

Approved by
Chairman of the Board - Rector
of NPJSC “Zhetysu University
named after I. Zhansugurov”,
Doctor of Geographical Sciences,
Professor



Baimyrzayev

2022

POLICY
of learning outcomes assessment
IRD-ZU-09-09

Taldykorgan, 2022

CONTENT

1 General provisions..... 3

2 Regulatory references..... 3

3 Terms and definitions..... 3

4 Symbols and abbreviations..... 4

5 Responsibility and authority..... 4

6 Policy of learning outcomes assessment..... 4

1 GENERAL PROVISIONS

1.1 This Policy of learning outcomes assessment of the Zhetysu University named after I. Zhansugurov (hereinafter referred to as the University) was developed in accordance with ESG 2015 standards, Standard Rules of Activity of educational organizations implementing educational programs of higher and (or) postgraduate education dated October 30, 2018 No. 595 and other regulatory legal documents in the field of educational activity.

1.2 The Policy establishes a procedure for transparent and objective assessment of students based on established criteria.

1.3 This Policy defines the mechanisms for achieving an improvement in the quality of assessment in order to reveal the individual capabilities of students and improve teaching methods.

1.4 This Policy is used by the teaching staff of the University, the Educational and Methodological Department of Higher and Postgraduate Education and the Registrar's office to organize and control the procedure for evaluating the learning outcomes of students in bachelor's, master's and doctoral programs.

2 REGULATORY REFERENCES

References to the following regulatory documents are used in this Policy:

Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated July 27, 2007 No. 319-III	On educationE
Order of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated October 30, 2018 No. 595	On approval of the Standard Rules of activity of educational organizations of the corresponding types
Order of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 604 dated October 31, 2018	On the approval of the state mandatory standards of education of the relevant levels of education
Order of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 152 dated April 20, 2011	About the approval of the Rules of the organization of the educational process on credit technology of training
ESG 2015	Standards and guidelines for quality assurance of higher education in the European Higher Education Area
IRD-ZU-10-01	Academic policy of the NPJSC "Zhetysu University named after Ilyas Zhansugurov"
IRD -ZU-20-02	Policy of academic honesty of the NPJSC "Zhetysu University named after Ilyas Zhansugurov"
IRD -ZU-10-02	Regulations on forms of students' knowledge control
IRD -ZU-15-02	Documented procedure. Management of documented information

3 TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Following terms and definitions are used in this Policy:

Evaluation criteria	Parameters described in syllabuses of disciplines, according to which the current, intermediate and final assessment of students' academic achievements is carried out
Rating scale	The breadth of use by the teaching staff of the university of the entire spectrum of assessments in accordance with the 100-point assessment system
Rating accumulation system (accumulation of ratings)	The procedure and rules for the accumulation of points by students in disciplines during the academic period
Educational achievements of	Knowledge and competencies of students acquired by them in the

students	learning process and reflecting the achieved level of personal development
Academic rating of the student	A quantitative indicator of the level of mastery of the student's curriculum of disciplines and (or) modules and other types of educational activities, compiled according to the results of intermediate certification
Syllabus	Syllabus is an educational and methodological program of the discipline, which includes a description of the subject being studied, goals and objectives, a summary, topics and duration of each lesson, tasks of independent work, consultation time, teacher requirements, evaluation criteria and a list of basic and additional

4 SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations are used in this Policy:

MES RK	Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan;
EP	Educational program
EMDHPE	Educational and Methodical Department of higher and postgraduate education
RO	Registrar's Office

5 RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY

5.1 The Chairman of the Board - Rector of the University approves this Policy.

5.2 The member of the Board - Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs is responsible for the implementation of the Policy.

5.3 The head of the Educational and Methodological Department of Higher and postgraduate education and the director of the Registrar's office are responsible for organizing the procedure.

5.4 The responsibility for compliance of the evaluation procedure of educational achievements with the requirements of this Policy is borne by the heads of educational programs and the teaching staff.

6 POLICY OF LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

6.1 General provisions

6.1.1 The University follows the academic standards of honest, transparent assessment of students based on established criteria.

6.1.2 The purpose of the assessment is to provide each student with an opportunity to demonstrate their level of achievement of learning outcomes in order to obtain appropriate credits or qualifications. The components of the assessment are the scope, timing and nature of the assessment.

6.1.3 The assessment system provides each student with an equal opportunity to demonstrate their achievements, stimulate involvement, learning and progress in development.

6.1.4 The assessment system provides each student with an equal opportunity to demonstrate their achievements, stimulate involvement, learning and progress in development.

6.1.5 The assessment process should be aimed at establishing differences in the levels of achievement of learning outcomes by students (according to the grade descriptors).

6.1.6 Evaluation principles:

- the assessment should be valid, i.e. aimed at determining the student's achievement of learning outcomes;
- the evaluation should be reliable, i.e. accurate and repetitive, with quality control procedures;
- the evaluation should be transparent, i.e. the information about it will be detailed and accessible;
- assessment should be inclusive and fair, i.e. it should be aimed at providing all students with the opportunity to demonstrate their achievements;

- the assessment must be genuine, i.e. reflecting the potential conditions of the student's future professional activity;
- the assessment should establish differences between students, which will be reflected in the assessments;
- the assessment process should give students the opportunity to receive feedback.

6.1.7 Professors and lecturers ensure that the evaluation criteria meet the goals and objectives of the discipline.

6.1.8 Professors and lecturers ensure the application of evaluation criteria to evaluate all types of educational activities of students.

6.1.9 Professors and lecturers provide preliminary familiarization of students with the evaluation criteria.

6.1.10 The evaluation process is a measurement of the results of academic work, for which appropriate measuring scales are used.

6.2 Evaluation procedure and rules

6.2.1 Assessment of students' knowledge is carried out in the form of checking students' knowledge in the studied disciplines on the basis of control tasks of various types during the current, boundary and final control.

6.2.2 The current control is a systematic check of the student's academic achievements, conducted by the teacher in the current classes in accordance with the curriculum of the discipline (syllabus) and the assessment, which is mandatory weekly in the journal of the educational portal.

The points of the current control are set by each teacher independently in the context of each component of the discipline (for lectures, practical or laboratory classes) in personal cabinets, tab in the electronic journal "Current control".

The maximum number of points that students can receive weekly for each of the types of classes is 100 points.

6.2.3 Midterm – control carried out for a certain period of the semester - on the 8th and 15th weeks. Boundary control is estimated as the sum of points for all current types of control for 7 weeks in automatic mode in the SmartZhetysu information system.

Midterm scores reflect the cumulative total assessment of the student's current academic performance (according to the scores displayed in the progress and attendance log) and the results of performing special boundary control tasks (if necessary).

6.2.4 Assessment of students' knowledge on the based on technical and vocational education, full-time higher education with the use of distance educational technologies under current control is carried out according to two components: for work in classroom classes - 50% of the final rating, for completing tasks (online) - 50%.

Assessment in classroom classes includes attendance accounting - max 10 points; activity (answers to questions, discussion of topics, etc.) – max 15 points; performance of practical tasks (practical work, participation in group discussions, etc.) - max 25 points.

Completion of boundary control tasks (online) - max 50 points.

6.2.5 Final control (exam) is an examination of the student's academic achievements, which is carried out after the completion of the study of the discipline during the interim certification in oral, written or combined forms, as well as in the form of computer testing.

Academic achievements (knowledge, skills, skills and competencies) of students on the exam are evaluated in points on a 100-point scale corresponding to the letter system adopted in international practice: positive grades - in descending order from "A" to "D", grades "unsatisfactory" – "F", "FX" with the corresponding the digital equivalent on a 4-point scale.

6.2.6 All types of control and, accordingly, assessment of knowledge are carried out in accordance with the academic calendar and syllabus of the discipline.

6.2.7 Periods of grading students: for full–time students – weekly, for full-time students on the based on technical and vocational education, full-time higher education (distance learning), in master's and doctoral studies - twice during the academic period: on the 8th and 15th weeks (see also paragraph 6.2.4).

6.2.8 Teachers are obliged to carry out all types of training and control activities in a timely manner within the time limits established by the academic calendar. If necessary, the teacher may be given the opportunity to extend the periods of performance of certain activities on the basis of an application addressed to the Vice-rector for Academic Affairs with an indication of a reasoned justification, provided that this extension does not lead to a deterioration in the quality of the educational process and infringement of the rights of students.

6.2.9 The points set by the teacher are not subject to correction. In case of missing a class for a valid reason (for health reasons, etc.), the student must submit an appropriate exculpatory document to the Registrar's office within 3 days. Upon confirmation of the authenticity of the submitted documents, teachers are allowed to score points for missed disciplines. The submitted documents are registered in the educational content of the SmartZhetysu information system, the "Registration of applications" tab.

6.2.10 During the academic period, students' independent work (SIW) is also evaluated. The points scored by the student for performing the SIW are entered into the electronic journal four times per semester – on the 4th, 7th, 11th and 14th weeks of the semester.

6.2.11 The final assessment of the discipline includes assessments of current academic performance and final control (examination assessment). The share of the assessment of current academic performance (milestone rating) is 60% in the final assessment of the degree of mastering the curriculum of the discipline, the assessment of the final control is 40% of the final assessment of knowledge in this academic discipline.

6.2.12 The final score is formed automatically according to the letter system corresponding to the digital equivalent of the four-point system. The assessment received by the student serves as the basis for supplementing the mastered credits with the established number of credits in the relevant discipline.

6.2.13 Students studying with the use of distance learning, according to the academic calendar, pass the boundary control twice during the semester or trimester. A student in a remote format is obliged to complete and send through his personal account the tasks provided by the syllabus. In the semester form of the academic year, the milestone weeks are 8 and 15 weeks, in the trimester – 5 and 10 weeks. During these periods, teachers evaluate the tasks completed by students.

6.2.14 All academic achievements of students – points according to two current ratings, examination assessment (before and after the appeal - if an appeal application was submitted by a student or a graduate student) and the final assessment for each discipline are reflected in the cumulative statement.

The cumulative statement is generated automatically in the information system of the university and is available in the personal offices of teachers and in the content for deans.

6.2.15 The teacher's assessment of students' knowledge should be distributed in the following ratio (according to the Bell Curve):

«A», «A-» (90-100 %) - no more than 10% of the total number of students in the abstract group;

«B+», «B», «B-» (75-89%) - no more than 25% of the total number of students in the abstract group;

«C+», «C», «C-» (60-74%) - no more than 30% of the total number of students in the abstract group;

«D+», «D», «D-» (50-59%) - no more than 25% of the total number of students in the abstract group;

«F» (0-49%) - no more than 10% of the total number of students in the abstract group;

6.2.16 When evaluating all control measures, teachers should adhere to the above ratios, with the exception of small streams (less than 25 people).

6.2.17 Teachers are obliged to provide a methodological variety of control tasks that allow for a differentiated assessment of the competencies of all students.

6.3 Criteria for assessing students' knowledge

6.3.1 The evaluation policy of the discipline with the indication of the parameters of the evaluation criteria, their weight fraction, specific maximum values of points and mechanisms for the accumulation of evaluation points during the entire period of study in the discipline is reflected in syllabuses.

6.3.2 Evaluation criteria indicating all parameters and their weight share in the evaluation of each type of task are described in syllabuses of disciplines and are available to students online.

6.3.3 Students should have access to examples of evaluation of current, intermediate and examination papers with the indication of grades in accordance with the criteria.

6.3.4 Approximate criteria for assessing students' knowledge:

- from 90 to 100 points: demonstration of deep and complete knowledge and understanding of the entire volume of the studied material; full understanding of the essence of the concepts, phenomena and patterns, theories, relationships under consideration; the ability to make a complete and correct answer based on the studied material; highlight the main points, independently support the answer with concrete examples, facts; independently make a reasoned analysis, generalize conclusions; the ability to establish interdisciplinary (based on previously acquired knowledge) and intra-subject connections.

- from 70 to 89 points: knowledge of all the studied program material; a complete and correct answer based on the studied theories; minor errors and shortcomings in the reproduction of the studied material, definitions of concepts, inaccuracies in the use of scientific terms or in conclusions and generalizations; the material is presented in a certain logical sequence, but one rough error or no more than two shortcomings, and the student can correct them on his own if required or with a little help from a teacher; he has mostly mastered the teaching material; confirms the answer with concrete examples.

- from 50-69 points: there are significant deviations from the topic in the answer; the analysis of the problem provided by the question is fragmentary, incomplete; facts are not always separated from opinions, but the student understands the difference between them.

- below 50 points (F, FX): the main content of the material has not been assimilated and disclosed; lack of conclusions and generalizations; gross errors in the student's answer; a significant deviation from the topic and the program being studied in the process of presenting the answer; refusal to answer.

6.3.5 Approximate criteria for evaluating students' written works:

- from 90 to 100 points: logical content is presented; the relevance of the topic under consideration is reflected, the main categories are correctly identified; detailed, independent conclusions are formulated in conclusion;

- from 70 to 89 points: logical content is presented; the relevance of the topic is revealed; there are minor errors and shortcomings in the studied material; general conclusions are formulated in conclusion.

- from 50-69 points: logical content is presented; the relevance of the topic is not fully disclosed; theoretical analysis is given descriptively, the student did not reflect his own position in relation to the materials under consideration, a number of judgments are superficial; conclusions are not formulated.

- below 50 points (F, FX): the main content of the material has not been assimilated and disclosed; the lack of conclusions and generalizations; the student's refusal to answer.

6.3.6 Approximate criteria for assessing the level of physical fitness of students when passing standards:

- from 90 to 100 points: high-quality performance of exercises, the presence of minor errors is allowed;

- from 70 to 89 points: no more than one significant mistake and several minor ones were made;

- from 50-69 points: several significant and/or one gross error was made when meeting the standards. However, the student with repeated executions can improve the result.

- below 50 points (F, FX): the exercise is not completed, or performed with the presence of many gross errors.

6.3.7 Approximate criteria for assessing students' knowledge when demonstrating professional skills (using the example of the EP "Music Education"):

- from 90 to 100 points: for technically flawless performance of the program, in which the freedom of performance serves to reveal the artistic content of the works. The program is performed by heart vividly and expressively, convincingly and completely in form. An individual attitude to the performed work is shown in order to achieve the most convincing embodiment of the artistic idea. Demonstrated fluency in technical techniques;

- from 70 to 89 points: technical freedom, meaningful and expressive play, the student demonstrates a sufficient understanding of the nature and content of the performed work, the program is performed by heart, an individual attitude to the performed work is shown, however, minor technical and stylistic inaccuracies are allowed;

- from 50-69 points: the student demonstrated the limitations of his abilities, a dim, not imaginative performance of the program. The program is executed by heart with inaccuracies and errors, a meaningful and individual attitude to the performed work is poorly manifested. The student shows insufficient mastery of technical techniques, lack of freedom and plasticity of the gaming device, admits errors in sound production.

- below 50 points (F, FX): lack of musical imagery in the performed work, poor knowledge of the program by heart, gross technical errors.

6.3.8 Approximate criteria for assessing students' knowledge when learning foreign languages

Level A1

Evaluation criteria for reading: the student uses an illustrated dictionary, reads and understands small artistic and non-artistic texts on social and everyday topics, defines the main meaning of small texts, defines specific information and details in small texts, defines universal values in texts.

Evaluation criteria for writing: the student correctly writes frequently used words, demonstrating knowledge of the differences between their spelling and pronunciation, writes short sentences under dictation, correctly puts punctuation marks at the end of sentences.

Evaluation criteria for speaking: the student formulates the main statements and statements about himself, formulates questions, answers questions, pronounces the main words and phrases with the correct intonation and emphasis when describing objects and events, expresses what he likes and dislikes.

Evaluation criteria for listening: the student understands the main content of a short conversation on a familiar topic, recognizes the sound of familiar words and phrases, understands short questions about colors and numbers, uses contextual hints to predict the content and meaning of a short conversation on a familiar topic, understands the general meaning of short stories that sound slow and distinct

Level A2

Evaluation criteria for reading: the student determines the main content and distinguishes detailed information in texts of different styles and genres on the topics of the educational and cognitive sphere, uses various information resources in a foreign language, predicts the content of the text by title, text fragment, illustration, keywords, determines the attitude or opinion of the author, evaluates information from various texts

Evaluation criteria for writing: the student conveys the main content of the text within the framework of the studied topics, building a logical course of events; uses formal and informal styles of oral communication, asks questions to obtain the necessary information, analyzes and compares texts, justifying his point of view; orally presents information about his country and its culture in the conditions of foreign-language intercultural communication, shows a tolerant attitude to representatives different cultures, understands and can explain the importance of a foreign language for the successful integration of Kazakhstan into the world community

Evaluation criteria for speaking: the student determines the main facts and understands the main meaning of the listened text on the topics of social, social, cultural and educational-cognitive spheres of communication; distinguishes between detailed and specific information within the studied topics; composes questions based on what he has heard in order to obtain additional information; understands the arguments that justify the speaker's opinion.

Evaluation criteria for listening: the student fills out documents of various formats: tables, diagrams, diagrams, questionnaires, forms; draws up a plan, writes, edits and corrects the text within the framework of the studied topics, makes extracts from the text in accordance with communicative tasks, describes real and/or fictional events from the past, present and future, based on knowledge of previously studied topics, creates texts of various styles and genres, observing the appropriate rules and format within the framework of the studied topics

Level B1

Evaluation criteria for reading: the student understands the main content of journalistic, popular science, fiction, pragmatic texts of a certain complexity in academic subjects of social and humanitarian direction, improves work with the text, highlighting the necessary, basic and detailed information; uses reading strategies, including research, commented, selective, role-playing reading, reading with notes, reading for the purpose of extracting special information, analytical reading; determines the temporal and causal relationship of events and phenomena, analyzes and compares the meanings of words using book and electronic resources, critically evaluates and identifies the main problems, inconsistencies in texts of different genres and styles

Evaluation criteria for writing: the student conducts an ethical dialogue, a dialogue, a dialogue-exchange of information, of a mixed type based on the use of extended topics in situations of official and informal everyday communication; uses lexical and grammatical means of language that ensure the correct language design of statements, expresses an emotional and evaluative attitude to the surrounding reality, implementing the previously proposed tactics of speech communicating with your peers; analyzes and compares texts, expressing and arguing his point of view, argues, expressing his own opinion and evaluating events, opinions and problems, uses specific vocabulary on the problem during a casual conversation, evaluates statements on a certain topic, draws conclusions and offers his own solutions to a given problem

Evaluation criteria for speaking: the student understands the main content of authentic texts of various genres, dialogues on familiar and partially familiar topics; extracts the most functionally significant semantic, including detailed and specific, information for filling out forms, tables, diagrams, identifies the semantics of mathematical, physical, chemical, medical terms, key units of texts of subjects of the educational cycle, as well as other areas of communication, answers questions about the content of the text, distinguishes fact and opinion, extracts and compares inconsistencies in texts of medium volume of different genres and styles within the framework of studied and general topics, guesses the meaning of unfamiliar words by context

Evaluation criteria for listening: the student draws up a plan, theses of written communication, edits and corrects texts of different genres and styles based on what he has heard and read; observes spelling and grammatical norms, uses complex sentences of different constructions, writes a reasoned text, a story, a report based on media information, writes his own written texts of an informative nature in the form of a personal or official business letter, as well as texts of a business nature (statements, requests, explanatory notes), writes an essay on a given topic.

Level B2

Evaluation criteria for reading: the student understands the message on contemporary issues, the authors of which take a special position or express a special point of view. The student understands modern fiction.

Evaluation criteria for writing: the student understands the general content of complex texts on abstract and specific topics, including highly specialized texts. Speak quickly and spontaneously enough to constantly communicate with native speakers without much difficulty for either side. The student is able to make clear, detailed messages on various topics and state his view on the main problem, show the advantages and disadvantages of different opinions.

Evaluation criteria for speaking: the student understands detailed reports and lectures and even complex argumentation contained in them, if the subject of these speeches is familiar enough to them. The student understands almost all news and reports about current events. The student understands the content of most films if their characters speak a literary language.

Evaluation criteria for listening: the student is able to write understandable detailed messages on a wide range of issues of interest to them. The student is able to write essays or reports, highlighting issues or arguing a point of view "for" or "against". The student is able to write letters, highlighting those events and impressions that are particularly important to them.

Level C1

Evaluation criteria for reading: the student understands large complex non-fiction and artistic texts, their stylistic features. The student also understands special articles and technical instructions of a large volume, even if they do not relate to the scope of their activities.

Evaluation criteria for writing : the student understands voluminous complex texts on various topics, recognizes the hidden meaning. He speaks spontaneously at a fast pace, without experiencing difficulties with the selection of words and expressions. Flexibly and effectively uses language for communication in scientific and professional activities. Can create an accurate, detailed, well-structured message on complex topics, demonstrating mastery of text organization models, communication tools and combining its elements.

Evaluation criteria for speaking: the student understands detailed messages, even if they have a fuzzy logical structure and insufficiently expressed semantic connections. The student understands almost fluently all television programs and films.

Evaluation criteria for listening: the student is able to express his thoughts clearly and logically in writing and to cover his views in detail. The student is able to present complex problems in detail in letters, essays, reports, highlighting what they think is most important. The student is able to use the language style corresponding to the intended addressee.

Level C2

Evaluation criteria for reading: the student understands large complex non-fiction and artistic texts, their stylistic features. The student also understands special articles and technical instructions of a large volume, even if they do not relate to the scope of their activities.

Evaluation criteria for writing: the student understands almost any oral or written message, can compose a coherent text based on several oral and written sources. Speak spontaneously with a high tempo and a high degree of accuracy, emphasizing shades of meaning even in the most difficult cases.

Evaluation criteria for speaking: the student freely understands any spoken language in direct or indirect communication. The student fluently understands the speech of a native speaker speaking at a fast pace, if they have the opportunity to get used to the individual peculiarities of his pronunciation.

Evaluation criteria for listening: the student is able to logically and consistently express his thoughts in writing, using the necessary language tools. The student is able to write complex letters, reports, reports or articles that have a clear logical structure that helps the addressee to note and remember the most important points. The student is able to write resumes and reviews of both professional works and works of art.

6.4 Academic honesty of evaluation and receiving an assessment

6.4.1 Academic honesty is a set of moral norms, principles and values that determine the behavior of each member of the university community – teachers, staff and students, including principles such as avoiding deception and plagiarism, adherence to academic standards, honesty and honesty in scientific research and publications.

6.4.2 The rules of compliance with academic honesty by all subjects of the educational process are described in the Policy of Academic Honesty of the ZU named after I. Zhansugurov.

6.4.3 Academic honesty of assessment and evaluation is considered as a procedure of strict adherence by all participants of the educational process to the criteria for the performance of work, grading when evaluating students' work, as well as mechanisms for appealing an assessment that is not set according to criteria.

6.4.4 The principles of academic honesty are:

- conscientiousness is an honest, decent performance by students of evaluated and unappreciated types of educational work;
- implementation of the protection of the rights of the author and his legal successors – recognition of authorship and protection of works that are the object of copyright, through the correct transmission of someone else's speech, thoughts and indication of sources of information in the evaluated works;
- openness – transparency, mutual trust, open exchange of information and ideas between students and teachers;
- respect for the rights and freedoms of students – the right to free expression of opinions and ideas;
- equality – each member of the university community ensures compliance with the rules of academic honesty and equal responsibility for their violation.

6.4.5 Academic dishonesty is any type of fraud or deception that is associated with scientific and educational activities. The types of **academic dishonesty** include cheating, plagiarism, double passing,

falsification of grades and data of the evaluated work, acquisition of answers, evaluated works dishonestly, sale or other ways of helping to buy or sell finished evaluated works or answers to exam tests, etc.

6.4.6 Informing teachers and staff about the prevention of unfair behavior during scientific research, the personal responsibility of teaching staff and students for non-compliance with the rules of research ethics, the use of the teaching staff of a transparent criteria system for evaluating assignments and other criteria of academic honesty is carried out systematically during the academic year.

6.4.7 Academic honesty during the interim certification is ensured by electronic means of analysis and online proctoring. The SmartZhetysu database records a photo report on the state of the student's desktop computer interface during the selection of the answer and a photo report on the student's behavior at the stage of each test question, as well as the moment of arbitrary shooting at any stage of testing. After completing the selection of answers, the student agrees to complete the test, the program processes the results, the points received by the student automatically appear on the computer screen and are recorded in the database.

6.4.8 One of the important principles of academic honesty in the assessment is the possibility of students filing appeals.

Appeals are filed in case of disagreement with the assessment received during the current, milestone or final control, or if, in the opinion of the student, the established procedure for conducting intermediate / final control of knowledge is violated. The basis for the appeal of the exam results in writing is the content of the student's answer sheet, the exam in the form of computer testing - the details of the test version. Access to the details of the student's response during computer testing is provided by employees of the department of digitalization and process automation.

6.4.9 The composition of the appeal commission is approved by the order of the Chairman of the Board - Rector for a period of one academic year on the recommendation of the Director of the OR. The most experienced and qualified teachers of the university are included in the composition of the appeal commission. The Chairman of the Appeals Commission organizes the work of the appeals commission, distributes responsibilities among the members of the appeals commission, monitors the work of the commission in accordance with this policy.

6.4.10 The Chairman and members of the Appeal Commission are obliged to:

- 1) to carry out timely and objective consideration of appeals in accordance with this policy and the requirements of regulatory legal acts of the Republic of Kazakhstan;
- 2) perform the functions assigned to them at a high professional level, observing ethical and moral standards;
- 3) inform the Registrar's office staff in a timely manner about problems or difficulties that may lead to violation of the terms of consideration of appeals;
- 4) respect confidentiality.

In case of non-fulfillment or improper fulfillment of assigned duties, violation of confidentiality and information security requirements, abuse of established powers committed out of selfish or other personal interest, the chairman and members of the appeal commission may be brought to disciplinary responsibility.

6.4.11 The mechanisms and procedures for conducting appeals on the appeals of students are described in the Academic Policy of the University.

6.5 Principles and procedures for the analysis and evaluation of learning outcomes

6.5.1 The procedures for evaluating and analyzing distributed assessments are described in the Academic Policy of the University, in the Regulations on the forms of students' knowledge control and the Regulations on educational and methodological work (.

6.5.2 The organization of final control (intermediate certification) and accounting of educational achievements of students is carried out by the Registrar's office.

6.5.3 The Registrar's Office conducts:

- monitoring of the results of the current, boundary and final control of students and their analysis in accordance with the evaluation table reflecting the actual percentage distribution of absolute grades above the passing level in groups of students;

- analysis of the median and standard deviation of the normal distribution of grades based on the results of students' academic performance;
- critical analysis of teachers' excellent grades (if they exceed 15%);
- statistics of awarding diplomas with honors and their critical analysis.

6.5.4 The main element of the statistical analysis of the quality of teaching and grading is the Bell Curve grade distribution curve. To analyze the distribution of grades based on the results of the current, milestone and final control of students' knowledge, a diagram with numeric and letter grades is constructed.

6.5.5 Reports on the results of the interim certification in the form of a diagram of the normal distribution of the number of grades by numeric and letter values of grades, data on the indicator "Median grade" by university, educational programs, etc. formed by the Registrar's office.

6.5.6 Analytical reports on the results of the winter and summer intermediate attestation are discussed at meetings of the academic and Academic Councils twice during the academic year and are brought to the attention of the teaching staff of the university.

6.5.7 Based on the results of the review of analytical data (taking into account the Bell Curve assessment distribution curve), a set of measures is determined aimed at improving the quality of teaching and evaluating students' knowledge with subsequent monitoring of their implementation.