Rules & Regulations concerning examinations for programmes in the Faculty of Spatial Sciences 2025-2026

Article 1 Applicability

These Rules and Regulations apply to the examinations for the Bachelor's degree programmes in Human Geography & Planning, and Spatial Planning & Design and for the Master's degree programmes in Economic Geography, Real Estate Studies, Society, Sustainability & Planning, Population Studies, Environmental & Infrastructure Planning and the Research Master's in Spatial Sciences.

Article 2 Definitions

The following definitions apply to these Rules and Regulations:

1. *Examination regulations*: the Teaching and Examination Regulations for the programmes listed in Article 1.
2. *Board of Examiners*: the Board of Examiners for the programmes listed in Article 1.
3. *Final assessment*: a final assessment of the knowledge and/or skills of the examinee concerning the programme or a certain part of the programme, i.e. the propaedeutic phase, those parts of the Bachelor's programme after the propaedeutic phase or the Master's degree program, which is considered to be passed if all the requirements of the entire propaedeutic phase, Bachelor's or Master's degree programme have been satisfied.
4. *Examinee:* the person who takes an examination or examination
5. *Examination*: an assessment of the knowledge and/or skills of the examinee concerning a separate course module in the teaching programme.
6. *Student*: a person who has registered for the degree programme.
7. *Fraud:* Fraud is an act or omission by a student designed to partly or wholly hinder the forming of a correct assessment of his or her own or someone else's knowledge, understanding and skills. Fraud also includes plagiarism, which means copying someone else's or your own work without correct reference to the source.
8. *Examiner:* a person appointed by the board of examiners in line with the criteria formulated on examiners (Article 2) who is allowed to develop and grade specific (e.g. only theses) or all exams

Article 3 The administrative duties of the Board of Examiners

The Board of Examiners will appoint from its members a chairperson and a secretary, who will be charged with the administrative duties of the Board of Examiners.

Article 4 Final assessment

The Board of Examiners will determine the result for the final assessment.

Article 5 Judicia 'Cum Laude' and 'Summa Cum Laude'

The Board of Examiners will award an honours predicate following the requirements as laid out in the Teaching and Examination Regulations of the programme.

Article 6 Examination times

1. Written examinations must be taken at the times set by the Board of Examiners in consultation with the relevant examiners. These times will be published at least two months before the start of the semester.
2. When determining the times as referred to in Article 6.1, as far as possible no examinations will be planned concurrently.
3. Changes to a time as referred to in Article 6.1 may only take place as a result of force majeure, for example the non-availability of the required examination hall.
4. Oral examinations will—where possible—be taken at a time to be agreed between the examiners in question and the examinee.
5. The provisions of Article 6.4 will also apply as far as possible to examinations to be taken other than in written or oral form.

Article 7 Enrolment for and participation in course modules

1. Students who have enrolled for one or more course modules are registered automatically for the exam(s) by the Education Office. The students receive an email for which exam(s) they are registered.
2. After the students are automatically enrolled for the exam(s) they can check their registration in Progress in week 5 of the semester. They can register for exams that are missing (if they are allowed to take the exam) and de-register from exams they are not going to take.
3. Students who did not take the exam and students who did not pass the exam are enrolled automatically for the resit exam.
4. Students can request a third exam attempt provided it is their last required course, reasonable participation in the course can be proven, and not granting the request would lead to a substantial study delay. Study Advice will need to have been consulted by the student beforehand.
5. Students may participate in courses given abroad, granted they have been given permission in accordance to the process stipulated in Appendix 3.

Article 8 Request for exemption

1. A request for exemption from a module must be submitted in writing to the Board of Examiners, stating the reasons and providing any relevant documentation.
2. Requests for an exemption will be handled when they are submitted prior to the start of the course module in question. If a request is submitted after the course module has started, the Board of Examiners may choose to handle the request in the case of extraordinary circumstances.
3. The Board of Examiners must discuss the matter with the relevant examiners before making a decision.
4. The Board of Examiners will make its decision within twenty working days of receipt of the request. The person making the request will be informed of the decision immediately.

Article 9 Order during examinations

1. The Board of Examiners will ensure that invigilators are appointed to supervise written examinations; the invigilators are responsible for examinations proceeding in good order. The Board of Examiners delegates the appointment of invigilators to the relevant examiner, who shall ensure the presence of sufficient surveillance.
2. Examinees should be able to identify themselves by means of their student card at the request or behest of the Board of Examiners. The examinees should be able to show their student card when asked by the examiner. If an examinee does not show a student card, another form of identification is required.

3. Examinees must obey the directions of the Board of Examiners or the examiner, which will be published before the start of the final assessment or the examination, as well as directions given during or immediately after the examination.
4. If an examinee ignores one or more of the directions referred to in Article 9.3, he or she may be excluded from further participation in the examination in question by the Board of Examiners or the examiner. Exclusion means no mark will be awarded for the examination in question.
5. The duration of every examination is such that the examinee may reasonably have enough time to answer the questions.
6. The scratch paper may not be taken out of the examination hall by the examinee, unless the examiner has decided otherwise.
7. Smart communication devices must be switched off and may not be placed on the tables.
8. Using the lavatory during examinations is not allowed, unless a medical certificate is showed to the examiner, or the examiner makes an exception for another reason.
9. The use of graphic calculators (or other smart communication devices) during examinations is not permitted. Additionally, the use of calculators which can be connected to computers via electronic interfaces such as USB or Bluetooth is not permitted during examinations. Only standard scientific calculators may be used during examinations in which the use of a calculator is permitted. Examples of such standard scientific calculators include TI-30Xb, TI-30XS, TI-30XA or TI-30 Eco RS, or the Casio fx-82EX, Casio fx-82DE plus, Casio fx-82SOLAR, Casio fx-82MS or Casio fx-85DE plus or similar.
10. All exam sheets that are submitted will be read and marked. Any 'non-marking' requests will be denied.
11. All students who enter the examination hall will be registered, with the exception of students who are in line with article 9.4 excluded from the examination.
12. Students who participate in the exam will receive a grade.
13. Access to the examination hall will be denied after the first half hour of the examination.
14. No-one may leave the examination hall during the first half hour of the examination.
15. If an examinee repeats an exam the most recent grade shall apply.

Article 10 Fraud & Irregularities

1. Definition of fraud and in relation, plagiarism as stated in the Teaching and Examination Regulations:

(Note: this article, 10.1, is formally defined in the Teaching and Examination Regulations and is copied in here for reference)

1. Fraud is an act or omission by a student designed to partly or wholly hinder the forming of a correct assessment of the student's own or someone else's knowledge, understanding and skills.
2. Fraud also includes plagiarism, which means copying someone else's or your own work without correctly acknowledging reference to the source.
3. Students who substitute their personal effort with work generated by artificial intelligence (AI) outside of what is defined as acceptable within the instructions given in the respective course guide of the specific course and present this as their own work will also be considered to have committed fraud.
4. The assessment of theses and written assignments requires a plagiarism check to be performed, by means of a plagiarism scanner accessed by the University. Students are individually responsible for maintaining academic integrity of the whole work submitted on their behalf.
5. If a student commits fraud, the Board of Examiners may exclude that student from participation in one or more examinations or final assessments for a maximum of one year.
6. In cases of serious fraud, the Board of Examiners can advise the Board of the University to permanently terminate a student's registration in the degree programme.

7. The Board of Examiners will set out its course of action in the event of fraud in its Rules and Regulations.

2. Fraud and plagiarism FSS modus operandi

1. The protocol is linked to the Teaching and Examination Regulations of the respective degree programme as stated in Article 10.1
2. Plagiarism is considered hierarchically placed under fraud, meaning that plagiarism is regarded as fraud if it is intentional and/or hinders the forming of a correct assessment.
3. Fraud includes, but is not limited to the following acts:
   - copying or using fellow students' work and presenting this as one's own work;
   - deliberately bringing or using aids (such as pre-programmed calculators, mobile phones or other digital devices, books, internet-based sources, syllabi, notes, course summaries from previous years etc.) during take home, online or on campus exams, unless the exam instructions permits the use of such aids;
   - deliberately enabling someone else to cheat;
   - having others complete an assignment or part thereof on one's behalf;
   - taking possession of the relevant exam questions of the examination without the examiner's explicit consent with the aim of studying, distributing or using them in any other manner;
   - faking research data (including questionnaire or interview answers);
   - submitting papers acquired from a (commercial) institution or written by someone else (whether paid for or not).
4. Plagiarism includes, but is not limited to the following acts:
   - copying or using other people's work without referring to the original source, thereby raising the suggestion that this is one's own work;
   - resubmitting previously submitted own work without stating the source and presenting it as original work ('self-plagiarism') produced for the course module in question, unless the examiner explicitly permits this;
   - copying text from digital sources or printed media such as books, reports, theses, journals, encyclopaedias or websites without using proper referencing, either by quoting or paraphrasing, including translations of such sources;
   - copying (research) data, video, audio or test material from others without mentioning the source and thus presenting it as one's own work;
   - providing permission to copy one's work without correct referencing is considered as being complicit to plagiarism;
   - using artificial intelligence (AI), if: 1) the use of AI is not explicitly allowed by the examiner as stated in the course guide and/or bright space, 2) the work submitted cannot sufficiently be considered to be the student's own work; or, 3) the student has not correctly mentioned/referred to the use;
   - if one of the authors collaborating on a joint assignment commits plagiarism, the other authors are complicit if they could or should have known that the other author was fraud or committing plagiarism.

3. Irregularities and fraud and plagiarism procedure

1. If a student is caught in the act of fraud during an exam, the examiner will exclude the student concerned from the rest of the exam. The examiner will inform the Board of Examiners of the fraud in writing (including a full description).
2. If a student is suspected of improper use of AI in such a way that it hinders the forming of a correct assessment, Examiners may hold additional oral exams. If Examiners wish to

leave this option open, they should include this into the course guides beforehand. The Course Coordinator should notify the BoEx in advance of the oral exam session. The normal rules for oral exams, as stated in the TER, apply. The oral exam is not intended to substantiate a case of fraud, but only serves for the purpose of finalizing the grading.

3. When an examiner suspects fraud in any other examination, he/she must first check whether the suspicions are founded to the degree that fraud can be reasonably assumed to have taken place. The examiner will compile a brief report and send it, combined with structured evidence and preliminary conclusions, to the Board of Examiners. The examiner also informs the student and (preliminary) examination results are withheld.
4. The Board of Examiners documents all accusations in a secured database only accessible to the Board of Examiners for future reference.
5. The Board of Examiners summons the student for a formal mandatory hearing, in which the student, a representative of the Board of Examiners and the examiner are present. The student can bring a counsellor. A copy of the evidence will be provided to the student by the Board of Examiners before the hearing.
6. After speaking to the student and examiner concerned, the Board of Examiners will decide whether fraud took place. If the student did not attend the hearing, the decision of the Board of Examiners will be based upon the written evidence only.
7. The decision on consequences shall be made on the basis of the invigilator's written report of the fraud he or she has detected or suspected, the hearing of the examinee and any further investigation by the examination board. It must be established beyond reasonable doubt that the examinee has committed fraud. If in doubt, the examination committee should give the examinee the benefit of the doubt.
8. Once a decision has been made by the Board of Examiners, the student and examiner involved will be informed in writing.

4. Fraud consequences

1. If fraud has been established, the Board of Examiners will:
   - issue a warning if the extent of the fraud is relatively minor. This warning will be recorded in the student's file; or:
   - annul the (partial) examination or assignment in which the fraud took place and record the case of fraud in the student's file and
   - inform the student that, in line with the relevant stipulations in the Teaching and Examination Regulations, this decision may influence the student's eligibility to graduate with honours .

2. If a student is found to have cheated on more than one occasion, the Board of Examiners will:
   - annul the (partial) examination or assignment in which the fraud took place and;
   - record the case of fraud in the student's file and;
   - exclude the student from taking part in the course module concerned (including resits) and;
   - request the Education Office to register the result for the course module as FR (meaning 'fraud') in Progresswww, and;
   - instruct the Director of Education to ensure that every examiner who teaches that student is informed of the fact that he/she has been caught fraud at least twice.

3. In the event of very serious fraud, the Board of Examiners:
   - can decide to exclude the student concerned from participation in one or more examinations or final assessments to be determined by the Board of Examiners, for a period of time also to be determined by the Board of Examiners with a maximum of one year;

- may advise the Board of the University to terminate the student's registration at the University;
- may inform the student's home faculty/university if it concerns a student from outside the Faculty of Spatial Sciences.

5. Prevention of Fraud

1. The anti-fraud policy set out by the Faculty of Spatial Sciences' Board of Examiners aims to prevent and combat fraud. To this end, the topic of fraud is discussed at the start of every Bachelor's, Premaster's and Master's degree programmes, explaining what fraud is, why it is unacceptable, how to avoid it and what the possible consequences of fraud are. It is the task of Educational Management to make sure this is part of the programme. Students need to be informed that good academic practise includes protecting and respecting ideas of others. It is important to emphasize that in the academic world, plagiarism is not considered merely a mistake that anyone can make and that fraud in a university setting jeopardizes the reputation of academia as a whole. It is important to inform students on how plagiarism constitutes a form of fraud. Therefore, measures are proposed in this article to help Educational Management and examiners to prevent fraud and to assist in designing examinations with low fraud risks (good practice). The consequences of fraud and the measures to be taken when a case of fraud is discovered are set out in Article 10.4 of the Rules and Regulations of the Faculty of Spatial Sciences' Board of Examiners.

   When informing students on fraud and plagiarism, explicit attention is given to the use and possible mis-use of AI. The memo 'FSS 10 basic rules of AI in education' (version Feb 2024) can be used. The memo is attached as appendix 4 to the rules and regulations.

2. In order to prevent fraud, the following rules apply:
   - students may not visit the toilet during on campus examinations, unless a medical statement can be presented to the examiner or the examiner decides to make an exception for other reasons.

   Regarding the use of AI, the following rules apply:
   - In line with in line with the memo 'FSS 10 basic rules of AI in education' (version Feb 2024), AI tools may be used as aids to support general functionalities (study tool/assistant/input for own work). Examiners will announce possible permitted use(s) in the course guide.
   - When GenAI functionalities are used (to create new content or replace own work), this should always be mentioned/referred to in student work. Examiners are to announce in their course in what way and when AI is to be referred to. They shall mention specifically whether prompts need to be included.
   - Any additional rules with regard to the use of AI functionalities in addition to the above-mentioned rules must be communicated before the start of the course unit in question.
   - Any changes to the AI rules in your course after the course started need to be communicated to the BoE.
   - Examiners have read the 'FSS 10 basic rules of AI in education' (version Feb 2024), attached as Appendix 4 to the rules and regulations
   -

3. Examiners take fraud seriously and will make every effort to prevent fraud, which could include but is not limited to the following acts:
   - preparing various versions of (online) exams
   - in addition to manual checking for fraud, possibly using plagiarism software to scan written assignments.

- refusing to provide credits to answers—in the case of an open book exam—that copy model answers from previous exams, as the practice of copying model answers hinders the assessment of student's own knowledge and skills.
- providing exam instructions that include a clear statement of what *is* allowed, and what is *not* allowed during examinations. Examples of this are:
  - students should use their own words when writing reports and assignments. This means that the difference between a student's own writing and their quoting of other people's work should be clear. This also means that a full copy of text from elsewhere is never an acceptable answer to an open essay question, and will therefore receive no points.
  - including interim checks for theses/final projects and (take home) assignments and essays to trace student progress, while considering the role of AI
  - in some cases, it may be a good idea to explicitly forbid the use of quotes.

Article 11 Examination papers

1. The scope of an examination paper shall not exceed the content of the sources upon which the paper is based. These sources will be made public in general terms before the start of the module that will prepare for the examination. The scope of the examination's topics shall be published no later than twenty working days prior to the examination taking place.
2. The examinations will reflect the learning objectives, both with regard to content and form.
3. The questions and assignments in the examination will be clear and contain sufficient indications of the detail required in the answers.
4. No later than 10 working days prior to the examination taking place, the examiner will announce the type of examination in line with the provisions of the Teaching and Examination Regulations.
5. Under certain conditions, the examiner may deviate from this rule. In that case, the examiner will inform the educational management and the students.
6. No later than 10 working days before an examination takes place, the examiner will—if possible—enable the examinees to familiarize themselves with a written example of such an examination, as well as the model answers and the assessment criteria.

Article 12 Assessment

1. The final assessment for the Bachelor's degree programme is deemed to have been passed if all relevant examinations have been awarded a mark of 5.5 or higher or a pass.
2. The final assessment for the Master's degree programme is deemed to have been passed if all relevant examinations have been awarded a mark of 5.5 or higher or a pass.
3. The assessment of written examinations is conducted in line with assessment criteria, as set out in writing in advance.
4. The means of assessment is such that the examinee can check how the results of his or her examination were determined.
5. If an examination or partial examination for a module is taken several times, the result from the most recent examination or partial examination will apply.
6. Compensation between partial examinations is possible (unless the course guide states otherwise).
7. In cases of force majeure in which it is not possible to conduct assessments as stated in the course guide, alternative modes of assessment may be used. This is only allowed after explicit approval from the Board of Examiners, and only on the condition that the course learning outcomes are still achieved upon completion of the course module in question. The Board of Examiners needs to be informed of this in writing at the examiner's earliest opportunity, before the assessment takes place.

Article 13 Inspection of Exams

1. The provisions in the Teaching and Examination Regulations apply.
2. There are two options for exam inspection based on the wishes of the examiner: inspection via the Digital Exam Module on Nestor and inspection on paper at the Student Support Desk.
3. Examiners are responsible for what they provide to the student, i.e. in addition to the student answers either / or exam questions and the answering model.
4. If the questions are hidden from the student during the inspection, the examiner is required to organize a collective inspection in the form of a seminar, group meeting or allow the students to inspect the questions and answers individually.
5. The answers of the students are offered individually for inspection.
6. An examinee can request an inspection with the relevant examiner of the results of an examination (unless it was in the form of an oral examination) within ten working days of the day of the publication of the results. The discussion will take place at a time and place determined by the examiner.
7. If the Board of Examiners arranges a collective inspection of an examination and this is announced at least a week in advance, then an examinee can submit a request as defined in Article 13.6 if he or she has attended the collective inspection and motivates the request, or if he or she is unable to attend the collective inspection due to force majeure.
8. The provisions in Article 13.7 also apply when the Board of Examiners or the examiner enable the examinee to compare his or her solutions with model answers.
9. The Board of Examiners or the examiner may permit exceptions to the provisions of Articles 13.6 and 13.8.

Article 14 Decisions

The Board of Examiners and/or the examiners make their decisions in compliance with:

a. legal, university and faculty regulations and policies
b. general principles of good governance

Article 15 Approval of the study programme

1. Students have to apply for the approval of their study programme by the Board of Examiners at least 6 weeks after they have started with the Bachelor project. After starting a Master thesis, students have to ask approval at least 6 weeks before they expect to graduate.
2. The Board of Examiners decides within four weeks after receiving the request for approval.
3. The approval remains valid as long as the course modules that are part of the programme are still taught with the same course names and course codes.

Article 16 Retention Periods

1. In connection with possible appeals procedures, work that has been assessed, or assessable proof of that work and attendance list, must be retained for at least two months after the result has been made known.
   Exception: if the assessed work, assessable proof and/or attendance list is part of a representative selection for a visitation then a retention period of two years applies.
2. In respect of re-accreditation of the degree programme, notwithstanding the first paragraph, final papers that meet the criteria set for the Bachelor's and Master's degree, and the relevant assessment forms, must be retained for seven years.
3. If the result was not made known, or if it was not allowed to be made known, the period stipulated paragraph one will commence on the date that the examination was set.
4. The results of examinations and theses must be retained for at least seven years.

5. These terms are based on the Basic Selection List for Universities[1]

Article 17 Right of appeal

It is possible to lodge an appeal against decisions made by the Board of Examiners or examiners with the Board of Appeal for Examinations within the meaning of Article 7.60 ff. of the Act.

Article 18 Amendments to the rules and regulations

No amendments shall be made that have an effect on the current academic year, unless the interests of students would otherwise be harmed.

Article 19 Disputes

1. In the event of a dispute concerning these Rules and Regulations, the Board of Examiners decides.
2. Students can dispute a decision as mentioned under 17.1 by lodging an appeal with the Examination Appeals Board. This must be done within six weeks of the date of issue of the decision in question.

Article 20 Date of commencement

These rules and guidelines will take effect on 1 September 2025

As decreed on [..]-10-2025 by the Board of Examiners.

[1] https://www.nationaalarchief.nl/sites/default/files/field-file/Selectielijst%20universiteiten%20en%20umc%20versie%20vastgesteld_0.pdf

Appendix 1 (added September 2019)

Altering or revoking an examination date

Determining the final examination date is the decision and responsibility of the Board of Examiners. This body establishes whether a student has met all the requirements of the degree programme. The further process is an administrative but important one. The steps that need to be taken in order to notify the student of the Board of Examiners' outcome are: entering the examination result, entering the final examination date and entering the distinction. After receiving this notification, the student has two weeks to postpone their graduation and to request that the final examination date will not yet be confirmed. Therefore, unless the student has previously notified us that they agree with the final examination date, the examination date is final after two weeks. This is a UG-wide process; there are no faculty specific exceptions.

Once the examination date has become final, a notification is sent to the BRON HO results register–of which students can request a legal extract from DUO–thus, revoking the examination date is undesirable and only possible in exceptional cases.

Once the examination date has become final, a request for altering a final examination date or for revoking the finalization of the exam must always go through ABJZ, even if it concerns an administrative error.

Because the Board of Examiners determines the final examination date, the request to adjust it should always come from the Board of Examiners, together with the reason for its adjustment or deletion, the CROHO (Central Register of Higher Education Programmes) and the new final examination date.

Should the student wish to alter the final examination date, when the examination result has not yet been finalized, this must always be processed via the CSA.

Appendix 2 (added August 2022)

FSS examiners

The Board of Examiners appoints all examiners of the Faculty of Spatial Sciences. In doing so, the board takes consideration of the following criteria (in line with the decision by the Faculty Board in this matter as communicated to the board of examiners on November 14, 2014):

A person is eligible to become examiner for all the Faculty's course modules if this person:

1) is employed at the Faculty of Spatial Sciences or is otherwise part of the organisation of Faculty of Spatial Sciences, including being accountable to its management and procedures, and

2) has successfully completed a BKO/UTQ, or

3) currently participates in following a trajectory for getting a BKO/UTQ, or

4) has finished an alternative (series of) course(s) that are by the Board of Examiners considered viable to replace a BKO/UTQ.

A person is eligible to become examiner for specific Faculty's course modules (such as Bachelor and Master Theses) if this person:

1) has finished an alternative (series of) course(s) that are by the Board of Examiners considered viable to allow them to examine a specific (set of) exam(s); e.g. courses by ESI on grading Master theses and
2) is employed at the Faculty of Spatial Sciences or is otherwise part of the organisation of Faculty of Spatial Sciences, including being accountable to its management and procedures, or
3) is appointed by the board of examiners as an examiner for examining a specific (set of) exam(s), while not being part of the organisation of the Faculty of Spatial Sciences, based on
    (a) their qualifications regarding and familiarity with the field of Spatial Sciences, which may include e.g.: (1) knowledge of the discipline, (2) promotion right, (3) experience in examining and/or thesis supervision, (4) a UTQ or similar and/or (5) experience with the programme based on long-term collaboration, and
    (b) being active in teaching in the Faculty programmes (i.e. academic staff at other faculties, universities or partner institutions, such as FEB, Double Degree partners, NIDI, etc.),

Examiners that leave the Faculty of Spatial Sciences will remain eligible to be part of examination until the end of the academic year of their departure, unless otherwise decided by the Board of Examiners.

The Director of Education maintains a list of all trained and/or certified examiners. On an annual basis, the list is sent to the Board of Examiners for approval. In the process of grade registrations, the list of examiners is used by the Education Office.

Appendix 3 (added September 2022)

Protocol Recognition short courses abroad taken by FSS students

The Faculty of Spatial Sciences (FSS) allows students to participate in course modules taken abroad, both in semester exchanges with known partner universities and in individual courses, including with lesser known universities (e.g. blended intensive programmes, summer schools). The Board of Examiners is responsible for recognizing foreign study results. The FSS International Office (IO) has an important coordinating role, due to its knowhow for coordinating the process of (a) acquiring funding (e.g. Erasmus+), (b) assessing the quality of the course modules and (c) advising on recognizing the study results. Given the expertise of the IO the Board of examiners delegates responsibility for recognition of course modules taken abroad to the IO in line with the rules stipulated in this protocol.

For the recognition of study results booked by FSS students in these course modules the FSS follows the following rules:

1. Study results booked by FSS students in the context of *semester exchanges* to partner universities the IO coordinates a process where student exchange agreements are established after a careful check including quality and level of courses offered. For contract proposals with non-European universities agreements also are checked, also for quality, by ISR (International Strategy and Relations) and ABJZ (Legal Department); contract proposals within Europe are only with universities recognized by Erasmus+. Furthermore:

- Course modules that students aim to take at partners need to be approved by IO (for MSc courses: in consultation with MSc programme coordinators), based on the level and quality of courses as well as overlap with contents of courses in FSS programmes.
- Upon completion of courses abroad, IO converts foreign study results to European credits (if applicable) and Dutch grades (using a grade conversion table, that whenever needed is updated after approval of the Board of Examiners). These converted study results are communicated to the Office of Education.
- In cases of doubt the IO will ask the Board of Examiners for a decision.

2. For study results booked by FSS students on course modules outside of the context of semester exchanges the IO coordinates a process, based on the following guidelines:

a. Students with an interest in participating in a short course, summer school or any other single course or package of courses not being a semester (or equivalent) exchange to an existing student exchange partner of FSS or UG in a foreign country, are directed to the IO for advice.

b. The IO evaluates, ex ante, and if needed in consultation with BSc and MSc programme coordinators, a number of features of the proposed course(s):
   (1) quality/level: in line with the UG/FSS quality levels? (e.g., delivered by/at HEI?).
   (2) contents: no significant overlap of contents with courses in the University of Groningen curriculum
   (3) study load: is the study load (in ECs or otherwise, to be converted by IO) reasonable?
   (4) accreditation: is the course included in the curriculum of a bachelor or master programme, and is that programme accredited?

c. Based on the ex ante evaluation the IO will develop an advice, which has three possible results:
   (1) The course is part of an accredited curriculum (incl. being offered as an elective course by local students of that curriculum) in a HEI. IO will advise the FSS programme coordinator to recognize the course as an elective course in the FSS curriculum, if the course meets the other conditions (1), (2), (3) mentioned above. The IO FSS programme coordinator will decide and inform the IO; the IO will inform the students on this decision.
   (2) If the course is not part of an accredited curriculum, but meets other conditions (1), (2), (3) in this Proposal, IO can advise the FSS programme coordinator to qualify the course result as extra-curricular. The FSS programme coordinator will decide and inform the IO; the IO will inform the student on this decision.
   (3) In case a FSS programme coordinator and IO do not agree on the elective course/extracurricular status of the course, the Board of Examiners will be asked to decide. The Board of Examiners will decide and will inform relevant FSS programme coordinator, the IO and the student on its decision.

d. Based on a positive decision, the IO, due to its know-how and the internal institutional contacts, will establish if students are eligible for possible scholarships (e.g. Erasmus+ or other) and, if so, guides the student in the application procedure.

e. Upon completion of courses abroad, IO converts foreign study results to European credits (if applicable) and Dutch grades (using a grade conversion table, that whenever needed is updated after approval of the Board of Examiners). These converted study results are communicated to the Office of Education.

f. Once a year, IO generates a short report (table) of the recognition results of short courses taken abroad by FSS students, presented to the Board of Examiners and the Director of Education.

Appendix 4 memo FSS 10 basic rules of AI in education (version March 2024)

Outline

Recently, the Board of the University of Groningen has established the "10 UG Basic Rules for the use of GenAI in education". You can find them here: https://www.rug.nl/about-ug/organization/quality-assurance/education/artificial-intelligence-ai/

The backdrop to this is the increased use of GenAI-like technologies by students and staff in education. This yields great opportunities. However, some forms of assessment are under threat. In particular, use of GenAI by students could distort the Examiner's view on the student's progress and achievements. Has the student really achieved the learning objectives? Likewise, use of GenAI by Examiners can have negative consequences for students - unfair grading for example. As an Examiner, it is easy to overestimate one's own capability to spot malpractice, and on top of that, it is easy to overestimate the BoEx's capabilities of policing such issues in hindsight.

Take-home, summative and typically essay-style individual or group assignments, have become very vulnerable for illicit GenAI use. The same may apply to other forms. These are precisely those assignments where we expect students to write a decent line of argumentation, to produce an interesting line of questioning or a novel spatial intervention. Assignments which, at the same time, are central to the FSS teaching approach.

We will outline however, taking the UoG 10 Basic Rules as a productive starting point, that adjustments are possible, which furthermore can serve to foster good academic practices in the way our students take part in these assignments. A simple and general referral to the 10 Basic Rules in your course guide will not suffice. The translation and considered implementation is key.

Via this Memo, the FSS Board of Examiners (BoEx) and Education Management, advises Examiners of actions that must urgently be undertaken and of the more general reading and implications of these 10 Basic Rules for FSS. We will do so by:

1. Outlining for which types of assessment action is needed now and how we can help
2. Outlining other more general actions that Examiners can take
3. Informing Examiners of the BoEx reading and interpretation for FSS of these 10 GenAI Basic Rules, making them (hopefully) as actionable as possible for you, and explaining the background to our position under 1. and 2.
4. Informing Examiners of our next steps in the coming months

We conclude with a FAQ.

Please check version dates when using this document. Developments are likely to occur, and adjustments may be necessary. Consider this a living document.

Some background

Early last year, Education Management and the BoEx, issued joint advice on the implementation of GenAI in education at FSS. Throughout the faculty has already led to adjustments in assignment regulations and modes of examination. There are some good examples of clever integration of GenAI in education, as well as some good examples of clever rule writing and re-design of assignments, well done.

The UoG Board requested that faculties start implementing its 10 Basic Rules for GenAI use in Education. In addition, the BoEx already frequently receives requests from you to advise on matters related to GenAI in Education. For example: which forms of examination are suitable, are there ways to write rules in a watertight way, etc. This urgency is not surprising: development moves fast and everyone senses this has profound implications for education, positive and negative. We believe therefore that it is in everyone's interest to take action sooner rather than later.

The University's 10 Basic Rules provide a productive starting point to do so, but require translation to the specifics of the situation here at FSS. The remainder of this document therefore outlines the position of the BoEx, and the advice for Examiners that follows from this from BoEx and Education Management. We communicate this to make sure our position is clear and our responses will be predictable, allowing Examiners to move forward and make adjustments where necessary.

Following from this, we will denote tasks that Examiners are advised to complete as soon as possible. Note that in what follows we will loosely refer to assessment activities as assignments, but this is understood to include all formative (= the assignment is not graded, and served purely to add to student learning, typically also leaving considerable ownership with the student) and summative assessment types.

1. Outlining for which types of assessment action is needed now and how we can help

There is a rich variety of assessment in our faculty. Unfortunately, some of these types are at a substantial risk of GenAI interference with the Examiners capability to assess whether the student has achieved the learning outcomes.

These high-risk assessments are summative unsupervised take-home assignments for both groups as well as individuals, where only the end-product is graded. The BoEx view is that these sorts of assignments are best adjusted as soon as possible. If the grading in a course depends substantially on such assignments, we request that the Examiner discuss with Education Management or BoEx in which ways this situation can be amended. Solutions may include:

- Switching the assignment to formative testing only, moving the summative elements to a more secure testing setting such as the exam hall
- Replacing the assignment end-product grading with process-grading, whereby step-by-step in-between products are graded
- Make students are obliged to participate in in-between activities
- Have students submit code, logbooks, data, reflections along with the final product, narrating their learning journey

In our faculty, such summative assessment is already applied in such a way that students are closely supervised on process, even though part of the work is done at home (think of design ateliers, the BSc thesis process, practicals, group fieldworks). Nevertheless, it is important for Examiners to check their course rules carefully and ensure that supervision on process is indeed achieved. Other solutions which achieve the same are also welcome.

The 10 Basic AI Rules open up the possibility for Examiners to hold additional oral exams to check in case of suspicions. If Examiners wish to leave this option open, you should include this into your course guides beforehand. It is up to the Course Coordinator, for example on the advice of group examiners, to call for such an extra oral exam. The Course Coordinator should notify the BoEx in advance of the oral exam session. The normal rules for oral exams, as stated in the TER, apply. The BoEx will also add this option to its Rules and Regulations, effective upon publication.

If you are not sure whether the above would apply to your course, feel free to reach out, we are happy to think along.

2. Outlining other more general actions that you can take

In general, it should be clear for students and staff alike what permissible GenAI use in a course looks like. The 10 GenAI Basic Rules leave room for GenAI in education, but what that room ought to be specifically depends on the details of the course. We will elaborate below but for now the BoEx

recommends that your write, in your course guide, explicitly what you will allow in your course, and what not.

Once again: a simple general referral to the 10 Basic Rules is not sufficient as everything depends on the exact nature of your course's intended learning outcomes.

The BoEx also recommends that you think about ways to integrate student activity logs, tractability, transparency etc in your course. These are good academic practices to begin with, but will also help students understand, and see better, where GenAI and other sources end and where their contributions and actions started.

Once again, we are happy to think along.

3. BoEx reading and interpretation for FSS of the 10 GenAI Basic Rules

The BoEx believes the UoG has produced helpful and concrete guidelines in these 10 GenAI Basic Rules. Nevertheless, we have the following additions and clarifications, which, we feel, are essential in properly implementing the Basic Rules in our FSS. You can find them here: https://www.rug.nl/about-ug/organization/quality-assurance/education/artificial-intelligence-ai/

@ Rule 1: AI tools may be used as aids to support general functionalities (study tool/assistant/input for own work).
This first Rule outlines general functionalities in which GenAI use is allowed without further reference. The BoEx agrees only to a point and holds the view that the allowance here is too general. The activities mentioned here include summaries and brainstorming. If your course includes ILO's covering students being able to do "synthesis", "summarize", "write research questions", "write proposals" GenAI use directly negatively affects your ability as Examiner to assess the student's skills. This would take us to the scenario described under Rule 2. So, whether a so-called "general functionality" is harmful or not depends strongly on the ILO's in your course. Task: Examiners are to check their course ILO's and determine whether such "general functional" use of GenAI is to be permitted or not, and announce accordingly in the course guide.

@ Rule 2: When GenAI functionalities are used (to create new content or replace own work), this should always be mentioned/referred to.
This rule states that if GenAI is used when permitted, it must be referred to like any other source. See here for example: https://apastyle.apa.org/blog/how-to-cite-chatgpt For you as an Examiner, what is central is this: you need to be able to distinguish what comes from the student themselves, and what comes from other sources. The word "create" is to be read in a wide sense here. Using GenAI to generate a proposal or a review, is also "creating", even if the result is included in one's own words in the resulting product. GenAI use should then be reported on in, for example, a side-submission outlining the research process. This is particularly important when these GenAI (underlying) outputs link to ILO's. Task: announce in your course in what way and when GenAI is to be referred to. Mention specifically whether you want the prompts included.

@ Rule 3: Any additional rules with regard to the use of GenAI functionalities in addition to the above-mentioned rules 1 and 2 must be communicated before the start of the course unit in question.
This rule states that (GenAI) course regulations need to be announced before the course starts (this is standing policy, and valid for all course rules). This is of course good practice and this should always be strived for. However, developments move fast. These 10 GenAI Basic Rules were announced in December 2023, with a request to implement as soon as Semester 2. That is short notice, and therefore the Board of Examiners will allow late rule changes to your courses. Just make sure to consult with BoEx if indeed you make rule changes in your course after it started, or in relation to what was announced in OCASYS.

@ Rule 4: Using AI tools is regarded as fraud if: 1) the work submitted cannot sufficiently be considered to be the student's own work; or, 2) the student has not correctly mentioned/referred to the use.
The Rules 4.1 and 4.2 follow quite closely the existing fraud regulations, thus linking GenAI use explicitly to the existing fraud regulations.

The burden of proof is on the Examiner, and we must realise that GenAI detection tools are deemed insufficient evidence of guilt (see also Rule 7). So, in order to prove fraud (= the examiner is no longer able to see the student's actual level due to deliberate actions of the student) proper evidence is needed.

So, prevention is better than curing. Following rule 4.1, we emphasize supervision of process next to the final product, or perhaps even instead of the final product, for those assessments that take place outside of controlled exam situations. Insight in student process will help the Examiner do their job better along the way.

Furthermore, having to report on process will teach the student key academic practices of working in a way that is tractable and transparent, and can be reported on at any time during the process. This will also help students to determine whether they are doing a "Rule 1" type of GenAI use, or rather "Rule 2" GenAI use, and will help to avoid fraud discussions later on.

@ Rule 5: Use the positive functionalities of AI tools, but do so consciously and critically and @ Rule 6: Processing agreements/UG licences are a precondition for requiring the use of tools in teaching.
These rules warn against introduction of unlicensed software and the potential drawbacks there.

@ Rule 7: Scores of AI detection tools do not constitute evidence for fraud.
This rule states that existing (online) GenAI checkers are not considered sufficient evidence for fraud to have taken place. That is standing policy, also in plagiarism check software. However, akin to plagiarism, the Board of Examiners wishes to clarify that it will accept results from GenAI checkers as a ground for suspicion and further investigation, but normally not as sufficient evidence alone.

@ Rule 8: Lecturers *(* sic, what is meant here is Examiners)* **bear final responsibility for the assessment of students and the content of the teaching.**
As elaborated in the 10 Basic Rules, do not use GenAI to grade submissions (essay or otherwise).

@ Rule 9: Any adjustments to modes of assessment in order to ensure the validity of assessments must be communicated in good time. The lecturer may conduct an additional oral check when irregularities prevent the forming of a correct assessment.
This rule re-iterates that modes of examination need to be announced on time (in Ocasys, before the start of the academic year). That is good practice and should be adhered to. In addition, in situations of force majeure the Board of Examiners may allow exceptions (standing policy). The BoEx would like to herewith clarify that, considering the speed of development, GenAI-related adjustments stand a good chance being considered a result of force majeure, and will be permitted also if they are late. Also, Rule 9 opens the possibility of ad-hoc oral examinations to check student submissions, in case of doubt regarding the meeting of the learning objectives. Both actions (change mode of examination and oral examinations) occur at the initiative of the Course Coordinator, who notifies the Board of Examiners. Oral examinations as an option need to be written into the Course Manual.

@ Rule 10: Interim checks are conducted for theses/final projects.
This rule notes that intermediate checks are necessary for thesis / final projects. The logic here seemingly is that if you impose this for the final thesis, students throughout their programmes will then assume that this needs practising for, and will exhibit the desired behaviour in all courses.

Whether or not this is realistic remains to be seen, but the Board of Examiners considers Rule 10 too restrictive in the context of FSS. BoEx holds the position that any summative (= the performance is graded and contributes to the final assessment in the course) student assignment / assessment, which takes place outside of a controlled exam environment, should be completed in such a way by the students that intermediate steps can be checked and traced back. This trains academic skills of transparency and tractability.

Whether these steps should all be graded or not is left for the Examiner to decide. This includes all summative take home individual and group assignments. If this mode of assessment (on process essentially) is too intensive for your course, then it needs to be considered to run these assessments in a purely formative sense, replacing them with tailored summative assessment in the exam hall. At the level of individual courses, we may expect enough forward-looking skills for students to see that proper practice makes perfect, and for them to take formative assessment seriously.

4. Our steps in the coming months

It will be clear by now that action is required. For the courses in starting in period 2a of the academic year 2023-2024 immediately, but for the courses of period 2b 2023-2024 also on the short term. Not all assessment is equally vulnerable, and some types of assessment are not vulnerable to begin with.

The BoEx is aiming to use the establishment of the assessment plans for next academic year 2024-2025 to perform an integral check of FSS assessment on GenAI vulnerabilities. This will also generate an overview of good practices.

If we have not heard from Examiners / courses at risk already by that time, we will reach out if there are any remaining unclarities in this respect in your course. Many changes have already been made, and more will be done in the coming weeks, but we will try to map the remaining issues and see whether we can help plan a route to improvements.

In the longer term, a wider debate on these issues is necessary, as they affect directly the way in which staff and students collaborate in our Faculty.

FAQ

Please find below some questions that were sent our way, in feedback on earlier versions.

- ChatGPT was trained on “old” data, are issues prevented by covering very recent periods?
    - Unlikely, technology progresses and newer version have access to the internet.
- Could it be another way to use elements or connections that cannot be done by AI? For example using examples only given in the lecture, or professionals who have only talked on a field trip? That is not tracing back / process-grading, but AI could only be hugely generic without such knowledge from course activities and would very likely fail, even if a text would be error-less.
    - This could certainly work, but then there is always the risk that such statements end up in reports, which are then used to train new generations of language models.
- Is peer- assessment, for example aided by FeedBackFruits or otherwise, a means to monitor each student’s contribution to the group project?
    - Potentially, as long as it add “trail” to the activities. Take-home group assignments in general are no less vulnerable to collective GenAI use, it should be noted. So, peer review should not be the only source of information on steps taken.
- Would Google Docs (which enable the reader to see which consecutive changes were made to a document) help to see whether, for example, chunks of text were copied in from elsewhere?
    - See below
- Could or should this mean, for example, to demand submitting a document with track changes (all previous versions) at the end? Any larger text infill would be visible, and that would likely be a hint towards AI. For Bachelor and Master theses, many students do that anyway and it has helped me a lot in previous years to follow also for supervision.
- Are their limits or recommendations for the share/contribution to the final grade for
    - Potentially, yes. But the amount of changes to a document could be overwhelming if in-between checks are not implemented.
- Is it necessary to change our Program Learning Outcomes as a result?

    - Our proposals have the positive side effect of incorporating in courses good academic practice such as record and note-keeping, transparency. Such skills could very well also be part of ILO's if they are not already.
- Are there other/new/different forms of assignment that are possible for the following process grading? For example different 'small' products or reflections than written text?
    - Yes. Our ReMa program has experience grading scientific diaries, for example.
- Which (new) options do we have or should we use for process grading? Small steps are, in my experience, often more prone to undetectable AI use than large and complex ones.
    - The idea is that Examiner develops a view on what reasonable progress for the student looks like, and what parts where undertaken with the help of GenAI. This is best done in smaller steps rather than bigger ones.
- Our grading options for the process as such are, so far, relatively limited. I have no clue yet how to decide, but there would then be a point to remove a student, for example, from a course or thesis supervision, even before seeing the final product.
    - Yes, this could happen, for example when a student systematically withdraws from observation by not participating in (obligatory) in-between meetings, does not submit intermediate products, etc. Students can be excluded or failed if they do not comply with course regulations (standing policy)
- I have some doubts about using our position of power here, or even to observe student processes at all times. What would happen if someone does not participate? How would we deal with special circumstances?
    - There is nothing new here. If someone does not participate in mandatory events they shall be excluded, or whatever other consequence is stipulated in the course guide. We place a heavy weight on visibility in these proposals. Not strange in academic communities. There is of course a value in sending a student away to simmer on their own on an assignment. But if that is a skill that needs to be learned the examiner needs to think of ways to arrange that in such a way that the skill is actually established. Special Circumstances will continue to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. This is standing policy. Proper course design will allow for some flexibility / plan B's in case of unforeseen circumstances, but the general principle should be clear.
- Are you proposing to abolish the essay assignment?
    - Our proposals should hopefully achieve the exact opposite, and retain the essay / take home assignment as the important part of FSS assessment that it is.
- Which AI detection tools are we allowed to use according to GDPR? So far, I have followed the principle never use any AI tool with respective student, staff, or research data. Obviously, that has to change at some point, but I am puzzled how/when. We have no control about what such tools do with submitted data, so which ones are accepted? Or will OURIGINAL get an addition to it?
    - This will need to be checked with CIT