grade is established (for later reference in case irregularities are found);
- The final version will be submitted via Turnitin and will be sent to the supervisor via e-mail. The course coordinator will check for plagiarism using the Turnitin-generated report and will grade the final version of the written assignment;
- In case the course coordinator suspects plagiarism, he/she will inform the board of examiners who will investigate the case, take a decision and communicate this to the course coordinator; In case plagiarism has been established, sanctions will incur as specified below;
- In case plagiarism has been established, sanctions will be determined individually for each plagiarism case but in principle, the student will incur sanctions leading to a study delay of around 3 months. This may include exclusion from taking further examinations for a certain period of time. In addition, the student will not be allowed to take/re-take the written proposal/assignment for a period of 3 months. The written assignment will be considered invalid and graded with 1 (recorded as a failed course);
- The student will write a new version of the assignment and submit it via Turnitin; the coordinator will check for plagiarism;

Junior Research Project 1 (JRP1)

- The student writes his/her report using feed-back from the project coordinator and/or daily supervisor. All corrections (both by the student and by the project coordinator/daily supervisor) will be made with track changes and all versions will be saved until the final grade is established (for later reference in case irregularities are found);
- The student uploads the final draft of his/her report in Turnitin and discusses the final draft and the Turnitin report with the project coordinator. The project coordinator approves the final draft of the report and attests on the assessment form that the originality of the report has been discussed with the student;
- The student uploads the final version of the report in KL-app for assessment.
- The final version of the report is also uploaded by the student in Turnitin and CIS will check the report for plagiarism;
- CIS will attest in KLAPP that the report has been checked in Turnitin for plagiarism;
- In case plagiarism is suspected, CIS will inform the MIC and report to the board of examiners;
- The board of examiners will investigate the case, take a decision and communicate this back to CIS/MIC; in case plagiarism has been established, the student and project coordinator will be informed and sanctions will incur as specified below;
- The sanctions will be determined individually by the board of examiners for each plagiarism case but in principle, the student will incur sanctions leading to a study delay of around 6 months. This may include exclusion from taking further examinations for a certain period of time. In addition, the student will not be allowed to take/re-take JRP1 for a period of 6 months. The report will be considered invalid and graded with 1 (recorded as a failed JRP1); the student will submit a new version of the report via Turnitin and plagiarism will be checked by CIS.

Junior Research Project 2 (JRP2)

- The student writes his/her report using feed-back from the project coordinator and/or daily supervisor. All corrections (both by the student and by the project coordinator/daily supervisor) will be made with track changes and all versions will be saved until the final grade is established (for later reference in case irregularities are found);
- After approval of the final version of the report by the project coordinator, the student will upload the final version of the report in KL-app and Turnitin;
- CIS will check the final version of the report for plagiarism;
- CIS will attest in KLAPP that the report has been checked in Turnitin for plagiarism;
- In case plagiarism is suspected, CIS will inform the MIC and report to the board of examiners;
- The board of examiners will investigate the case, take a decision and communicate this back to the MIC/CIS; In case plagiarism has been established, sanctions will incur as specified below;
- The sanctions will be determined individually by the board of examiners for each plagiarism case but in principle, the student will incur sanctions leading to a study delay of around 6 months. This may include exclusion from taking further examinations for a certain period of time. In addition, the student will not be allowed to take/re-take JRP2/elective internship for a period of 6 months. The internship will be considered invalid and graded with 1 (recorded as a failed JRP2 or elective internship); the student will submit one new version of the report via Turnitin and plagiarism will be checked by CIS.

Scientific review

- The student writes his/her Scientific review using feed-back from the project coordinator. All corrections (both by the student and by the project coordinator) will be made with track changes and all versions will be saved until the final grade is established (for later reference in case irregularities are found);
- After approval of the final version of the scientific review by the project coordinator, the student will upload the final version in KLAPP and Turnitin;
- CIS will check the final version of the Scientific review for plagiarism;
- CIS will attest in KLAPP that the review has been checked in Turnitin for plagiarism;
- In case plagiarism is suspected, CIS will inform the MIC and report to the board of examiners.
- The board of examiners will investigate the case, take a decision and communicate this back to the MIC/CIS; In case plagiarism has been established, sanctions will incur as specified below;
- The sanctions will be determined individually by the board of examiners for each plagiarism case but in principle, the student will incur sanctions leading to a study delay of around 6 months. This may include exclusion from taking further examinations for a certain period of time. In addition, the student will not be allowed to take/re-take the scientific review for a period of 6 months. The report will be considered invalid and graded with 1 (recorded as a failed Scientific review); the student will submit one new version of the Scientific review via Turnitin and plagiarism will be checked by CIS.

In all cases: in case the student commits plagiarism for the second time, he/she will be excluded from any form of examination for 1 year.

APPENDIX 3

LEIDEN UNIVERSITY CODE OF CONDUCT ON PLAGIARISM

Plagiarism

On these pages, Leiden University will explain its views on plagiarism, how it is defined, and what consequences may be faced by students who commit this offence.

Generally, plagiarism is understood as presenting, intentionally or otherwise, someone's else's words, thoughts, analyses, argumentations, pictures, techniques, computer programmes, etc. as your own work - including generated texts or programming codes by software such as AI software without indicating the source. This includes not only 'cutting and pasting' digital sources such as encyclopaedias, digital magazines without inverted commas and reference.

Most students will understand that cutting and pasting is not allowed without mentioning the source of the material, but plagiarism has a wider meaning. This also applies to presenting AI software-generated text or programming code - as by ChatGPT - as your own text in an exam or thesis, without proper citation of the source. Paraphrasing someone else's texts, e.g. by replacing a few words by synonyms or interchanging some sentences is also plagiarism. Even reproducing in your own words a reasoning or analysis made by someone else may constitute plagiarism if you do not add any content of your own; in so doing, you create the impression that you have invented the argumentation yourself while this is not the case. The same still applies if you bring together bits of work by various authors without mentioning the sources. Plagiarism is the act of copying data or sections of text from others in a thesis or other work without citing the source. The use of language models such as ChatGPT offers all kinds of new possibilities for creating texts. Realise that if you do this and present it as your own work, it will be considered fraud. Therefore, use ChatGPT in your studies only when the lecturer approves it and when you mention it.

Quoting sources

Plagiarism is always a violation of someone else's intellectual property rights. Obviously, each discipline advances by building on the knowledge and understanding gained and published earlier. There is no objection at all if you refer to previous work and quote it while mentioning the source. It must, however, remain clear where existing knowledge ends and where you start presenting the results of your own thinking or research. As long as you are not capable of contributing to the discipline by adding something essential to what others have already found, it is misleading and therefore wrong to pretend you have reached that level. It is very important for both the teacher and the student to have a correct impression of the knowledge, understanding and skills of the latter.

Internet texts

The rules concerning plagiarism apply to all data sources, not just books; extracts from internet pages may not be used without mentioning the source either. Contrary to what some people may think, internet texts are not public property; it is equally important here that you never present someone else's work as your own.

Dos and don'ts

To help you to avoid committing plagiarism or related offences, we indicate below some dos and don'ts.

1. When copying someone else's texts, pictures, graphs, etc., including texts generated via software such as AI software, obey the rules set out by your department, for example, in the thesis regulations. As a rule, you should generally put the text between quotes. In certain cases, a clearly different lay-out may be used.. Always mention their author and origin, using one of the common or prescribed ways to indicate references.
2. If you want to reproduce someone else's thoughts, considerations, ideas, etc., in your own words without using literal quotes, make unambiguously clear who is the source of these ideas and avoid giving the impression they may be attributed to you

3. Be even more cautious when copying texts from the internet. Take Wikipedia as an example: the author is usually unknown, but the article may well be plagiarised, in part or in full. In general, avoid copying texts from unknown authors, even if you mention the source you used. Also, texts generated via AI software, such as ChatGPT, you cannot just copy as your own.
4. When you partially copy texts, be careful not to change their meaning by leaving out sentences or parts of sentences, or by turning them around, etc. If you do not have the original version of a text and therefore must rely on a reproduction by someone else, make this clear as well; if it turns out the original author has been quoted incorrectly, it will then be clear who made the mistake.
5. If others have contributed to your work, for instance by carrying out experiments, preparing illustrations, etc., you should mention this too. This does not apply to advice and comments from your supervisor, nor if someone proofreads your text for style, grammar and spelling errors. In some cases, relevant rules are set out in departmental regulations.
6. In some cases, even citing your own work may be considered plagiarism (sometimes called 'autoplagerism'). When you largely copy a paper you have produced for a prior assignment and then submit it again for another assignment, you deliver only one performance instead of the required two. This will not always be considered problematic, but you should discuss it with the lecturer involved.
7. Strictly speaking, composing a thesis, for example, largely from acknowledged quotations does not result in plagiarism. Yet, few teachers will accept your paper if your contribution is limited to cutting and pasting texts. After all, teachers will hold you to the learning objectives of a unit of study. Moreover, very long quotations may violate copyrights. If work by others in its entirety is essential for your paper, then refer to it, possibly with a short summary of its contents, without quoting from it.
8. If a paper or thesis was written in co-operation between several students, make clear, as far as possible, who authored the various parts.
9. In principle, the same set of rules applies to copying computer programmes. Using standardised procedures that are common to many applications, there is no question of plagiarism; in such cases, the original author is often unknown. It is a different matter if you copy the underlying idea or the approach of a whole programme, even if it is developed somewhat differently. When comparing it to ordinary language, the use of words and common sentences is not plagiarism, but copying whole paragraphs or the underlying ideas and thoughts is.

Combatting plagiarism

Plagiarism is a form of fraud and is therefore an offence. For some time now, the University has been taking active steps to combat plagiarism. Computer software is often used to analyse papers and theses. If plagiarism is proven, the relevant Board of Examiners will, as a rule, impose penalties. Their severity will depend on the seriousness of the offence, and may be influenced by previous infringements. The heaviest penalty that may be imposed is exclusion from all examinations for one full year. This might mean that you would have to wait for a year for your thesis to be marked; as a consequence, you cannot graduate during that year. The penalty may also relate to just one or a few examinations, or may apply for a shorter period.

The University of Leiden considers plagiarism a serious offence for which severe penalties may follow.

APPENDIX 4

MODEL FORM FOR OFFICIAL REPORT

Notification by the examiner of irregularity, fraud or disturbance pursuant to Articles 4.6, 4.7 and 6.3 of the Rules and Regulations

LEIDEN UNIVERSITY**OFFICIAL REPORT OF IRREGULARITY – FRAUD – DISTURBANCE**

Examination:	Date and time:
Practical:	Date and time:
Location:	

DETAILS

NAME AND INITIALS OF EXAMINER: Course/Practical: Study programme: Faculty:	NAME AND INITIALS OF STUDENT: Student number: Study programme and year: Faculty:
--	--

IRREGULARITY – FRAUD – DISTURBANCE

NOTIFICATION OF IRREGULARITIES

DESCRIPTION

TIME

COMMENTS

CONFISCATED ITEMS

This form has been completed truthfully by:

Examiner	Signature	Date:	
Invigilator (if present)	Signature	Date:	
Student	Signature (as 'seen')	Date:	

**APPENDIX 5
MODEL FORM FOR NOTIFICATION OF PLAGIARISM**

Notification by the examiner of plagiarism or fraud pursuant to Article 6.5 of the Rules and Regulations

Form for notification of detected plagiarism

The completed form must be sent (by email) to the Secretary of the Board of Examiners (include email address).

Please note: a student's product must be checked for plagiarism in a plagiarism programme (Turnitin, Ephorus) before an assessment of any kind is given or released.

Date			
Person submitting the notification		Email	
		Tel.	
Student(s)		Student number(s)	
Year of the study programme		Bachelor's / Master's	
Type of examination assignment		Study programme component	
Summative test	<input type="radio"/> Additional requirement <input type="radio"/> Counts towards the final grade (accounts for ... %)		
Relates to:	<input type="radio"/> Fraud <input type="radio"/> Plagiarism		
Description of (suspected) fraud/plagiarism and, if applicable, the form of plagiarism (see explanation at the end).			
If plagiarism: percentage plagiarism according to the programme used (if known):		average %, suspected section %	
Reaction of the student(s) to being informed that suspected fraud / plagiarism has been detected.			
Method of handling			
<input type="radio"/> Notification will be submitted to the Board of Examiners → further complete A and B			

A	
Proposal for handling by Board of Examiners (more than one option can be selected)	
<input type="radio"/> Not serious plagiarism <input type="radio"/> First time this has been detected for this/these student(s) <input type="radio"/> Student was not aware of plagiarism <input type="radio"/> "Clumsiness" of the student <input type="radio"/> Cultural difference (for a student from a country other than the Netherlands) <input type="radio"/> Interview reveals that this is a learning moment for the student(s) and there will be improvement in the future <input type="radio"/> Seriousness of plagiarism <input type="radio"/> Second time this has been detected for this/these student(s) <input type="radio"/> Attitude of the student(s) <input type="radio"/> Other; i.e.	
<input type="radio"/> Interview with the student about the (suspected) plagiarism <input type="radio"/> Other; i.e.	
If applicable, additional information that may be relevant for the Board of Examiners	
B	
The student has been informed of this notification	Yes / No
Evidential material is appended	Yes / No
If yes: this material is	

This form has been completed fully and truthfully by:

Signature

City

Date

Name of person submitting the notification

APPENDIX 6

Format for the Annual Report of the Board of Examiners

ANNUAL REPORT OF ACADEMIC YEAR <add date>

of the BOARD OF EXAMINERS of the degree programme(s) in:

Composition of Board of Examiners (as of dd/mm/yyyy) Chair elected by the Board of Examiners: Member 1: Member 2: Member 3: Member 4: External member: Official secretary: Term of appointment of the members:	... years
Number of meetings of the Board of Examiners in 2014-15	
Rules and Regulations of the Board of Examiners	Adopted on Published on
Training followed	
Procedure on how the Board of Examiners appoints examiners	
Approach and results of quality assurance (review of activities in annual report year: • Tests and examinations • Final assignments Which issues call for further investigation and more specific policy?	
Conclusions and actions points for the subsequent academic year. Also reflect on matters that appear on the programme cards such as degrees awarded and BSAs issued. • What will the Board of Examiners tackle in the current academic year? • Which topics require attention in the longer term? • Desired training and/or support	

Plagiarism prevention by: Number of cases of plagiarism detected: Measures taken: Number of decisions concerning the enforcement of sanctions:	
Other fraud Number of cases: Types of fraud: Measures taken: Number of decisions concerning the enforcement of sanctions:	
Number of complaints lodged by students with the Board of Examiners: <i>NB please also list complaints submitted to a separate complaints board.</i>	
Number of students who lodged an objection/appeal with the Examination Appeals Board:	
Number of students who were granted exemption from one or more examinations and/or from practicals and assignments. Other decisions concerning exemptions:	
Number of students who were granted an extension of the period of validity of a pass result for an examination:	
Number of students who were granted permission to take an examination in a way other than that laid down in the Course and Examination Regulations (OER):	
Number of students for whom the Board of Examiners: a. verified that evidence had been supplied of an adequate command of the Dutch language, and b. granted exemption from this entry requirement:	
Number of students provided with a statement showing the number of examinations passed (= students who dropped out of the programme and do not receive a degree certificate):	
Number of students who were granted permission to follow an individual curriculum compiled by the student him/herself:	

This annual report of the Board of Examiners was:	
Drawn up by:	The official secretary of the Board of Examiners
Discussed by the Board of Examiners on:	..
Adopted by the Board of Examiners on:	..