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**MARP 2017-18**

**UNDERGRADUATE ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS**

**UG 1 UNDERGRADUATE AWARDS**

The University currently offers the following undergraduate awards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate awards</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>FTE period of study (normal)</th>
<th>Normal total credit value</th>
<th>Normal minimum credit at level of award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree (Integrated): MArts (Hons); MChem (Hons); MEcon (Hons); MEng (Hons); MLang (Hons); MPhys (Hons); MPsych (Hons); MSci (Hons); MSocial Wk (Hons); MStat (Hons)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBChB</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree with honours: BA (Hons); BBA (Hons); BEng (Hons); BMus (Hons); BSc (Hons); LLB (Hons)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree unclassified – Pass degree: BA; BBA; BEng; BMus; BSc; LLB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree as top-up to Foundation degree: BA (Hons); BSc (Hons)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Degree: FdA; FdSc; FdEng</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma of Higher Education (DipHE)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Higher Education (CertHE)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Award</td>
<td>4,5,6,7</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>20-90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UG 2  STRUCTURE OF BACHELORS DEGREE PROGRAMMES AND INTEGRATED BACHELORS/ MASTERS DEGREE PROGRAMMES

UG 2.1 Bachelors degrees, with the exception of Foundation degree top-ups, as well as Integrated Bachelors/Masters degrees, comprise learning across levels 4, 5, 6, and, in the case of the Integrated Masters 7, normally with 120 credits of assessment at each level. Level 4 learning is collectively referred to as Part I and is qualificatory, i.e. successful completion is required for progression to further study but obtained credit does not contribute to final classification of awards. Learning levels 5, 6 and, as appropriate, 7 are collectively referred to as Part II and comprise all credit upon which final classification of awards is determined.

UG 2.2 Undergraduate degree programmes and assessment arrangements for Part II are based on the principle that the load on students in terms of total teaching, learning and assessment activities should be equally distributed between each academic session i.e. normally four units (equivalent to 120 credits) in the second year and four units in the third and/or final year.

UG 2.3 A commensurate arrangement shall apply to students undertaking programmes of study that are divided into Part IIA and Part IIB. This shall not preclude the attribution of a differential assessment weighting between units studied and assessed in the second year and those studied and assessed in the final year. The arrangement for each programme of study shall be published in the Courses Handbook, available online for staff and current students at: http://www.lusi.lancs.ac.uk/OnlineCoursesHandbook/.

UG 3  CRITERIA FOR AWARD

UG 3.1 The pass mark for undergraduate honours degrees and other undergraduate awards shall be 9.0, unless otherwise stipulated in the Appendix 6 of the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations, with credit for a module being awarded when the overall mark for the module is 9.0 or greater or the module has been condoned.

UG 3.2 In order to qualify for the overall award, students must have attained in full the minimum credit requirement for the programme (including credit for failed modules which have been condoned) and passed all contributory modules with an aggregation score of at least 9.0 unless otherwise stipulated in Appendix 6. A pass degree may be awarded with an aggregation score of 8.1 or above.

UG 4  PROGRESSION

UG 4.1 GENERAL

UG 4.1.1 Each programme 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 programme giving full countenance to mitigating circumstances as reported from the Mitigating Circumstances Committee, reassessment and condonation opportunities as detailed below.
UG 4.1.2  In order to qualify to progress to the next stage of the programme, students must have attained in full the minimum credit requirement for the stage completed (including credit for failed modules which have been condoned).

UG 4.1.3  Additional progression requirements for programmes with professional accreditation are detailed in Appendix 6 of the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations.

UG 4.2  PROGRESSION FROM PART I TO PART II

UG 4.2.1  In order to progress to Part II:

(a)  an overall aggregation score of 10.3 is required in the major components, plus an aggregation score of at least 9.0 in both the coursework and exam elements. A major component is any module, theme or subject that is defined as core to the intended degree programme; and

(b)  an overall aggregation score of 9.0 is required in all minor components. A minor component is any module, theme or subject that is defined as optional or non-essential to the intended degree programme. There is no further requirement for students to attain a particular score in the coursework or exam elements.

UG 4.2.2  Students who initially fail one or more subjects at Part I will be offered an opportunity to resit the subjects failed. Students who choose not to participate in this resit opportunity will be deemed to have withdrawn from the University.

UG 4.2.3  After taking resits as required, a student who passes all subjects with the required aggregation scores qualifies to progress to Part II. Otherwise, if and only if the proposed major department requests a condonation, failures up to 40 credits may be condoned where the aggregation score is at least 9.5 for a major subject or at least 7.0 for a minor subject. If the department which recorded a fail mark is unwilling to accede to this request for condonation, the final decision will be made by the Part I Board of Examiners.

UG 4.2.4  Students who have not passed all subjects, and whose failures have not been condoned, 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.

UG 4.2.5  Students opting for a repeat year will:

(a)  have full-time student status;
(b)  lose all credit, marks and grades gained in the original Part I 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;
(e)  otherwise be treated the same as any other Part I 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 mitigating circumstances where approved by the Part I Resit Board.

UG 4.2.6 Students enrolling for a repeat year will have the right to be registered for the same degree programme as before; alternatively, it will normally be permissible to change to a new degree programme for which eligibility criteria have been met.

UG 4.2.7 The award of Certificate of Higher Education shall be made to students who have achieved 80 credits with a mark of 9.0 or more at level 4 or above and a further 40 credits with a mark of 7.0 or more at level 4 or above, but who have ended their studies at the University without qualifying for either a degree or a Diploma of Higher Education.

UG 4.2.8 For progression on Study Abroad degree programmes, and some degree programmes with significant levels of industrial engagement, students must achieve a pass, at the first attempt, as defined above. Additionally they should achieve higher overall grades in all units. The exact requirement is for each department to determine but it should normally be in the region of an aggregation score of at least 15.0 in major components plus at least 12.0 in minor components.

UG 4.2.9 Students who were not admitted to the following degree programmes will have no entitlement to transfer into these programmes at the end of Part I even if they achieve a majorable mark in the appropriate Part I course:

- BSc Accounting, Auditing and Finance
- BSc Accounting and Finance
- BSc Accounting and Economics
- BSc Accounting, Finance and Mathematics
- BSc Accounting, Finance and Computer Science
- BSc Accounting and Management Studies
- BSc Finance
- BSc Finance and Economics
- BSc Finance and Management Studies
- BSc Financial Mathematics
- BSc Financial Mathematics (Industry)
- MSci Financial Mathematics
- BBA Management
- BBA International Business Management
- BSc Management and Information Technology
- BA Advertising and Marketing
- All Study Abroad (including North America/Australasia) degrees

UG 4.3 PROGRESSION WITHIN PART II

UG 4.3.1 To progress to the final year of a Bachelors with honours degree (or part-time equivalent) all students must achieve, following all opportunities for reassessment, an overall aggregation score of 9.0 with no more than 30 credits condoned.
UG 4.3.2 To progress from **year 2 to year 3 on Integrated Masters degrees** the regulations are the same as for a Bachelors Honours degree. All students who meet these progression requirements will remain on the Integrated Masters degree during year 3.

UG 4.3.3 Progression from **year 3 to year 4 on Integrated Masters degrees** should be automatic for students meeting the criteria, at the first sitting, for a 2(i) Bachelors Honours degree.

UG 4.3.4 Progression from **year 3 to year 4 on Integrated Masters degrees** for those students who have not met the standard criteria for a 2(i) Bachelors Honours degree will be permitted provided they have met other criteria defined under programme-specific regulations which have been previously approved and published as part of the University’s programme approval procedures.

UG 4.3.5 Any student who does not meet the requirement for progression from year 3 to year 4, or who does not wish to continue to year 4, will be considered for classification for a Bachelors Honours degree.

UG 4.3.6 The award of Diploma of Higher Education shall be made to students who have achieved 90 credits with a mark of 9.0 or more at level 5 or above and a further 30 credits with a mark of 7.0 or more at level 5 or above, but who have ended their studies at the University without qualifying for a degree.

**UG 5  CLASSIFICATION OF AWARDS**

UG 5.1 Each programme will have final award criteria detailed and approved through the programmes approval process. Examining bodies will determine whether a student has successfully met the final award criteria giving full countenance to mitigating circumstances as reported from the **Mitigating Circumstances Committee**, reassessment and condonation opportunities as detailed below.

UG 5.2 In order to qualify for the overall award, students must have attained in full the minimum credit requirement for the programme (including credit for failed modules which have been condoned).

UG 5.3 In order to qualify for the overall award, students must have passed all contributory modules with an aggregation score of at least 9.0 unless otherwise stipulated in **Appendix 6 of the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations**.

UG 5.4 Where awards are classified the overall mean for the programme should be computed from the module aggregation scores in proportion with the approved credit weightings for each module. This overall mean score should be expressed to one decimal place and be used to determine the class of degree to be awarded in accordance with the class boundaries as defined below.

UG 5.5 There will be four classes of honours: first, upper second, lower second and third. A student who is not placed in one of the four classes will not be eligible for the award of an honours degree. This will not prevent the award of an unclassified honours degree within the terms of the regulations.

UG 5.6 Where the mean overall aggregation score falls within one of the following ranges, the examining bodies will recommend the award stated:
17.5 to 24.0  first class honours  
14.5 to 17.0  upper second class honours  
11.5 to 14.0  lower second class honours  
9.0 to 11.0  third class honours  
0.0 to 8.0  fail  

UG 5.7  Where the mean overall aggregation score falls within one of the ‘borderline’ ranges defined below:

17.1 to 17.4  either first or upper second class honours  
14.1 to 14.4  either upper or lower second class honours  
11.1 to 11.4  either lower second or third class honours  
8.1 to 8.9  either pass degree or fail  

the examining bodies will apply the following rubric for deciding the degree class to be recommended.

(a)  For all students, where a student falls into a borderline then the higher award should be given where either half or more of the credits from Part II are in the higher class or the final year average is in the higher class.

(b)  Borderline students not meeting either of the criteria described in (a) above would normally be awarded the lower class of degree unless (c) applies.

(c)  That for all students, borderline or not, Examination Boards should continue to make a special case to the Committee of Senate for any student where the class of degree recommended by the Board deviates from that derived from a strict application of the regulations. Such cases would be based around circumstances pertaining to individual students where these circumstances have not already been taken into account.

UG 5.8  Integrated Masters students who withdraw during the Level 7 final year of their programmes, or whose achievement at the end of that year does not qualify them to be awarded an Integrated Masters degree, may be awarded a classified Bachelors degree (BA, BSc, BEng, etc.) with Honours, in accordance with the regulations for the corresponding Bachelors award.

UG 5.9  Academic judgement does not constitute grounds for appeal; however, students who wish to challenge the process may do so under the procedures for Academic Appeals.

UG 5.10  In addition to standard University classification requirements, certain degrees which carry professional accreditation have additional requirements. These are detailed in Appendix 6 of the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations.

UG 6  REASSESSMENT

UG 6.1  PART I REASSESSMENT

UG 6.1.1  A student who fails a Part I module will be required to undertake a reassessment for that module in order to be considered for progression to Part II. If the module aggregation
score after reassessment is an improvement on the original score, the reassessment score will count; otherwise the original aggregation score will stand. The reassessment score will not be subject to a cap. Condonation will not be considered until after reassessment.

**UG 6.2 PART II NON-FINAL YEAR REASSESSMENT**

**UG 6.2.1** A student who fails a module will be required to undertake a reassessment for that module in order to be considered for progression to the next stage. If the module aggregation score after reassessment is an improvement on the original score, the reassessment score will count subject to a cap of 9.0 aggregation points; otherwise the original aggregation score will stand. The resulting aggregation score will count towards the overall average. Condonation will not be considered until after reassessment.

**UG 6.3 PART II FINAL-YEAR ASSESSMENT**

**UG 6.3.1** *For students who entered the programme prior to 2016-17:* A student who fails a module with a score below 4.0 will be required to undertake a reassessment for that module in order to be considered for the award of a degree. In addition, if more credits are failed than can be condoned or the overall average aggregation score is below 9.0, a student must resit either all failed modules or sufficient failed modules to ensure that condonation may be a possibility.

*For students who entered the programme from 2016-17 onwards:* A student who fails a module with a score below 7.0 will be required to undertake a reassessment for that module in order to be considered for the award of a degree. In addition, if more credits are failed than can be condoned or the overall average aggregation score is below 9.0, a student must resit either all failed modules or sufficient failed modules to ensure that condonation may be a possibility.

**UG 6.3.2** Where a student has undertaken a reassessment for a module and the module aggregation score after reassessment is an improvement on the original score, the reassessment score will count subject to a cap of 9.0 aggregation points; otherwise the original aggregation score will stand. The resulting aggregation score will count towards the overall aggregation average used for degree classification.

**UG 6.3.3** The normal expectation is that final-year students will resit all failed modules, even where this is not compulsory. However, if a student applies within five working days of results being made available, condonation will be applied immediately where consistent with the regulations without the need for resubmission.

**UG 6.4 GENERAL PRINCIPLES**

**UG 6.4.1** The precise form of reassessment is for the department 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.
Both final and non-final year students will be given the opportunity to undertake reassessment within the same academic year in which they made their first attempt.

Where reassessment is prohibited for reasons of professional accreditation this will be clearly stated in the assessment guidelines provided to students and alternative awards and other available options identified.

Students may not seek reassessment to improve a passing grade unless required for professional accreditation and allowed under specific accreditation arrangements (see Appendix 6 of the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations for further details).

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.

**UG 6**

**CONDONATION**

**UG 7.1**

**GENERAL**

Where a student, after all opportunities for reassessment, has failed, the examination board should, subject to the learning outcomes for the programme being met, normally condone credit whereby said credit will be available as an element of either progression or final classification requirements of the award.

Where a programme separately assesses modules with a credit value of 15 or less, for specified undergraduate programmes these may be combined to a maximum size of 30 credits for the consideration of condonation. Approved combinations must:

(a) ensure learning outcomes for the programme can continue to be met irrespective of the condonation of combined modules;

(b) be approved by the faculty teaching committee and notified to Academic Standards and Quality Committee; and

(c) be published prior to students’ enrolment on to any modules which have been combined for the purposes of condonation.

**Non Final Year Students**

**UG 7.1.3**  *

For students who entered the programme prior to 2016-17: When the results of all reassessments relating to the third year of a four-year Bachelors Hons degree or Integrated Masters degree are available, the overall profile will be reviewed by the relevant examining bodies and up to 30 credits should normally be condoned where the aggregation score is between 4 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 4, nor may any module be condoned if a student has not attempted reassessment.

For students who entered the programme from 2016-17 onwards: When the results of all reassessments relating to the second year of a three-year Bachelors Hons degree or to the second or third year of a four-year Bachelors Hons degree or Integrated Masters degree are available, the overall profile will be reviewed by the relevant examining bodies and up to 30 credits should normally be condoned where the aggregation score is between 7 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 7, nor may any module be condoned if a student has not attempted reassessment.
Final Year Students (3 Year Programmes)

UG 7.1.4  **For students who entered the programme prior to 2016-17:** When the results of all assessments and reassessments relating to the final year of a three-year Bachelors Hons degree are available the overall profile will be reviewed by the relevant examination board and a maximum of 30 credits in total (for the whole of Part II) should normally be condoned where the aggregation score is between 4 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 4. The condonable maximum of 30 credits applies to all three-year programmes regardless of the total classified credit.

**For students who entered the programme from 2016-17 onwards:** When the results of all assessments and reassessments relating to the final year of a three-year Bachelors Hons degree are available the overall profile will be reviewed by the relevant examination board and a maximum of 30 credits in total (for the whole of Part II) should normally be condoned where the aggregation score is between 7 and 9. No module maybe condoned with an aggregation score of less than 7. The condonable maximum of 30 credits applies to all three-year programmes regardless of the total classified credit.

Final Year Students (4 Year Programmes)

UG 7.1.5  **For students who entered the programme prior to 2016-17:** When the results of all assessments and reassessments relating to the final year of a four-year Bachelors Hons degree or the final year of an Integrated Masters degree are available the overall profile will be reviewed by the relevant examination board and a maximum of 45 credits in total (for the whole of Part II) should normally be condoned where the aggregation score is between 4 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 4. The condonable maximum of 45 credits applies to all four-year and Integrated Masters programmes regardless of the total classified credit.

**For students who entered the programme from 2016-17 onwards:** When the results of all assessments and reassessments relating to the final year of a four-year Bachelors Hons degree or the final year of an Integrated Masters degree are available the overall profile will be reviewed by the relevant examination board and a maximum of 45 credits in total (for the whole of Part II) should normally be condoned where the aggregation score is between 7 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 7. The condonable maximum of 45 credits applies to all four-year and Integrated Masters programmes regardless of the total classified credit.

Award of Pass Degree

UG 7.1.6  **For students who entered the programme prior to 2016-17:** For a pass degree, an examination board should normally condone an additional 30 credits to total of 60 credits maximum (for the whole of Part II) where the aggregation score is between 4 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 4.

**For students who entered the programme from 2016-17 onwards:** For a pass degree, an examination board should normally condone an additional 30 credits to total of 60 credits maximum (for the whole of Part II) where the aggregation score is between 7 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 7.
UG 7.2 EXCEPTIONS

UG 7.2.1 The phrase “should normally” in UG 7.1.1 to UG 7.1.6 above means that condonation, where allowable and subject to the learning outcomes for the programme being met, must be granted unless the examiners believe that there is good reason not to do so. Any such reason must be described and justified in the examination board minutes. The final decision will be taken by Senate.

UG 7.2.2 Where a reassessment is not available, for example for an outgoing study abroad student, the examination board may condone credit even where the aggregation score is below the condonable threshold. If such a student has failed more than 30 but not more than 45 credits, 15 credits may be set aside – normally this will be for the module with the lowest fail mark. The student may progress from the second year to the third year and will undertake an additional 15 credits (uncapped) in the final year.

UG 8 INCOMPLETE ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES

UG 8.1 For the purposes of these regulations ‘mitigating 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.

UG 8.2 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 his or her programme of studies; or, the student’s performance in examination or other instrument of assessment being manifestly prejudiced.

UG 8.3 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.

UG 8.4 ‘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.

UG 8.5 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 within this time.
UG 8.6 All departments or equivalent will have a Mitigating 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 Mitigating 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 Mitigating Circumstances Committee will produce minutes of its meetings to be submitted to the appropriate examination body.

Guidance on the management and operation of Mitigating Circumstances Committees can be found in Section GR 2.4 of the General Regulations for Assessment & Award.

UG 8.7 In considering claims of good cause:

(a) the evidence provided by the student claiming good cause, and any relevant and available material submitted by him or her 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.

UG 8.8 Where it is determined that the evidence presented does not support the student’s claim that s/he was prevented by good cause from attending an examination or from submitting work for assessment, the student will be awarded Grade N (an aggregation score 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 his or her 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.

UG 8.9 In the event of incomplete assessment arising from good cause being established the student will normally be expected to complete his or her assessment by attending the examination at a subsequent session, or submitting outstanding work for assessment, if an opportunity to do so occurs within his or her 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 he or she is 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 his or her first attempt.

UG 8.10 Where it is determined that the evidence presented supports the student’s claim that he or she was 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 score(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, he or she will be regarded as not having completed sufficient assessment to be awarded a grade in the module. In such cases he/she should be given an opportunity to complete the missing work as a first attempt.

(d) At programme level where the student has:

(i) completed 75% or more of the total work required for programme assessment, the Examining bodies will recommend an award or other outcome on the basis of the work completed;

(ii) completed at least 30% but less than 75% of the work required for assessment, an Aegrotat (unclassified honours) degree may be recommended if the completed portion is of honours standard, or, if the completed portion is not of honours standard, no award will be made;

(iii) completed less than 30% of the work required for assessment he or she will be regarded as not having completed sufficient assessment to be awarded a degree.

UG 8.11 Where examining bodies decide to recommend an Aegrotat (unclassified honours) degree, and this recommendation is approved by the Committee of Senate then the Aegrotat degree will be awarded forthwith and the student will be invited to attempt, within two years, to qualify for the award of a classified honours degree by completing examinations and/or other work, under conditions and at times specified by the examining bodies, and approved by the Committee of Senate. Students who:
(a) undertake the further assessment specified, and who achieve the required level of attainment, will subsequently be awarded an appropriate classified honours degree;
(b) attempt further assessment, but who fail to achieve the required level of attainment for the award of a classified honours degree, will retain the Aegrotat degree already awarded;
(c) decline the invitation to attempt further assessment within two years, will retain the Aegrotat degree already awarded.

UG 9 CONSIDERATION AND CONFIRMATION OF RESULTS

UG 9.1 Senate has ultimate authority to determine all results of assessment leading to Lancaster University credit and awards. It exercises its authority to make final decisions as to granting of all credit-bearing University awards, primarily through the Committee of Senate, the terms of reference of which are set out in the University Ordinances.

UG 9.2 The Committee of Senate provides:

(a) formal confirmation (or not) of recommendations from Boards of Examiners for the award to individual students of a named degree (i.e. qualification and subject) of a particular class;
(b) formal approval of recommendations from Boards of Examiners that students be awarded no degree with or without a further re-sit opportunity (i.e. Fails);
(c) formal ratification of second year results (of courses finally assessed at the end of the second year) including the timing and nature of re-sit opportunities for failed elements.

Further procedural details are set out in the section on Procedures for the Committee of Senate Chapter GR 2.7 of the General Regulations for Assessment & Award.

UG 9.3 For each degree programme 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. The constitution and terms of reference for examination bodies within the constituent elements of the University are set out in the section on examination boards in Chapter GR 2.6 of the General Regulations for Assessment & Award.

UG 9.4 The examination bodies will receive decisions from the Mitigating Circumstances Committee. Examination bodies cannot, of themselves, reconsider or change decisions of the Mitigating Circumstances Committee. Examination bodies may challenge decisions of Mitigation Circumstances Committees by referring final decisions to the Committee of Senate, or equivalent body.

UG 9.5 The Part I 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 Part I to Part II and to which degree programmes. Details of the role and operation of the Part I Board can be found in Chapter GR 2.6 of the General Regulations for Assessment & Award.
Part II Boards of Examiners will consider the results of examinations and final marks and make recommendations to the Committee of Senate as to the award of degrees (and the classes of degrees) within the approved degree programme classification scheme. Part II Boards of Examiners also consider and confirm marks derived from all non-final year modules taken and examined in the academic year under consideration. Details of the role and operation of Part II Boards of Examiners can be found in Chapter GR 2.6 of the General Regulations for Assessment & Award.

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 Mitigating 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 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 will normally uphold its decision providing it had the support of the majority of the external examiners present at that examination board.

The determination of results and the classification of University degrees are subject always to ratification by the Senate and will be regarded as provisional until ratified, normally through the annual meeting of the Committee of the Senate.

Immediately after the meetings of the relevant examining bodies, departments or equivalent may notify students of their provisional degree results.

Within forty days of the ratification of degree results, students will receive a transcript of their results together with a Higher Education Achievement Report, both of which will conform in scope and layout to principles agreed by Senate.

Students who, after undertaking agreed reassessment opportunities, fail to meet the stipulated criteria for progression or final award will be excluded from the University. Students are entitled to appeal against exclusion under the University’s Academic Appeals procedures.
APPENDICES TO THE UNDERGRADUATE ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

APPENDIX 1: LATE PENALTIES FOR ASSESSED WORK

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Mark</th>
<th>Mark after penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87-100</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74-86</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-73</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-39</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 2: GRADING TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Broad descriptor</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Aggregation score</th>
<th>Primary level descriptors for attainment of intended learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>A⁺</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A⁻</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>B⁺</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B⁻</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>C⁺</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C⁻</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>D⁺</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D⁻</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Marginal fail</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Attainment of intended learning outcomes appreciably deficient in critical respects, lacking secure basis in relevant factual and analytical dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Poor fail</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Very poor fail</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No convincing evidence of attainment of any intended learning outcomes, such treatment of the subject as is in evidence being directionless and fragmentary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other transcript indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flag</th>
<th>Broad descriptor</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Malpractice</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Non-submission</td>
<td>Failure to submit assignment for assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Penalty</td>
<td>Failure to submit within regulation requirements (late submission, improper format, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Resit</td>
<td>Attainment of a passing grade through reassessment processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Decision Pending</td>
<td>The grade is subject to investigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 3: PERCENTAGE CONVERSION TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(%) to aggregation score</th>
<th>1 = 0.225</th>
<th>2 = 0.450</th>
<th>3 = 0.675</th>
<th>4 = 0.900</th>
<th>5 = 1.125</th>
<th>6 = 1.350</th>
<th>7 = 1.575</th>
<th>8 = 1.800</th>
<th>9 = 2.025</th>
<th>10 = 2.250</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.475</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.700</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.925</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.150</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.725</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.950</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.175</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.400</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.625</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.975</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.200</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.425</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.650</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.875</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>15.300</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15.600</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15.900</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16.200</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16.500</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>18.300</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18.600</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18.900</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>19.200</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19.500</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>22.650</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>22.800</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>22.950</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23.100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>23.250</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4: 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 14.5-17.5 (or 58% to 68% for percentage marks) then examiners must consider whether or not there is a case for the marks to be scaled. **Note:** For International and Regional Teaching Partnership provision the range outside which scaling must be considered is 13.5-17.0 (or 55% to 66.7%)

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%), or no condonable mark is turned into an uncondonable mark.
For work marked in percentages, piecewise linear interpolation may be used, where each mark is plotted for each student against his or her average mark on other assessments, as in the graphs below.
APPENDIX 5: TRANSLATION OF GRADES FROM EXCHANGE PROGRAMMES

1. Departments will not attempt to re-examine work undertaken on exchange. Exchange grades will, in general, be taken as they stand as the basis of conversion. Exceptions may be made where there is some particular reason to think that an exchange grade is unsuitable for direct conversion; for example, in cases where Lancaster undergraduates take exchange postgraduate units.

2. Departments will ensure that all students returning from a year on exchange, and before they begin their final year at Lancaster, are given guidance on the standard of their exchange performance and the likely consequences for their overall degree classification.

3. Overseas grades will not be confirmed as Lancaster grades before the full results of the students’ Lancaster-assessed units are available. For each student the Examination board will be presented with:

   (a) the grades for all exchange units;
   (b) preliminary recommendations as to the appropriate conversions of these grades into Lancaster marks where required;
   (c) any other evidence relating to the student’s work in exchange which may be relevant to the final assessment decision?

4. It is the role of the Examination board either to confirm or to amend the conversions in the light of the evidence available.

5. Where students take more than the equivalent of four Lancaster units during the year on exchange, the first units to be set aside will be any which are in areas not directly related to the students’ major or minor subject. After that procedure, the best units will be used. Where it is necessary to combine units, this will be done in whichever way is to the student’s best advantage.

6. Where exchange partners mark using the same grading scale as Lancaster (A+ to F) marks will usually be used as is and not be translated. This includes most exchange arrangements with North America, Hong Kong, Singapore and New Zealand.

7. Where exchange partners do not mark using the same grading scale as Lancaster the grades will normally be translated using the tables contained in the Grade Translation Booklet, available from the International Office.

   **For BBA International Business Management**

   Each BBA International Business Management partner marks on a points-based system. For each programme said points will be multiplied by such factors (including taking account of those partners which use a scale where lower points represent higher achievement) so as to give a Lancaster aggregation score out of twenty-four, taking due consideration of pass marks. This will then be recorded as the aggregation score for the course.

8. For new partner institutions which use a grading system different from Lancaster’s the means for translating the grades will be determined as an element of institutional approval.
APPENDIX 6: ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PROFESSIONAL AWARDS

1. Certain awards within Lancaster University carry alongside the academic award professional accreditation from the Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB) associated with the academic discipline. In certain cases these PSRBs have the authority to set requirements above and beyond those required by Lancaster’s regulations. These additional requirements are set out below.

PART I

2. LLB, LLB (Study Abroad), LLB Law with Criminology, LLB Law with Politics

2.1 Law majors are required to take all 120 Part I credits in their prescribed programme. There is no route out of Part I Law for LLB and LLB (Study Abroad) into an alternative Part II programme if they are unsuccessful at Part I. In order to comply with PSRB regulations (and qualify for accreditation) the pass mark for all Part I modules is 9.0 and students have to achieve a pass or condonation in all courses in order to progress to Law Part II.

2.2 Part I Condonation. When the results of all reassessments relating to Part I are available, the overall profile will be reviewed by the Part I Exam Board and up to 30 credits may be condoned where the aggregation score is between 8.1 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 8.1, nor may any module be condoned if a student has not attempted reassessment.

3. BA (Hons) Social Work, MSocial Work (Hons) Social Work, Ethics and Religion

3.1 Students cannot progress to Part II if they fail the preparation for practice assessment elements in SWK115.

PART II

4. BEng and MEng (Integrated)

Paragraphs 4.1 through to 4.4 apply to the following degree programmes:

- BEng (Honours) Chemical Engineering
- MEng (Honours) Chemical Engineering
- BEng (Honours) Electronic and Electrical Engineering
- MEng (Honours) Electronic and Electrical Engineering
- BEng (Honours) Mechanical Engineering
- MEng (Honours) Mechanical Engineering
- BEng (Honours) Mechatronic Engineering
- MEng (Honours) Mechatronic Engineering
- BEng (Honours) Nuclear Engineering
- MEng (Honours) Nuclear Engineering

4.1 For the award of honours BEng or the award of an honours MEng degree, the major project modules (individual and group) must not be condoned.

4.2 For the award of an honours BEng or the award of an honours MEng degree, no Part II module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 7.0.
4.3 **This paragraph applies to students entering full-time degrees in 2016-17 onwards.**

For the award of an honours BEng or the award of an honours MEng degree, no more than 20 credits may be condoned in any level of study. In addition, where modules include two assessment modes (coursework and examination) that assess different learning outcomes, a pass threshold of 7.0 will be adopted for each mode that contributes more than 30% to the overall module mark.

4.4 Students who do not fulfil the requirements of paragraphs 4.1 to 4.3 but who nevertheless fulfil the University requirements for an undergraduate award will be awarded a BSc (Hons) Engineering Science. The BSc (Hons) Engineering Science is not accredited by any of the engineering institutions with which the Engineering department holds accreditation (IMechE, IET or IChemE).

5. **BA/BSc (Hons) Psychology**

5.1 The classification will be calculated in accordance with standard regulations except that where a candidate fails the final year project, a degree in Psychology will not be awarded. Instead a degree in Psychological Studies will be awarded which, unlike the degree in Psychology, will not be accredited by the British Psychological Society.

6. **BSc (Hons) Psychology in Education**

6.1 The classification will be calculated in accordance with standard regulations except in two conditions where a degree in Psychology in Education will not be awarded. These conditions are:

   (a) where a candidate fails the final year project, no resit will be permitted; and
   (b) where a candidate fails to achieve a lower second class honours degree.

6.2 In these cases a degree in Psychological Studies in Education will be awarded which, unlike the degree in Psychology in Education, will not be accredited by the British Psychological Society. Students who fail to achieve a lower second class honours degree will not be permitted to resit modules to improve the degree class for accreditation purposes.

7. **BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science**

7.1 The classification will be calculated in accordance with standard regulations except that where a candidate fails the final year project, a degree in Biomedical Science will not be awarded. Instead a degree in Biological Science with Biomedicine will be awarded which, unlike the degree in Biomedical Science, will not be accredited by the Institute of Biomedical Science.

8. **BA (Hons) Social Work, MSocial Work (Hons) Social Work, Ethics and Religion**

8.1 In addition to satisfying the conditions for the award of a degree, candidates must satisfy all the professional requirements of the scheme as laid down by the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) in order to be eligible to register with the HCPC. If they fail to do so, their transfer to registration for a BA in Applied Social Studies (from the BA in Social Work) or for a BA in Social Care, Ethics and Religion (from the MSocial Work Social Work,
Ethics and Religion) may be approved by the Department of Sociology. In order to satisfy the HCPC requirements candidates must, on the basis of pass/fail, pass each of the two placements in Part II. In addition candidates must obtain a pass mark in examinations in the areas of Social Work with Children & Families and Mental Distress & Health. In order to meet this examination requirement, students are eligible to undertake up to two resits of the examination and the module mark will be capped at either 9 or the first attempt module mark if higher than 9.

8.2 To progress from year 3 to year 4 on the MSocial Work, all students must achieve, following all opportunities for reassessment, an overall aggregation score of 9.0 with no more than 30 credits condoned in total over years 2 and 3.

Condonation

8.2 There is no condonation of the direct practice element of the placement modules or of Social Work with Children & Families and Mental Distress & Health where the examination is failed. 15 credits awarded to the essay assignment in Placement 1 and 30 credits awarded to the essay assignment in Placement 2 may be condoned, and likewise examinations for Social Work with Children & Families and Mental Distress & Health modules, for a degree in Applied Social Studies or Social Care, Ethics and Religion where the University criteria for condonation are met.

8.3 Where condonation is being considered for a Social Work student, a special re-sit assessment panel made up of all markers will consider if the student has satisfactorily met the HCPC’s Standards of Proficiency and The College of Social Work's Professional Capabilities Framework in other work. If a student has not done so, they may not be condoned for a degree in Social Work. Students may have failed units condoned for a degree in Applied Social Studies or Social Care, Ethics and Religion where the University criteria for condonation are met.

Fitness to practice

8.4 Examination boards will be held at five points in the programme:

(a) the end of Part I;
(b) the end of the first placement;
(c) the end of Part II, year 1;
(d) the end of the second placement; and
(e) the end of the final year.

8.5 Failure at any of these five stages may be the subject of an appeal to a panel on fitness to practice, consisting of members of the University, a service user and an agency programme partner.

Aegrotat degree

8.6 An Aegrotat degree cannot be awarded for the BA (Hons) Social Work or MSocial Work (Hons) Social Work, Ethics and Religion, but may, if the candidate fulfils the University’s criteria for the award of Aegrotat, be made for the award of BA (Hons) Applied Social Studies or BA (Hons) Social Care, Ethics and Religion.
9. **Degrees in the School of Computing and Communications** (Students must have studied at
the Lancaster campus, as detailed on the transcript of study):

- BSc (Hons) Computer Science
- BSc (Hons) Computer Science (Study Abroad)
- BSc (Hons) Computer Science Innovation
- BSc (Hons) Software Engineering
- BSc (Hons) IT for Creative Industries
- BEng (Hons) Communication Systems and Digital Electronics
- MSci (Hons) Computer Science (with Industrial Experience)
- MSci (Hons) Computer Science Innovation
- MSci (Hons) Software Engineering (with Industrial Experience)
- MSci (Hons) IT for Creative Industries (with Industrial Experience)

9.1 **BCS, The Chartered Institute for IT accredited degrees**

9.1.1 For the award of honours BSc (Hons) Computer Science/MSci (Hons) Computer Science (with
Industrial Experience), BSc (Hons) Computer Science (Study Abroad), BSc (Hons) IT for
Creative Industries/MSci (Hons) IT for Creative Industries (with Industrial Experience), BSc
(Hons) Computer Science Innovation/MSci (Hons) Computer Science Innovation, the final
year project must be passed without condonation. Where a candidate fails the final year
project, the degree of BSc/MSci Computer Systems will be awarded where the candidate
fulfils the requirements of the award, which is not BCS accredited.

9.1.2 For the award of honours BSc (Hons) Software Engineering/MSci (Hons) Software
Engineering (with Industrial Experience), the final year project must be passed without
condonation. Where a candidate fails the final year project, the degree of BSc/MSci
Software Systems will be awarded where the candidate fulfils the requirements of the
award, which is not BCS accredited. *Note that the new scheme MSci (Hons) Software
Engineering (with Industrial Experience) has received initial accreditation, with the
application to confirm it due in June 2016.*

9.2 **The Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)*

9.2.1 For the IET accredited degrees: BSc (Hons) Computer Science, BSc (Hons) Computer Science
(Study Abroad), and BSc (Hons) Computer Science Innovation, the final year project must be
passed without condonation and no more than 20 credits may be condoned in any year of
study. Candidates who fail to meet these criteria will be awarded the degree of BSc in
Computer Systems where they fulfil the requirements of the award, which is not IET
accredited.

9.2.2 For the IET accredited degree: BSc (Hons) Software Engineering, the final year project must
be passed without condonation and no more than 20 credits may be condoned in any year
of study. Candidates who fail to meet these criteria will be awarded the degree of BSc in
Software Systems where they fulfil the requirements of the award, which is not IET
accredited.

9.2.3 For the IET accredited degree: BEng (Hons) Communications Systems and Digital Electronics,
the final year project must be passed without condonation and no more than 20 credits may
be condoned in any year of study. Candidates who fail to meet these criteria will be
awarded the degree of BSc Communications Systems and Digital Electronics where they fulfil the requirements of the award, which is not IET accredited.

* Students admitted in the academic years 2012-13 and 2013-14 to any one of the following programmes:

- BSc (Hons) Computer Science
- BSc (Hons) Computer Science (Study Abroad)
- BSc (Hons) Computer Science Innovation
- BSc (Hons) Software Engineering
- BEng (Hons) Communications Systems and Electronics

who fulfil the requirements of IET accreditation will be awarded a degree with this title and their degree certificate will be endorsed to show the degree is accredited by the IET. Students who do not fulfil the requirements of IET accreditation but who nevertheless fulfil the University requirements for an undergraduate award will be awarded a degree with this degree title and their degree certificate will be endorsed to show the degree is not accredited by the IET.

10. LLB Study Abroad

10.1 For progression on the LLB (Study Abroad) degree programme students must achieve a pass, at the first attempt, of all MODULES in Year 2. If they do not pass at the first attempt they will be transferred to the standard LLB Programme.