



**Please be advised this text is a Google Translate of the  
Decision in Dutch**

EXAMINATION APPEALS  
BOARD

No. 2024/27/1169

THE EXAMINATION APPEALS BOARD

Ruling on the appeal by [appellant], [student number], against the assessment of the subject Socially Intelligent Robotics, by the examiner Prof. Dr K. Hindriks, respondent, with the mark 7.4.

### **I. Course of the proceedings**

The appellant lodged an appeal with the Examination Appeals Board on 28 February 2024 against the respondent's decision of 9 February 2024. On 11 March 2024, the receipt of the notice of appeal was acknowledged and the Board asked the Examination Board of the Faculty of Science, in consultation with the appellant and the examiner, to explore the possibility of an amicable settlement of the dispute. On 19 March 2024, a meeting took place between the appellant, the respondent and the Examination Board. No amicable settlement was reached. The Examination Board submitted a statement of defence on 28 March 2024. The appeal was heard at the hearing of the Board on 13 May 2024. The appellant and the respondent were present at the hearing. Dr V. de Boer (deputy chairman) and S. van Dorresteijn (official secretary) were present on behalf of the Examination Board.

### **II. Facts**

Based on the documents and the proceedings at the hearing, the Board assumes the following facts. The appellant received the assessment of the subject Socially Intelligent Robotics on 9 February 2024. The test was assessed with the mark of 7.4.

The test of the subject Socially Intelligent Robotics consists of several components. Of these, certain parts are group work and micro- assignments are individual. The components have different weightings. The study manual for the subject states that 0.5 points can be awarded for the individual micro-assignments in case of a satisfactory result and 0.5 points can be awarded for the group presentation in the final assessment of the subject. According to the appellant, he was wrongly not awarded 0.5 points for the group presentation.

### **III. Views of the parties**

The appellant disagrees with the assessment of the test for the subject Socially Intelligent Robotics. According to the appellant, the final result for the test for the subject Socially Intelligent Robotics was wrongly not awarded 0.5 point for the group result. The group achieved second place in the group presentation and was therefore eligible for 0.5 points.

The appellant was awarded a grade of 7 for the individual part of the test. The appellant cannot agree with this. Appellant argues that he did most of the work for the group assignment and also completed all

the micro-assignments. Because he spent so much time on the group work and also took and obtained three other subjects, the appellant had little time left for the micro-assignments. The micro-assignments were only a small, unimportant part of the test. Appellant knew no better than that it was sufficient to have participated in the micro-assignments and met the minimum requirements for those assignments. This was also made known to the appellant in that manner by the teaching assistant. Appellant argues that he met the minimum requirements.

Appellant did not receive feedback on the micro-assignments, while other students did, so it did not become clear to him earlier that he was scoring inadequately on the micro-assignments. Appellant was under the impression that he simply had to hand in something. If appellant did receive the feedback, he could have still made adjustments to ensure that he completed the remaining micro-assignments with a pass. Similarly, making one of the micro-assignments required information included on the slides, but the slides were not available at the time the appellant was working on the assignments. Afterwards, the slides were made available, but by then the appellant was busy with the other assignments and subjects. The appellant feels he did not get the grade he deserved; he did most of the work on the assignments, but ended up with the lowest grade of the whole group.

The respondent explains that the test of the subject Socially Intelligent Robotics consists of several parts. Contrary to the appellant's argument, the 0.5 (bonus) point for the group presentations was indeed allocated to the group result.

The respondent confirmed that the micro-assignments are small assignments aimed at getting students to actively contribute to the course. However, the assignments do have minimum requirements to ensure that the student also produces substantive work. The appellant failed to meet those minimum requirements and therefore received a 0.5 point deduction for the individual part of the assessment. If two of the micro-assignments were not met or were assessed with a failing grade, this is not a problem, but more than two will result in point deductions.

In dealing with the appellant's appeal, it emerged that he did not receive feedback for the micro-assignments during the course. This was possibly because the teaching assistant did not click 'submit'. This should have been done, according to the respondent. The respondent acknowledges that the appellant should have received the feedback, but also argues that these were small-scale assignments for which students can easily get a pass. Appellant could have inquired with the teacher about the lack of feedback. Regarding the appellant's ground of appeal that the slides to be responded to in the micro-assignment had not been published on time, the respondent states that it is not known to the respondent what went wrong therein. The slides were eventually published, but the appellant did not look at the assignment after that point.

The defendant argues that despite the fact that the appellant did not receive the feedback on time and the slides may not have been published on time, the appellant did not meet the requirements for a satisfactory assessment of the micro-assignments. Therefore, the defendant cannot review the assessment.

#### **IV. Considerations of the Board**

The appellant's appeal was lodged on time and also otherwise meets the legal requirements.

The Board starts by stating that its jurisdiction is limited to assessing whether the examiners' decision is contrary to law (section 7.61, second paragraph, of the Higher Education and Scientific Research Act (WHW)). The Board therefore tests whether the assessment was carried out correctly and whether the assessment is not manifestly unreasonable in terms of content.

The Board considers that the file and the hearing showed that the examiner conducted the assessment in accordance with the rules in the study guide. Part of the assessment are five individual micro-assignments, for which minimum requirements must be met. It is sufficiently clear from the documents and the hearing that the 0.5 point for the group presentation was awarded to the group result.

The defendant's explanation showed that the appellant's guidance during the course did not go as it should have. The appellant should have received feedback on the micro-assignments during the course.

Due to a carelessness on the part of the teaching assistant, the appellant did not receive that feedback. However, the fact that the appellant did not receive the feedback in time is no reason for the Board to rule that the assessment was made carelessly. After all, the appellant does not dispute that he failed to make the minimum effort required for the assignments and thus failed to meet the requirements.

The Board is of the opinion that, despite a carelessness in the guidance, the assessment was properly conducted and that there was no assessment that was manifestly unreasonable in substance

The above considerations lead to the following ruling.

**V. Ruling**

The Board declares the appeal unfounded.

Done in Amsterdam, on 14 June 2024, by H. Bolt, Prof. J.J. Beishuizen and R.A. Brouwer, in the presence of S.A. Snoeren, secretary.

H. Bolt,  
Chairman

S.A. Snoeren,  
Secretary

An appeal against a decision of the Examinations Appeals Board may be lodged by the person concerned with the Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State, PO Box 20019, 2500 EA The Hague, the Netherlands. The period for submitting a notice of appeal is six weeks. A Safe Mail web form can be used. A court fee is payable. See [www.raadvanstate.nl/studentzaken](http://www.raadvanstate.nl/studentzaken).