

B 356

L.N. 28 of 2016

**EDUCATION ACT
(CAP. 327)****University Undergraduate Awards (Amendment) Regulations, 2016**

IN EXERCISE of the powers conferred upon him by articles 74 (5) and 75 (6) of the Education Act (Cap. 327), the Chancellor of the University of Malta has promulgated the following regulations made by the Senate of the University of Malta by virtue of the powers conferred upon it by articles 75 (3) and 79 (b) of the said Act:

Citation

1. These regulations may be cited as the University Undergraduate Awards (Amendment) Regulations, 2016 and shall be read and construed as one with the General Regulations for University Undergraduate Awards, published as Legal Notice 127 of 2004, hereinafter referred to as “the principal regulations”.

Applicability

2. These regulations shall be applicable from 19th June, 2015 onwards.

Renumbering of regulations 84 to 87 of the principal regulations

3. Regulations 84 to 87 of the principal regulations shall be renumbered as regulations 87 to 90.

Addition of regulations 84 to 86 to the principal regulations

4. The following regulations 84 to 86 shall be added after regulation 83 of the principal regulations:

“Boards of Examiners for Dissertations

84. Dissertations submitted for a Bachelor’s degree shall be assessed by a Board of Examiners appointed by Senate for the purpose, on the recommendation of the Board, which shall normally be composed of at least three members.

Assessment of Dissertations

85. For dissertations presented for the award of a Bachelor's degree, an oral examination may be held, if this requirement is included in the method of assessment, or if a dissertation is deemed to be of borderline quality verging on a fail, in order to allow the Board of Examiners to decide the mark.

86. (1) (a) When an oral examination is a requirement in terms of regulation 85, after examining the dissertation, the Board of Examiners shall either:

(i) admit the student to the oral examination if it is satisfied with the quality of the dissertation or in cases of a borderline quality dissertations verging on a fail or where there is no clear consensus among the examiners about the quality and standard of the dissertation; or

(ii) decide not to admit the student to the oral examination in cases of low quality dissertations, and declare the student to have failed the dissertation with the possibility of resubmission.

(b) Following the oral examination, the Board of Examiners shall either:

(i) approve the oral performance and the dissertation unconditionally or subject to minor corrections which shall be submitted within a time established by the Board of Examiners and to the satisfaction of the chairman of the Board of Examiners in consultation with the supervisor; or

(ii) approve the oral performance and the dissertation but advise major corrections which shall be submitted within a time established by the Board of Examiners and to the satisfaction of the chairman of Board of Examiners in consultation with the supervisor, in which case the final mark shall not be greater than 10 marks of the preliminary mark as agreed by the Board of Examiners following the oral examination; or

(iii) agree that the oral performance is poor although the dissertation is of passing standard and allow the student to be re-examined orally at the first suitable opportunity in order to allow the Board of Examiners to decide on a final mark that shall not be greater than 10 marks of the preliminary mark as agreed by the Board of Examiners following the oral examination; or

(iv) in the case of borderline quality dissertations verging on a fail, approve the oral performance or, agree that the overall performance is also poor and refer the dissertation back to the student for major revision, and resubmission within a time established by the Board of Examiners and to the satisfaction of the chairman of the Board of Examiners in consultation with the supervisor, in which case the mark of 45%, grade D shall be awarded.

(2) When an oral examination is not a requirement in terms of regulation 85, after examining the dissertation, the Board of Examiners shall either:

(i) approve the dissertation unconditionally or subject to minor corrections which shall be submitted within a time established by the Board of Examiners and to the satisfaction of the chairman of the Board of Examiners in consultation with the supervisor; or

(ii) agree that the dissertation is of a passing standard but advise major corrections which shall be submitted within a time established by the Board of Examiners and to the satisfaction of the chairman of the Board of Examiners in consultation with the supervisor, in which case the final mark shall not be greater than 10 marks of the preliminary mark as agreed by the Board of Examiners; or

(iii) in the case of borderline quality dissertations verging on a fail, refer the dissertation back to the student for major revision and resubmission within a time established by the Board of Examiners in a revised form and to the satisfaction of the chairman of the Board of Examiners in consultation with the supervisor; the maximum mark that may be awarded shall be of 45%, grade D. In addition, a Board of Examiners may also call the student for an oral examination if it deems this to be in the student's best interests; or

(iv) in cases where the Board of Examiners agree that the dissertation is of low quality, declare the student to have failed with the possibility of resubmission with marks being awarded as indicated in sub-paragraph (iii) of this paragraph and to the satisfaction of the chairman of the Board of Examiners in consultation with the supervisor to ensure that the changes were effected as directed.

(3) When a Board of Examiners fails to reach consensus about the final mark/grade they shall follow the Procedures for Board of Examiners as stipulated in the University Assessment Regulations, 2009.

(4) A Board of Examiners shall not allow a period longer than six months for major revisions unless there are valid reasons which shall be recorded in the report.”

