

**Medical Sciences Divisional Board****Approved by Ros Whiteley on 20 08 2019****Title of Programme/ Name of Regulation**

Honour School of Neuroscience

**Brief note about nature of change:** minor amendments to pronouns and possessive determiners plus clarification of research project viva process.**Location of change**In *Examination Regulations 2018-19* <https://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/examregs/2018-19/hschoofneur/studentview/>**Effective date****For students starting FHS from MT 2018 (starting Part II in TT 2019)**

And

**For first examination from 2019-20****Detail of change**

A

1. The subject of the Honour School of Neuroscience shall be all aspects of the scientific study of the nervous system.

2. No candidate shall be admitted to examination in this school unless they have ~~he or she has~~ either passed or been exempted from the First Public Examination.

3. The examination in this school shall be under the supervision of the Medical Sciences Board, which shall make regulations concerning it.

4. The examination in Neuroscience shall consist of two parts: Part I and Part II.

5. No candidate shall be admitted to the Part II examination in this school unless they have ~~he or she has~~ completed the Part I examination in this school.

## B

### Part II

#### 4. The Research Project

##### (iii) Submission of the Project Report

The length and format of the Project Report shall be according to guidelines published by the Medical Sciences Board. Material in a candidate's Project Report must not be duplicated in any answer given in a written examination paper. Project Reports previously submitted for the Honour School of Neuroscience may be resubmitted. No Project Report will be accepted if it has already been submitted, wholly or substantially, for another Honour School or degree of this University or for a degree of any other institution.

Project Reports must be submitted via WebLearn (according to the instructions set out in the letter to candidates from the Chair of Examiners), not later than noon on the Friday of Week 8 of the Hilary Term in which the candidate intends to take the examination. Each Report shall be accompanied by a certificate of authorship indicating that the research project is the candidate's own work. In the case of work that has been produced in collaboration, the certificate shall indicate the extent of the candidate's own contribution.

In exceptional cases, where through unforeseen circumstances a research project produces no useable results (i.e. not even negative or ambiguous results), the candidate may apply through their ~~his or her~~ college to the Course Director, or a deputy, for permission to submit a concise review of the scientific context and the aims of the work that was attempted, in place of the normal Project Report. Such an application must be accompanied by supporting evidence from the supervisor of the project. The concise review to be submitted in such circumstances should be comparable in length to the Report of a successful research project, will be presented orally to the examiners, and will be examined viva voce in the usual way for a research project. The examiners will be advised that substantive results could not be produced.

The examiners shall obtain and consider a written report from each supervisor indicating the extent of the input made by the candidate to the outcome of the project and also any unforeseen difficulties associated with the project (e.g. unexpected technical issues or problems in the availability of materials, equipment, or literature or other published data).

##### (iv) Oral Assessment of Project-based Written Work

In addition, each candidate shall make a brief oral presentation of their project to a group of two examiners (or examiners and assessors appointed to ensure an adequate representation of expertise), after which, the candidate shall be examined viva voce on the project. A third examiner (usually the Chair) may also be present. The form of the presentation to the examiners shall be specified in guidelines published by the Medical Sciences Board.

### **Explanatory Notes**

The regulations are now written with gender-neutral pronouns and possessive determiners in line with inclusivity best practice. It also seemed advisable to alert students to the

possibility that examiner panels at research project vivas may include a third person (usually the Chair), to avoid unsettling surprises on the day.