



CBE Z22000702

Admission to degree programme

DECISION

In the matter of A., hereinafter referred to as the Appellant,

and

the Admissions Board for the International Master in Innovative Medicine (IMIM) track of the Faculty of Medical Sciences, hereinafter also referred to as the Defence,

regarding the decision taken by the Defence on 23 February 2022.

I. Description of the disputed decision

The decision taken by the Defence on 23 February 2022 to turn down the Appellant's request for admission to the IMIM track of the Faculty of Medical Sciences.

II. The hearing

The appeal was heard in open court on Thursday 14 July 2022, where the Appellant did not appear and sent no notice and where the Defence appeared via video link, represented by V., member of the Admissions Board.

III. Origin and course of the proceedings

The Appellant participated in the selection procedure for the MSc IMIM track. However, his score was insufficient for admission to the track. This decision was conveyed to the Appellant in a letter dated 23 February 2022.

The Appellant appealed against this decision via the CLRS on 8 March 2022. Subsequently, the Defence provided extra information about the decision taken on 23 February 2022 in an email dated 6 April 2022. The Appellant indicated that he wished to continue the appeal procedure, after which the appeal was heard on 14 July 2022.

IV. The parties' positions

The **Appellant's** position, as set out in the appeal, is as follows.

The Appellant states that he is very motivated to follow the IMIM track and he believes that he is also highly suited for it due to his background. He is involved in various research projects as a graduate assistant in the areas of histochemistry, neurochemistry, and sleep biology.

In addition, the Appellant states that the percentage of 'brain drain' in his home country of Nigeria is highly alarming and that the field of biomedical science has hardly been developed.

The Appellant would like to contribute to the field of biomedical science and innovative medicine. The UG degree programme is very suitable in the eyes of the Appellant, partly due to the grant that is made available to follow it.

The Appellant has supplemented his appeal with a recommendation letter from his supervisor. The Appellant therefore requests that the disputed decision be reversed and that he be admitted to the IMIM track.

The **Defence** defended itself as follows in the statement of defence and at the hearing.

The Appellant took part in the selection programme for the IMIM track. Roughly 600 candidates apply each year, while there are only around 35 places available on the track. As a



result, many candidates must unfortunately be denied admission. The selection requirements are stated clearly on the University website. The selection procedure is organized into rounds. The Appellant's file was carefully assessed by the Admissions Board. The Appellant's knowledge relating to areas that are relevant to the MMIT degree programme was unsatisfactory in comparison to other candidates. This is based on his previous education and his academic experience. In addition, other candidates scored better during the interview. The Appellant's presentation was not as good as those of the other candidates. The text was too long, the results were presented without graphics, and the Appellant did not understand the questions posed by the Admissions Board very well.

Unfortunately, the Appellant's score in comparison to the scores of other candidates is too low to grant him admission.

Finally, the Defence requests the Board to declare the appeal unfounded.

V. Review

The Board of Appeal points out that the content of the appeal must be tested against Article 7.61.2 of the Higher Education and Research Act (WHW). The question is whether the disputed decision was made in all fairness. A content-related assessment falls outside this assessment framework.

The admission requirements for the IMIM track are clear and cognizable and are set out on the UG website as well as in the OER of the respective degree programme. A selection procedure takes place every year. At the hearing, the Defence explained how this procedure is carried out and on what grounds the contested decision was taken. Places on the IMIM track are subject to very heavy competition, with around 600 applicants vying for only 35 places.

In the contested decision and in the Defence's explanation for taking the decision, the Defence clarified that the Appellant's score was unsatisfactory in comparison with the scores of other candidates to be admitted to the IMIM track.

The Board of Appeal for Examinations understands the Appellant's disappointment but judges that the Defence's decision is based on proper grounds. The contested decision can therefore be upheld.

VI. Decision

The Board of Appeal for Examinations declares the Appellant's appeal unfounded.

Thus established on 26 July 2022 by Dr E. van Wolde, Chair, Dr W. M. H. Grooten, and M. R. C. de Groot, members, in the presence of M. E. A. Donkersloot, Secretary.

Chair

Secretary

In accordance with the General Administrative Law Act and Article 7.66 of the Higher Education and Research Act (WHW – *Wet op het Hoger onderwijs en Wetenschappelijk onderzoek*), interested parties have the right to appeal against this decision to the national Higher Education Appeals Tribunal (CBHO – *College van Beroep voor het Hoger Onderwijs*), P.O Box 16137, 2500 BC The Hague within six weeks of the decision being sent to them.