

# **Annual Report Legal Protection EUR 2015**

**Board of Appeal for Examinations - CBE**

**Advisory Committee for Notices of Objection - ACB**

**Complaints Committee for Undesirable Conduct - SIAG**

**Board of Appeal for Non-Initial Programmes - GNIO**

**Confidant for Scientific Integrity - VPWI**

**Committee for Scientific Integrity - CWI**

## Preface

This Annual Report covers the period between 1 January 2015 and 31 December 2015 inclusive. During this year, the Legal Affairs Department (JZ) and the Administrative Affairs Department (BZ) of the General Management Directorate at Erasmus University Rotterdam were incorporated into a new department: Administrative and Legal Affairs (BJZ). The legal protection boards at both these former departments have been receiving support from the Legal Protection Cluster at the new department with effect from 1 November 2015. This annual report relates to the work carried out by both the legal protection boards supported by JZ in 2015 and by the legal protection boards supported by BZ and subsequently by BJZ in that year.

This report combines the annual reports of the Board of Appeal for Examinations (CBE), the Advisory Committee for Notices of Objection (ACB), the Complaints Committee for Undesirable Conduct (SIAG), the Board of Appeal for Non-Initial Programmes (GNIO), the Confidant for Scientific Integrity (VPWI) and the Committee for Scientific Integrity (CWI) in one communal annual report. The report gives an overview of the matters handled by the various boards and committees during the year under review.

	Number of matters handled in 2015	Number of matters handled in 2014	Number of matters handled in 2013	Number of matters handled in 2012
CBE	226	250	223	200
ACB	54	41	90	78
SIAG	1	0	0	1
GNIO	1	4	3	2
VPWI	30	11	N.A.	N.A.
CWI	5	2	N.A.	N.A.

A total of 226 appeals were submitted to the CBE in 2015. The ACB received 54 notices of objection. One complaint was submitted to the SIAG Committee in 2015 and one appeal was submitted to the GNIO in 2015. The VPWI held 30 discussions and the CWI handled 5 complaints during the year under review (2015).

This annual report was compiled under the responsibility of the secretaries of the legal protection boards. They would like to thank Ms K. Afrasiyabi at the department secretariat for compiling the tables and the first draft of the text for this document.

S. El Ghafour LL.M.  
Secretary

W.A. Kleinjan  
Secretary

Th.J. van Laar MPA  
Head of Administrative and Legal Affairs, Secretary

R. te Lindert  
Secretary

## 1. Board of Appeal for Examinations (CBE)

### 1.1 Introduction

The number of appeal cases at the CBE has been at a high level for several years now. A total of 226 appeals were submitted in 2015, while the total number of appeals submitted in 2014 was 250. In paragraphs 2 and 3, we will be taking a brief look at the CBE's statutory regulation and composition at the end of the year under review. We will give a quantitative overview of the appeal cases in paragraph 4. These appeals have been divided up according to the faculty or programme, and this has also been included here. The overview gives figures on the results of the appeals. The CBE gave decisions in 51 matters in 2015: 7 appeals were upheld, 38 appeals were rejected and 6 appeals were found to be obviously inadmissible. Finally, paragraph 5 contains an overview of the appeals against the CBE's decisions submitted to the Board of Appeal for Higher Education (CBHO) in 2015. In 2014, 12 appeals against the CBE's decisions were submitted, while 13 such appeals were submitted in 2015.

### 1.2 Statutory regulation

One part in Section 7 of the Higher Education and Research Act sets out legal protection for students. Article 7.60 of this Act states that each institution of higher professional education and academic higher education must have a CBE.

Article 7.61 of the Higher Education and Research Act provides for the CBE's jurisdiction. There is only one ground for assessment, i.e. assessment in relation to the law. This ground specifies that the CBE must carry out assessments in relation to the written and unwritten administrative and non-administrative legal rules and legal principles. In the case of assessment in relation to written law, this centres on the question of whether the disputed decision conflicts with regulations prescribed in a formal sense in or pursuant to the General Administrative Law Act (AWB), the Higher Education and Research Act (WHW) or any other Act. It also examines whether the relevant decision conflicts with regulations at the institution itself, such as the Course and Examination Regulations for the programme or the Rules and Regulations of the examining board. In the case of assessment in relation to unwritten law, the CBE can verify whether a decision complies with other general principles of proper administration or other general legal principles.

The CBE must limit itself to assessing the legitimacy of the decision. Pursuant to the WHW, the efficiency aspects of a disputed decision made by one of the bodies at the institution in question are not relevant in procedures at the CBE.

Appeals submitted to the CBE are deemed to be administrative appeals as referred to in Article 1:5 paragraph 2 of the AWB. This means that apart from a number of exceptions, the AWB applies to the procedure for the CBE. The period for lodging appeals with the CBE is six weeks.

### 1.3 Composition of the CBE

The CBE comprises 11 members, five of whom are deputy members and all of whom are appointed and removed by EUR's Executive Board. Except for the external chairman, the majority of the CBE are members of the academic staff. There are three student members. The CBE is assisted by a secretary. Generally speaking, the CBE holds sessions with five members, although it is sometimes difficult in practice to form a CBE with five members. However, the CBE's standing orders enable the CBE to hold sessions with only three members. The CBE has taken advantage of this opportunity on several occasions.

At the end of the year under review, the CBE comprised the following members:

#### **Members:**

P.J.W.M. Sliepenbeek	<i>chairman</i>
C.J. Bax	<i>member and deputy chairman</i>
N.A. Hofstra	<i>member</i>
Professor H.A.M. Neumann	<i>member</i>
H. van 't Foort	<i>student member</i>
M.R.A. Slag	<i>student member</i>

#### **Deputy Members:**

F.W.H. van den Emster	<i>deputy member and deputy chairman</i>
W.H. den Harder	<i>deputy member and deputy chairman</i>
Dr J. van Dalen	<i>deputy member</i>
Dr A.G.H. Klaassen	<i>deputy member</i>
W. Veldhoven	<i>deputy student member</i>
Vacancy	

#### **The CBE received support from the following persons in 2015:**

W.A. Kleinjan	<i>secretary</i>
S. El Ghafour LL.M.	<i>secretary</i>
M.S. Poppelaars-Melaard	<i>secretariat</i>
S.A. Dekker	<i>secretariat</i>
S. Aoulad Said	<i>secretariat</i>

### 1.4 A quantitative overview of the appeal cases

The tables below give a concise overview of the appeal cases at the CBE in 2015. A total of 231 matters were submitted to the CBE in 2015, 226 of which actually turned out to be intended for the CBE. All these matters occurred at the faculties and concerned appeals against decisions made by examining boards, examiners, deans and admission boards.

**Table 1 - Number of matters submitted to the CBE**

CBE	2015	2014	2013	2012
Matters submitted	231	250	223	200
Appeals	<b>226</b>	250	221	200
No appeals (sent on: CBE not authorised to handle them)	<b>5</b>	0	2	0

**Table 2 - Division of the appeals according to the examining board**

Examining board	2015	2014	2013	2012
Healthcare Policy & Management	7	14	11	11
Public Administration	4*	0	7	16
Erasmus School of Economics	55	57	60	41
Erasmus MC	13	28	12	9
Rotterdam School of Management RSM/IBA	62	67	63	48
Erasmus School of Law	54	64	54	61
Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication	10	9	5	3
Psychology	15*	8	5	5
Sociology	1*	2	3	5
Faculty of Philosophy	1	0	1	0
Pedagogical and Educational Sciences	3*	1	0	1
Erasmus University College	1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>200</b>

\* Combined to form one examining board for the Faculty of Social Sciences (FSW)

**Table 3 - Results of the appeals**

Result/Progress	2015	2014	2013	2012
Appeals	226	250	221	200
Settlement/withdrawal	180	177	158	153
<b>Decision:</b>	<b>51*</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>48</b>
Inadmissible	6	10	6 (1 partly unfounded)	1
Unfounded	38	32	38	39
Upheld	7	8	6	8
Matters still in progress on 31 December	5	25	13	0

\*10 of these decisions concerned matters that occurred in 2014

**Table 4 - Decisions for each Examining Board in 2015**

Examining board	Number of decisions	Unfounded	Upheld	In-admissible
Healthcare Policy & Management	4	0	4	0
Public Administration	2	0	1	1
Erasmus School of Economics	5	4*	0	1
Erasmus MC	5	5**	0	0
Rotterdam School of Management RSM/IBA	6	4	0	2
Erasmus School of Law	16	13***	1	2
Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication	0	0	0	0
Psychology	10	10	0	0
Sociology	1	1	0	0
Faculty of Philosophy	0	0	0	0
Pedagogical and Educational Sciences	2	1	1	0
Erasmus University College	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>

\*2 of these decisions concern matters that occurred in 2014

\*\*3 of these decisions concern matters that occurred in 2014

\*\*\*5 of these decisions concern matters that occurred in 2014

## 1.5 Decisions of the CBE

**Table 5 - Decisions of the CBE in 2015**

Case number	Examining board	Subject	Decision
14.169	ESL	BSA	Unfounded
14.194	ESL	BSA	Unfounded
14.197	EMC	BSA	Unfounded
14.199	ESL	BSA	Unfounded
14.201	ESE	BSA	Unfounded
14.216	EMC	BSA	Unfounded
14.221	ESE	Assessment of thesis	Unfounded
14.222	EMC	BSA	Unfounded
14.237	ESL	Excluded from participation in the course	Unfounded
14.249	ESL	Interim examination	Unfounded
15.003	ESL	Interim examination	Unfounded
15.013	ESL	BSA	Unfounded
15.025	PSY	Fraud	Unfounded
15.026	ESE	Admission for participation in a seminar	Unfounded
15.027	SOC	Exemption	Unfounded
15.034	BSK	Fraud	Upheld
15.041	PED	Enrolment with retroactive effect	Upheld
15.066	EMC	Diploma supplement to diploma	Unfounded
15.075	EMC	Oral examination	Unfounded
15.077	PSY	Admission to Master programme	Unfounded
15.086	IBA	Admission to Bachelor programme	Unfounded
15.093	iBMG	Fraud	Upheld
15.095	PED	Extra resit	Unfounded
15.097	RSM	Examination marks	Unfounded
15.102	iBMG	Fraud	Upheld
15.103	iBMG	Fraud	Upheld
15.104	iBMG	Fraud	Upheld
15.108	ESL	Examination marks	Unfounded
15.109	ESL	VoVo resit for bachelor degree	Unfounded
15.118	ESL	Examination marks	Unfounded
15.124	PSY	BSA	Unfounded
15.126	PSY	BSA	Unfounded
15.134	PSY	BSA	Unfounded
15.136	PSY	BSA	Unfounded
15.142	PSY	BSA	Unfounded
15.145	PSY	BSA	Unfounded
15.161	ESE	BSA	Unfounded

15.165	RSM	BSA	Unfounded
15.168	PSY	BSA	Unfounded
15.170	IBA	BSA	Unfounded
15.183	ESL	BSA	Unfounded
15.188	PSY	BSA	Unfounded
15.196	ESL	BSA	Upheld
15.202	ESL	BSA	Unfounded
15.209	ESL	Dispensation	Unfounded

In addition, 6 decisions were made regarding inadmissibility of the appeals during the year under review (2015). An appeal is (*inter alia*) inadmissible if the relevant student fails to submit the appeal within 6 weeks of the date of the disputed decision. The CBE will decide whether there is an excusable reason for exceeding this period.

Many appeals are settled at an earlier stage. 51 out of the 226 appeals submitted were handled during a hearing procedure. The most frequently-occurring subject of the appeals submitted was a negative binding study advice.

#### 1.6 External appeals at the CBHO

Appeals against decisions by the CBE may be submitted (in first and last resort) to the Board of Appeal for Higher Education (CBHO) in The Hague.

Appeals against decisions by the CBE were submitted in 13 matters during the year under review (2015). The total number of appeals in 2014 was 12. We have observed that students are submitting appeals more frequently to the CBHO. Demonstrable reasons might include the fact that it is increasingly important for students to complete their studies without any delays.

The CBHO's decisions may be perused on their website: [www.cbho.nl](http://www.cbho.nl).

The number of appeals in 2015 should include four appeals concerning non-CBE matters (see paragraph 2.5.).

**Table 1 - Number of appeal cases submitted to the CBHO**

CBHO	2015	2014	2013	2012
Appeal cases submitted	13	12	11	4

## 2. Advisory Committee for Notices of Objection (ACB)

### 2.1 Introduction

The number of notices of objection submitted to the ACB increased during the past year. During the year under review (2015), a total of 54 notices of objection were submitted. To compare: 41 notices of objection were submitted in 2014, no less than 90 notices of objection were submitted in 2013, and 78 notices of objection were submitted in 2012. In paragraphs 2 and 3, we will be taking a brief look at the ACB's statutory regulation and composition. We will give a quantitative overview of the objections in paragraph 4.

**Table 1 - Number of objections submitted to the ACB**

ACB	2015	2014	2013	2012
Matters submitted	55	41	90	78
<b>Objections</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>78</b>
No objections (sent on: ACB not authorised to handle them)	1	0	0	0

### 2.2 Statutory regulation

The ACB is an advisory committee within the meaning of Article 7:13 of the AWB and was set up in order to prepare decisions to be made in respect of notices of objection. In addition, the committee is also the disputes advisory committee as referred to in Article 7.63a of the WHW, which stipulates that each higher education institution must have its own disputes advisory committee. The disputes advisory committee gives advice on objections with respect to decisions other than those referred to in Article 7.61 of the WHW, which determines the CBE's authority.

### 2.3 Composition of the ACB

The ACB comprises several chairmen who are also members of the committee, and several other members including staff members as well as external members.

The committee is divided into four sections: personnel affairs, student affairs, electoral affairs and administrative affairs. The committee is assisted by a secretary.

The ACB comprised the following persons at the end of the year under review:

#### **Members:**

J.H.M. Nijhuis,	<i>chairman</i>
F. Verhulst,	<i>chairman</i>
C.J. Bax,	<i>deputy chairman</i>
B.D. Peters,	<i>deputy chairman</i>
V.H.M. Beerkens	
W.J. van den Bos	
M.H. Carp-den Baas	

C.M. Dirks-van den Broek  
 C.A. Dubbeldam  
 I.N. Fokma-Lanzing  
 P.Th.M. de Haan  
 W.A. Kleinjan  
 G. Kooistra  
 D.Y.M. Korthals Altes-Biemans  
 Th.J. van Laar MPA  
 Dr R. Pieterman  
 C.S.J. Sallaerts\*  
 J.J. Sirks  
 G.W.M. Stevens  
 S.P.C. Theeuwes.

\*Mr Sallaerts passed away at the beginning of 2015

**The ACB received support from the following persons in 2015:**

S. El Ghafour LL.M.	<i>secretary (personnel affairs)</i>
W.A. Kleinjan	<i>secretary (student affairs)</i>
Th.J. van Laar MPA	<i>secretary (electoral and administrative affairs)</i>
P.C.E. de Jong	<i>minutes secretary</i>
M.S. Poppelaars-Melaard	<i>secretariat</i>
S.A. Dekker	<i>secretariat</i>
S. Aoulad Said	<i>secretariat</i>

**2.4 A quantitative overview of the objections**

A total of 54 notices of objection were submitted during the year under review (2015). 16 of these notices of objection were for the personnel affairs section, 35 for the student affairs section (these included 11 notices of objection concerning the decentralised selection for Medicine), 2 for the electoral affairs section and 1 for the administrative affairs section. We note that the number of notices of objection has increased by 13 compared to 2014.

**Table 2 - Number of objections submitted to the ACB**

ACB	2015	2014	2013	2012
Personnel affairs committee*	16	10	16	3
Student affairs committee	35	30	72	74
Electoral affairs committee	2	1	2	1
Administrative Affairs	1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>78</b>

\* One objection was settled by the HR/USC Department after having been submitted to the ACB.

\* One matter is still being handled

**Table 3 - Results of the objections**

Result/Progress	2015	2014	2013	2012
Objections	54	41	90	78
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>12</b>
Inadmissible	1	0	3	1
Unfounded	12	10	20	10
Upheld	5	3	7	1

**Table 4 - Number of recommendations for the objections made by each section**

Committee	Number of recommendations	Unfounded	Upheld	In-admissible
Personnel affairs	7	4	3	0
Student affairs	9	7	2	0
Electoral affairs	1	0	0	1
Administrative affairs	1	1	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

The relatively large number of matters that come before the ACB's student affairs section is mainly due to the notices of objection submitted against decisions in connection with decentralised selection for the Medicine programme at Erasmus MC.

### 2.5 External appeals

With respect to personnel affairs, persons seeking justice may submit an appeal against a decision on an objection to the administrative tribunal, and may subsequently lodge a further appeal with the Central Appeals Tribunal (CRvB). With respect to student affairs, appeals against decisions on objections may be submitted (in first and last resort) to the Board of Appeal for Higher Education (CBHO).

Appeals were submitted to the CBHO in four cases relating to student affairs in **2015**. A settlement was reached in one case, while the second case was declared unfounded. The third case was upheld, and the fourth case is still being handled. These matters must be included under the heading of matters in which appeals against CBE decisions were submitted (see paragraph 1.6.).

### 3. Complaints committee for sexual harassment, aggression, violence, bullying and discrimination (SIAG)

#### 3.1. Introduction

A complaints procedure for cases of undesirable behaviour is in force at EUR. This procedure gives people the opportunity to submit a complaint - through a confidant - concerning harassment, sexual harassment, aggression, violence, bullying and/or discrimination to the Executive Board. The decision on the manner of handling written complaints submitted to the Executive Board and concerning undesirable behaviour rests with the Executive Board. Depending on the nature and gravity of the complaint, the Executive Board may call in the SIAG complaints committee or one of the departmental administrators, as well as asking the confidant for advice.

#### 3.2. Handling complaints, investigation and working method

After the Executive Board has transferred a complaint to be handled to the SIAG committee, this committee will launch an investigation. The operation of the committee is recorded in Articles 6 and 7 of the SIAG Regulations. The committee must interview the complainant as soon as possible after receipt of a complaint. It must notify the person(s) accused of the complaint and interview the person(s) accused. This interview may take place in the complainant's presence, but complainants and persons accused have always been interviewed separately in all matters handled to date. This has always been done at the express request of the complainants.

The committee must give confidential and substantiated advice to the Executive Board on whether the complaint is admissible or unfounded and also on any measures to be taken, no later than ten weeks after receipt of the complaint.

#### 3.3. Composition of the SIAG committee

The SIAG complaints committee comprises three members and three deputy members, all of whom are appointed and removed by EUR's Executive Board. The committee is supported by a secretary.

At the end of the year under review, the SIAG committee comprised the following members:

##### **Members:**

Professor H. Bart, *chairman*  
W. Bezemer  
Dr A.G.H. Klaassen

##### **Deputy Members:**

G.W.M. Stevens *deputy chairman*  
B.D. Peters  
C.S.J. Sallaerts\*

*\*Mr Sallaerts passed away at the beginning of 2015*

**The SIAG Committee received support from the following persons in 2015:**

W.A. Kleinjan	<i>secretary</i>
S.A. Dekker	<i>secretariat</i>

**3.4. Number of complaints**

Only a limited number of complaints have been submitted to the SIAG committee for handling. The committee investigated one complaint in 2015, and this complaint was withdrawn after being handled. No complaints at all were submitted during 2014 and 2013, and one complaint was submitted for handling in 2012. This complaint was declared unfounded.

## 4. Board of Appeal for Non-Initial Programmes (GNIO)

### 4.1 Introduction

The GNIO is a facility for students participating in accredited non-initial programmes. These students cannot follow the CBE-CBHO legal procedure for appealing against decisions made by the examining boards for these programmes. If no special facility existed, they would have to lodge an appeal against decisions made by these examining boards with the civil court.

Article 6 of the GNIO Regulations states that the GNIO's powers are stipulated in the Course and Examination Regulations for the relevant programme. This means that the GNIO is not automatically authorised. The main reason for this is to give commercial programmes - such as e.g. the "BVs" - the opportunity to arrange for legal protection themselves. Unlike the faculties with respect to the CBE, programmes with respect to the GNIO pay EUR the cost price for handling for each case handled.

### 4.2. Composition of the GNIO

At the end of the year under review, the GNIO comprised the following members:

#### **Members:**

J.H.M. Nijhuis *chairman*

B.D. Peters

Dr R. Pieterman

#### **Deputy Members:**

V.H.M. Beerkens

Dr J. van Dalen

A.G.H. Klaassen

#### **The GNIO received support from the following persons during the year under review:**

Th.J. van Laar MPA *secretary*

W.A. Kleinjan *secretary*

M.S. Poppelaars-Melaard *secretariat*

S. Aoulad Said *secretariat*

S.A. Dekker *secretariat*

#### 4.3. Matters handled

**Table 1 - Number of appeals submitted to GNIO**

<b>GNIO</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2012</b>
Appeals submitted	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
Institute for Housing and Urban Development Studies (IHS)	1	1	3	1
International Institute of Social Studies (ISS)	0	1	0	1
Maritime Economics and Logistics (MEL)	0	1	0	0
Master City Developer (MCD)	0	1	0	0

The matter submitted by IHS was settled without a hearing and judged inadmissible.

## 5. Committee for Scientific Integrity (CWI) and Confidant for Scientific Integrity (VPWI)

### 5.1 Introduction

All persons involved in education and research at Erasmus University Rotterdam have a personal responsibility for maintaining scientific integrity. To this end, the general principles of professional scientific conduct must be observed at all times.

The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice (VSNU 2005, amended in 2014) gives an elaboration of these principles, which are also endorsed by EUR and which are intended to provide guidelines for the university as referred to in Article 1.7 of the Higher Education and Research Act.

One of the ways of testing scientific integrity is the right to submit a complaint if staff at the university violate such scientific integrity, or if they are suspected of such violation.

The Executive Board has laid down a Scientific Integrity Complaints Procedure in order to implement this right to submit complaints.

### 5.2 Handling complaints, investigation and working method

The complaints procedure provides for the working methods to be used by the central scientific integrity confidant as well as the scientific integrity committee. Everyone is entitled to submit complaints to this committee, either through the Executive Board or the scientific integrity confidant.

The scientific integrity confidant's role is that of a contact and central discussion partner for questions and complaints concerning scientific integrity. If the confidant sees an opportunity for so doing, he will endeavour to mediate or otherwise resolve the complaint amicably, and will inform the complainant how best to submit a complaint to the scientific integrity committee.

The committee's task is to investigate complaints and subsequently make recommendations to the Executive Board. The committee will give an opinion on the admissibility of the complaint within three weeks of its receipt. If the committee considers the complaint admissible, it will proceed with its investigation in conformity with 4d. of the complaints procedure. The committee must give a recommendation to the Executive Board on whether the complaint is founded no later than twelve weeks after receipt of the complaint.

### 5.3 Appointment of Scientific Integrity Confidant and composition of the Scientific Integrity Committee

The Executive Board will appoint one or more confidants for a period of four years after hearing the Doctorate Board. These confidants may be reappointed for subsequent periods of four years each.

The committee comprises a chairman and at least two members. The chairman is permanent and will be appointed by the Executive Board for a period of four years. The Executive Board

may reappoint the chairman. The members of the committee will be appointed for a specific investigation.

#### **The Scientific Integrity Confidant:**

Professor Patrick Groenen (ESE) for the Woudestein faculties;  
Professor Peter Koudstaal (Erasmus MC) for Erasmus MC.

#### **Scientific Integrity Committee:**

During the year under review, the chairman of the scientific integrity committee was Professor Hans de Doelder (emeritus professor at ESL).

The confidant and the committee both receive official support. This support is provided by Ms Riette te Lindert (BJZ) for the Woudestein faculties and by Dr Jantine Spithoven (education & research support) for Erasmus MC.

#### 5.4 Number of confidential talks and complaints

The confidants held confidential talks on 30 occasions in 2015.

A total of 5 complaints were submitted to the committee in 2015. Three of these complaints were declared admissible, one was declared partially admissible and one inadmissible.

**Table 1 - Number of complaints submitted to the Scientific Integrity Committee**

Complaints submitted to the Scientific Integrity Committee	2015	2014	2013*	2012**
<b>Admissible</b>	3	2	0	N.A.
<b>Partially admissible</b>	1	0	0	N.A.
<b>Inadmissible</b>	1	0	0	N.A.
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0*</b>	<b>N.A.</b>

\* Only follow-up investigations were conducted in 2013

\*\* The complaints for 2013 were not registered in this manner

An independent advisor was appointed to handle one of the complaints. This concerned a conflict on first authorship, and the confidential talks resulted in the parties being able to reach a compromise.

A total of four committees have been set up. Two of these four committees have completed their investigations.

With respect to one of the investigations completed, the relevant committee concluded that there was no question of scientific misconduct. However, the committee found that the person in question had displayed a lack of integrity in his behaviour as an employee. The committee furthermore concluded that the reliability of the scientific data had never been endangered. With respect to the other investigation completed, the committee concluded that scientific integrity had actually been violated, in the sense that research data had not been handled with due care. In view of the nature and the scope of the carelessness and the fact that the research group had tackled the person concerned about his carelessness and subsequently dealt with it themselves, the seriousness of the misconduct could be limited. A further two ongoing investigations from preceding years were also completed in 2015. As a result of both these investigations, the committee concluded that scientific integrity had actually been violated.