

UNIVERSITY ACADEMY 92 (UA92)

MANUAL OF ACADEMIC REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES

2026-27

**ACADEMIC REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES FOR UA92 FOUNDATION YEAR
PROGRAMMES**

(APPLICABLE FROM SEPTEMBER 2026)

CONTENTS

FP 1	FOUNDATION YEAR PROVISION	2
FP 2	STRUCTURE OF FOUNDATION YEAR	2
FP 3	CRITERIA FOR FOUNDATION YEAR COMPLETION.....	2
FP 4	PROGRESSION	2
FP 4.1	GENERAL	2
FP 4.2	PROGRESSION FROM FOUNDATION YEAR TO LEVEL 4 OF BACHELORS DEGREE PROGRAMMES.....	3
FP 5	REASSESSMENT	3
FP 5.1	FOUNDATION YEAR REASSESSMENT.....	3
FP 5.2	GENERAL PRINCIPLES	4
FP 6	INCOMPLETE ASSESSMENT AND EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES....	4
FP 7	CONSIDERATION AND CONFIRMATION OF RESULTS.....	6
FP 8	PUBLISHED INFORMATION	7
FP 9	EXCLUSION	8
	APPENDIX 1: GRADING TABLE	9
	APPENDIX 2: GUIDANCE FOR SCALING OF MARKS.....	10
	APPENDIX 3: LATE PENALTIES FOR ASSESSED WORK.....	12
	APPENDIX 4: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY	13

MARP 2026-27
UA92 FOUNDATION YEAR ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

FP 1 FOUNDATION YEAR PROVISION

FP 1.1 UA92 currently offers the following Foundation Year provision:

Foundation Year	Level of award	FTE period of study (normal)	Normal total credit value
International Foundation Year	3	1 year	120

FP 2 STRUCTURE OF FOUNDATION YEAR

FP 2.1 The Foundation Year comprises learning across level 3 with 120 credits of assessment. It is collectively referred to as year zero and is qualificatory, i.e. successful completion is required for progression to further study but where students exit at this point they will receive a transcript of all credits obtained.

FP 3 CRITERIA FOR FOUNDATION YEAR COMPLETION

FP 3.1 The pass mark for Foundation Year shall be 40% in each module.

FP 3.2 In order to complete the overall Foundation Year, students must have attained in full the minimum credit requirement for the Foundation Year and passed all contributory modules.

FP 3.3 Regulations outlining progression requirements into undergraduate studies beyond the Foundation Year are detailed under FP 4 below.

FP 4 PROGRESSION

FP 4.1 GENERAL

FP 4.1.1 Each Foundation Year will have progression requirements detailed and approved through the programmes approval process. Examining bodies will determine whether a student has successfully met the progression requirements for a Foundation Year giving full countenance to exceptional circumstances as reported from the Exceptional Circumstances Committee and reassessment opportunities as detailed below.

FP 4.1.2 In order to qualify to progress to the next stage of the degree programme, students must have attained in full the minimum credit requirement for the stage completed.

FP 4.2 PROGRESSION FROM FOUNDATION YEAR TO LEVEL 4 OF BACHELORS DEGREE PROGRAMMES

FP 4.2.1 In order to progress to Level 4:

- (a) an overall aggregation score of 40% is required in each module; and
- (b) for the English language module the requirement is normally an overall aggregation score of 60%, with a minimum of a 40% in each assignment.

FP 4.2.2 Students who initially fail one or more subjects at Foundation Year will be offered an opportunity to resit the subjects failed. Students who choose not to participate in a resit opportunity will be deemed to have withdrawn from the University.

FP 4.2.3 Exceptionally, an examination board may offer a student the opportunity to repeat the year on the same foundation year without having to take the associated resits. Students retain the right to undertake the resits should they so wish. The department (or equivalent) must work closely with the student to advise them on their available options. Normally students should only be offered the opportunity to repeat the year without taking resits where they have failed a significant portion of the year.

FP 4.2.4 After taking resits as required, a student who passes all subjects with the required aggregation marks qualifies to progress to Level 4 of Bachelors Degree Programmes.

FP 4.2.5 Students who have not passed all subjects, after resit, will be offered, immediately following the examination board at which the student was considered, the choice of:

- (a) one (and only one) further resit opportunity as an external candidate; or
- (b) a repeat year.

FP 4.2.6 Students opting for a repeat or restart year will:

- (a) have full-time student status;
- (b) lose all credit, marks and grades gained in the original Foundation Year;
- (c) undergo an assessment of support needs (both academic and general wellbeing) at the start of the repeat year;
- (d) be placed on academic probation, with especially close monitoring of academic progress by the major department (or equivalent);
- (e) otherwise be treated the same as any other Foundation Year student;
- (f) have one resit opportunity if necessary;
- (g) not be allowed any further resit opportunity as an external candidate or another repeat year, except under exceptional circumstances where approved by the Programme Assessment Resit / Module Panel and Progression Board.

FP 5 REASSESSMENT

FP 5.1 FOUNDATION YEAR REASSESSMENT

FP 5.1.1 A student who fails a Foundation Year module will be required to undertake a reassessment for that module. If the module aggregation mark after reassessment is an improvement on the original score, the reassessment score will count; otherwise the

original aggregation mark will stand. The reassessment score will be subject to a cap at 40%.

- FP 5.1.2 Where a student achieves a pass mark but fails to reach a progression threshold they will be entitled to undertake the same reassessment as a student who has failed outright.

FP 5.2 GENERAL PRINCIPLES

- FP 5.2.1 The precise form of reassessment is for the department (or equivalent) to decide, but the following principles should be borne in mind:
- (a) the principal purpose of reassessment is to re-examine the learning objectives which have been failed at the first attempt;
 - (b) students who have failed all elements of assessment at the first attempt should not be advantaged over those who have failed only a part of the assessment.
- FP 5.2.2 Students will be given the opportunity to undertake reassessment within the same academic year in which they made their first attempt.
- FP 5.2.3 When all the results of reassessment are available the overall profile will then be considered following procedures detailed below in the section on the consideration and confirmation of results.

FP 6 INCOMPLETE ASSESSMENT AND EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES

- FP 6.1 For the purposes of these regulations 'exceptional circumstances' will mean properly evidenced and approved claims from students that demonstrate good cause as to why their performance and achievements have been adversely affected by means which have not been fully addressed through extension and other available assessment procedures.
- FP 6.2 For the purposes of these regulations 'good cause' will mean illness or other relevant personal circumstances affecting a student and resulting in either the student's failure to attend an examination, or submit coursework at or by the due time, or otherwise satisfy the requirements of the scheme of assessment appropriate to their programme of studies; or, the student's performance in examination or other instrument of assessment being manifestly prejudiced.
- FP 6.3 A chronic medical condition, for which due allowance has already been made, will not itself be considered a good cause although a short-term exacerbation of such a condition might be so judged.
- FP 6.4 'Evidence' will mean a report descriptive of the medical condition or other adverse personal circumstances, which are advanced by the student for consideration as amounting to good cause. Such a report should include a supporting statement from an appropriate person. Where the report refers to a medical condition of more than five days' duration the report must be completed by an appropriate medical practitioner who would be requested to comment on how the medical condition concerned would be likely (if this were the case) to have affected the student's ability to prepare for or carry out the assessment(s) in question.

- FP 6.5 Where an incomplete assessment may be the result of good cause, it will be the responsibility of the student concerned to make the circumstances known to their department or equivalent body and to provide appropriate evidence. Notification later than forty-eight hours after the examination, or after the date at which submission of the work for assessment was due, will not normally be taken into account unless acceptable circumstances have prevented the student from notifying the department (or equivalent) within this time.
- FP 6.6 All departments or equivalent will have an Exceptional Circumstances Committee whose primary responsibility it is to consider claims of good cause for the programmes they administer. Any such claims would be subject to confirmation by the examining bodies at a later date. The Exceptional Circumstances Committee would be required to meet at least once per annum prior to the final Examining bodies, but might usefully meet to consider claims of good cause on a more frequent basis. The Exceptional Circumstances Committee will produce minutes of its meetings to be submitted to the appropriate examination body. Guidance on the management and operation of Exceptional Circumstances Committees can be found in the [General Regulations for Assessment & Award](#).
- FP 6.7 In considering claims of good cause:
- (a) the evidence provided by the student claiming good cause, and any relevant and available material submitted by them for assessment will be scrutinised;
 - (b) fairness to the individual student claiming good cause must be balanced with fairness to other students and the integrity of the assessment as a whole;
 - (c) in the event of the student having failed to attend an examination or examinations, or having failed to submit course material or other work for assessment at or by the due time, it will be determined whether the failure to attend or submit has been justified by good cause;
 - (d) in the event of the student having submitted work for assessment by examination or otherwise, it will be determined whether such work has been manifestly prejudiced by good cause. If such prejudice is established the work affected will normally be deemed not to have been submitted.
- FP 6.8 Where it is determined that the evidence presented does not support the student's claim that they were prevented by good cause from attending an examination or from submitting work for assessment, the student will be awarded Grade N (an aggregation mark of zero) for the assessment or assessments in question. Where work is submitted but the student makes a claim that it has been affected by good cause (or a late penalty is applied), and the evidence presented does not support the student's claim then their work will be assessed (or penalised) as though no claim of good cause had been received and the student's grade for the module will be calculated accordingly.
- FP 6.9 In the event of incomplete assessment arising from good cause being established the student will normally be expected to complete their assessment by attending the examination at a subsequent session, or submitting outstanding work for assessment, if an opportunity to do so occurs within their period of study. In considering whether this requirement should apply, the desirability of the student's assessment being conducted in full should be balanced with the practical considerations and financial costs to the student and the University of providing a later completion date. Consideration should

also be given to the student's other assessment commitments to ensure that they are not unreasonably burdened. In order to permit such completion:

- (a) a special sitting of an examination may be arranged, or the student will be required to attend for examination at a scheduled session; and/or
- (b) a date for completion of non-examination assessment will be set; as appropriate in the circumstances. In any such event, that sitting or submission will be regarded as the student's first attempt if the examination or assessment missed would itself have been their first attempt.

FP 6.10 Where it is determined that the evidence presented supports the student's claim that they were prevented by good cause from completing work for assessment on or by the due time and where no means of substituting an alternative assessment may be found, the assessment(s) in question will be excluded (without penalty) from the calculation of the module aggregation mark(s) and the following regulations will apply:

- (a) The extent to which the student's total assessment has been completed will be determined as a percentage, taking into account the relative weights attributed to those assessments as published in the relevant approved assessment scheme.
- (b) Examining bodies will make an overall judgement of the student's work submitted for assessment, using as far as possible the standards and criteria applied in respect of the work of other students.
- (c) At module level where the student has:
 - (i) completed 33% or more of the total summative assessment required, the examining bodies can recommend an overall module result on the basis of work completed so long as that work is deemed to demonstrate attainment against substantial elements of the module's learning outcomes;
 - (ii) completed less than 33% of the work required for assessment, they will be regarded as not having completed sufficient assessment to be awarded a grade in the module. In such cases they should be given an opportunity to complete the missing work as a first attempt.
- (d) At Foundation Year level where the student has completed 75% or more of the total work required for Foundation Year assessment, the Board of Examiners will recommend progression.

FP 6.11 Academic judgement does not constitute grounds for appeal; however, students who wish to challenge the process may do so under UA92's academic appeals. Following completion of procedures, students have a final right of appeal to Lancaster University under its [Academic Appeals procedures](#).

FP 7 CONSIDERATION AND CONFIRMATION OF RESULTS

FP 7.1 Senate exercises its authority to make final decisions as to granting all credit-bearing University awards, primarily through the Committee of Senate with non-standard cases considered and recommended by the Classification and Assessment Review Board.

- FP 7.2 For each Foundation Year approved by the University there will be an Examination Board comprising external and internal examiners, which will be responsible for the assurance of standards through the exercise of their academic judgement both directly in the assessment of students' work and indirectly in the design of specific forms of assessment. Details of the role and operation of Boards of Examiners can be found in the relevant UA92 procedures, as approved by Lancaster University.
- FP 7.3 The examination bodies will receive decisions from the Exceptional Circumstances Committee. Examination bodies cannot, of themselves, reconsider or change decisions of the Exceptional Circumstances Committee. Examination bodies may challenge decisions of Exceptional Circumstances Committees by referring final decisions to the Committee of Senate via the Classification and Assessment Review Board, or equivalent body.
- FP 7.4 The Foundation Year Board of Examiners will consider the results of examinations and final marks and make recommendations to the Committee of Senate as to whether students have qualified to proceed from Foundation Year to Level 4 and to which degree programmes.
- FP 7.5 The business of the examination boards will be minuted and the minutes will include a record of the External Examiner's adjudications, comments and recommendations, as well as particular decisions made by the Board. The minutes will also record the decisions of the Exceptional Circumstances Committee for each candidate considered by that committee (although detailed discussion of circumstances should not be undertaken at the Examination Board). The minutes must include a list of attendees (together with their status as external or internal examiners or assessor). This record of the proceedings of the board will be restricted and made available only to: the participating examiners and assessors; the Vice-Chancellor and other officers of the University as appropriate; the Committee of Senate and the Classification and Assessment Review Board; and appropriate Academic Appeal and Review Panels as defined in the chapter on [Academic Appeals](#). Where the examination body has exercised its discretion in a particular case, as provided by these Regulations, the Committee of Senate via the Classification and Assessment Review Board will normally uphold its decision providing it had the support of the majority of the external examiners present at that examination board.

FP 8 PUBLISHED INFORMATION

- FP 8.1 The determination of results of the Foundation Year are subject always to ratification by the Committee of Senate and will be regarded as provisional until ratified.
- FP 8.2 Immediately after the meetings of the relevant examining bodies, departments or equivalent may notify students of their provisional degree results.
- FP 8.3 Within forty days of the ratification of foundation year results, students will be sent a transcript of their results.

FP 9 EXCLUSION

- FP 9.1 Students who, after undertaking agreed reassessment opportunities, fail to meet the stipulated criteria for progression will be excluded from the University. Students are entitled to a final right of appeal against exclusion under the University's [Academic Appeals](#) procedures.

APPENDICES TO THE FOUNDATION YEAR ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

APPENDIX 1: GRADING TABLE

Result	Broad descriptor	Percentage score	Primary level descriptors for attainment of intended learning outcomes
Pass	Excellent	70.0% to 100%	Exemplary range and depth of attainment of intended learning outcomes, secured by discriminating command of a comprehensive range of relevant materials and analyses, and by deployment of considered judgement relating to key issues, concepts and procedures
Pass	Good	60.0% to 69.0%	Conclusive attainment of virtually all intended learning outcomes, clearly grounded on a close familiarity with a wide range of supporting evidence, constructively utilised to reveal appreciable depth of understanding
Pass	Satisfactory	50.0% to 59.0%	Clear attainment of most of the intended learning outcomes, some more securely grasped than others, resting on a circumscribed range of evidence and displaying a variable depth of understanding
Pass	Weak	40.0% to 49.0%	Acceptable attainment of intended learning outcomes, displaying a qualified familiarity with a minimally sufficient range of relevant materials, and a grasp of the analytical issues and concepts which is generally reasonable, albeit insecure
Fail	Marginal fail	30.0% to 39.0%	Attainment deficient in respect of specific intended learning outcomes, with mixed evidence as to the depth of knowledge and weak deployment of arguments or deficient manipulations
Fail	Fail	20.0% to 29.0%	Attainment of intended learning outcomes appreciably deficient in critical respects, lacking secure basis in relevant factual and analytical dimensions
Fail	Poor fail	10.0% to 19.0%	Attainment of intended learning outcomes appreciably deficient in respect of nearly all intended learning outcomes, with irrelevant use of materials and incomplete and flawed explanation
Fail	Very poor fail	0 – 9.0%	No convincing evidence of attainment of any intended learning outcomes, such treatment of the subject as is in evidence being directionless and fragmentary



Note: For a grade to be awarded, students must also satisfy the primary level descriptors listed in the grades at all levels below that which is awarded (i.e. descriptors are to be read *cumulatively* up to and including the grade achieved).

Other transcript indicators		
Flag	Broad descriptor	Definition
M	Malpractice	Failure to comply, in the absence of good cause, with the published requirements of the course or programme; and/or a serious breach of regulations
N	Non-submission	Failure to submit assignment for assessment
P	Penalty	Failure to submit within regulation requirements (late submission, improper format, etc.)
R	Resit	Attainment of a passing grade through reassessment processes
DP	Decision Pending	The grade is subject to investigation

APPENDIX 2: GUIDANCE FOR SCALING OF MARKS

1. All assessments and marking schemes should be created with the aim of ensuring that the resulting grades/marks give a good indication of the ability and application of the students. However, it is inevitable that on occasion this will not work as planned.
2. Reasons may include a misprinted examination paper, the interruption of an examination or, in a science laboratory, an instrumental malfunction not obvious at the time of the experiment; or it may simply be that examiners agree, using their academic judgment and with the benefit of hindsight, that an assessment, or part of an assessment, proved to be significantly harder or easier than expected.
3. In such cases it is appropriate to consider whether the marks should be scaled. Scaling may be of the overall mark for the module or of any assessment therein.
4. Although an unusual distribution of grades/marks is not of itself a sufficient reason for scaling to be applied, it may be an indication that something has gone wrong. For this reason, if the overall mean aggregation score for any module lies outside the range 55% to 66.7% then examiners must consider whether or not there is a case for the marks to be scaled
5. Where the possibility of scaling is being discussed, the precise method should also be discussed and should reflect both the nature of the assessment and the size of the cohort. Both the reason for scaling and the method used must be justified within the minutes of the examining body. If scaling is discussed and not used, the reason for not scaling must be recorded in the minutes. In all cases both the original and the scaled marks must be permanently recorded.
6. Where scaling is applied for the same module for at least part of its assessment on more than one occasion, the assessment practices of the module must be reviewed as appropriate.
7. Scaling may take any form as long as it preserves the ordering of students' marks; thus, for example, if Student A has a higher unscaled mark than Student B, then Student A's scaled mark must not be lower than that of Student B. Common examples of scaling methods are given below, but other methods are possible.
 - (a) For work marked in letter grades, all grades may be raised or lowered by a constant amount.
 - (b) For work marked in percentages, every mark may be multiplied by a constant factor, or have a constant value added to or subtracted from it, or a combination of the two.
 - (c) As in (a) or (b) above, except that where marks are being reduced no pass is turned into a fail (thus, for example, where marks are in general being reduced by 10%, for an undergraduate module or assessment, all unscaled marks between 40% and 49% become scaled marks of 40%).

- (d) For work marked in percentages, piecewise linear interpolation may be used, where each mark is plotted for each student against their average mark on other assessments, as in the graphs below.



APPENDIX 3: LATE PENALTIES FOR ASSESSED WORK

Work submitted up to three days late without an agreed extension will receive a penalty. Saturdays and Sundays are included as days in this regulation; however, where the third day falls on a Saturday or Sunday, students will have until 10.00 a.m. on Monday to hand in without receiving further penalty. Where the application of a late submission penalty results in a Fail mark, the assessment will be treated according to the standard procedures for failed work.

For **work assessed using percentages**, marks between 50% and 69% will be reduced by ten percentage points for example a mark of 62% would become 52%). Other marks will be reduced according to the following table.

Original Mark	Mark after penalty
87-100	68
74-86	65
70-73	62
40-49	31
31-39	18
18-30	9
0-17	0

APPENDIX 4: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

1. UA92 values a culture of honesty and mutual trust (academic integrity) and expects all members of the institution to respect and uphold these core values. It is an academic offence for a student to commit any act designed to obtain for himself or herself an unfair advantage with a view to achieving a higher grade or mark and/or a professional competency than he or she would otherwise secure. Any attempt to convey deceitfully the impression of acquired knowledge, skills, understanding, or credentials, may constitute grounds for exclusion. Details can be found in Lancaster University's Academic Integrity Regulations and Procedures.
2. Should an accusation of malpractice be brought against a student a grade indicator of DP (decision pending) will be lodged on the student records until a decision is reached.

[Lancaster University's Academic Integrity Regulations and Procedures.](#)