

From: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e <[REDACTED] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>
Sent: Friday, [REDACTED] 5.1.2e 7:25 PM
To: LAW - Advanced Master Board of Examiners
<AdvancedMasterBoardOfExaminers@LAW.leidenuniv.nl>
Cc: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e <[REDACTED] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>; [REDACTED] 5.1.2e
<[REDACTED] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>; [REDACTED] 5.1.2e
<[REDACTED] 5.1.2e @LAW.leidenuniv.nl>
Subject: Re: Follow-up, approval request for a second resubmission - Re: Response Board of Examiners after meeting student [REDACTED] 5.1.2e

Dear all,
Please find attached our report of the oral defence of the second resubmission of the thesis we have flagged with you for issues of plagiarism.

We also attach

1. The resubmission of the retake
2. the Turnitin report and
3. a differences-file between the first and second resubmission.

The outcome of our assessment of both the resubmission text and the oral defence is that the work still fails to meet our standards concerning proper attribution, as well as demonstrated capacity to express the work as the outcome of independent thinking.

Following up on point 5 in my mail of [REDACTED] 5.1.2e about how to proceed from here:

As the final part of the report of the oral defence shows, we have communicated to the student that [REDACTED] 5.1.2e has the option to leave the program (with certificates) or to reregister to try and pass the thesis process.

[REDACTED] 5.1.2e has chosen the latter option, and we assisted [REDACTED] 5.1.2e in the registration process.

Given this fact, we ([REDACTED] 5.1.2e and Thesis Coordinator) propose to the board of examiners that [REDACTED] 5.2.1

5.2.1

We ask the board of examiners for approval for this proposal for proceeding.

Best wishes,

[REDACTED] 5.1.2e
Also on behalf of [REDACTED] 5.1.2e, and [REDACTED] 5.1.2e (thesis coordinator)
Adv.LL.M [REDACTED] 5.1.2e

From: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e <[REDACTED] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>
Date: Tuesday, [REDACTED] 5.1.2e at 08:59

To: LAW - Advanced Master Board of Examiners

<AdvancedMasterBoardOfExaminers@LAW.leidenuniv.nl>

Cc: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@law.leidenuniv.nl>, 5.1.2e

<5.1.2e@law.leidenuniv.nl>, 5.1.2e

<5.1.2e@LAW.leidenuniv.nl>

Subject: Re: Follow-up, approval request for a second resubmission - Re: Response Board of Examiners after meeting student 5.1.2e

Thank you 5.1.2e and colleagues of the BoE,

I will follow up with the student and inform 5.1.2e of the next steps.

We will keep the BoE posted on the outcome.

Best wishes, 5.1.2e

From: LAW - Advanced Master Board of Examiners

<AdvancedMasterBoardOfExaminers@LAW.leidenuniv.nl>

Date: Tuesday, 5.1.2e at 08:28

To: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@law.leidenuniv.nl>

Cc: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@law.leidenuniv.nl>, 5.1.2e

<5.1.2e@law.leidenuniv.nl>

Subject: FW: Follow-up, approval request for a second resubmission - Re: Response Board of Examiners after meeting student 5.1.2e

Dear 5.1.2e

The BoE have by a majority voted to agree with your proposal to allow the student one last chance under the proposed points you have made in your request for permission. However, the BoE have no suggestions for navigating the administration in the event that the student fails once more. This is something that you should raise if it comes to that point.

Best regards

5.1.2e

From: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@law.leidenuniv.nl>

Sent: Monday, 5.1.2e 4:07 PM

To: LAW - Advanced Master Board of Examiners

<AdvancedMasterBoardOfExaminers@LAW.leidenuniv.nl>

Cc: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@law.leidenuniv.nl>; 5.1.2e

<5.1.2e@law.leidenuniv.nl>; 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@law.leidenuniv.nl>; 5.1.2e

5.1.2e <5.1.2e@law.leidenuniv.nl>; 5.1.2e

<5.1.2e@linc.leidenuniv.nl>; 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@law.leidenuniv.nl>

Subject: Follow-up, approval request for a second resubmission - Re: Response Board of Examiners after meeting student 5.1.2e

Dear Board of Examiners,

I am following up on your response below, regarding a reported case of (moderate) plagiarism in one of the theses in our program, 5.1.2e, requesting another decision from you.

I am writing to you to inform you that we inspected the resubmission of the student's thesis, which was handed in, as requested, by last 5.1.2e at noon.

Our assignment to the student was to address the problematic passages as pointed out to 5.1.2e in emails, during the meeting we held about it (Wednesday 5.1.2e transcript sent in prior

communication), and in the Turnitin report (provided to 5.1.2e, and in general: to bring the text up to the standards of our Adv.LL.M. programs regarding citing and proper attribution.

We have unfortunately come to the conclusion that the resubmission, while seemingly addressing a few of the passages that were pointed out explicitly (and repeatedly), still fails to meet the standards for proper attribution in a vast number of places - to the effect that we consider the resubmission not to deserve a passing grade.

I attach the Turnitin report of the resubmission (of the pdf - which, as with the first submission, scores higher than the Word version), and a document containing the remarks we (myself, 5.1.2e and thesis coordinator) collected while assessing this Turnitin report, to come to this conclusion. I also attach a Word document which shows via track changes where the retake version differs from the original hand-in.

Our proposal for proceeding requires approval of the Board of Examiners:

1. [REDACTED] 5.1.2e 5.1.2e 5.1.2e 5.1.2e 5.1.2e
2. [REDACTED] 5.1.2e 5.1.2e 5.1.2e
3. [REDACTED] 5.1.2e 5.2.1 5.1.2e
4. [REDACTED] 5.1.2e 5.1.2e 5.1.2e
5. If 5.1.2e does not pass, 5.1.2e has passed all courses but not the thesis. In our view, 5.2.1
[REDACTED] 5.2.1
5.1.2e However, according to my information (but I would like to be corrected if I am wrong), the student has 5.1.2e, 5.2.1
[REDACTED] 5.1.2e, 5.2.1

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

While waiting for your response, I will go ahead and inform the student that 1) 5.1.2e resubmission was insufficient (so 5.1.2e will not graduate with the rest of the class) and 2) that we are awaiting your decision on the possibility for another opportunity to finish within this academic year.

Best wishes,

[REDACTED] 5.1.2e
Also on behalf of [REDACTED] 5.1.2e, and [REDACTED] 5.1.2e (thesis coordinator)

Adv.LL.M [redacted] 5.1.2e

From: LAW - Advanced Master Board of Examiners

<AdvancedMasterBoardOfExaminers@LAW.leidenuniv.nl>

Date: Friday, [redacted] 5.1.2e at 17:22

To: [redacted] 5.1.2e <[redacted] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>

Cc: [redacted] 5.1.2e <[redacted] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>, [redacted] 5.1.2e
<[redacted] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>, [redacted] 5.1.2e <[redacted] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>, [redacted] 5.1.2e
<[redacted] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>, [redacted] 5.1.2e
<[redacted] 5.1.2e @llinc.leidenuniv.nl>, [redacted] 5.1.2e <[redacted] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>

Subject: Response Board of Examiners after meeting student [redacted] 5.1.2e

Dear [redacted] 5.1.2e

Many thanks for your very rapid response. The BoE agrees that point deduction should occur, on the basis that the student exercised insufficient due diligence in sourcing and attribution. deducted for those reasons. We had considered that the same result of lesser points could be achieved through incorporation of the aspect of low self-sufficiency and longer time taken to complete the thesis, leaving that to your discretion. We understand fully however that you would prefer the point deduction to be applied by the Board of Examiners. Given the need to maintain consistency in measures in comparable cases, the BoE would however, given its appraisal of the extent of the flaws in this case, prefer the point deduction to be limited to 0.5.

As such, we will inform the student of the following decision:

- The Board of Examiners considers the flaws pertaining to sources and attribution to qualify as moderate under the pertinent guidelines and as such determines as follows:
- The thesis is to be resubmitted, with all flaws pertaining to sources and attribution fully corrected;
- The deadline therefore will be established by the thesis supervisor, who will ensure that reassessment takes before the deadline for the submission of grades, in the event of full correction, enabling graduation in [redacted] 5.1.2e.
- In light of flaws in the submitted version of the thesis, in the event that the program is satisfied with corrections brought about in the new submission, 0,5 points will be deducted from the final grade.

On behalf of the BoE,

[redacted] 5.1.2e

[redacted] 5.1.2e

[redacted] 5.1.2e | Leiden University | Kamerlingh Onnes Building, Steenschuur
25, 2311 ES Leiden | E [redacted] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl

Working from home on [redacted] 5.1.2e

Working in the office on [redacted] 5.1.2e

[redacted] 5.1.2e

From: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e <[REDACTED] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>
Sent: Friday, [REDACTED] 5.1.2e 12:52 PM
To: LAW - Advanced Master Board of Examiners
<AdvancedMasterBoardOfExaminers@LAW.leidenuniv.nl>
Cc: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e <[REDACTED] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>; [REDACTED] 5.1.2e
<[REDACTED] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>; [REDACTED] 5.1.2e <[REDACTED] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>; [REDACTED] 5.1.2e
[REDACTED] 5.1.2e <[REDACTED] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>; [REDACTED] 5.1.2e
<[REDACTED] 5.1.2e @llinc.leidenuniv.nl>; [REDACTED] 5.1.2e <[REDACTED] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>
Subject: Re: Response Board of Examiners after meeting student [REDACTED] 5.1.2e

Dear [REDACTED] 5.1.2e and colleagues,
Dear BoE,

Thank you very much for your careful assessment of the situation. Your decision clarifies to us that the label "severe" entails evident malicious intent, which we also do not find applicable to this case.

We can agree with the proposed proceedings, in terms of providing the Turnitin report and revising the thesis - not only to amend the comments made by the supervisor, but also those that were made in the email exchange with the programme board regarding the flagging of the final version including unacceptable amounts of text (pages) copied from one report (note that this was not flagged as such in the supervisor comments).

In grading the revised thesis, we would not only look into adjusting the partial grade for self-sufficiency, but also (following the plagiarism protocol for moderate cases) a grade penalty.

As far as I know, the Turnitin report has already been made available to the student prior to the call we had earlier. (If not, could you please forward it? I only have my phone - I am [REDACTED] 5.1.2e [REDACTED] 5.1.2e)

I propose to set the deadline for the revision at [REDACTED] 5.1.2e 12:00. This means the student should be able to graduate within the current academic year.

I hope to have answered all questions and will now turn off my phone again.

Thanks again for the careful consideration.

Best wishes, [REDACTED] 5.1.2e

[REDACTED] 5.1.2e

On [REDACTED] 5.1.2e at 12:29, LAW - Advanced Master Board of Examiners
<AdvancedMasterBoardOfExaminers@law.leidenuniv.nl> wrote:

Dear [REDACTED] 5.1.2e

The Board of Examiners (BoE) meeting with student [REDACTED] 5.1.2e took place this morning.

The conclusion is that the student had no malicious intent and that the BoE members consider this to be a moderate case. The BoE members advise that the thesis must be revised following the remarks that you as thesis supervisor made about the thesis. In addition, the Turnitin report of the

final thesis should be shared with the student. Also, the student should be given a deadline enabling 5.1.2e to graduate this year.

When grading the revised thesis, we advise to consider that the student needed extra help, this influences the assessment of the student's self-sufficiency.

Can you please let us know if you have any comments to this decision before we inform the student?

On behalf of the BoE,

5.1.2e

5.1.2e | Leiden University | Kamerlingh Onnes Building, Steenschuur
25, 2311 ES Leiden | E 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl

Working from home on 5.1.2e

Working in the office on 5.1.2e

5.1.2e