

Guidance for Boards of Examiners concerning major project resubmission

1. Components for reassessment

- 1.1 In different courses, major projects may be stand-alone reports or associated with oral examinations and/or assessed project proposals.
- 1.2 If a student fails the research project report component then both the report and any associated oral examination will need to be re-done. It would not be expected that an assessed project proposal would have to be resubmitted where this was assessed prior to completion of the major project itself.

2. Nature of the resubmission requirements

- 2.1. It will be at the discretion of the Board of Examiners (drawing on the advice of the markers, supervisors and the Course Directors) to determine whether the candidate is required to:
 - amend ('rewrite') the project they submitted, or
 - need to collect further/new data prior to revising and re-submitting ('new data'), or
 - undertake an entirely new project ('new project').
- 2.2 This consideration will be based upon the causes of the failure of the project and the capacity and practical feasibility of the project (rather than the student) to deliver work of the required standard.

3. Deadline for resubmission

- 3.1. In all cases the Board should determine a deadline by which the student can reasonably be expected to complete the work required.
- 3.2 A typical deadline for a 'rewrite' project would be three months from the notification of the result. There is no typical deadline for other forms of resubmission and the Board should be guided by the practicalities of the student undertaking the work and the reassessment involved.
- 3.3. All deadlines will be subject to the normal regulations and expectations that apply to project submission overall.

4. The resubmitted report

Where it has been decided that the resubmission is a 'rewrite', in addition to the newly submitted report the student should submit a "track changes" version showing modifications from the original, or else give a summary sheet describing the specific changes made.

5. Support for students and students' responsibilities in this situation

5.1. For 'Rewrites'

- 5.1.1. All students that have to rewrite their research project should receive feedback that will guide them in the required task. Written feedback provided by staff on the original submission should provide guidance for the direction any new work should take. Revisions should be based on this written feedback provided by staff. However the student should still be aware that it is their responsibility to strive further to meet the standard required and this could involve work beyond that provided in the feedback.

5.1.2. Students are allowed one meeting with either their supervisor or a Course Director, and/or email correspondence up to a total of two hours staff time, to help clarify the feedback guidance. Staff are not expected to read or comment on revised drafts prior to re-submission.

5.2. Where there is a requirement to undertake further work or data collection, or an entirely new project

5.2.1. In addition to that for a 'Rewrite' above, the same level of supervision should be provided for a second attempt as for a 'first attempt' project wherever possible, although the same supervisor may not always be available.

5.2.2. Students should be aware that for 'new data' projects, a revised ethics submission may be needed.

5.2.3. For entirely new projects, the student should go through the course's full project approval procedure again (including ethics).

5.2.4. For 'new data' projects, if there are practical barriers to obtaining material or an appropriate supervisor cannot be found, it may be necessary for the student to undertake a new project.

*Julie Clark
With thanks to the Vet Epi team
March 2014*

Author:	Julie Clark
Date:	04.03.14