

**Assessment Policy and Procedures of the autonomous organization of education
“Nazarbayev University”**

Category: Policy

Approval Date: 23.07.2025

Effective Date: 23.07.2025

Level of Access: Open to Public

Classification Number: 2.2 IE

Approving Authority: Academic Council

Registration Number: 35

Owner: The Center for Innovation in Learning
and Teaching

Revision Date: 26.04.2028

Applicability: Nazarbayev University

Retired Documents: Not Applicable

Title:

Date:

Registration Number:

Approving Authority:

Section 1. Purpose and Application

1.1. The purpose of this Assessment Policy and Procedures of the autonomous organization of education “Nazarbayev University” (hereinafter – the Assessment Policy) is to elaborate on the principles of the Nazarbayev University Assessment Strategy by providing actionable policy and procedures.

1.2. This policy applies to NU faculty, students and academic administrators involved in the assessment of learning and the administration of assessment in NU academic courses and programs.

1.3. This Policy and procedures describes the procedures and guidelines for the assessment of credit-bearing academic programs, including microcredentials and joint programs with external providers, and non-credit-bearing courses that include assessment at Nazarbayev University (hereinafter “the University” or “NU”).

Section 2. Terms/Definitions

2.1. The following terms and definitions are used in this Policy:

1) An Additional Assessment Task – a ‘make-up’ task provided to an eligible student, at the discretion of a designated person within a school or center, to confirm they have met the required learning outcomes for the course (e.g. resitting an examination with a new paper). This is not an assessment for extra credit;

2) Academic Quality Framework – a framework that establishes processes for setting, maintaining and assuring academic standards and academic quality;

3) Annual Program Monitoring (APM) – a component of the NU Academic Quality Framework, which requires annual reporting on the academic performance of schools;

4) Assessment – the method(s) and procedure(s) by which a student's academic progress and performance are measured in a course or program. It includes assessment for learning (formative assessment) and assessment of learning (summative assessment), applied to a wide range of learning activities including, but not limited to, coursework, examinations, group work, fieldwork, placements/internships, presentations, dissertations, theses and projects;

5) Assessment Extension – a process involving the formal permission for a student to delay the completion or submission of an assessment task after the original date/time (e.g. examinations, tests) or due date/time (e.g. assessment tasks);

6) An Assessment Task – any activity that may be used to gauge the progress of student learning and determine the student’s result for the course. Attendance at classes, in itself, is an invalid form of assessment;

7) An Assessment Brief – a detailed description of an assessment task;

8) Artificial Intelligence (AI) – a set of technologies that enable computers to perform advanced functions, including the ability to see, understand and translate spoken and written language, analyze data and make recommendations. Specifically, AI in this policy refers to generative artificial intelligence which produces artefacts used in scholarly work;

9) Assurance of Learning – processes that demonstrate that students achieve learning outcomes of respective courses/programs;

- 10). Benchmarking – a quality process to evaluate performance by comparing institutional practices to sector-wide good practices;
- 11) Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) – statements that describe what students should know and be able to do by the end of a course;
- 12) Course Specification Form – the document that outlines the fundamental course components (content, pedagogy and assessment) and their alignment with CLOs, PLOs and NU Graduate Attributes;
- 13) Criterion-referenced assessments – a type of assessment that requires judgments and allocation of marks/grades based on standards and criteria linked to the CLOs and made clear to learners before completing the tasks;
- 14) CurrIQunet – the centralized curriculum management system used at NU;
- 15) Feedback – information given to the learner about the learner's performance relative to learning goals or outcomes. It is a process in which learners make sense of information about their performance and use it to enhance the quality of their work or learning strategies;
- 16) Formative Assessments – informal assessments (learning activities and tasks) that are used by instructors to make judgements about student understanding, provide developmental feedback to learners and inform the development of subsequent teaching strategies. The outcomes of these tasks are not included in the course grade;
- 17) A Grade – either a numeric code used to signify the percentage range of the mark awarded (if applicable) or an alphabetic code used to indicate the outcome of the course or an interim status until the course outcome is determined;
- 18). Grade Descriptors – statements that describe the characteristics of performance at each grade;
- 19) An Incremental Assessment task – a set or series of low-stakes assessment tasks designed to provide students with opportunities to practise skills/behaviours/ thinking/communication approaches appropriate to the discipline and to improve their performance through feedback (for example, a series of multiple-choice quizzes);
- 20) Learning Management System (LMS) – the university system used for the management of student learning, for example, Moodle. Each course has an allocated learning space for communication and storage of learning resources and results for a course;
- 21) Mark/s – the level of achievement against specified criteria for an individual assessment item. A mark can be numeric or alphabetic;
- 22) Moderation – also known as a Reliability Procedure – is a quality assurance process that ensures that marks or grades are awarded appropriately and consistently. Moderation may involve a range of activities, for example, checking and reviewing assessment schemes, items and assessor judgments;
- 23) Norm-referenced assessment – an assessment that determine how well a student performs in comparison to other students taking the same assessment. It ranks students compared to a predefined population with similar experiences;
- 24) NU Graduate Attributes – are high-level qualities, skills and understandings that a student is expected to gain by the time they graduate from NU, as a result of the learning and experiences engaged in throughout their university life;
- 25) Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) – statements that describe what students should know and be able to do by the end of a program;

26) Reasonable Adjustment – a measure or action to assist a student with a disability or special learning need (SLN) to participate equitably in an assessment, course or program. An adjustment is reasonable if it balances the interests of all parties affected;

27) A rubric – a scoring guide that articulates specific components and expectations for the assessment of an activity or task;

28) Scaling – the process of adjusting the raw marks for a cohort of students (or all students) to change the mean or distribution of the marks, often used with norm-referenced assessment;

29) School Teaching and Learning Committee – a school-level committee charged with decision-making related to learning and teaching;

30) Summative assessments – assessments used to evaluate learners' understanding and knowledge of a specific topic or the development of skills and attributes after the learners have been taught the relevant knowledge, skills or attributes over a period of time. It is an end-point assessment.

Section 3. Main Provisions

3.1. Purposes and Principles of Assessment

3.1.1. The primary purpose of assessment at NU is to enable students to enhance and demonstrate their intellectual, social and physical development by achieving CLOs and PLOs. Assessment is valued as a tool to aid learning and to provide a measure of learning attainment. Assessment enables students to reflect on their learning and their success in meeting the learning outcomes of courses and programs. NU stakeholders must be assured that assessment activities provide a reliable and consistent basis for the recommendation of an appropriate grade and academic award.

3.1.2. The University expectations and principles of assessment, presented in the NU Assessment Strategy, are the basis of this assessment policy.

3.1.3. The University uses a criterion-referenced approach to assessment (in most cases), with student achievement assessed against the NU Graduate Attributes, the PLOs and the CLOs.

3.1.4. Assessment must be aligned with the program and course outcomes, as embedded in CurriQunet. Assessment modifications must be managed by the designated school personnel, through CurriQunet.

3.1.5. The University recognizes that assessment is highly varied and contextualized; consequently, it expects instructors to employ distinctive, diverse and contemporary assessment practices across its range of undergraduate and graduate study programs, as appropriate to the discipline.

3.1.6. Assessment practices will be subject to quality assurance processes to meet the standards required by the University and its accrediting authorities.

3.2. Designing Assessment

3.2.1. The definitive assessment details are provided in the Course Specification Form and approved by the School Teaching and Learning Committee. The Course Coordinator/Program Director/Chair ensure constructive alignment of the course specification assessment details with the CLOs, PLOs, course content and the NU Graduate Attributes. The Course Specification form consists of two parts: Definitive elements (Part A) - the core course components (course aims, CLOs and student workload) that have an impact on the program and, therefore, are subject for approval by the School Learning and Teaching Committee and Part B: which includes details of teaching, learning, assessment and curriculum outline. Both parts are reviewed and updated as needed as part of the Annual Course Monitoring process. The approval process is managed through the CurrIQunet platform.

3.2.2. Assessment will be designed to reflect best assessment practices, including manageability for students, instructors and the institution. This includes the following:

- 1) The scheduling of assessment tasks will enable students to receive formative feedback before subsequent assessments;
- 2) The schedule should be developed in consultation with other course/program instructors to avoid overloading and disadvantaging students;
- 3) At least 40% of student assessment should be completed before the course withdrawal date, to ensure that students have the necessary information to make decisions about their course completion; and
- 4) Examination questions should be varied each year.

3.2.3. Assessments will be designed to minimise and discourage potential breaches of academic integrity (for example, by changing assessment topics/tasks; including ‘live’ performance or oral tasks; incorporating audit trails such as evidence of drafting, etc.).

3.2.4. Assessment processes for the setting, marking/grading and moderation of assessment tasks will be established before the commencement of the course, and will be explicit and transparent to all stakeholders.

3.2.5. Assessment tasks will ensure that students have opportunities to demonstrate a wide range of authentic knowledge, skills and attributes, including generic skills and capabilities (e.g. critical thinking, problem solving and communication) using processes and materials appropriate to the discipline and relevant to real-world environments.

3.2.6. Assessment should, as applicable, include a focus on learning processes, in addition to single-point product assessments (for example, an exam or a laboratory report).

3.2.7. Assessment is a process of sampling student learning. Courses will use the minimum number of assessment tasks necessary to make an informed decision about student achievement against the CLOs. It is recommended that most courses of 6 ECTS have three to five summative assessment tasks.

3.2.8. All courses should provide opportunities for formative and summative assessment. Formative assessments are learning activities that provide students with feedback about their progress towards the achievement of the CLOs. Formative assessment results are not included as part of the final grade.

3.2.9. Attendance will not, in itself, be assessable unless it is directly linked to a CLO. Consequences for non-attendance can be applied through other regulatory processes (for example, failure for not fulfilling course requirements.)

3.2.10. Assessment tasks that involve group work will provide explicit guidance about the basis for mark allocation. Assessment methods should account for group and/or individual contributions to ensure fairness, transparency and defensibility.

3.2.11. A series of low-stakes assessment tasks (e.g. short quizzes, steps towards a larger summative task) can be grouped as an incremental assessment task (see definitions). To be grouped as an incremental assessment task, each task in the series/set will be similar or linked. Incremental assessments may be formative or summative.

3.2.12. A summative incremental assessment task should not have more than four parts. Each part should be worth no less than 5% of the total assessment.

3.2.13. Summative assessment tasks should not be weighted less than 20%.

3.2.14. No single assessment should be weighted at more than 40% of the total course assessment (except a thesis or capstone project). Other exceptions require approval through the School Teaching and Learning Committee.

3.2.15. Participation and/or engagement may be assessed if the course has appropriate CLOs. Participation/engagement should not be weighted at more than 20% of the final grade. Clear criteria or a rubric should detail how participation and engagement will be demonstrated and assessed.

3.2.16. Inclusive and equitable assessment tasks will allow all learners equal opportunity to demonstrate achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

3.2.17. Reasonable adjustment(s) may be made for students with a verified disability, medical or other condition/needs, consistent with the NU Special Learning Needs Policy (such as the modification of assessment tasks, processes or format).

3.3 Communicating Assessment Requirements

3.3.1. Assessment requirements will be communicated to students via the Course Specification Form accessible via the CurriQunet platform and the LMS (Moodle), no later than the first day of the semester or the commencement of a block learning period.

3.3.2. Additional School, Department or Program Policies related to assessment (over and above those outlined in this policy) will be included in the program handbook and/or course documentation available on the LMS. This will include information about any penalties to be applied for late assessment.

3.3.3. Students will be given clear, accurate and transparent assessment briefs for each assessment. This information will be included in the LMS at the commencement of the learning period.

3.3.4. Criteria for student success should be made explicit to students. This may be through assessment criteria, an assessment rubric for each assessment task, or the determination of a pass/fail mark for tests/quizzes. Requirements to pass the course will be explicitly stated in the Program Handbook and/ or Course Documentation.

3.3.5. Minor changes may be made to assessment tasks and associated guidance for assessment processes provided that such changes have been discussed with and communicated to students. Changes must be promptly published on LMS. Any student

experiencing a difficulty related to the change should contact the course coordinator. Changes cannot be made to the type of assessment or its weighting without amending the Course Specification Form using the course modification process (Parts A and B) in CurrIQunet.

3.4 Assessment Submission

3.4.1. The assessment submission process (unless precluded by assessment type, e.g. oral presentation) will include a declaration of originality, identifying any use of AI tools and the specific contribution of the student in the case of a group-based assessment.

3.4.2. Unless otherwise stated, all assessment artifacts should be submitted electronically, through LMS.

3.4.3. Anti-plagiarism and AI detector software may be used to review submitted work.

3.5 Late Assessments/Extension

3.5.1. Assessments will be submitted by the due date and time, as indicated on the LMS.

3.5.2. Where exceptional circumstances exist (involving circumstances beyond the control of the student such as sudden, severe illness or immediate family trauma) s/he may request an Assessment Extension by email, before the submission date. The existence of exceptional circumstances does not guarantee that an Assessment Extension will be approved.

3.5.3. An application for an assessment extension may be accepted up to five working days after the due date at the discretion of the decision-maker designated at the department/school level.

3.5.4. The decision maker, as designated by the department/school and identified in course documents, is responsible for determining whether applications for Assessment Extension will be accepted and for promptly notifying students (within three working days), by email, about the approval or dismissal of the request.

3.5.5. A Course Coordinator, in consultation with the Dean/Vice Dean of Academic Affairs, may offer an Assessment Extension to a student or group of students, without application, in recognition of circumstances where the resources required to complete the assessment are not available. This might arise, for example, if essential equipment is damaged or unavailable for a period of time, which would unfairly disadvantage students' assessment.

3.5.6. If a school decides to apply penalties for late submission of work, students must be provided with information about late penalties in course documents and on LMS. Students should be given information about their performance on the assessment before and after applying the late penalty.

3.5.7. If no policy is stated in the course documents or on the LMS, then no penalties can be applied for late submission.

3.6. Examinations

3.6.1. All examination durations will be stated on the LMS at the commencement of the course.

3.6.2. Examinations should not exceed three hours in duration.

3.6.3. Examinations will be conducted and invigilated with close attention to academic integrity. Students will be provided with clear information about the items that can be brought into and used during an examination.

3.6.4. Examination results will be available within 15 working days of the examination.

3.6.5. Students can seek feedback on their examination and access a marked copy of their examination from their instructor, either in person or through an online meeting.

3.6.6. A sample of marked examination papers should be retained by each instructor for three years.

3.7 Academic Integrity

3.7.1. All student work should comply with the Student Code of Conduct and AI Acceptable Usage Statements (included in Course Documents and annually approved by the School Learning and Teaching Committee) as outlined in the NU Response to Generative AI in Learning and Teaching.

3.7.2. Instructors will take reasonable steps to ensure the authenticity of students' work. Such steps may involve electronic software checks (e.g. Turnitin, AI detection tools), declaration statements, oral confirmation checks, or other processes consistent with the discipline and the task.

3.8. Marking and Grading of Assessments

3.8.1. Reliability Procedures (Moderation) will be in place in all programs to ensure the reliability of marking/grading. Such procedures may include:

1) The collaborative design of assessment tasks/tests, criteria, rubrics and/or the establishment of an agreed passing mark on a test/exam/quiz..

2) Double marking of a sample of student work according to an established moderation plan (e.g., a 5% sample, or at a range of success levels (high, medium, low) and/or specific cut-off points (A/B, B/C, P/F).

3) Review of grades by an assessment or examination board.

3.8.2. A reliability plan should be developed for each program, explicitly stating:

1) Type of moderation activities to be completed;

2) Identification of the assessment tasks for which moderation will be undertaken;

3) The moderation sample size/ sampling procedure; and

4) Where moderation records will be stored.

3.8.3. Student work samples should be deidentified for blind moderated marking processes.

3.8.4. Samples of moderated assessment tasks and scripts will be retained with a summary of the process and the outcomes for five years, or the time required by relevant accreditation bodies.

3.8.5. Rounding will occur to the final course mark. The threshold is x.5 (e.g. a mark between 79.5 and 79.9 will be rounded to 80.00 and a mark between 79.0 and 79.5 will be rounded to 79.00).

3.8.6. Student results should remain confidential and not be shared publicly with other students.

3.8.7. Scaling student marks to a normal distribution is not permitted (with the exception of programs in the Graduate School of Business that are not assessed according to criterion referencing). Any requirement to adjust marks as part of a moderation process or to recalibrate an external result to be consistent with NU's grading system will be approved by the School Teaching and Learning Committee or a committee that is established by the School for reviewing and moderating marks.

3.8.8. If concerns or appeals are raised about the grading of student work within a course, the School Teaching and Learning Committee may be tasked by the Dean to examine student results in a course and propose a strategy to deal with any identified errors or non-compliance with policy in response to their review. In extreme cases, to ensure the tenets of the NU Assessment Strategy and Policy are upheld, marks may be adjusted by the School Teaching and Learning Committee.

3.8.9. Further Assessment: A student may be eligible for an Additional Assessment Task if they have attempted all required assessment tasks for the course and have failed the course by less than 5%. The course documentation should specify if this option is available within the course.

3.9. Feedback

3.9.1. Students will be informed of when and how they will receive feedback on each assessment task. Under normal circumstances, feedback and marks should be provided within 15 working days of the due date or submission date (whichever is later).

3.9.2. Feedback will be explicitly linked to the intended learning outcomes, and be timely, developmental, constructive and actionable.

3.9.3. Feedback provided to directly support a subsequent assessment task will be provided in sufficient time for the feedback to be applied to the next assessment task.

3.10. Recording Marks and Grades

3.10.1. Marks for each summative assessment task will be entered into a school-approved electronic repository for assessment task results, such as LMS or other Google Drive.

3.10.2. Each instructor is responsible for accurately uploading grades to the Office of the Registrar.

3.10.3. Schools may establish grade review processes to be completed before grades are uploaded to the Office of the Registrar. A grade review process should be

conducted by either a Vice Dean, a School LTC or a committee established for this purpose (e.g. an assessment or examination or student progression committee, see, for example, SOM/CPS).

3.10.4. If student integrity misconduct issues are identified, the student's marks will not be entered until the case is finalized.

3.11. Assessment Appeals

3.11.1 Students have the right to a fair and transparent assessment mark or grade appeal process if they believe an error has occurred. The error must be based on one of the following criteria:

- 1) Error in calculation;
- 2) Error in the application of the class grade policy as presented in the Course Specification Form or LMS or other course documentation;
- 3) Incorrect entry of the grade into an assessment record;
- 4) The incomplete marking of an assessment.

3.11.2. A student is encouraged to seek assistance and advice (e.g. from the Student Government) in preparing an assessment appeal.

3.11.3. If a student is concerned about some element of a grade or mark, the student must consult with the course instructor within 3 (three) working days of the dissemination of the appealed mark/grade. The course instructor has 3 (three) working days to address the concern and respond to the request.

3.11.4. If a student remains dissatisfied, s/he may submit a formal appeal, following the process outlined in the Program Handbook or by contacting the Vice Dean of Academic Affairs within 5 days of receiving a response from the instructor.

3.11.6. If the authorized officer believes there are sufficient grounds for further review of the mark or the grade awarded, they will arrange for the work in question to be re-marked by a person/s not previously involved in assessing the student's work.

3.11.7. Where possible, the re-marking will be conducted anonymously with the student's identity not disclosed to the marker/s.

3.11.8. Where the authorized officer has been involved in the original assessment for which the appeal has been lodged, they will not be involved in the appeal process. The appeal will be determined by the Dean, Vice Dean or other delegate.

3.11.9. On receipt of a formal assessment appeal, the Dean (or authorized officer) will request the Chair or Course Coordinator to provide information and documents relevant to the appeal. These could include the following

- 1) Comments on the appeal, including any information on discussions already conducted with the student;
- 2) A recommendation as to how the matter will be determined;
- 3) A copy of the assessed work that is subject to the appeal (if available);
- 4) Details of the criteria used to assess the student's work; and
- 5) Any other information relevant to the appeal.

3.11.10. Where work is subject to re-marking, the following applies:

- 1) If the mark awarded by the two markers differs by less than 10%, the mark is determined by averaging the two marks.

2) If the mark awarded by the two markers differs by more than 10%, the markers should attempt to reach a consensus decision about the mark. Where a consensus can be reached, this new mark will stand as the mark. If a consensus cannot be reached, a third marker will be appointed. In this case, the mark will be the average of the two closest marks from the three markers.

3.11.11. Where suitable staff eligible to re-mark work are not available within the University, the Dean may nominate an external marker.

3.11.12. The appeal will be determined within 10 working days of it being received by the Dean (or authorized officer).

3.11.13. The decision of the Dean (or authorized officer) is final.

3.11.14. Once a decision has been made on the appeal by the Dean (or authorized officer), the student will be advised in writing of the outcome of the appeal and the reasons for the decision, no later than three working days from the date of the decision.

3.11.15. Where a student is subject to misconduct investigations during an assessment appeal, the assessment appeal will be set aside until the misconduct is finalized.

3.11.16. In any discussions regarding the review of marks or official results, the student and instructor are entitled to be accompanied and assisted by a support person, but the support person will not act as an advocate unless invited to do so.

3.12. Change of Results

3.12.1. Where an appeal has been upheld and the result for a student requires amendment, it is the responsibility of the Dean (or authorized officer) to arrange the change of result on the student records system.

3.12.2. Students must be informed if any changes are made to assessment results or grades after they have been disseminated to students.

3.13. Storage of Assessment Artefacts

3.13.1. Copies of assessment tasks worth more than 20% of a course grade, (including assessment Task Briefs, examinations and tests, criteria, and rubrics) must be retained in an electronic space (drive) or designated centralized physical locations within each school, for five years or the period of time required by an accrediting body.

3.13.2. Samples of students' assessed work (including projects, essays, laboratory reports, and examinations), or a representation of the artefact, must be retained for five years or the period of time required by an accrediting body.

3.13.3. Schools will identify the number of samples of student work required for retention. It is recommended that samples should include the highest scoring, the lowest scoring and samples at critical cut-off points (e.g. pass/fail).

3.13.4. Documents demonstrating moderation procedures and the associated work samples, briefs, rubrics and minuted records of the proceedings should also be electronically stored for accreditation purposes.

3.14. Quality Assurance

3.14.1. Schools are encouraged to develop systematic and holistic assessment review plans before the commencement of each academic year or semester, as appropriate. Best practices are exemplified in schools with a dedicated assessment review committee that meets at the end of a semester or teaching block so that any assessment modifications can be made through CurrIQunet, in a timely manner (see for example, the Center for Preparatory Studies and School of Medicine).

3.14.2. Schools' assessment review processes may include a review of assessment tasks, criteria, and rubrics before the commencement of the semester, a moderation process and a process for the review of results before submission of results or after the semester.

3.15. Quality Enhancement

3.15.1. Assessment methods and processes should be annually reviewed as part of the APM process to ensure their effectiveness in measuring learning outcomes and modified as required. Assurance of Learning should be one of the guiding principles in enhancing assessment practices.

3.15.2. Assessment review processes should include a focus on closing the loop by reporting to students how their feedback has informed assessment practices.

3.15.3. The School's program-level assessment practices and assessment activities will be evaluated against rigorous international standards through periodic review and international accreditation.

3.16. Professional Development to Support Continuous Improvement of Assessment

Instructors are encouraged to access professional learning opportunities related to assessment provided by the Center for Innovation in Learning and Teaching or other external providers. Engaging in professional learning relevant to pedagogy, assessment and curriculum development will be expected when applying for renewal or promotion.

Section 4. Waiver

4.1. Only the Approving Authority of this Policy — the Academic Council — may grant a waiver of any of its provisions.

4.2. A waiver may be granted only for a specified period and in exceptional circumstances, as defined in the University's internal regulations.

4.3. A request for a waiver shall be submitted by the relevant School Dean and may be endorsed by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

Section 5. Temporary Provision

5.1. Not applicable.

Section 6. Revision

6.1. This Policy will be reviewed in April 2028 to assess its effectiveness and alignment with the Nazarbayev University Assessment Strategy, national policy, and international best practices.

Section 7. Related Documents

7.1. Assessment Strategy of the autonomous organization of education “Nazarbayev University”

7.2. Academic Quality Framework of the Autonomous Organization of Education Nazarbayev University (2014-05-03)

7.3. Academic Policies and Procedures for Graduate Programs of the autonomous organization of education Nazarbayev University

7.4. Academic Policies and Procedures for Undergraduate Programs of the autonomous organization of education Nazarbayev University

7.5. The Annual Program Monitoring Policy of the autonomous organization of education Nazarbayev University (2014-11-26)

7.6. Nazarbayev University Learning and Teaching Strategy 2024-2030 (2023-11-01)

7.7. Nazarbayev University's Response to Generative Artificial Intelligence in Learning and Teaching (2023-10-18)

7.8. Regulatory Framework for Graduate Programs, Micro-Credentials and Courses of autonomous organization of education Nazarbayev University (2024-08-29)

7.9. Regulatory Framework for Undergraduate Programs and Courses (2018-06-26)

7.10. Student Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures of the autonomous organization of education Nazarbayev University (2015-09-08)

7.11. Support for Students with Disability and Special Learning Needs Policy and Procedures of the autonomous organization of education Nazarbayev University (2023-05-17).