	JSC «Kazakh University of Technology and Business named after K. Kulazhanov»
	QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
	Documented procedure

APPROVED
Rector of
JSC «KazUTB named after K. Kulazhanov»
_____ L.K. Baibolova
"20" September 2026

ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING QUALITY
KazUTB-DSD-DP-9.1.3-2026-16

Astana, 2026

Version: 2.0	CE: GHSD	Registration №_____ on EDM

FOREWORD

This Documented Procedure (DP) has been developed by the Strategic Development Department of JSC «KazUTB named after K. Kulazhanov»

This DP is approved by the Rector of JSC «KazUTB named after K. Kulazhanov» by affixing their personal signature to the title page.

This DP is mandatory for all structural departments and employees of JSC «KazUTB named after K. Kulazhanov» involved in the planning, implementation, analysis, and technical support of teaching quality monitoring.

This DP shall be periodically reviewed by the Director of the Strategic Development Department at least once every three years, as well as in the event of changes in legislation, organizational structure, the platform, or the assessment methodology.

This document supersedes the previous version KazUTB-DQAaA-DP-8.5.1-2025-18.

CONTENT

1 Terms and definitions	4
2 General provisions and procedure description	4
3 Planning and assigning inspections	5
4 Situational video monitoring	7
5 Assessment and decision-making	8
6 Documented information and process reporting	10
7 Responsibility and authority	11
8 Risks and anti-corruption measures	11
9 Confidentiality	12
10 Final provisions	12
Applications	13
Unified application form F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-01 (mandatory)	13
Situational video monitoring checklist form F. DSD -9.1.3-2026-16-02	18
Form of the corrective action plan F. DSD -9.1.3-2026-16-03	20
The form of appeals F. DSD -9.1.3-2026-16-04	21
The form of the non-disclosure declaration F. DSD - 9.1.3-2026-16-05	23
Approval sheet F. DSD -7.5-2026-01-02 (mandatory)	24
Familiarization sheet F. DSD -7.5-2026-01-03 (mandatory)	24
Change registration sheet F. DSD -7.5-2026-01-04 (mandatory)	25
Periodic inspection record sheet F. DSD -7.5-2026-01-04 (mandatory)	25

1. TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

The term	Definition
Platform Administrator	An employee responsible for technically verifying the completeness of questionnaires, managing reference directories, and generating reports, without the right to modify the scores assigned by the evaluator.
Valid Evaluation	An evaluation conducted by an authorized and trained individual, with sufficient observation duration and complete completion of the evaluation form.
Remote Teaching Evaluation	Observation of a synchronous online class with access to audio, instructional content, and interaction among participants.
Calibration	Comparison of evaluators' assessments using a common example to develop a consistent understanding of the criteria and rating scale.
Class Information Card	An automatically generated set of information about a class, including the discipline, instructor, group, classroom, type and language of instruction, topic, and learning outcomes specified in the syllabus.
Verification Evaluation	A follow-up observation conducted by another evaluator to confirm that identified deficiencies have been addressed or to review a discrepancy or complaint.
Critical Violation	An observed fact that poses an immediate risk to safety, participants' rights, academic integrity, or the legality of the educational process and requires a separate response.
Primary Teaching Evaluation	A structured observation of a class conducted by an authorized evaluator using approved assessment criteria.
Calibration Evaluation	Simultaneous and independent evaluation of the same class by two evaluators to compare the application of assessment criteria.
Follow-up Evaluation	An additional observation scheduled following a low assessment score, a confirmed concern, or the implementation of an improvement plan.
Situational Video Monitoring	Brief remote observation through video cameras, without assessing instructional content or teaching quality, intended to verify organizational facts.
Traditional (Face-to-Face) Format	A class conducted with the physical presence of the instructor and students in a classroom, laboratory, sports facility, or other educational environment.
N/A — Not Applicable	A criterion that is not applicable to the type or content of the class and is excluded from the calculation.
N/O — Not Observed	A criterion that cannot be observed. This designation indicates incomplete observation and must not be replaced with a score of zero.
Coverage	The proportion of full-time teaching staff who have undergone the required number of completed face-to-face evaluations during the specified period.
Conflict of interest	Circumstances that may affect an evaluator's impartiality or give rise to reasonable doubts about it.

2. GENERAL PROVISIONS AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCEDURE

2.1 The purpose of this Documented Procedure is to obtain reliable data on teaching quality, support the professional development of teaching staff, and ensure continuous improvement of the educational process.

2.2 The object of pedagogical evaluation is a specific class and the observable conditions for achieving the planned learning outcomes. The evaluation does not replace the assessment of the

educational programme, the academic performance of a student group, or the overall performance of an instructor.

2.3 This DP applies to all full-time teaching staff who actually conduct classes during the reporting academic year. Part-time and invited instructors are included by a separate decision documented in the annual plan.

2.4 Each full-time instructor engaged in teaching activities shall undergo at least two in-person evaluations during the academic year — one in each semester. The evaluations shall be conducted by different evaluators.

2.4.1 At least one in-person evaluation shall be conducted by a member of the KRK per semester.

2.4.2 At least one online evaluation shall be conducted through the situational monitoring system.

2.4.3 Evaluations shall be conducted on a cross-assignment basis, whereby each evaluator is assigned an instructor to evaluate.

2.4.4 The same KRK member may evaluate an assigned instructor only once.

2.4.5 A verification evaluation, required in the event of a low score in the previous evaluation, shall be assigned to another KRK member.

2.5 Pedagogical evaluation and situational monitoring are independent processes. Situational monitoring does not generate a pedagogical assessment score and does not replace in-person class observation.

2.6 Evaluations shall be conducted through the platform https://krk.kaztbu.edu.kz/. A paper-based form may be used only in the event of confirmed technical unavailability of the platform and must subsequently be entered into the system.

2.6.1 The login credentials for the system shall be identical to those used for the Platonus LMS.

2.6.2 After completing the paper-based form, the data must be entered into the platform https://krk.kaztbu.edu.kz/ using the evaluator's login credentials.

2.7 In-person pedagogical evaluation and situational video monitoring are different types of quality control, use separate forms, and shall not be combined into a single final score.

2.8 The procedure applies to full-time teaching staff. Part-time and invited instructors shall be included in the evaluation plan, taking into account the volume and duration of their teaching workload.

2.9 Evaluations shall be based on the principles of impartiality, competence, confidentiality, evidence-based assessment, non-interference with the conduct of classes, traceability of actions, and the instructor's right to review the results and provide a response.

2.10 The presence of presentations, digital tools, or sophisticated equipment is not, in itself, an indicator of teaching quality. The appropriateness of such tools for achieving the intended learning outcomes shall be assessed.

2.11 Evaluation results shall primarily be used to improve teaching. Personnel-related or disciplinary decisions shall not be made on the basis of a single evaluation or video monitoring signal without additional verification.

2.12 Only applicable criteria shall be used when evaluating physical education classes, laboratory sessions, practical classes, creative activities, distance learning, and other specialized forms of instruction. The absence of technical equipment shall not, in itself, result in a lower assessment score.

2.13 A single evaluation or video monitoring signal shall not serve as the sole basis for personnel-related, disciplinary, or financial decisions.

3. PLANNING AND ASSIGNMENT OF EVALUATIONS

3.1 The annual evaluation requirement shall be calculated using the following formula: the number of instructors conducting classes during the relevant period multiplied by the prescribed number of primary pedagogical evaluations, plus a reserve for verification evaluations.

3.2 Each instructor shall undergo at least two primary pedagogical evaluations during the academic year — one in each semester — conducted by different evaluators. If an instructor teaches during only one semester, at least one evaluation shall be conducted.

3.3 Situational monitoring shall be planned separately, using a sample that ensures coverage of structural units, time intervals, university buildings, and types of classes. The number of situational monitoring activities shall not reduce the required number of pedagogical evaluations.

3.4 Until all instructors have undergone an initial evaluation, repeated assignment of the same instructor shall not be permitted, except in cases involving verification evaluations, complaints, or substantiated risks.

3.5 The same evaluator shall not conduct both primary evaluations of an instructor. At least two evaluations shall be conducted by individuals who are not members of the same department as the instructor being evaluated.

3.6 The identity of the instructor selected for evaluation shall not require approval from the Head of Department. The department shall only confirm the accuracy of the class schedule, substitutions, and organizational arrangements.

3.7 An evaluator must be recused in cases of direct reporting relationships, close family relationships, personal conflicts, shared interests in the evaluation outcome, or any other substantiated threat to impartiality.

3.8 Data preparation:

3.8.1 Before the beginning of each semester, the responsible structural unit shall upload and verify the register of full-time teaching staff, class schedules, types and languages of instruction, departmental information, and structured calendar-thematic plans.

3.8.2 The platform shall generate a Class Information Card containing the weekly topic, planned learning outcomes, and the prescribed type of learning activity or assessment. The full text of the syllabus must be accessible through a link.

3.8.3 Changes to class schedules, instructor substitutions, and class cancellations shall be entered into the platform database by the responsible employee before the class begins.

3.9 ***Algorithm Rules:***

3.9.1 Assignments shall be made from among classes available to the evaluator based on time, location, language of instruction, and area of professional competence.

3.9.2 Priority shall be given to the instructor with the lowest number of completed evaluations in the current cycle.

3.9.3 Repeated selection of an instructor shall not be permitted until all other teaching staff members of the relevant department have undergone their initial evaluation.

3.9.4 The same evaluator shall not be assigned to conduct both evaluations of a single instructor.

3.9.5 At least one primary evaluation shall be conducted by an individual who is not the instructor's immediate supervisor.

3.9.6 Evaluators shall not evaluate their own classes and must declare any conflict of interest when assigned to evaluate an instructor from their own department. Any refusal shall be recorded with an indication of the reason.

3.9.7 The algorithm shall ensure the distribution of evaluations across semesters, languages of instruction, types of classes, and departments, as well as an appropriate interval between evaluations.

3.9.8 The instructor's identity shall be disclosed to the evaluator after the assignment has been confirmed. All actions shall be recorded in the audit log.

3.9.9 Prior approval of the name of the instructor selected for evaluation by the Head of Department shall not be required. The department shall receive only the information necessary for organizational support and shall not have the right to alter the random selection.

3.10 ***Evaluator Preparation:***

3.10.1 Before attending a class, the evaluator shall review the Class Information Card, the topic and learning outcomes specified in the syllabus, the type of class, and the declared language of instruction.

3.10.2 Teaching and methodological documentation (UMOD) must be uploaded to the Platonus LMS of JSC «KazUTB named after K. Kulazhanov». Its availability and accessibility shall be verified in the system.

3.10.3 The evaluator shall verify that the course syllabus corresponds to the week being evaluated.

3.10.4 The evaluator shall attend at least 50% of the class duration. To ensure a comprehensive and high-quality evaluation, it is recommended that the class be assessed as thoroughly as possible. A shorter observation period may result in incomplete and/or unreliable information.

3.10.5 The evaluator shall not interfere with the class, comment on the instructor's actions in the presence of students, or make assessments unsupported by specific observable facts.

3.10.6 Before submitting the evaluation form, the evaluator shall indicate the actual class topic, approximate attendance, language of instruction, type of class, and comments. For scores below 5.9, a comment explaining the low assessment is mandatory.

3.11 ***Technical Verification and Feedback:***

3.11.1 The completed questionnaire shall be automatically forwarded to the Platform Administrator. The Administrator shall verify the completion of mandatory fields, validity of entered values, absence of technical duplicates, and availability of explanatory comments, but shall not modify the scores assigned by the evaluator.

3.11.2 An incorrect or incomplete questionnaire shall be returned to the evaluator with an explanation of the reason. All returns and subsequent changes shall be recorded in the audit log.

3.11.3 Once the questionnaire has been accepted, the instructor shall receive the evaluation results, recorded observations, and recommendations. The instructor shall have the right to submit an explanation or objection within five working days.

3.12 ***Objectives of Teaching Quality Evaluation (the objectives established for the evaluation of teaching quality shall take into account the following):***

3.12.1 Impartiality of all participants in the evaluation process: all individuals involved in teaching quality assessment shall be competent, act professionally, and comply with ethical standards.

3.12.2 Both the instructor being evaluated and the evaluator shall have access to feedback mechanisms that contribute to the continuous improvement of their work.

3.12.3 The use of teaching and methodological materials.

3.12.4 Teaching workload, student academic performance, and student graduation.

3.12.5 Non-interference with the educational process, while ensuring the possibility of discussion and analysis at departmental meetings.

3.13 Procedure for Monitoring Visits to Classes Conducted by Teaching Staff (monitoring visits to classes conducted by teaching staff shall be carried out in accordance with the following requirements):

3.13.1 The Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs, the Vice-Rector for Science and Innovation, and the Director of the Strategic Development Department shall each conduct at least two video monitoring sessions per semester;

3.13.2 KRK representatives shall conduct at least **4 in-person** class observations per semester;

3.13.3 The Dean of the Faculty shall conduct at least **2 in-person** class observations per semester;

3.13.4 The Head of Department shall conduct at least **3 in-person** class observations per semester;

3.13.5 The Heads of EPD and ED shall each conduct at least **4 video monitoring** sessions per semester;

3.13.6 The Heads of MD and QMSD shall each conduct at least **2 in-person** class observations per semester.

3.13.7 The criteria for evaluating the quality of classes shall be based on the average qualification indicators used to assess the quality of lectures, practical classes, and laboratory sessions **(F. DSD - 9.1.3-2026-16-01).**

4. SITUATIONAL VIDEO MONITORING

4.1 Video monitoring without audio is intended to verify organizational facts. Its results shall not be included in the final teaching quality assessment score.

4.2 Table of observation items:

Observation Item	Permissible Recording
Beginning and end of the class	Presence of the instructor and student group at the scheduled time; absence of any obvious premature termination of the class.
Compliance with the scheduled classroom	Confirmation that the class is conducted in the designated classroom or identification of the need to clarify a classroom change.
Continuity	Absence of prolonged and unexplained interruptions to the class or absence of the instructor.
Visible learning activity	Visible evidence of activities involving learning materials, assignments, the board, or equipment, without drawing conclusions about teaching quality.
Limited camera coverage	The designation "Not visible" shall be recorded if the camera does not cover the instructor, student group, or learning activity area.

4.3 When reviewing video footage without audio, it is prohibited to assess compliance of the lesson content with the syllabus, language of instruction, clarity of speech, assessment methods, feedback, pedagogical interaction, relevance, or practical orientation of the learning materials.

4.4 The recommended duration of a single situational observation is 10–15 minutes. When monitoring the beginning or end of a class, a separate short observation period shall be used.

4.5 A single adverse finding from video monitoring shall not serve as grounds for lowering an assessment score or making disciplinary conclusions. The response procedure shall follow this sequence: repeated observation, verification of the class schedule and substitutions, obtaining an explanation, and subsequently conducting an in-person class observation if the risk persists.

4.6 If JSC «KazUTB named after K. Kulazhanov» requires a remote teaching evaluation, it shall be conducted through an authorized communication channel that provides access to the audio and instructional content of the class, in compliance with established access and data protection requirements.

4.7 Poor-quality video footage resulting from technical limitations shall not be interpreted to the detriment of the instructor.

Permissible and Prohibited Assessment Activities

What May Be Recorded	What Must Not Be Evaluated
- Time and location of the class; - visible presence TS and students; - visible learning activity; - Technical quality and coverage of the camera view; - Obvious safety risks	- Instructional content and scientific accuracy; - Language of instruction and clarity of speech - Teaching methods; - feedback; - Achievement of learning outcomes; - Personal qualities of the TS

5. PEDAGOGICAL EVALUATION: CRITERIA, SCORING AND FOLLOW-UP

5.1 Structure of the Evaluation Questionnaire:

5.1.1 The pedagogical evaluation questionnaire consists of 15 general criteria and one specialized module containing three criteria, selected according to the type of class. Each criterion is formulated as a question and is accompanied by observable indicators.

Section	Content	Weight
A	Relevance, instructional content, and learning outcomes	20%
B	Organization and teaching methods	25%
C	Interaction, language, and inclusion	20%
D	Assessment, feedback, and verification of learning	20%
E	Module specific to the type of class	15%

5.12 Rating Scale:

Score	Rating	Standardized Interpretation
3	Fully demonstrated	The criterion is supported by consistent observable evidence, with no significant deficiencies.
2	Mostly demonstrated	The criterion is met, but minor shortcomings exist that do not prevent the achievement of the intended outcome.
1	Partially demonstrated	Significant gaps are identified; the outcome is incomplete or inconsistent.
0	Not demonstrated	No observable evidence is available, or the observed practice directly contradicts the criterion.
NA	Not applicable	The criterion is objectively irrelevant to the type of activity and is excluded from the calculation.
NO	Not observed	The criterion cannot be assessed due to incomplete observation or the specific conditions of the class. This designation affects the validity of the evaluation form.

5.2 Calculation of Evaluation Results

5.2.1 For each section, the average score shall be calculated based on criteria rated from 0 to 3. Criteria marked "N/A" or "N/O" shall be excluded from the calculation of the average score.

5.2.2 The final indicator on a 10-point scale shall be calculated using the following formula:

$$\mathbf{PI = (10 / 3) \times (0.20 \times S_A + 0.25 \times S_B + 0.20 \times S_C + 0.20 \times S_D + 0.15 \times S_E)}$$

5.2.3 A final score shall be calculated only if at least 80% of the applicable criteria have been evaluated and at least half of the criteria in each section have been observed. Otherwise, the result shall be assigned the status "Insufficient Data".

5.2.4 If an entire section is objectively not applicable, its weight shall be redistributed proportionally among the remaining sections. The reason for excluding the section must be documented.

Interpretation of Evaluation Results

Final indicator	Performance Level	Required action
8,50–10,00	High	Support effective teaching practices and disseminate successful approaches with the instructor's consent.
7,00–8,49	Satisfactory	Provide recommendations for individual improvement.
5,00–6,99	Needs improvement	Develop an improvement plan and conduct a follow-up evaluation within 4–8 academic weeks.
0–4,99	Unsatisfactory	Provide methodological support, develop an improvement plan, and conduct a follow-up evaluation by different evaluators.
Insufficient data	Invalid Result	Conduct a new primary evaluation without assigning a score based on the invalid result.

5.3 ***Verification of the implementation of proposals and recommendations:***

5.3.1 The results of teaching quality evaluations shall be documented in the minutes of departmental meetings.

5.3.2 Based on the discussion results, measures shall be developed to improve the educational process at JSC «KazUTB named after K. Kulazhanov».

5.3.3 The average teaching quality evaluation score obtained by each instructor during the academic year shall be taken into account when determining the professional rating of teaching staff and during competitive selection procedures.

5.4 ***Completion and Processing of Evaluation Forms:***

5.4.1 The evaluation form shall be completed within two working days. At least one specific observable fact must be provided for each section.

5.4.2 Scores of 0 and 1, indications of critical violations, and recommendations must be supported by evidence and explanatory comments. General statements unsupported by specific facts shall not be accepted.

5.4.3 The Platform Administrator shall verify the completeness of the evaluation form, validity of entered values, and absence of duplicate records, but shall not modify the evaluator's professional judgment.

5.5 ***Feedback and Appeal:***

5.5.1 Following technical validation, the instructor shall receive the evaluation scores, recorded observations, identified strengths, and recommendations within five working days.

5.5.2 Feedback discussions shall be confidential and aimed at improving teaching practices. Evaluation comments shall not be discussed with students or unauthorized third parties.

5.5.3 The instructor shall have the right to submit a reasoned appeal within five working days from the date of receiving the evaluation results.

5.5.4 Following consideration of an appeal, one of the following decisions may be made: retain the original result, correct a technical error, invalidate specific criteria, cancel the evaluation form, or assign a follow-up evaluation.

5.5.5 Until the appeal procedure has been completed, the disputed evaluation result shall not be used in professional rating calculations, competitive selection procedures, financial decisions, or disciplinary proceedings.

6. DOCUMENTED INFORMATION AND PROCESS REPORTING

6.1 At the beginning of each academic year, all KRK members shall sign the Data Non-Disclosure Declaration using Form F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-05.

6.2 Teaching quality evaluations shall be conducted using Form **F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-01.**

6.3 Situational video monitoring shall be assessed using Form **F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-02.**

6.4 The Head of QMSD shall analyze the results of class evaluations and student surveys and prepare reports twice during the academic year (for the first half of the academic year and for the full academic year).

6.5 In the event of an appeal, Form **F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-04** shall be completed to facilitate a detailed review of the case.

6.6 The consolidated report shall include teaching staff coverage, completion of the assigned evaluation workload by evaluators, distribution of assessment scores, follow-up evaluations, implementation status of recommendations, calibration results, and systemic issues identified across departments, types of classes, and languages of instruction.

6.7 Based on the evaluation results, a corrective action plan shall be developed for each department using Form **F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-03.**

6.8 The Teaching Quality Evaluation Report shall be reviewed and endorsed by the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs and the Director of the Strategic Development Department, signed by the Rector, and distributed via corporate email to all structural units involved in the teaching quality evaluation process.

6.9 **List of Documented Information**

Code	Title
F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-01	Teaching Quality Evaluation Form
F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-02	Situational video monitoring checklist
F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-03	Corrective Action Plan
F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-04	Appeal Form
F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-05	Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest Declaration

7. RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY

Responsible Party	Responsibilities and Authorities
Rector	Approves the procedure, the composition of the KRK, and final management decisions within the scope of their authority.
Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs	Provides overall supervision of the process, reviews systemic risks, and approves improvement plans.
Strategic Development Department (DSD)	Acts as the process owner: develops the evaluation coverage plan, provides methodological guidance, organizes appeals, and monitors compliance with the procedure.
Faculty Deans and Heads of Departments	Discuss evaluation results with instructors, provide methodological support, and ensure the implementation of agreed measures without modifying the scores assigned by evaluators.
KRK Members and Other	Undergo training and calibration, declare conflicts of interest, conduct observations, and document evidence without interfering with the class.

Authorized Evaluators	Ensure the timely recording of evaluation results using the electronic Form **F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-01**. Comply with the Data Non-Disclosure Declaration using Form **F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-05.**

8. RISKS AND ANTI-CORRUPTION MEASURES

8.1 Process-Related Risks:	8.2 Risk Prevention Measures:
- Superficial or excessively brief evaluation.; - Overestimation or underestimation of evaluation scores; - Conflict of interest; - Undue influence on an evaluator; - Data manipulation; - Incorrect output from the video sequence; - Unauthorized disclosure of evaluation results; - Failure to implement recommendations	- Establish minimum observation duration requirements, monitor the use of the "N/O" designation, and conduct technical validation; - Use behavioral indicators, conduct calibration, perform random verification, and analyze discrepancies between evaluations; - Require mandatory conflict-of-interest declarations, automated assignment of evaluators, and recusal where necessary; - Maintain an assignment log, provide a secure reporting channel, and ensure independent review of reported incidents; - Implement role-based access control, maintain a change history, and ensure regular data backups; - Use a separate evaluation form, prohibit pedagogical assessments based solely on video footage, and conduct repeated verification; - Minimize access to information, anonymize data, and establish accountability for breaches of confidentiality; - Develop an improvement plan specifying responsible persons and deadlines, followed by a subsequent verification evaluation.

8.3 Any attempt to offer remuneration, exert pressure, alter an evaluation score outside the established procedure, or conceal relevant facts shall be immediately documented and reported through the established anti-corruption reporting channel. Any person who is the subject of such a report shall not participate in its review.

9. CONFIDENTIALITY

9.1 This Documented Procedure is an internal regulatory document of JSC «KazUTB named after K. Kulazhanov» and shall not be disclosed to third parties, except to experts of certification bodies during certification audits and to partner organizations with the Rector's authorization.

9.2 When conducting teaching quality evaluations, all evaluators shall comply with the requirements of the Quality Management System (QMS).

9.3 Before commencing an evaluation, KRK members shall sign a declaration of non-disclosure of information concerning all interested parties.

9.4 In the event of non-compliance with the established evaluation procedure by evaluators, the assessment scores shall not be taken into account for either party.

10. FINAL PROVISIONS

10.1 This Procedure shall enter into force by order of the Rector following the approval of the relevant forms, configuration of the platform, and completion of evaluator training.

10.2 Amendments to the evaluation criteria, rating scale, weighting factors, or rules governing the use of evaluation results shall be approved in accordance with the same procedure established for

the approval of this Documented Procedure and shall not be applied retroactively to evaluations that have already been completed.

10.3 Matters not regulated by this Procedure shall be resolved in accordance with the legislation of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the applicable internal regulatory documents of JSC «KazUTB named after K. Kulazhanov».

10.4 The results of teaching quality evaluations shall be taken into account when determining the overall professional rating of the teaching staff of JSC «KazUTB named after K. Kulazhanov» and establishing salary supplements to the basic official salary.

APPLICATIONS

F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-01
(mandatory)

UNIFIED TEACHING QUALITY EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

TS name (person being evaluated): _____
Discipline: _____
Group: _____
Date and time: _____
Classroom or Online Link: _____
Evaluator (person conducting the evaluation): _____
Type of lesson: _____lecture / practice / seminar / laboratory / distance / physical education / creative_____

Rating Scale: *1–2 — The criterion is barely demonstrated; 3–4 — The criterion is demonstrated with significant deficiencies; 5–6 — Acceptable minimum level; 7–8 — a good level; 9–10 — Consistently high-quality performance supported by observable evidence.*

Completion Rules: *Each question shall be assigned an integer score from 1 to 10. All questions are mandatory. If observation conditions do not allow even one question to be evaluated, the final score shall not be calculated, and a follow-up observation shall be scheduled. For scores of 1–4 and 9–10, documentation of a specific observable fact is mandatory.*

№	Evaluation Question	Observable Indicators	Score 1–10
A	**Class objectives and content Weight 20%**		
A1	Do the actual topic, assignments, and learning activities correspond to the schedule, syllabus, and lesson plan?	The course, topic, type of class, and content are consistent. Any deviation is pedagogically justified and does not alter the intended learning outcome.	——
A2	Are the class objectives and expected learning outcomes clear to students?	The objective is explicitly stated or clearly follows from the assignment. Students understand what they should know, be able to do, or complete by the end of the class.	——

A3	Is the instructional content academically accurate, up to date, and professionally relevant?	Accurate concepts, data, and sources are used. The material is related to the educational programme and future professional practice.	____
A4	Does the class have a logical structure and sequence?	By the end of the class, there is observable evidence of achievement: a completed activity, solved problem, produced output, explanation, demonstration of a skill, or valid conclusion.	____
B	**Teaching methods and organization Weight 25%**		
B1	Does the lesson have a logical structure and sequence?	The introduction, main activities, and conclusion are clearly identifiable. Transitions are understandable, and key concepts are logically connected.	____
B2	Are the teaching methods appropriate to the objectives and type of lesson?	Explanations, discussions, assignments, exercises, demonstrations, or experiments contribute to achieving the intended learning outcomes.	____
B3	Is the study time used efficiently?	There are no unjustified pauses or unnecessary delays. The pace reflects the complexity of the material, and most of the time is devoted to meaningful learning activities.	____
B4	Is the complex material explained clearly?	Terms are explained, examples and connections are provided, and understanding is checked. Explanations help students progress towards independent performance.	____
C	**Student engagement and interaction Weight 20%**		
C1	Are the majority of students present engaged in meaningful learning activities?	Most students listen with a specific task, answer questions, participate in discussions, solve problems, complete exercises, work with materials, or produce outcomes.	____
C2	Does the teacher create conditions for independent thinking of students?	Questions, problem-based situations, comparison of alternatives, argumentation, error analysis, or independent selection of problem-solving methods are used.	____
C3	Do students get the opportunity to ask questions and engage in interactions?	Meaningful communication takes place between the instructor and the group. Questions are welcomed and discussed, and students' responses are incorporated into subsequent learning activities.	____

C4	Does the teacher maintain a respectful and inclusive learning environment?	Respectful communication, absence of humiliation and discrimination, equal opportunities for participation, clear instructions, and appropriate support when difficulties arise.	____
D	**Assessment and feedback Weight 20%**		
D1	Do students understand the requirements for the task and the signs of a high-quality result?	The required task, format, completion time, and criteria for assessing the outcome are clearly specified.	____
D2	Does the instructor check the understanding and progress of the work?	Meaningful questions, observation of task performance, short assignments, demonstrations of solutions, or other forms of ongoing assessment are used.	____
D3	Do students receive specific and useful feedback?	Feedback identifies what has been completed correctly, what needs improvement, and what subsequent actions will improve the result.	____
D4	Is there observable evidence of students achieving learning outcomes or making progress?	Students demonstrate understanding, perform tasks, explain solutions, produce outputs, or correct errors based on feedback.	____

Section E (15%):

Specialized module by type of class

Lecture

№	Evaluation Question	Observed signs	Score 1–10
E1	Is the new material connected to previously studied content and the overall structure of the course?	Prior knowledge is activated, and connections between topics are demonstrated.	____
E2	Are key concepts supported by evidence, examples, or professional case studies?	Accurate data, sources, examples, or demonstrations are used.	____
E3	Is the understanding of the key ideas of the lecture tested?	Questions, short assignments, student summaries, or other methods are used to check understanding.	____

Practical Class or Seminar

№	Evaluation Question	Observed signs	Score 1–10
E1	Do students apply theoretical knowledge when completing assignments?	Most of the class time is devoted to problem-solving, analysis, discussion, or producing results.	____

E2	Are assignments appropriate to students' level of preparation and progressively more challenging?	Assignments are achievable but require meaningful application of knowledge. Support is provided when students encounter difficulties.	____
E3	Are problem-solving approaches and common errors discussed?	Students explain their solutions, compare approaches, and correct errors.	____

Laboratory work

№	Evaluation Question	Observed signs	Score 1–10
E1	Are the necessary instructions given and security requirements ensured?	Before starting work, the procedure, restrictions and safety measures are clear.	____
E2	Do students perform the envisaged operations independently?	Students work with the equipment, program, or experiment; the instructor provides metered support.	____
E3	Are the results of the work recorded and interpreted?	The results are measured or recorded, analyzed and correlated with the expected conclusion.	____

Physical education or creative activity

№	Evaluation Question	Observed signs	Score 1–10
E1	Are instructions, demonstrations, and safe organization of activities provided?	The correct technique is clearly explained, and the learning space and equipment are used safely.	____
E2	Do students have sufficient time for practical activities?	Most of the class is devoted to performing exercises or creating a product.	____
E3	Do students receive individualized corrections to their techniques or results?	The teacher observes, corrects and takes into account differences in the level of training.	____

Calculation of the final grade

Average score of the section: the sum of the scores of the four questions of the section / 4.

Final grade = A × 0.20 + B × 0.25 + C × 0.20 + D × 0.20 + E × 0.15.

A: _____ B: _____ C: _____ D: _____ E: _____

Average score: _____ / 10

Level:

9.0–10.0 — high;

7.0–8.9 — good;

5.0–6.9 — needs improvement;

1.0–4.9 — unsatisfactory.

Final conclusion:

Strengths:_____

_____

_____

Areas for Improvement and Specific Actions:

_____

_____

Report on the result of the audit:

Field	Information
Total points for sections: **SA+SB+SC+SD+SE**	
Final Performance Indicator	
Performance Level	
Strengths of the class	
Areas for Improvement	
Recommendations	
Critical Violation	No/Yes; Specific observed fact:
Follow-up Evaluation Required	No /Yes; Deadline:
Instructor's Position	Acknowledged / Explanation Attached / Appeal Submitted

F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-02 (mandatory)

SITUATIONAL VIDEO MONITORING CHECKLIST

The card is filled out in the following form:

Field	Value	Field	Value
Date		Observer	
Corpus and auditorium		Camera	
Schedule		Actual Observation Period	
Instructor		Course and Group	

Observations are established on the following issues:

Verification question	Information to Be Recorded	Status
Is the class held in the classroom and time interval specified in the current schedule?	The schedule, instructor substitutions, and rescheduling shall be verified. In the event of a discrepancy, organizational clarification shall be requested first.	yes / no / unclear / not visible / NA
Is the instructor visible in the area where the class is being conducted?	Only the instructor's visible presence shall be recorded. If the camera does not cover the instructor, "Not Visible" shall be selected.	yes / no / unclear / not visible / NA
Is the student group visible in the classroom?	Only the visible presence of the group shall be recorded, without identifying individual students or attempting an exact headcount when camera coverage is limited.	yes / no / unclear / not visible / NA
Is visible learning activity observed?	Activities involving the board, learning materials, assignments, equipment, or independent work shall be recorded. Teaching quality shall not be assessed on the basis of video footage.	yes / no / unclear / not visible / NA
Is there an absence of prolonged and unexplained interruptions to the class?	The format of the learning activity shall be taken into account. Silence during an independent assignment shall not be considered an interruption to the class.	yes / no / unclear / not visible / NA
Are there no visible circumstances requiring an immediate response for safety reasons?	Only obvious risks shall be recorded. Pedagogical or disciplinary conclusions shall not be drawn on the basis of a single observation.	yes / no / unclear / not visible / NA

Verification question	Information to Be Recorded	Status
Are the connection quality, lighting, and camera coverage sufficient to make an organizational assessment?	If the technical quality is insufficient, the result shall be recorded as "Technically Impossible to Assess" and shall not be interpreted to the detriment of the instructor.	yes / no / unclear / not visible / NA
Is there any other discrepancy that needs to be confirmed in person or by documents?	The specific observed fact, timestamp, and method of subsequent verification shall be indicated.	yes / no / unclear / not visible / NA

Reporting

Outcome	Status and Required Actions
Overall Status	Compliant / Clarification Required / Organizational Nonconformity Confirmed / Technically Impossible to Assess
Verification of Schedule and Substitutions	
Repeat Observation	Not Required / Date & Time:
Face-to-face verification	Not required/ Scheduled:
Technical Support Request	No / Request Number:
Commentary	

F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-03
(auxiliary)

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN

Upgrade Zone & Proof	Action	Expected result	Responsible	Term	Confirmation & Status

Date of discussion: _____ Teacher: _____

Head of Department: _____

Date of control check: _____ Inspector: _____

Result: _____

F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-04
(auxiliary)

APPEALS FORM

Field	Table of Contents
Instructor and Department Name	
Date of Receipt of Evaluation Results	
Disputed Evaluation (Name of Evaluator and Course Title)	
Criterion or Procedure Disputed by the Instructor	
Justification and Supporting Documents	
Declaration Regarding the Absence of a Conflict of Interest (Yes / No)	
Verified Facts	
Decision	Retain the Original Result / Correct a Technical Error / Exclude a Criterion / Invalidate the Evaluation / Schedule a Follow-up Evaluation
Explanation (if necessary)	
Date and signatures	

F. DSD-9.1.3-2026-16-05
(mandatory)

NON-DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

I, _____,
(FULL NAME)

« _____»
(job title, department, faculty)

acknowledge that, in accordance with the Documented Procedure (DP) «Teaching Quality Evaluation», KazUTB-DSD-DP 9.1.3-2026-16, I am granted access to data in my capacity as a KRK member pursuant to Order No._____dated _____.

I also understand that, in the course of performing my duties, I will be involved in the collection, processing, accumulation, storage, and updating of data concerning the teaching quality of the teaching staff of JSC «KazUTB named after K. Kulazhanov».

I undertake to comply with the following requirements when conducting teaching quality evaluations:

- Maintain impartiality during evaluations;
- Comply with the Teaching Staff Code of Honor;
- Uphold academic integrity;
- Comply with the requirements of the Quality Management System (QMS).

I acknowledge that I have been informed that, in the event of unauthorized disclosure or loss of personal data, I shall bear responsibility in accordance with this Documented Procedure.

«___» _____20____y.

_____/_____
Signature Deciphering the signature

F. DSD-7.5-2026-07-02 (mandatory)

APPROVAL SHEET

Position	Full name	Date	Signature
Vice-Rector for AA	Askarbekov E.B.	29.09.2026	
Vice-Rector for SAaSD	Berdigaliuly S.	29.09.2026	
Head of LAaHRD	Zaynutdinov A.A.	29.09.2026	
Director of the DSD	Orazalina D.K	29.09.2026	
Head of QMSD	Ernst A. S.	29.09.2026	
Head of the CaLSO	Kuat A.A.	29.09.2026	
Head of HRO	Myrzalieva M. B.	29.09.2026	

F. DSD-7.5-2026-07-03 (mandatory)

FAMILIARIZATION SHEET

Position	Full name	Date	Signature

F. DSD-7.5-2026-07-04 (mandatory)

CHANGE REGISTRATION SHEET

Change Number	Change Notice Number	Number of sheets (pages)				Total sheets (after changes)	Date of entry	Full name of the person making the changes	Signature of the person who made the changes
		modified	replaced	new	cancelled				

F. DSD-7.5-2026-07-05 (mandatory)

PERIODIC INSPECTION RECORD SHEET

Verification Date	full name of the person, who performed the check	Signature who performed the Verification	Formulation Comments