

L.N. 16 of 2017**EDUCATION ACT
(CAP. 327)****University Undergraduate Awards (Amendment) Regulations, 2017**

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, 2017 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 1st January, 2017 onwards.

Amendment to regulation 84 of the principal regulations

3. Regulation 84 of the principal regulations shall be renumbered as paragraph (1) of regulation 84.

4. The following paragraph (2) shall be added after paragraph (1) of regulation 84 of the principal regulations:

“(2) The Board of Examiners shall follow the procedures for the assessment of dissertations for Bachelor degrees, as approved by Senate.”

Amendment to regulations 85 and 86 of the principal regulations

5. For regulations 85 and 86 of the principal regulations there shall be substituted the following:

“Assessment of Dissertations

85. For dissertations presented for the award of a Bachelor’s degree:

(1) an oral examination shall be held if it is indicated in the method of assessment of the dissertation study-unit. A second oral examination may be held at the discretion of the Board of Examiners in cases of resubmission of dissertations following major corrections or resubmission of failed dissertations;

(2) if an oral examination is not indicated in the method of assessment of the dissertation study-unit, it may be held in cases of borderline dissertations verging on a fail, in cases of resubmission of failed dissertations, or in cases where there is lack of consensus among the Board of Examiners.

86. (1) When an oral examination is indicated in the method of assessment in terms of regulation 85 (1), after reading and marking the dissertation, the Board of Examiners shall call the student for the oral examination and shall either:

(a) award an overall pass to 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. If the changes are not effected properly, the Board of Examiners shall award a mark and grade for the original version; or

(b) in the case of borderline dissertations verging on a fail, advise major corrections to the dissertation 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 order to qualify for a minimum pass mark and grade (ie 45%, grade D). If the changes are not effected properly, the dissertation shall be declared as failed and a re-assessment shall be allowed if eligible in terms of these regulations; or

(c) in cases of low quality dissertations, declare the student to have failed with the possibility of a re-assessment if eligible in terms of these regulations.

(2) When an oral examination is not indicated in the method of assessment in terms of regulation 85 (2), after reading and marking the dissertation, the Board of Examiners shall either:

(a) award a pass to 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. If the changes are not effected properly, the Board of Examiners shall award a mark and grade for the original version; or

(b) in the case of borderline dissertation verging on a fail, the Board of Examiners may:

either (i) refer the dissertation back to the student for 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 order to qualify for a minimum pass mark and grade (ie 45%, grade D). If the changes are not effected properly, the dissertation shall be declared as fail and a re-assessment shall be allowed if eligible in terms of these regulations;

or (ii) call the student for an oral examination before deciding if the dissertation should be referred back to the student for major corrections or if the dissertation shall be declared as fail with the possibility of a re-assessment if eligible in terms of these regulations; or

(c) in cases of low quality dissertations, declare the student to have failed with the possibility of a re-assessment if eligible in terms of these regulations.

(3) When a Board of Examiners fails to reach consensus about the final mark/grade they shall proceed according to regulation 24 of the University Assessment Regulations, 2009.

(4) A Board of Examiners shall not allow a period longer than three months for major corrections in cases of borderline dissertations verging on a fail, and not longer than six months for resubmission of failed dissertations, unless there are valid reasons which shall be recorded in the report of the Board of Examiners.

(5) Major corrections to borderline dissertations verging on a fail as required by the Board of Examiners may be re-submitted once only.

