



KEPLER GLOBAL INSTITUTE PTE LTD

北 斗 国 际 学 院

190 CLEMENCEAU AVENUE #04-02 SINGAPORE SHOPPING CENTRE SINGAPORE (239924)

KGI Academic Board & Examination Board Manual

Policies, Procedures & Records (ERF / EduTrust Aligned)

Version: 1.0 | Effective Date: 27 Jan 2026 | Review Cycle: At least once every 2 years



1. Purpose and Scope

This manual sets out the policies, procedures, and record-keeping requirements for Kepler Global Institute (KGI)'s Academic Board (AB) and Examination Board (EB). It is designed to demonstrate effective academic governance and assessment governance for ERF registration/renewal and EduTrust compliance.

This manual applies to all courses offered by KGI, including internally developed courses and externally developed courses delivered under partnership or licensing arrangements.

2. Regulatory and Standards Alignment

This manual supports:

- Private Education Regulations 2009 requirements on Academic Board and Examination Board governance (including policy review at least once every 2 years).
- SSG ERF evidence expectations for AEB policies/records, meeting minutes, appointment/acceptance letters, member credentials and declarations.
- EduTrust criteria (notably Criteria 5 and 6) relating to course approval, delivery integrity, assessment integrity, and internal quality assurance.

3. Definitions

- Academic Board (AB): KGI's governing body responsible for academic governance and approval of courses and teacher deployment.
- Examination Board (EB): KGI's governing body responsible for assessment governance, moderation and results approval.
- AEB: Academic Board and Examination Board collectively.
- Major assessment: High-stakes summative assessments that contribute to final course/module award decisions.

4. Governance Structure and Independence

The AB and EB operate under the overall oversight of the Designated Manager(s) and / or the Board of Directors. They are empowered to make independent academic and assessment decisions within the scope of their Terms of Reference.

To preserve integrity, the EB must maintain sufficient independence from day-to-day teaching delivery in matters of assessment approval, moderation, investigation of irregularities, and results approval.

5. Composition, Appointment and Tenure

5.1 Membership requirements

KGI appoints AB and EB members who are suitable and competent for their governance roles. Member selection considers relevant academic and/or industry expertise, governance capability, and experience.



5.2 Appointment process

For each AB/EB member, KGI maintains the following appointment records:

- Appointment letter issued by KGI.
- Acceptance letter signed by the member.
- Self-declaration confirming the member meets applicable regulatory requirements and is not disqualified.
- Member record pack: NRIC/passport number, resume/CV, highest qualification certificate(s) or transcript(s), and past employment records.

5.3 Term of office and renewal

Members are appointed for a defined term (e.g., 2 years) and may be re-appointed. Re-appointment should be documented with updated acceptance/declarations and refreshed credential records where changes occur.

5.4 Resignation and removal

A member may resign by written notice. KGI may remove a member for disqualification, breach of integrity, non-attendance, unmanaged conflict of interest, or other reasons determined by the Designated Manager(s).

6. Roles and Responsibilities

6.1 Academic Board – core responsibilities

- Approve new courses, course revisions, and periodic course review outcomes (including any changes to learning outcomes, entry requirements, and delivery plans).
- Approve teacher deployment (course/module/subject mapping) and ensure staff suitability for the assigned teaching roles.
- Review course delivery performance and student progression trends; direct improvement actions where needed.
- Ensure academic policies are implemented (e.g., admissions suitability, credit transfer/RPL if applicable, progression rules, academic integrity).
- Provide oversight of external academic partners (where applicable) and ensure agreements/approvals are current and evidence is retained.

6.2 Examination Board – core responsibilities

- Approve assessment policy and procedures and ensure they are fit-for-purpose for KGI's assessment methods.
- Approve assessment plans (including assessment modes, weightings and grading criteria) for each course/module, where applicable.
- Approve major assessment papers set (or the assessment blueprint) and confirm assessment security controls (preparation, storage, reproduction).
- Oversee moderation and post-assessment review (including analysis of passing rates, investigation of low passing rates, and recommendations).
- Manage assessment irregularities and academic dishonesty processes; endorse outcomes and actions.



- Approve final results and awards, and oversee appeals and special consideration / deferred or re-sit arrangements (where applicable).

6.3 Chairperson and Secretary roles

Chairperson's responsibilities:

- Set meeting agenda, chair meetings, ensure quorum, guide decision-making, and sign off minutes.

Secretary responsibilities:

- Issue meeting notices and papers, take minutes, track actions, maintain AEB records and evidence index.

7. Policies and Procedures Administered by the Academic Board and Examination Board

The following policies/procedures are owned or administered through the AB/EB governance process (as applicable to KGI's course portfolio):

7.1 Academic Board policy set

- Course Design, Development, and Review Procedure (including course approval workflow and documentation standards).
- Teacher Suitability and Deployment Approval Procedure (including deployment mapping and approval evidence).
- Admissions Suitability Oversight Procedure (academic entry requirements, exemptions, placement tests where applicable).
- Student Progression and Learning Support Oversight Procedure (monitoring, interventions, progression rules).
- Credit Transfer / RPL Policy (if applicable).
- External Academic Partner Oversight Procedure (where externally developed courses exist).

7.2 Examination Board policy set

- Assessment Policy and Procedures (principles, roles, timelines, student/invigilator code of conduct).
- Assessment Plan Procedure (mode, weightings, grading criteria, award rules).
- Assessment Paper/Instrument Approval and Security Procedure (setting, secure storage, controlled reproduction).
- Moderation and Post-Assessment Review Procedure (pre- and post-assessment moderation, analysis, investigations).
- Results Approval, Release and Records Procedure (including awards and certification readiness inputs).
- Appeals, Re-sit/Deferred Assessment and Special Consideration Procedure (where applicable).
- Academic Integrity and Misconduct Handling Procedure (investigation and outcomes).

7.3 Policy review frequency

All AB/EB policies and procedures listed in Section 7 must be reviewed at least once every 2 years. Each review must be evidenced through meeting minutes and/or a policy review record showing the review date, changes made (if any), and approval by the relevant board.



8. Meetings, Quorum and Decision-Making

8.1 Meeting frequency

AB and EB meet at least twice a year, and additionally as required for course approvals, teacher deployment approvals, assessment approvals, and results approvals. For ERF readiness, KGI maintains meeting records for at least the past 12 months.

8.2 Quorum

Quorum is achieved when at least half of appointed members (including the Chairperson or appointed alternate) are present. If quorum is not met, decisions must be deferred or ratified at a subsequent quorate meeting.

8.3 Voting and resolutions

Decisions are made by simple majority vote of members present. In the event of a tie, the Chairperson has the casting vote. Resolutions may be passed via circulation where urgent, provided all members are given the opportunity to review and vote; circulated resolutions must be filed with the minutes of the next meeting.

8.4 Conflict of interest

Members must declare any actual or potential conflict of interest. The Chairperson may require the member to abstain from discussion and voting on the affected item. Declarations and abstentions must be minuted.

9. Records and Evidence Management (ERF Submission-Ready)

KGI maintains an AEB Evidence File containing, at a minimum:

- AEB policies and procedures with evidence of review/approval at least once every 2 years (latest review record).
- Minutes of AB and EB meetings for the past 12 months (as at submission date).
- Evidence that AB approves courses and teachers deployed for the past 12 months (minutes and supporting papers).
- Appointment and acceptance letters for all current AB and EB members.
- Member record packs (NRIC/passport number, CV, certificates/transcripts, past employment records).
- Self-declaration evidence that AB and EB members meet applicable regulatory requirements.
- An AEB action log tracking issues, corrective actions, and follow-ups.

9.1 Document control

All AEB records are version-controlled, retained securely, and made available for audit/inspection upon request. The Secretary maintains the master index and ensures only approved versions are in use.



10. Linkages to Quality Assurance and Management Review

AEB findings and decisions (e.g., academic risks, assessment irregularities, areas for improvement) are fed into KGI's internal assessment and management review processes, with corrective actions tracked through CAPA where relevant.



Appendix A – Standard Meeting Agenda Templates

A1. Academic Board agenda (minimum): course approvals; teacher deployment approvals; academic performance/progression; academic risks; policy review.

A2. Examination Board agenda (minimum): assessment plans/papers; assessment security; moderation; results approval; appeals/irregularities; policy review.



2026 Academic Board Meeting Template

Date	Insert date []
Time:	Insert time []
Venue:	Insert venue []
Attendance:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr Chiew Song Kwong 2. Mr Clarence Lee 3. Mdm Jaswant Kaur 4. Dr Chan Mun Kitt
Agenda:	<p><u>For Academic Board</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Selection and Approval of New Trainers/Teachers 2. Approval of New Courses and Submission to SSG 3. Deployment of New Trainers/Teachers for Approved Courses 4. Any Other Business (AOB) and Conclusion

1. Selection and Approval of New Trainers/Teachers

The Academic Board reviewed the credentials of newly appointed trainers/teachers, ensuring compliance with ERF, EduTrust, and SSG requirements. The following trainers/teachers were approved:

Name	Qualification	Relevant Experience	Assigned Course(s)

2. Approval of New Courses and Submission to SSG

The following new course was reviewed and approved for submission to SSG:

Course Title	Duration	Target Audience	Course Objective



3. Deployment of New Trainers/Teachers for Approved Courses

The Board approved the deployment of trainers/teachers to newly introduced course. The deployment chart is as follows:

Trainer/Teacher Name	Assigned Course(s)	Start Date

6. Any Other Business (AOB) and Conclusion

The meeting concluded with the following key takeaways:

- New trainers/teachers were approved based on ERF, EduTrust, and SSG requirements.
- Two new courses were approved for submission to SSG.
- Deployment of trainers/teachers for new courses was confirmed.

Meeting adjourned at 3.00 PM.

Minutes Approved by:

Mdm Jaswant Kaur

On behalf of the Academic & Examination Board



Appendix B – Required Forms and Records (Templates)

- B1. AB/EB Appointment Letter Template
- B2. AB/EB Acceptance Letter + Self-Declaration Template
- B3. AB/EB Member Record Summary Sheet (NRIC/passport, qualifications, work history)
- B4. AB/EB Conflict of Interest Declaration Form
- B5. AB/EB Resignation Letter Template
- B6. AB/EB Educator Deployment Approval Form
- B7. AB/EB Policy Review Record Template (2-year cycle)
- B8. Assessment Plan Template (EB)
- B9. B9. Assessment Results Endorsement Form (EB)
- B10. CAPA Log Template for AEB follow-ups



Appointment Letter for Academic Board Member

The Board of Directors of
KEPLER GLOBAL INSTITUTE PTE LTD

Hereby appoints

[Name of Academic Board Appointee]

as a member of its Academic Board from **[Date of Commencement]**

Your duties are to:

1. Ensure the content and duration, entry and graduation requirements of the modules or subjects are appropriate.;
2. Approve the deployment of educators based on requirements stipulated by the SSG.;
3. Facilitate the implementation and comply with the policies stipulated by the SSG.; and
4. Review annually the academic policies and procedures.

Your appointment is based on your declaration that:

- i) I am not an undischarged bankrupt;
- ii) I have never been convicted in any court of law in Singapore or elsewhere for any offence involving dishonesty or moral turpitude or for any offence under the PE Act;
- iii) I am not a manager of an unregistered PEI; and
- iv) I have never been the manager of a private education institution (registered under the Private Education Act) or private school (registered under the Education Act) which registration has been cancelled by the SkillsFuture Singapore or the Director-General of Education.

Approved by:

Name :

Date:

Designation :



Appointment Letter for Examination Board Member

The Board of Directors of
KEPLER GLOBAL INSTITUTE PTE LTD

Hereby appoints

[Name of Examination Board Appointee]

as a member of its Examination Board from **[Date of Commencement]**

Your duties are to:

1. Ensure the security of examinations script and answer scripts
2. Ensure the proper conduct of examinations and assessments
3. Define and ensure the proper discharge of duties and responsibilities of invigilators and markers
4. Conduct moderation of examination and assessment marks
5. Handle appeals from learners with regard to examination or assessment matters

Your appointment is based on your declaration that you:

- i) I am not an undischarged bankrupt;
- ii) I have never been convicted in any court of law in Singapore or elsewhere for any offence involving dishonesty or moral turpitude or for any offence under the PE Act;
- iii) I am not a manager of an unregistered PEI; and
- iv) I have never been the manager of a private education institution (registered under the Private Education Act) or private school (registered under the Education Act) which registration has been cancelled by the SkillsFuture Singapore or the Director-General of Education.

Approved by:

Name :

Date:

Designation :



Acceptance Letter for Appointment as Academic Board Member

I, **[Name of Academic Board Appointee]** accept the Board of Director's appointment as the Academic Board Member of Kepler Global Institute Pte Ltd from **[Date of Commencement]**

My acceptance is based on my declaration that:

- i. I am not an undischarged bankrupt;
- ii. I am not convicted in any court of law in Singapore or elsewhere for offences involving dishonesty, moral turpitude or any offences under the PE Act.
- iii. I am not a manager of an unregistered PEI;
- iv. I have never been the manager of a private education institution (registered under the Private Education Act) or private school (registered under the Education Act) which registration has been cancelled by the SkillsFuture Singapore or the Director-General of Education; and
- v. I am also a member of the management team who is empowered to make decisions. (delete where appropriate)
- vi. All the information provided in this document is true and accurate.

Signed

Date



Acceptance Letter for Appointment as Examination Board Member

I, **[Name of Academic Board Appointee]** accept the Board of Director's appointment as the Examination Board Member of Kepler Global Institute Pte Ltd from **[Date of Commencement]**

My acceptance is based on my declaration that:

- i. I am not an undischarged bankrupt;
- ii. I am not convicted in any court of law in Singapore or elsewhere for offences involving dishonesty, moral turpitude or any offences under the PE Act.
- iii. I am not a manager of an unregistered PEI;
- iv. I have never been the manager of a private education institution (registered under the Private Education Act) or private school (registered under the Education Act) which registration has been cancelled by the SkillsFuture Singapore or the Director-General of Education; and
- v. I am also a member of the management team who is empowered to make decisions. (delete where appropriate)
- vi. All the information provided in this document is true and accurate.

Signed

Date



DECLARATION FORM for Academic & Examination Board Member

To: SkillsFuture Singapore (SSG)
Paya Lebar Link, Paya Lebar Quarter 2
#08-08 Singapore 408533

UEN / Registration No.: 202302155E	Name of Private Education Institution ("PEI"): Kepler Global Institute Pte. Ltd.
--	--

Section A: Particulars of Academic and Examination Board Member

Salutation <i>[Delete where Appropriate]</i>	Dr / Mr / Mrs / Miss / Ms / Others	
Name		
NRIC / Passport No. <i>[Last 3 digit & alphabet]</i>		
Nationality		
Residential Address		
	Postal Code	
Local Mailing Address <i>(if different from above)</i>		
	Postal Code	
Contact Information	Email	
	Mobile	
	Office	

**Please delete whichever is inapplicable.*



Section B: Declaration by Academic and Examination Board Member

I, [Name of Board Designate] (NRIC/Passport No. _____) hereby declare the following:

- 1) I am not an undischarged bankrupt;
- 2) I have not been convicted in any court of law in Singapore or elsewhere for any offence under the PE Act within a period of 5 years preceding the date of this declaration;
- 3) I am a person of good character and have never been convicted of any offence involving fraud or dishonesty or the conviction for which involved a finding that I have acted fraudulently or dishonestly, whether in Singapore or elsewhere, within a period of 5 years preceding the date of this declaration;
- 4) I have never been a manager of an unregistered private education institution or an unregistered school; and
- 5) I have never been a manager of a private education institution (registered under the Act) or private school (registered under the Education Act 1957), whose registration has been cancelled by the SkillsFuture Singapore (SSG) or the Director-General of Education.
- 6) All the information provided in this document is true and accurate.

Signed

Date



Conflict of Interest Declaration Form

This declaration form is to be completed by all members of the Academic Board (AB) and Examination Board (EB) to disclose any actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest, in accordance with the Private Education Regulations 2009, ERF requirements, and EduTrust governance principles.

Section A: Board Member Details

Board Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Academic Board <input type="checkbox"/> Examination Board
Full Name (as per NRIC/Passport)	
Role on Board	
Term of Appointment	
Date of Declaration	

Section B: Conflict of Interest Disclosure

Please declare any actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest, including but not limited to:

- financial or business interests;
- employment or consultancy relationships;
- personal or family relationships;
- involvement with partner organisations, vendors, or competitors.

If there is no conflict to declare, please state "Nil".

Nature of Interest / Relationship	Details (Organisation, Nature, Extent)

Section C: Declaration by Board Member

I declare that the information provided above is true and complete. I undertake to:

- promptly disclose any new or changed conflicts of interest;
- abstain from discussion or decision-making on matters where a conflict exists, as directed by the Chairperson;
- comply with all applicable policies and governance requirements.



Signature	
Name	
Date	

Section D: Board Review / Mitigation (For Official Use)

To be completed by the Chairperson or Secretary of the Academic Board / Examination Board.

Conflict Reviewed By	
Date Reviewed	
Decision / Mitigation Measures	
Remarks	



RESIGNATION LETTER

Date:

From:

Name

NRIC No: SXXXXXXXX

To:

The Board of Directors

Kepler Global Institute Pte. Ltd.

190 Clemenceau Avenue, #04-02,

Singapore Shopping Centre

Singapore 239924

Dear Sir.

Resignation as Academic and Examination Board Member

I hereby tender my resignation as the Academic and Examination Board Member of

Kepler Global Institute Pte. Ltd. with effect from _____

Thank you

Yours Sincerely,

(Name)



APPROVED DEPLOYMENT OF EDUCATOR

NAME OF THE COURSE	PREPARATORY COURSE – PRIMARY 3
BATCH	1
COURSE START DATE	10/11/24
COURSE END DATE	10/11/15
CLASSROOM NO	1
MODE	FULL TIME
TIME	9.00AM TO 1.00PM
DAYS	MONDAY TO FRIDAY

Name of the Educator	Course Id	Course Name	Name of the Module	Classes per week	Remarks/ Details of Deployment
WONG	FT-2401	Preparatory Course – Primary 1	English	2	2 months
WONG	FT-2401	Preparatory Course – Primary 1	Mathematics	2	2 months

Approved by:

Name and Designation of Staff

Signature/Date



Policy Review Record Template

This record documents the periodic review of policies and procedures administered by the Academic Board (AB) and Examination Board (EB), in compliance with Regulations 15(4) and 16(3) of the Private Education Regulations 2009, ERF requirements, and EduTrust governance expectations.

Section 1: Policy Details

Policy / Procedure Title	
Policy Reference No.	
Administering Board	<input type="checkbox"/> Academic Board <input type="checkbox"/> Examination Board
Date of Last Review	
Next Review Due (≤ 2 years)	
Policy Owner / Secretariat	

Section 2: Review Context

Reason for Review	<input type="checkbox"/> Scheduled Review <input type="checkbox"/> Regulatory Change <input type="checkbox"/> Audit / ERF Feedback <input type="checkbox"/> Incident / Issue <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Trigger Details (if applicable)	
Scope of Review	
Documents Referenced	

Section 3: Review Outcome

Review Findings / Observations	
Revision Required	<input type="checkbox"/> No Change Required <input type="checkbox"/> Minor Update <input type="checkbox"/> Major Revision
Summary of Changes (if any)	
Implementation Actions Required	
Effective Date of Revised Policy	

Section 4: Board Endorsement

Board Meeting Date	
Meeting Reference / Minutes No.	
Decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Approved with Conditions <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved



Conditions / Remarks (if any)	
-------------------------------	--

Section 5: Sign-Off & Control

Reviewed by (Name & Role)	
Signature	
Date	
Recorded by Secretariat	



Assessment Plan Template

Document Purpose: To provide a comprehensive plan for all assessments within a specific course or module for a given intake. This template ensures clear communication of assessment requirements, methods, schedules, and criteria to students and lecturers, facilitating fair and consistent assessment practices in compliance with EduTrust requirements.

Key Considerations for Pass Holders: Clear and timely communication of assessment plans is vital for all students. For international students (Student Pass, Dependent Pass, Work Pass holders), this transparency enables them to plan their study time, manage any cultural differences in assessment expectations, and be fully aware of deadlines, directly supporting their academic success and progression, which is linked to their visa status.

Section 1: Course/Module & Intake Information

- **Course Title:** _____
- **Module Title:** _____
- **Module Code:** _____
- **Intake Month/Year:** _____
- **Academic Period (e.g., Semester 1, Term 2):** _____
- **Module Lecturer(s):** _____
- **Date Prepared:** _____
- **Date Last Reviewed:** _____

Section 2: Module Learning Outcomes (MLOs) Assessed

- List the specific MLOs that will be assessed in this module. (Refer to ET 5.1 – KGI Module Outline Template)

MLO No.	Module Learning Outcome (MLO)
MLO 1.1	[Example: Analyze financial statements using ratio analysis.]
MLO 1.2	[Example: Prepare a comprehensive marketing plan.]



Section 3: Assessment Overview Table

No.	Assessment Item (e.g., Quiz, Mid-Term Exam, Individual Assignment, Group Project, Presentation, Final Exam)	Weightage (%)	MLO(s) Assessed	Submission Method (e.g., LMS, Hardcopy, In-Person)	Scheduled Date / Submission Deadline	Duration (for exams/ presentations)
1.	Quiz 1	10%	MLO 1.1	LMS	Week 4 / DD/MM/YYYY	30 mins
2.	Individual Assignment: Financial Analysis Report	30%	MLO 1.1, MLO 1.2	LMS	Week 8 / DD/MM/YYYY	N/A
3.	Final Examination	60%	MLO 1.1, MLO 1.2	In-Person (Exam Hall)	Week 12 / DD/MM/YYYY	2 hours
Total		100%				

Section 4: Detailed Assessment Requirements

- For each assessment item, provide more specific details. (Can reference separate Assessment Briefs).

4.1 Assessment Item 1: [Name of Assessment]

- Type: _____
- Description/Format: _____

- Learning Outcomes Assessed: _____

- Specific Instructions: _____

- Marking Rubric/Criteria: (Attach or reference separately)



- **Word Count/Duration (if applicable):**

- **Submission Deadline:** _____

- **Late Submission Policy:** (Refer to KGI Academic Policy)

- **Resit/Retake Policy:** (Refer to KGI Academic Policy)

4.2 Assessment Item 2: [Name of Assessment]

- *(Repeat structure for each assessment item)*

Section 5: Academic Integrity & Plagiarism

- KGI's strict policy on academic integrity and plagiarism will be enforced. Students are expected to submit original work. (Refer to KGI Academic Policy / Student Handbook).

Section 6: Special Accommodations / Support

- Students requiring special accommodations for assessments due to documented learning needs or disabilities should contact Student Services well in advance.
- For international students with specific language support needs, please contact Academic Department/Student Services.

Section 7: Assessment Review & Moderation

- All assessment instruments will undergo vetting and moderation processes to ensure fairness, validity, and reliability. (Refer to ET 5.5 – KGI Assessment Instrument Vetting Form, ET 5.5 – KGI Moderation Log, ET 5.5 – KGI Assessment Moderation Checklist).

Section 8: Communication to Students

- This Assessment Plan will be communicated to students via:
 - Student Portal
 - Email
 - First Class Session
- Date communicated: _____

Section 9: Approvals

- **Prepared By (Module Lecturer):**



- Name: _____
- Signature: _____
- Date: _____

• **Reviewed By (Course Manager/Academic Head):**

- Name: _____
- Signature: _____
- Date: _____

• **Approved By (Examination Board, if required for final exams):**

- Name: _____
- Signature: _____
- Date: _____



Assessment Results Endorsement Form

Document Purpose: To formally record the endorsement and approval of student assessment results, academic progression, and graduation recommendations by the KGI Examination Board. This ensures robust governance, adherence to academic regulations, and official certification of student achievements, which is fundamental for EduTrust compliance.

Key Considerations for Pass Holders: This form is critical for all students, as it formally approves their academic progression and eligibility for awards. For Student Pass holders, it confirms their satisfactory academic progress, which is a key condition for maintaining their Student Pass validity and for any future visa applications (e.g., extension of stay for course completion, application for post-study work visas).

Section 1: Examination Board Meeting Details

- **Date of Meeting:** _____
- **Time of Meeting:** _____
- **Venue:** _____
- **Chairperson:** _____
- **Secretary:** _____
- **Attendees:** (List names and designations) _____

- **Academic Period/Intake under Review:** _____

Section 2: Summary of Results Presented

- **Course Title(s) Reviewed:** _____
- **Number of Modules/Assessments Reviewed:** _____
- **Total Number of Students under Review:** _____
- **Summary of overall performance:**
 - Number of students in Good Standing: _____
 - Number of students on Academic Probation: _____
 - Number of students for Termination/Withdrawal: _____
 - Number of students recommended for Graduation: _____
 - Number of students with Deferred Assessments: _____
 - Number of Assessment Appeals received: _____
 - Number of Assessment Incidents reported: _____



Section 3: Key Decisions & Endorsements by Examination Board

No.	Decision Item	Yes	No	N/A	Remarks/Details of Decision
1.	All assessment results for the academic period have undergone moderation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(Refer to ET 5.5 – KGI Moderation Log)
2.	All assessment results have undergone final verification for accuracy?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(Refer to ET 5.5 – KGI Assessment Verification Log)
3.	Students' academic progression (pass/fail/probation/graduation) is determined in accordance with KGI's Academic Policy?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4.	All deferred assessment requests processed and appropriate actions taken?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(Refer to ET 5.5 – KGI Deferred Assessment Request Form)
5.	All assessment appeals processed and decisions made as per KGI's Appeal Policy?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(Refer to ET 5.5 – KGI Assessment Appeal Form)
6.	All assessment incidents reported and resolved appropriately?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(Refer to ET 5.5 – KGI Assessment Incident Report Form)
7.	Academic status of Student Pass holders (e.g., attendance, progression) aligns with ICA requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(Note any specific concerns for SP holders requiring ICA notification)
8.	Recommendations for awards/qualifications (e.g., Diploma, Advanced Diploma) are approved?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
9.	Any specific decisions regarding students on academic probation or recommended for termination?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(List Student IDs and specific actions)
10.	Any recommendations for curriculum review or assessment policy revision based on results analysis?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Section 4: Summary of Examination Board Endorsement

- **Overall Outcome:**

- Results Endorsed
- Results Endorsed with Conditions (List Conditions)

- Endorsement Deferred (State Reasons)

- **Key Resolutions and Directives from the Board:** _____
- _____



- **Date for Official Release of Results:** _____
- **Date for Graduation Ceremony (if applicable):** _____

Section 5: Examination Board Members' Signatures

- **Chairperson:**
 - Name: _____
 - Signature: _____
 - Date: _____
- **Board Member 1:**
 - Name: _____
 - Signature: _____
 - Date: _____
- **Board Member 2:**
 - Name: _____
 - Signature: _____
 - Date: _____
- ... (Add lines for all members present and approving)

Section 6: For Official Use Only

- Results released date: _____
- Notifications sent to relevant departments (e.g., Student Services for SP holders, Finance for fees): _____
- Record filed: _____



Corrective and Preventive Action (CAPA) Log Template

Document Purpose: To serve as a centralized log for recording and tracking Corrective and Preventive Actions (CAPA) specifically identified during internal audits. This ensures that assessment findings are systematically addressed, resolutions are implemented, and their effectiveness is verified, driving continuous improvement and compliance with EduTrust requirements.

Instructions for Use

- Each identified issue should be assigned a unique CAPA ID.
- All fields must be completed accurately and thoroughly.
- Root Cause Analysis should identify the fundamental reason(s) for the issue.
- Corrective Actions address the immediate problem, while Preventive Actions aim to prevent future occurrences.
- Regular reviews of open CAPA items should be conducted to ensure timely completion and effectiveness

CAPA Log Record

CAPA ID	Date Raised	Issue/Non-Conformance Description	Source of Issue (e.g., Audit, Student Feedback, Internal Review)	Root Cause Analysis	Corrective/Preventive Action(s) Taken	Person Responsible	Date Completed	Check Date	Effectiveness Check Outcome	Status (Open/Closed)

This CAPA log serves as a living document to ensure continuous improvement of KGI’s operational integrity and compliance with internal policies and external regulations. All updates and changes will be reviewed at quarterly Management Review Meetings and integrated into the institution’s governance framework.

Last Updated By: [Name] on [Date]



Appendix C – Academic Board & Examination Board Policy and Procedure Register

This register consolidates all policies and procedures administered, endorsed, or overseen by the Academic Board (AB) and Examination Board (EB), in compliance with **Regulations 15(4) and 16(3)** of the Private Education Regulations 2009.

All policies listed shall be reviewed **at least once every two (2) years**.

C1. Academic Board Policy & Procedure Register

No.	Policy / Procedure Title	Scope / Description
AB-1	Course Design, Development & Review Policy	Framework for design, review, and quality assurance of courses
AB-2	Course Approval, Revision & Discontinuation Procedure	Approval workflow for new, revised, or discontinued courses
AB-3	Course Write-up / Syllabus Approval Procedure	Standards and approval of course outlines and syllabi
AB-4	Course Planning & Delivery Oversight Procedure	Oversight of delivery plans, schedules, and approved delivery modes
AB-5	Course Implementation Monitoring Procedure	Monitoring compliance of actual delivery against approved structure
AB-6	Admission Criteria & Academic Suitability Framework	Academic entry requirements and exemptions
AB-7	Trainer / Lecturer Deployment Policy	Approval and oversight of trainer deployment by course/module
AB-8	Trainer Qualification & Suitability Criteria	Minimum academic / professional standards for trainers
AB-9	Student Progression & Learning Oversight Procedure	Oversight of progression rules, learning outcomes, interventions
AB-10	Academic Integrity Policy	Standards for academic honesty and misconduct prevention
AB-11	External Academic Partner Oversight Procedure	Governance of externally developed / validated courses
AB-12	Course Teach-Out & Transition Oversight Procedure	Academic oversight when courses are discontinued



C2. Examination Board Policy & Procedure Register

No.	Policy / Procedure Title	Scope / Description
EB-1	Assessment Policy & Procedures	Principles and governance of assessment practices
EB-2	Assessment Planning & Approval Procedure	Approval of assessment plans, modes, weightings
EB-3	Assessment Instrument Approval & Security Procedure	Setting, storage, and control of assessment materials
EB-4	Moderation & Post-Assessment Review Procedure	Pre- and post-assessment moderation and analysis
EB-5	Assessment Irregularities & Misconduct Procedure	Investigation, escalation, and resolution of irregularities
EB-6	Appeals & Special Consideration Governance Procedure	Board-level oversight of appeals, deferment, re-sit
EB-7	Results Ratification & Release Procedure	Approval, release, correction, and control of results
EB-8	Certification & Award Validation Procedure	Validation of awards prior to certification
EB-9	Assessment Records Management Procedure	Retention, integrity, and retrieval of assessment records

C3. Control and Review of Register

- This register shall be reviewed by the Academic Board and Examination Board **at least once every two (2) years**.
- Any addition, revision, or retirement of policies shall be:
 - approved through formal board meetings; and
 - documented in meeting minutes or policy review records.
- Evidence of review and approval shall be retained for ERF and EduTrust compliance.



Course Design, Development & Review Policy

1. Purpose

This policy establishes the institutional framework governing the design, development, implementation, monitoring, and periodic review of all PEI registered courses offered by Kepler Global Institute (KGI).

This policy is developed with explicit reference to KGI EduTrust Manual (EM5.1) – Section 5.1 Course Design, Development and Review, specifically:

- Sections 5.1.1A–5.1.1D (Course Design and Development Policy, Framework, and Procedures); and
- Sections 5.1.2A–5.1.2D (Course Review Policy, Framework, and Review Procedures).

This policy operationalises the KGI Curriculum Framework (SOP Curriculum Framework v1.0, 2024), which defines the six-stage curriculum lifecycle required for compliance with the Enhanced Registration Framework (ERF) and EduTrust Guidance Document Version 4.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all full qualifications and modular programme offered by KGI, including courses delivered via face-to-face, online, or blended learning modes, and joint or collaborative programmes, where applicable.

3. Policy Statement

In accordance with EM5.1 section 5.1.1A (Policy Statement), KGI adopts a structured and evidence-based course lifecycle management approach to ensure that all courses:

- Align with KGI's mission, Graduate Attributes, and strategic objectives;
- Remain relevant to current and emerging industry and workforce needs (Ref: EM5.1 Table 5.1A);
- Articulate clear learning outcomes supported by appropriate delivery and assessment strategies; and
- Are continuously improved through data-driven review, monitoring, and governance oversight (Ref: EM5.1 section 5.1.2).

4. Course Design and Development Framework

Course design and development at KGI shall be implemented in accordance with EM5.1 section 5.1.1B (Framework for Course Design and Development) and section 5.1.1D (Details and Procedures integrated with the KGI Curriculum Framework).

Accordingly, all courses shall be designed using the six stages of the KGI Curriculum Framework (SOP Curriculum Framework v1.0, 2024):

4.1 Strategic Planning and Course Proposal Approval
(Ref: EM5.1 Section 5.1.1D; Curriculum Framework Stage 1)

4.2 Needs Analysis
(Ref: EM5.1 Table 5.1A; Curriculum Framework Stage 2)

4.3 Curriculum Design
(Ref: EM5.1 Table 5.1B; Curriculum Framework Stage 3)



4.4 Instructional Materials & Development

(Ref: EM5.1 Table 5.1B; Curriculum Framework Stage 4)

4.5 Implementation

(Ref: EM5.1 Section 5.1.1C; Curriculum Framework Stage 5)

4.6 Evaluation and Review

(Ref: EM5.1 Section 5.1.1E and Section 5.1.2; Curriculum Framework Stage 6)

Each course must demonstrate constructive alignment between learning outcomes, curriculum structure, delivery strategies, and assessment methods, as required under EM5.1 Table 5.1A and Table 5.1B.

5. Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder engagement under this policy is implemented in accordance with EM5.1, Sections 5.1.1B and 5.1.1D(b).

Stakeholders engaged across the course lifecycle include:

- Industry practitioners and employers, to validate curriculum relevance and employability outcomes (Ref: EM5.1 Table 5.1A);
- Academic staff and Programme Leads, to ensure curriculum integrity and delivery feasibility;
- Students and alumni, to provide feedback on learning experience and graduate preparedness (Ref: EM5.1 Section 5.1.2B); and
- External academic or professional partners, where applicable, for benchmarking and co-development.

6. Monitoring and Review

The monitoring and review mechanisms under this policy comply with EM5.1, sections 5.1.1E and 5.1.2E (Monitoring and Review).

Accordingly, all courses are subject to:

- Annual course reviews (Ref: EM5.1 Table 5.1C and Table 5.1G);
- Graduate and employer feedback analysis (Ref: EM5.1 Section 5.1.2B);
- Assessment moderation and outcome analysis (Ref: EM5.1 Table 5.1E);
- Curriculum mapping audits against Graduate Attributes (Ref: EM5.1 Table 5.1C); and
- Corrective and Preventive Action (CAPA) tracking and follow-up (Ref: EM5.1 Section 5.1.2D).

Review findings shall be formally reported to the Academic Board in accordance with EM5.1 Section 5.1.2F.

7. Governance and Accountability

The governance and accountability arrangements under this policy are aligned with EM5.1, Sections 5.1.1F and 5.1.2F (Strategic Alignment & Governance).

- The Academic Board retains ultimate authority over course approval, major revisions, and review outcomes.
- The QA Unit and Curriculum & QA Committee oversee implementation, monitoring, and review processes.



- Programme Leads and Management Committee support operational execution and strategic alignment.

These roles are consistent with the governance structures set out in EM5.1, Tables 5.1D and 5.1H.

8. Policy Review

This policy shall be reviewed at least once every two years, or earlier where required due to changes in regulatory requirements, institutional strategy, or academic direction, in line with EM5.1 Section 5.1.2.



Course Approval, Revision & Discontinuation Procedure

1. Purpose

This procedure defines the formal, controlled workflow for the approval of new courses, revisions to existing courses, and the discontinuation of courses at Kepler Global Institute (KGI).

This procedure is developed with explicit reference to KGI EduTrust Manual (EM5.1) – Criterion 5.1 Course Design, Development and Review, specifically:

- Section 5.1.1B–5.1.1D (Course Design and Development Framework and Procedures);
- Section 5.1.1C (Academic Board approval and governance);
- Section 5.1.2B–5.1.2D (Course Review, Revision and Improvement); and
- Section 5.1.2F (Governance and oversight of review outcomes).

This procedure operationalises the Strategic Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation & Review stages of the KGI Curriculum Framework (SOP Curriculum Framework v1.0, 2024) in compliance with ERF and EduTrust GD v4.

2. Scope

This procedure applies to all academic programmes and modules offered by KGI, including:

- New course development;
- Minor and major course revisions; and
- Course discontinuation and teach-out arrangements.

3. Guiding Principles

In accordance with EM5.1 Sections 5.1.1A and 5.1.2A, all approval, revision, and discontinuation decisions shall be:

- Evidence-based and formally documented;
- Aligned with the KGI Curriculum Framework and institutional strategy;
- Subject to Academic Board oversight; and
- Implemented with due consideration for enrolled students and regulatory obligations.

4. New Course Approval Procedure

This procedure operationalises the Course Design and Development Process Flow (EM5.1 Flowchart 5.1A) and the Strategic Planning and Course Proposal Approval stage (Stage 1) of the KGI Curriculum Framework.

Process Steps

4.1 Initiation

The Programme Lead conducts a needs analysis in accordance with EM5.1 Section 5.1.1D and Table 5.1A, and prepares a formal course proposal.
(Curriculum Framework Stage 2 – Needs Analysis)



4.2 Internal Review

QA Unit reviews the proposal for curriculum alignment, assessment design, delivery feasibility, and regulatory compliance.

(Ref: EM5.1 Table 5.1B)

4.3 Stakeholder Validation

Industry practitioners, employers, or academic partners provide validation of relevance and skills alignment, where applicable.

(Ref: EM5.1 Section 5.1.1B – Stakeholder Engagement)

4.4 Academic Board Approval

The full proposal is submitted to the Academic Board for approval, in accordance with EM5.1 Section 5.1.1C.

4.5 Implementation Readiness

Teaching resources, academic staff deployment, LMS setup, and assessment instruments are finalised prior to course launch.

(Curriculum Framework Stage 5 – Implementation)

No course may be marketed, offered, or delivered without formal Academic Board approval.

5. Course Revision Procedure

Course revisions are governed by the Course Review and Evaluation Framework set out in EM5.1 Section 5.1.2B and Table 5.1E, and aligned to the Evaluation & Review stage (Stage 6) of the KGI Curriculum Framework.

Types of Revisions

- **Minor Revisions**
(e.g. content updates, learning activities, assessment weighting adjustments)
→ Approved by the QA Unit or Curriculum & QA Committee and reported to the Academic Board.
- **Major Revisions**
(e.g. changes to learning outcomes, course structure, duration, delivery mode, or assessment approach)
→ Require Academic Board approval prior to implementation.

All revisions must be supported by documented evidence arising from course reviews, assessment moderation, stakeholder feedback, or CAPA actions, in accordance with EM5.1 Section 5.1.2D.

6. Course Discontinuation Procedure

Course discontinuation is treated as a form of major course decision under EM5.1 Section 5.1.2D (Details and Procedures – Course Review).

Process Steps

- 6.1 Identification of discontinuation triggers
(e.g., sustained low enrolment, loss of relevance, strategic realignment).
- 6.2 Impact assessment
Including student progression implications and proposed teach-out arrangements.
- 6.3 Academic Board approval
Discontinuation proposal submitted for endorsement.



6.4 Communication and implementation

Approved teach-out plans communicated to affected students and stakeholders.

Student interests and regulatory obligations shall be prioritised at all times, consistent with ERF requirements.

7. Documentation and Records

All approval, revision, and discontinuation decisions shall be documented and retained in accordance with KGI's document control and record management procedures, supporting audit traceability under EM5.1 Sections 5.1.2E and 5.1.2F.



Course Write-up / Syllabus Approval Procedure

1. Purpose

This procedure establishes standards and approval requirements for course write-ups and syllabi to ensure accuracy, consistency, and transparency for learners, faculty, and regulators.

This procedure is developed with explicit reference to:

- EM5.1 Section 5.1.1D (Details and Procedures – Integrated with KGI Curriculum Framework); and
- EM5.1 Sections 5.1.2B and 5.1.2F (Course Review Framework and Governance Oversight).

2. Scope

This procedure applies to all:

- Course syllabi;
- Module descriptors; and
- Publicly issued course information used for student enrolment and delivery.

3. Standards for Course Write-ups and Syllabi

In accordance with EM5.1 Section 5.1.1D, each approved syllabus must accurately reflect the Academic Board-approved curriculum and include, at minimum:

- Course rationale and objectives;
- Intended learning outcomes aligned to KGI Graduate Attributes;
- Course structure, duration, and delivery mode;
- Assessment methods, weightings, rubrics, and progression requirements;
- Entry requirements and pre-requisites;
- Learning resources and learner support arrangements; and
- Academic integrity, assessment, and moderation policies.

Syllabi shall remain consistent with approved course proposals, assessment plans, and student information disclosures.

4. Development and Review

Programme Leads are responsible for drafting course write-ups using approved institutional templates, consistent with Curriculum Framework Stages 3 and 4 (Curriculum Design; Instructional Materials & Development).

The QA Unit shall review all syllabi for:

- Alignment with approved course structure and learning outcomes;
- Accuracy and completeness;
- Consistency with marketing and student information; and
- Compliance with ERF and EduTrust requirements.



5. Approval Authority

- All new or substantially revised syllabi require Academic Board approval, in line with EM5.1 Section 5.1.1C.
- Minor editorial updates may be approved by the QA Unit and recorded for audit purposes.

6. Version Control and Communication

Approved syllabi shall be:

- Version-controlled in accordance with KGI document control procedures; and
- Communicated to faculty and enrolled students prior to course commencement.

7. Review Cycle

Course syllabi shall be reviewed as part of the Annual Course Review Cycle, in accordance with EM5.1 Section 5.1.2 and Table 5.1F, or when significant curriculum changes are approved by the Academic Board.

Review outcomes shall inform syllabus updates, version control, and stakeholder communication.



Course Planning & Delivery Oversight Procedure

1. Purpose

This procedure establishes the governance, oversight, and control mechanisms for course planning and delivery readiness at Kepler Global Institute (KGI). It ensures that all courses are systematically planned, adequately resourced, and approved for delivery in accordance with institutional standards, regulatory requirements, and learner needs.

This procedure is developed with explicit reference to KGI EduTrust Manual (EM5.2) – Section 5.2 Course Planning and Delivery, specifically:

- Section 5.2.1A–5.2.1D (Course Planning Policy, Framework, and Procedures);
- Section 5.2.1F (Strategic Alignment & Governance); and
- Relevant interfaces with Section 5.2.2 (Course Delivery) where planning impacts delivery readiness.

This procedure operationalises the Instructional Materials & Development and Implementation stages of the KGI Curriculum Framework (SOP Curriculum Framework v1.0, 2024).

2. Scope

This procedure applies to all courses offered by KGI, including full qualifications and modular programmes, delivered via face-to-face, online, or blended learning modes.

3. Guiding Principles

In accordance with EM5.2 Section 5.2.1A (Policy Statement), course planning and delivery oversight at KGI shall ensure that:

- Courses are planned early and systematically to support effective delivery;
- Academic, logistical, and learner support resources are adequate and fit for purpose;
- Qualified academic staff are deployed in line with regulatory and curriculum requirements; and
- Oversight mechanisms provide assurance of delivery readiness prior to course commencement.

4. Course Planning & Delivery Oversight Framework

Course planning oversight is implemented in accordance with EM5.2 Section 5.2.1B (Framework for Course Planning) and aligned to the Instructional Materials & Development and Implementation stages of the KGI Curriculum Framework.

Key oversight areas include:

- **Intake and timetable confirmation**
(Ref: EM5.2 Table 5.2A; Curriculum Framework – Implementation)
- **Academic preparation and lesson planning**
(Ref: EM5.2 Table 5.2A; Curriculum Framework – Instructional Materials & Development)
- **Staff deployment and qualification verification**
(Ref: EM5.2 Table 5.2B)



- **Venue and learning platform readiness**
(Ref: EM5.2 Table 5.2A)
- **Pre-course student communication and support readiness**
(Ref: EM5.2 Section 5.2.1D)

5. Oversight Procedures

5.1 Pre-Delivery Readiness Review

Prior to course commencement, the Programme Lead and QA Unit shall confirm:

- Approved timetable and intake viability;
- Availability and readiness of teaching venues or digital platforms;
- Completion and quality-check of lesson plans and teaching materials;
- Deployment of qualified academic staff; and
- Completion of pre-course communication to students.

This review supports EM5.2 Section 5.2.1D (Details and Procedures).

5.2 Academic Board Oversight

In accordance with EM5.2 Section 5.2.1F (Governance), the Academic Board:

- Reviews delivery readiness reports for new programmes or major rollouts;
- Endorses course delivery schedules and staffing arrangements; and
- Provides strategic direction where delivery risks are identified.

6. Monitoring and Reporting

Course planning and delivery readiness is monitored using the mechanisms set out in EM5.2 Section 5.2.1E and Table 5.2C, including:

- Facilities and platform readiness reviews;
- Academic resource audits;
- Faculty capacity and workload monitoring; and
- CAPA tracking for identified gaps.

Findings are reported to the QA Committee and Academic Board for review and action.

7. Documentation and Records

All planning records, readiness checklists, staffing approvals, and oversight reports shall be documented and retained in accordance with KGI's document control requirements.

8. Review of Procedure

This procedure shall be reviewed at least once every two years or earlier where required due to changes in regulatory requirements, institutional strategy, or delivery modalities.



Course Implementation Monitoring Procedure

1. Purpose

This procedure defines the mechanisms by which KGI monitors, evaluates, and assures the quality of course implementation and delivery to ensure alignment with approved course structures, learning outcomes, and quality assurance standards.

This procedure is developed with explicit reference to KGI EduTrust Manual (EM5.2) – Section 5.2 Course Planning and Delivery, specifically:

- Section 5.2.2A–5.2.2D (Course Delivery Policy, Framework, and Procedures);
- Section 5.2.2E (Monitoring and Review); and
- Section 5.2.2F (Strategic Alignment & Governance).

This procedure operationalises the Evaluation & Review stage of the KGI Curriculum Framework (SOP Curriculum Framework v1.0, 2024).

2. Scope

This procedure applies to all courses delivered by KGI, across all delivery modes and academic units.

3. Monitoring Principles

In accordance with EM5.2 Section 5.2.2A (Policy Statement), course implementation monitoring shall ensure that:

- Teaching delivery aligns with approved lesson plans and learning outcomes;
- Learner engagement and participation are actively monitored;
- Academic staff performance is evaluated using structured criteria; and
- Issues are identified early and addressed through corrective action.

4. Course Implementation Monitoring Framework

Course implementation monitoring is conducted in accordance with EM5.2 Section 5.2.2B (Framework for Course Delivery) and Table 5.2E, covering:

- Alignment of delivery with learning outcomes;
- Effectiveness of multi-modal delivery;
- Teaching quality and learner engagement;
- Assessment administration integrity; and
- Continuous enhancement through feedback and CAPA.

5. Monitoring Procedures

5.1 Ongoing Delivery Monitoring

During course delivery, the QA Unit and Academic Leads shall:

- Observe teaching sessions;



- Review LMS usage, attendance, and participation data;
- Monitor assessment conduct and timelines; and
- Collect mid-course learner feedback where applicable.

(Ref: EM5.2 Section 5.2.2C and Table 5.2F)

5.2 Feedback and Evaluation

Structured feedback is collected from:

- Students (mid-course and end-course);
- Academic staff; and
- Programme teams.

This supports continuous improvement under EM5.2 Section 5.2.2D.

5.3 Intervention and CAPA

Where monitoring identifies gaps in delivery quality or learner engagement:

- Intervention measures are triggered;
- CAPA actions are documented and tracked; and
- Follow-up monitoring verifies effectiveness.

(Ref: EM5.2 Section 5.2.2E)

6. Reporting and Governance

In accordance with EM5.2 Section 5.2.2F (Governance):

- Delivery monitoring findings are consolidated into course delivery reports;
- Reports are reviewed by the QA Committee; and
- Key issues and trends are escalated to the Academic Board for oversight and direction.

7. Documentation and Records

All monitoring records, observation reports, feedback summaries, evaluation outcomes, and CAPA logs shall be retained in accordance with KGI's document control and audit requirements.

8. Review of Procedure

This procedure shall be reviewed at least once every two years or earlier where required due to regulatory updates, delivery model changes, or institutional review findings.



Admission Criteria & Academic Suitability Framework

1. Purpose

This policy establishes the academic admission criteria and suitability framework governing student selection and admission decisions at Kepler Global Institute (KGI). It ensures that prospective students admitted to KGI programmes possess the appropriate academic preparedness, language proficiency, and learning readiness to successfully undertake their chosen courses.

This policy is developed with explicit reference to KGI EduTrust Manual (EM4.1) – Pre-Course Counselling, Student Selection and Admissions, specifically:

- Section 4.1.1A (Policy Statement);
- Section 4.1.1B (Framework for Pre-Course Counselling, Student Selection and Admissions);
- Section 4.1.1D(c) (Student Selection and Admissions Procedures); and
- Section 4.1.1F (Monitoring and Review Cycle).

This framework supports compliance with the Enhanced Registration Framework (ERF) and EduTrust Guidance Document Version 4, focusing on academic relevance only under Criterion 4.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all applicants seeking admission to KGI programmes, including:

- Full qualifications;
- Modular programmes; and
- Courses requiring academic suitability assessment.

This policy covers academic eligibility and suitability only and operates in conjunction with (but distinct from) administrative, immigration, or student welfare procedures.

3. Policy Statement

In accordance with EM4.1 Section 4.1.1A, KGI adopts a transparent, objective, and evidence-based admissions framework to ensure that:

- Students meet clearly defined academic entry requirements;
- Admission decisions are aligned with course learning outcomes and delivery expectations; and
- Students are placed into programmes suitable to their qualifications, experience, and learning capacity.

Admission decisions shall prioritise academic fit and learner readiness, safeguarding student progression and institutional academic standards.

4. Academic Admission Criteria Framework

KGI's academic admission criteria are implemented in accordance with EM4.1 Section 4.1.1B (Framework for Pre-Course Counselling, Student Selection and Admissions) and form part of the Eligibility Verification & Selection stage outlined in Table 4.1A.

4.1 Core Academic Criteria

Admission criteria may include one or more of the following, depending on course level and nature:



- Minimum academic qualifications (e.g. secondary, post-secondary, or equivalent);
- Relevant subject background or prior learning;
- English language proficiency benchmarks;
- Prior work experience or industry exposure (where applicable); and
- Bridging or preparatory requirements for applicants with non-standard pathways.

All criteria shall be documented in approved course write-ups and communicated during pre-course counselling.

5. Academic Suitability Assessment

Academic suitability assessment is conducted in accordance with EM4.1 Section 4.1.1D(c) – Student Selection and Admissions Procedures.

5.1 Suitability Determination

Academic suitability is assessed using a structured approach that may include:

- Review of academic transcripts and certificates;
- Verification against course-specific entry criteria using a Selection Matrix;
- Assessment of learning readiness and course demands during pre-course counselling; and
- Consideration of alternative pathways or preparatory options where gaps are identified.

Applicants assessed as academically unsuitable for a selected course shall be counselled on alternative programmes or pathways, consistent with Flowchart 4.1A.

6. Admission Approval and Documentation

All academic admission decisions shall be:

- Supported by verified documentation;
- Recorded using standardised selection and verification tools (e.g. Selection Checklist, Document Verification Log); and
- Approved in accordance with delegated authority levels set out in EM4.1 Table 4.1A.

Where required, management or Academic Board endorsement shall be obtained for borderline or non-standard admissions.

7. Monitoring and Review

Monitoring of academic admission practices is conducted in accordance with EM4.1 Section 4.1.1F (Monitoring and Review Cycle).

Key monitoring mechanisms include:

- Periodic audits of admission and eligibility records;
- Review of student progression and early-stage performance trends;
- Feedback from academic staff on learner readiness; and
- Consolidation of findings into a central CAPA Log.

Monitoring outcomes are reviewed by the QA function and escalated for governance oversight where systemic issues are identified.



8. Governance and Accountability

Governance and accountability for this policy are aligned with EM4.1 Section 4.1.1G (Strategic Alignment & Governance).

- The Academic Board provides oversight on admission standards and academic integrity.
- The QA / Compliance function monitors adherence to admission criteria and suitability assessments.
- Programme Leads and Admissions personnel are responsible for consistent application of academic criteria and accurate documentation.

This governance structure ensures that admission decisions support student success, academic quality, and regulatory compliance.

9. Policy Review

This policy shall be reviewed at least once every two years, or earlier where required due to changes in regulatory requirements, course design, or institutional strategy, in accordance with EM4.1 Section 4.1.1F.



Trainer / Lecturer Deployment Policy

1. Purpose

This policy establishes the academic governance framework for the deployment of trainers and lecturers at Kepler Global Institute (KGI). It ensures that all academic staff deployed for course delivery are appropriately qualified, suitably matched to course requirements, and formally approved, safeguarding academic quality and regulatory compliance.

This policy is developed with explicit reference to:

- KGI EduTrust Manual (EM2.1) – Human Resource, specifically:
 - Section 2.1.1B (Human Resource Management Framework – Manpower Planning & Deployment);
 - Section 2.1.1C (Staff Selection and Recruitment – Academic Board approval for academic roles); and
 - Section 2.1.1H (Strategic Alignment & Governance); and
- KGI EduTrust Manual (EM5.2) – Course Planning and Delivery, specifically:
 - Section 5.2.1B–5.2.1D (Course Planning Framework and Staff Deployment); and
 - Section 5.2.1F (Governance Structure – Academic Board approval of trainer assignments).

This policy supports compliance with the Enhanced Registration Framework (ERF) and EduTrust Guidance Document Version 4.

2. Scope

This policy applies to the deployment of all trainers and lecturers (full-time, part-time, associate, or adjunct) involved in academic delivery across all KGI programmes and delivery modes.

3. Policy Statement

In accordance with EM2.1 Section 2.1.1A, KGI adopts a structured and merit-based approach to trainer deployment to ensure that:

- Academic staff deployment aligns with approved curriculum and delivery plans;
- Trainer expertise and workload are appropriate to course complexity and learner profile; and
- Deployment decisions are subject to Academic Board oversight to preserve academic integrity.

4. Trainer Deployment Framework

Trainer deployment is implemented in accordance with:

- EM2.1 Table 2.1A (Manpower Planning & Deployment); and
- EM5.2 Table 5.2B (Course Planning Process – Staff Deployment Stage).

Deployment considerations include:

- Subject matter expertise and teaching competence;
- Course level, learning outcomes, and assessment requirements;
- Delivery mode (on-site, online, blended); and



- Teaching workload and scheduling feasibility.

5. Deployment Procedures

5.1 Deployment Planning

Trainer deployment planning forms part of the Course Planning Process under EM5.2 Section 5.2.1D, and includes:

- Review of course schedules and intake plans;
- Matching trainer profiles against course requirements; and
- Verification of trainer availability and workload balance.

5.2 Academic Board Approval

In accordance with EM2.1 Section 2.1.1C and EM5.2 Section 5.2.1F, the Academic Board:

- Approves deployment of trainers for new programmes and major intakes;
- Endorses trainer assignment for specialised or regulated courses; and
- Reviews deployment risks or exceptions highlighted by HR or QA.

6. Monitoring and Review

Trainer deployment effectiveness is monitored through mechanisms outlined in:

- EM2.1 Section 2.1.1D (Staff Appraisal and Performance Monitoring); and
- EM5.2 Section 5.2.2E (Delivery Monitoring and Trainer Evaluation).

Monitoring inputs include teaching observations, learner feedback, appraisal outcomes, and delivery performance indicators.

7. Governance and Accountability

Governance arrangements are aligned with EM2.1 Section 2.1.1H:

- The Academic Board exercises oversight on academic deployment decisions;
- HR manages operational deployment and records;
- QA Committee monitors compliance and effectiveness; and
- Academic Management coordinates deployment with course planning.

8. Policy Review

This policy shall be reviewed at least once every two years, or earlier where required due to regulatory or academic changes, in line with EM2.1 Section 2.1.1G.



Trainer Qualification & Suitability Criteria

1. Purpose

This policy establishes the minimum qualification, competency, and suitability criteria for trainers and lecturers engaged in academic delivery at KGI. It ensures that all academic staff meet standards of professional competence, pedagogical capability, and regulatory compliance.

This policy is developed with explicit reference to:

- KGI EduTrust Manual (EM2.1), specifically:
 - Section 2.1.1A (Policy Statement – Staff Competence);
 - Section 2.1.1B (Recruitment & Selection – Minimum Qualification Setup);
 - Section 2.1.1C (Verification of Academic Credentials); and
 - Section 2.1.2A–2.1.2D (Staff Training and Development); and
- KGI EduTrust Manual (EM5.2), specifically:
 - Section 5.2.1B (Qualified Staffing); and
 - Section 5.2.2B (Framework for Course Delivery – Teaching Quality).

2. Scope

This policy applies to all academic staff appointed or deployed for teaching, assessment, supervision, or instructional support roles at KGI.

3. Qualification Criteria

Minimum qualification requirements shall be defined at course or programme level and may include:

- Academic qualifications relevant to the subject area;
- Professional certifications or industry credentials;
- Adult education or training qualifications (e.g. TAE or equivalent); and
- Demonstrated teaching or industry experience.

These requirements are documented in job descriptions in accordance with EM2.1 Table 2.1A.

4. Suitability Assessment

Trainer suitability is assessed in accordance with EM2.1 Section 2.1.1C, using a structured process that includes:

- Verification of academic and professional credentials;
- Review of teaching experience and subject relevance;
- Assessment of pedagogical competence and communication skills; and
- Consideration of past teaching evaluations and professional conduct.

Suitability assessment outcomes are recorded and retained for audit purposes.



5. Ongoing Competency and Development

In line with EM2.1 Section 2.1.2, KGI ensures that trainers:

- Participate in continuous professional development;
- Undertake training aligned to curriculum, pedagogy, and compliance needs; and
- Are evaluated using appraisal and observation frameworks.

Training effectiveness is monitored using the Kirkpatrick Model (Levels 1–4) as described in EM2.1 Section 2.1.2E.

6. Monitoring and Review

Trainer qualifications and suitability are reviewed through:

- Annual performance appraisals (EM2.1 Section 2.1.1D);
- Teaching evaluations and learner feedback (EM5.2 Section 5.2.2E); and
- CAPA tracking for identified gaps (EM2.1 Section 2.1.1G).

7. Governance and Accountability

Governance arrangements are aligned with EM2.1 Section 2.1.1H:

- The Academic Board approves qualification standards and reviews suitability risks;
- HR manages credential verification and records;
- QA Committee monitors compliance and effectiveness; and
- Academic Management ensures alignment with course delivery needs.

8. Policy Review

This policy shall be reviewed at least once every two years, or earlier where required due to regulatory updates or academic quality reviews.



Student Progression & Learning Oversight Procedure

1. Purpose

This procedure establishes the academic governance, oversight, and assurance mechanisms for monitoring student progression and learning outcomes at Kepler Global Institute (KGI). It ensures that students' academic performance is systematically tracked, learning gaps are identified early, and appropriate academic interventions are implemented to support successful course completion.

This procedure is developed with explicit reference to KGI EduTrust Manual (EM5.4) – Student Learning, specifically:

- Section 5.4.1A (Policy Statement);
- Section 5.4.1B (Framework for Student Learning and Support);
- Section 5.4.1D (Details and Procedures aligned with the Curriculum Framework);
- Section 5.4.1E (Monitoring and Review of Student Learning); and
- Section 5.4.1F (Strategic Alignment & Governance).

This procedure supports compliance with the Enhanced Registration Framework (ERF) and EduTrust Guidance Document Version 4, and operationalises the Evaluation & Review stage of the KGI Curriculum Framework (SOP Curriculum Framework v1.0, 2024).

2. Scope

This procedure applies to all students enrolled in KGI programmes, including full qualifications and modular programmes where academic progression monitoring is required.

It covers academic progression, learning performance, and intervention oversight only and operates in conjunction with assessment, delivery, and student support procedures.

3. Guiding Principles

In accordance with EM5.4 Section 5.4.1A, student progression and learning oversight at KGI shall ensure that:

- Learning outcomes are continuously monitored using valid academic evidence;
- Students at risk of not meeting academic standards are identified early;
- Academic support and interventions are proportionate, timely, and documented; and
- Oversight mechanisms ensure accountability, transparency, and continuous improvement.

4. Student Progression & Learning Oversight Framework

Student progression oversight is implemented in accordance with EM5.4 Section 5.4.1B and Table 5.4A (Student Learning Support & Monitoring Framework).

Key oversight components include:

- Progress monitoring through continuous assessment and LMS analytics;
- Early identification of at-risk students based on defined academic criteria;
- Academic intervention and support allocation; and



- Evaluation of intervention effectiveness to inform improvement actions.

This framework is aligned to the Evaluation & Review stage of the KGI Curriculum Framework.

5. Student Progress Monitoring Procedures

5.1 Academic Progress Tracking

In accordance with EM5.4 Section 5.4.1D(a) and Table 5.4B, lecturers and programme teams shall:

- Monitor student performance through formative and summative assessments;
- Review LMS dashboards, gradebooks, and feedback records; and
- Identify trends indicating learning gaps or progression risks.

5.2 Identification of At-Risk Students

Students are identified as at risk based on criteria defined under EM5.4 Table 5.4B – At-Risk Identification, including:

- Failure to meet minimum assessment benchmarks;
- Consistently weak academic performance; or
- Poor engagement affecting learning outcomes.

Identified cases are formally recorded using early alert or referral tools.

6. Academic Intervention and Support Oversight

6.1 Intervention Assignment

In accordance with EM5.4 Section 5.4.1D, appropriate academic support measures may include:

- Academic coaching or mentoring;
- Study skills workshops or targeted tutorials; and
- Peer support or structured academic guidance.

Interventions are matched to student needs and documented in support logs.

6.2 Escalation and Personalised Plans

Where students do not show improvement after initial support, cases are escalated for personalised intervention plans, in line with EM5.4 Table 5.4B – Review & Escalation Stage.

Escalation decisions are overseen by Academic Management.

7. Monitoring and Review of Learning Interventions

Monitoring of student progression and intervention effectiveness is conducted in accordance with EM5.4 Section 5.4.1E and Table 5.4C (Student Learning Monitoring Plan), including:

- Termly review of post-intervention academic performance;
- Analysis of progression, retention, and pass/fail trends;
- Student feedback on academic support effectiveness; and
- CAPA tracking for recurring or systemic issues.

Findings are consolidated into QA reports for governance review.



8. Reporting and Governance Oversight

Governance arrangements are aligned with EM5.4 Section 5.4.1F (Strategic Alignment & Governance):

- The Academic Board reviews student progression trends, intervention outcomes, and academic risk indicators;
- The QA Committee evaluates process effectiveness and compliance; and
- Academic Management coordinates escalation, intervention, and follow-up actions.

Student progression data contributes to institutional KPIs such as completion rates, learner satisfaction, and academic quality indicators.

9. Documentation and Records

All student progression records, intervention logs, monitoring reports, and CAPA records shall be documented and retained in accordance with KGI's document control and audit requirements.

10. Review of Procedure

This procedure shall be reviewed at least once every two years, or earlier where required due to regulatory updates, curriculum changes, or academic quality reviews, in line with EM5.4 Section 5.4.1E.



Academic Integrity Policy

1. Purpose

This policy establishes Kepler Global Institute's (KGI) institutional commitment to academic integrity, ensuring honesty, fairness, and ethical conduct in student learning and assessment. It safeguards the validity of assessment outcomes, protects the credibility of academic awards, and upholds the integrity of the learning process.

This policy is developed with explicit reference to:

- KGI EduTrust Manual (EM5.4) – Student Learning, specifically:
 - Section 5.4.1A (Policy Statement);
 - Section 5.4.1B (Framework for Student Learning and Support); and
 - Section 5.4.1E–5.4.1F (Monitoring, Review, and Governance); and
- KGI EduTrust Manual (EM5.5) – Student Assessment, specifically:
 - Section 5.5.1A (Policy Statement – Assessment Integrity);
 - Section 5.5.1B (Framework for Assessment Policy and Procedures);
 - Section 5.5.1D (Assessment Planning, Moderation, and Appeals); and
 - Section 5.5.1G (Strategic Alignment & Governance).

This policy supports compliance with the Enhanced Registration Framework (ERF) and EduTrust Guidance Document Version 4.

2. Scope

This policy applies to:

- All students enrolled in KGI programmes;
- All forms of assessment, including examinations, assignments, projects, portfolios, and online assessments; and
- All academic staff, invigilators, and assessment administrators involved in teaching and assessment processes.

3. Policy Statement

In accordance with EM5.5 Section 5.5.1A and EM5.4 Section 5.4.1A, KGI is committed to ensuring that:

- All learning and assessment activities are conducted with honesty, fairness, and accountability;
- Academic misconduct is clearly defined, consistently addressed, and fairly adjudicated; and
- Students are educated on ethical academic practices as part of their learning journey.

Academic integrity is recognised as fundamental to valid assessment, credible learning outcomes, and student progression.

4. Academic Integrity Framework

KGI's Academic Integrity Framework is embedded within:

- The Student Learning and Support Framework under EM5.4 Section 5.4.1B; and



- The Assessment Policy and Procedure Framework under EM5.5 Section 5.5.1B.

Key components include:

- Clear communication of academic honesty expectations and codes of conduct;
- Preventive measures embedded in assessment design and delivery;
- Detection and investigation mechanisms for academic misconduct; and
- Fair, transparent, and documented resolution processes.

5. Academic Misconduct Definition

Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to:

- Plagiarism, collusion, or unauthorised collaboration;
- Cheating during examinations or assessments;
- Fabrication or falsification of data or evidence;
- Use of unauthorised materials, tools, or AI applications; and
- Any behaviour that compromises assessment integrity or learning authenticity.

These definitions are aligned with EM5.5 Table 5.5A – Academic Integrity Component.

6. Prevention and Education Measures

In line with EM5.4 Section 5.4.1B and EM5.5 Section 5.5.1B, KGI implements preventive measures including:

- Student orientation briefings on academic integrity expectations;
- Clear assessment instructions and marking rubrics;
- Plagiarism detection tools and secure assessment environments; and
- Ongoing reinforcement through teaching and learning activities.

These measures support ethical learning behaviour and reduce inadvertent misconduct.

7. Detection, Investigation, and Resolution

7.1 Detection

Potential breaches of academic integrity may be identified through:

- Plagiarism detection systems;
- Invigilation reports;
- Assessment moderation and review; and
- Feedback from academic staff.

(Ref: EM5.5 Section 5.5.1D – Delivery & Monitoring)

7.2 Investigation and Due Process

All suspected cases are investigated using documented procedures that ensure:

- Fairness, confidentiality, and consistency;
- Opportunity for student explanation; and
- Evidence-based decision-making.



7.3 Outcomes and Appeals

Outcomes may include academic penalties, remediation, or reassessment, depending on severity and recurrence. Students retain the right to appeal in accordance with EM5.5 Section 5.5.1D (Results and Appeals).

8. Integration with Student Learning Support

In accordance with EM5.4 Section 5.4.1D, academic integrity cases that indicate learning gaps or poor academic skills may trigger:

- Targeted academic support or study skills interventions; and
- Monitoring under the Student Learning Monitoring & Intervention Process.

This ensures integrity management is developmental, not purely punitive.

9. Monitoring, Review, and CAPA

Academic integrity trends are monitored under:

- EM5.5 Section 5.5.1F – Assessment Monitoring and Review; and
- EM5.4 Section 5.4.1E – Monitoring and Review of Student Learning.

Monitoring activities include:

- Review of misconduct cases and recurrence patterns;
- Analysis of assessment integrity risks; and
- CAPA tracking for systemic or recurring issues.

Findings are consolidated into QA reports for governance review.

10. Governance and Oversight

Governance arrangements are aligned with EM5.5 Section 5.5.1G and EM5.4 Section 5.4.1F:

- The Academic Board approves this policy and reviews integrity trends;
- The Examination Board oversees assessment integrity, results, and awards;
- The QA Committee monitors implementation effectiveness; and
- Academic Management ensures corrective actions and continuous improvement.

This governance structure ensures academic integrity is institutionally embedded and auditable.

11. Policy Review

This policy shall be reviewed at least once every two years, or earlier where required due to regulatory updates, assessment modality changes, or emerging academic integrity risks.



External Academic Partner Oversight Procedure

1. Purpose

This procedure establishes the Academic Board–level oversight framework governing the engagement, management, monitoring, and review of external academic partners involved in collaborative, joint, or co-developed academic programmes at Kepler Global Institute (KGI).

This procedure ensures that all external academic partnerships:

- Add demonstrable academic value;
- Align with KGI’s curriculum standards and graduate attributes; and
- Are governed in compliance with ERF and EduTrust Guidance Document Version 4.

This procedure is developed with explicit reference to:

- EM5.3 Section 5.3.1A–5.3.1D (Policy, Framework, and Procedures for Partnerships);
- EM5.3 Section 5.3.1F–5.3.1G (Monitoring, Review, and Governance); and
- EM5.1 Sections 5.1.1B, 5.1.1E, and 5.1.2B (Curriculum design, review, and partner involvement).

2. Scope

This procedure applies to all external academic partnerships, including:

- Joint or collaborative programmes;
- Co-developed curricula or assessments;
- External academic validation or benchmarking arrangements; and
- Credit articulation or progression pathways involving academic partners.

3. Guiding Principles

In accordance with EM5.3 Section 5.3.1A, KGI adopts a structured and evidence-based approach to external academic partnerships to ensure that:

- Academic standards and learning outcomes remain under KGI’s governance control;
- Partner contributions are transparent, documented, and quality-assured; and
- Risks to academic integrity, delivery quality, and regulatory compliance are actively managed.

4. External Academic Partner Oversight Framework

External academic partner oversight is implemented in accordance with:

- EM5.3 Table 5.3A – Partnership Management Framework; and
- The Evaluation & Review stage of the KGI Curriculum Framework.

Oversight areas include:

- Academic credibility and regulatory standing of partners;
- Alignment of partner curriculum inputs with KGI learning outcomes;
- Quality of delivery, assessment, and moderation (if applicable); and



- Ongoing performance against agreed academic KPIs.

5. Partner Approval and Governance Control

5.1 Academic Board Approval

In line with EM5.3 Section 5.3.1D(a) and Table 5.3B, all external academic partnerships must be:

- Reviewed and endorsed by the Academic Board prior to formalisation; and
- Supported by due diligence documentation, academic scope definition, and risk assessment.

5.2 Agreement Governance

All partnerships shall be governed by formal agreements (e.g. MOUs/MOAs) that meet the minimum requirements set out in EM5.3 Table 5.3C, including:

- Academic roles and responsibilities;
- Quality assurance and review mechanisms;
- Data protection, IP, and dispute resolution; and
- Review, renewal, and termination provisions.

6. Monitoring and Review

Monitoring of external academic partners is conducted in accordance with EM5.3 Section 5.3.1F and Table 5.3D, and includes:

- Review of student learning and assessment outcomes;
- Delivery audits and moderation results (where applicable);
- Stakeholder and learner feedback; and
- CAPA tracking for identified gaps or risks.

Monitoring outcomes are reported to the Academic Board and integrated into course review cycles under EM5.1 Section 5.1.2.

7. Escalation, Adjustment, and Termination

Where partnership performance falls below agreed standards:

- Corrective actions are initiated in accordance with EM5.3 Section 5.3.1F;
- Adjustments or remediation plans are documented; and
- Termination decisions are escalated to the Academic Board for approval, in line with Flowchart 5.3A.

8. Governance and Accountability

Governance arrangements align with EM5.3 Section 5.3.1G:

- The Academic Board approves partnerships and reviews performance;
- The QA Committee monitors academic quality and compliance;
- Programme Leads manage operational coordination; and
- Management and Legal ensure strategic and contractual alignment.



9. Review of Procedure

This procedure shall be reviewed at least once every two years, or earlier where required due to regulatory updates, partnership risks, or strategic changes.



Course Teach-Out & Transition Oversight Procedure

1. Purpose

This procedure establishes the Academic Board–level oversight framework for managing course teach-out and transition arrangements when a course is discontinued, substantially revised, or affected by partnership termination.

It ensures that:

- Student academic interests are protected;
- Learning outcomes and certification integrity are maintained; and
- Transitions are managed in compliance with ERF and EduTrust GD v4.

This procedure is developed with explicit reference to:

- EM5.1 Section 5.1.2A–5.1.2D (Course Review, Change, and Discontinuation); and
- EM5.3 Sections 5.3.1F–5.3.1G (Partnership termination and governance).

2. Scope

This procedure applies to:

- Course discontinuation or sunset decisions;
- Major curriculum restructuring affecting existing cohorts; and
- Teach-out arrangements arising from external academic partner exit or non-renewal.

3. Guiding Principles

In accordance with EM5.1 Section 5.1.2A, KGI ensures that:

- Students are not academically disadvantaged by institutional decisions;
- Teach-out arrangements preserve approved learning outcomes and assessment standards; and
- All transitions are clearly communicated, documented, and governed.

4. Teach-Out & Transition Oversight Framework

Teach-out oversight aligns with:

- EM5.1 Table 5.1E – Course Review & Evaluation Framework; and
- The Implementation and Evaluation & Review stages of the KGI Curriculum Framework.

Key oversight areas include:

- Continuity of curriculum delivery and assessment;
- Adequacy of academic staffing and resources;
- Integrity of certification and outcomes; and
- Risk management for affected cohorts.

5. Teach-Out Planning and Approval



5.1 Trigger Events

Teach-out planning is initiated when:

- A course is approved for discontinuation;
- Major curriculum revisions affect existing cohorts; or
- An external academic partnership is terminated.

5.2 Academic Board Approval

In accordance with EM5.1 Section 5.1.2D, all teach-out plans must be:

- Submitted to the Academic Board for approval; and
- Supported by a documented impact assessment and transition plan.

6. Implementation and Monitoring

Teach-out implementation is monitored through:

- Delivery and assessment tracking;
- Student progression and completion monitoring; and
- Learner feedback and escalation logs.

Monitoring outcomes are reviewed under the Evaluation & Review stage of the Curriculum Framework and reported to the Academic Board.

7. Transition Arrangements

Where teach-out is not feasible, KGI ensures that:

- Alternative academic pathways or credit transfer options are identified (where applicable);
- External partner transitions are quality-assured; and
- Student consent and academic equivalence are documented.

All transitions are governed under EM5.1 Section 5.1.2D and EM5.3 Section 5.3.1F.

8. Governance and Accountability

Governance arrangements align with EM5.1 Section 5.1.2F:

- The Academic Board approves teach-out and transition decisions;
- The QA Committee monitors academic quality and compliance;
- Academic Management oversees implementation; and
- Programme Teams manage student communication and delivery continuity.

9. Documentation and Records

All teach-out plans, transition approvals, communications, and monitoring records shall be retained in accordance with KGI's document control and audit requirements.

10. Review of Procedure



KEPLER GLOBAL INSTITUTE PTE LTD

北 斗 国 际 学 院

190 CLEMENCEAU AVENUE #04-02 SINGAPORE SHOPPING CENTRE SINGAPORE (239924)

This procedure shall be reviewed at least once every two years, or earlier where required due to regulatory updates or institutional restructuring.



Assessment Policy & Procedures

1. Purpose

This policy establishes Kepler Global Institute's (KGI) institutional principles, governance controls, and procedures for the planning, conduct, moderation, security, review, and continuous improvement of student assessments.

This policy ensures that all assessments are:

- Valid, reliable, fair, and transparent;
- Aligned to approved learning outcomes and graduate attributes; and
- Governed with integrity and accountability through Examination Board oversight.

This policy is developed with explicit reference to:

- EM5.5 Clauses 5.5.1A–5.5.1G (Student Assessment – Policy, Framework, Procedures, Monitoring & Governance); and
- EM6.1 Clauses 6.1.1A–6.1.1F (Internal Assessment & CAPA for quality assurance).

2. Scope

This policy applies to:

- All courses and programmes offered by KGI;
- All modes of assessment (written, practical, project, portfolio, oral, online); and
- All staff involved in assessment design, delivery, marking, moderation, and governance.

3. Policy Statement

In accordance with EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1A, KGI adopts a principle-driven assessment system that ensures:

- Alignment between assessment, learning outcomes, and curriculum intent;
- Secure and ethical conduct of all assessments;
- Standardised marking and moderation; and
- Transparent communication of results and appeals.

Assessment integrity is recognised as a core determinant of academic credibility, student learning quality, and award validity.

4. Assessment Framework

KGI's assessment framework is implemented in accordance with EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1B and Table 5.5A (Assessment Policy and Procedure Framework) and is aligned to the Evaluation & Review stage of the KGI Curriculum Framework.

Key components include:

- Assessment scheduling and communication;
- Assessment instrument design and vetting;
- Marking and moderation;



- Storage, confidentiality, and security;
- Results processing and appeals; and
- Continuous review and improvement.

5. Roles and Responsibilities

In accordance with EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1G:

- **Academic Board**
Approves assessment frameworks and major revisions.
- **Examination Board**
Oversees assessment integrity, endorses results, and approves awards.
- **Assessment Committee / Academic Leads**
Manage moderation, consistency, and academic standards.
- **QA Unit**
Monitors compliance, documentation, and CAPA implementation (Ref: EM6.1).

6. Monitoring, Review, and Internal Assessment

Assessment processes are monitored through:

- Moderation reviews and Exam Board analysis (Ref: EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1F); and
- Internal assessments conducted under EM6.1 Internal Assessment Framework, including CAPA tracking and governance reporting.

Academic-related findings are escalated to the Academic Board for policy direction.

7. Policy Review

This policy shall be reviewed at least once every two years, or earlier where required due to regulatory changes, assessment risks, or QA findings.



Assessment Planning & Approval Procedure

1. Purpose

This procedure defines the structured process for assessment planning, mapping, review, and formal approval to ensure assessments are aligned with curriculum intent and regulatory requirements.

2. Scope

This procedure applies to all assessment plans for:

- **New courses;**
- **Revised courses;** and
- Ongoing delivery cycles.

3. Assessment Planning Framework

Assessment planning is conducted in accordance with:

- EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1D(a) (Assessment Planning and Implementation); and
- Table 5.5B – Assessment Process Overview.

Planning aligns to the following KGI Curriculum Framework stages:

- Needs Analysis;
- Curriculum Design; and
- Evaluation & Review.

4. Assessment Planning Steps

4.1 Assessment Mapping

Assessments are mapped to:

- Course learning outcomes;
- Graduate attributes; and
- Approved curriculum structure.

(Ref: EM5.5 Table 5.5B – Stage 1)

4.2 Assessment Scheme Design

Assessment types, weightings, rubrics, and grading criteria are defined and documented.

4.3 Review and Endorsement

Assessment plans are reviewed by:

- QA Unit (compliance and alignment); and
- Examination Board (formal endorsement).

No assessment may be implemented without Examination Board approval.

5. Documentation and Records



Approved assessment plans are retained as controlled documents and referenced during moderation, Exam Board reviews, and internal assessments.

6. Review of Procedure

This procedure shall be reviewed at least once every two years, or earlier where required due to security incidents, assessment risks, or regulatory updates.



Assessment Instrument Approval & Security Procedure

1. Purpose

This procedure establishes controls for the development, approval, storage, and security of assessment instruments to safeguard academic integrity and prevent compromise.

2. Scope

This procedure applies to all assessment instruments, including:

- Examination papers;
- Assignments and projects;
- Practical tests; and
- Digital and online assessments.

3. Instrument Development and Approval

In accordance with EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1D and Table 5.5A:

- Assessment instruments are developed by qualified faculty;
- Vetting is conducted for validity, level appropriateness, and alignment; and
- Final approval is granted by the designated Academic Lead / Assessment Committee.

4. Security and Confidentiality Controls

Security measures are implemented in line with:

- EM5.5 Table 5.5A – Storage & Confidentiality; and
- Internal control expectations under EM6.1 Internal Assessment.

Controls include:

- Restricted access and version control;
- Secure digital or physical storage;
- Controlled reproduction and transmission; and
- Confidentiality declarations by staff involved.

5. Breach Management and Escalation

Any suspected breach of assessment security is:

- Documented and investigated;
- Subject to CAPA under EM6.1 Clause 6.1.1D; and
- Escalated to the Examination Board for direction.

6. Monitoring and Review

Assessment instrument security is reviewed through:



- Internal assessments and CAPA tracking (Ref: EM6.1); and
- Examination Board reviews of assessment integrity trends.

Findings inform procedural updates and risk mitigation actions.

7. Review of Procedure

This procedure shall be reviewed at least once every two years, or earlier where required due to security incidents, assessment risks, or regulatory updates.



Moderation & Post-Assessment Review Procedure

1. Purpose

This procedure establishes the formal governance controls for pre-assessment moderation, post-assessment moderation, and post-assessment analysis at Kepler Global Institute (KGI).

It ensures that:

- Assessments are applied consistently and fairly;
- Marking standards are calibrated across assessors;
- Assessment outcomes are analysed for academic quality risks; and
- Findings drive continuous improvement.

This procedure is developed with explicit reference to:

- EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1D (Moderation Planning & Marking Analysis);
- EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1F (Assessment Monitoring & Review); and
- EM6.1 Clauses 6.1.1A–6.1.1F (Internal Assessment & CAPA Framework).

It operationalises the Evaluation & Review stage of the KGI Curriculum Framework.

2. Scope

This procedure applies to:

- All assessment instruments and marking processes;
- All assessors and modules;
- **All courses** delivered by KGI; and
- All examination cycles and assessment periods.

3. Guiding Principles

In accordance with EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1A, moderation ensures that:

- Assessment outcomes are valid and reliable;
- Students are graded equitably;
- Academic standards are preserved; and
- Institutional credibility is protected.

Moderation is recognised as a core academic risk control function.

4. Moderation Framework

Moderation is implemented in accordance with:

- EM5.5 Table 5.5B – Assessment Process Overview (Stage 3: Moderation Planning)
- EM5.5 Table 5.5D – Assessment Monitoring Plan

Moderation occurs in three structured layers:

1. Pre-assessment moderation



2. Marking moderation
3. Post-assessment analysis

5. Pre-Assessment Moderation

5.1 Objective

To verify that assessment instruments:

- Match approved learning outcomes;
- Are pitched at the correct academic level;
- Are fair, unbiased, and achievable; and
- Align with grading rubrics.

5.2 Activities

- Peer review of assessment instruments;
- Vetting of marking rubrics;
- Calibration of marking expectations;
- Approval of final instrument version.

5.3 Records

- Moderation Forms
- Vetting Logs
- Approval Sign-off Sheets

(Ref: EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1D – Instrument Vetting)

6. Marking Moderation

6.1 Objective

To ensure consistency across assessors.

6.2 Activities

- Sampling of marked scripts;
- Cross-marker comparison;
- Adjustment or recalibration where needed;
- Resolution of discrepancies.

6.3 Oversight

Moderation is overseen by the Assessment Committee / Academic Lead and reported to the Examination Board. (Ref: EM5.5 Table 5.5A – Marking & Moderation)

7. Post-Assessment Review & Analysis

Post-assessment review is conducted in accordance with EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1F.

7.1 Analysis Areas

- Pass/fail distribution trends;
- Assessment difficulty indicators;



- Marker consistency;
- Student feedback on clarity and fairness;
- Appeals and irregularities.

7.2 Risk Identification

Patterns indicating academic risk include:

- Abnormal failure spikes;
- Inconsistent marking clusters;
- Repeated appeals on same module;
- Assessment validity concerns.

7.3 Reporting

Findings are consolidated into:

- Moderation Reports
- Post-Assessment Analytics Reports
- Examination Board Review Papers

8. Integration with Internal Assessment & CAPA

Where systemic issues are identified:

- Findings are escalated under EM6.1 Internal Assessment Framework;
- Corrective Actions are logged into CAPA;
- Root cause analysis is conducted;
- Closure is tracked via QA monitoring.

This ensures moderation feeds into institutional QA governance.

9. Governance and Oversight

Governance arrangements align with EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1G:

- **Examination Board**
Endorses moderation outcomes and results
- **QA Committee**
Monitors moderation quality and CAPA
- **Academic Board**
Provides policy direction for systemic risks
- **Assessment Committee**
Executes operational moderation

10. Documentation & Record Control

All moderation records are:

- Controlled documents;
- Audit-traceable;
- Retained according to QA retention policy.



11. Review of Procedure

This procedure shall be reviewed at least once every two years, or earlier if triggered by:

- Internal assessment findings;
- Regulatory updates;
- Examination risks;
- External audit recommendations.



Assessment Irregularities & Misconduct Procedure

1. Purpose

This procedure establishes the formal framework for identifying, investigating, escalating, and resolving assessment irregularities and academic misconduct at Kepler Global Institute (KGI).

It safeguards:

- assessment validity,
- academic integrity,
- fairness to students, and
- institutional credibility.

This procedure is developed with explicit reference to:

- EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1A (Policy Statement – Assessment Integrity)
- EM5.5 Table 5.5A – Academic Integrity Component
- EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1F (Assessment Monitoring & Review)

It operates within the Evaluation & Review stage of the KGI Curriculum Framework.

2. Scope

This procedure applies to:

- all assessments,
- all students,
- all staff involved in assessment delivery,
- all examination cycles.

It covers suspected or confirmed:

- cheating,
- plagiarism,
- collusion,
- unauthorised assistance,
- impersonation,
- breach of exam security,
- administrative irregularities.

3. Guiding Principles

KGI adopts a fair, evidence-based, and proportionate approach:

- natural justice applies,
- confidentiality is maintained,
- decisions are documented,
- penalties are consistent,



- educational intent is considered.

Irregularities are treated as both:

- disciplinary matters
- quality assurance risks

4. Irregularity Classification Framework

Irregularities are classified into:

Level 1 – Minor

Procedural or unintentional breaches

Level 2 – Moderate

Assessment advantage obtained but reversible

Level 3 – Major

Deliberate fraud, impersonation, or systemic breach

Classification determines escalation authority.

5. Detection & Reporting

Irregularities may be identified through:

- invigilator reports
- plagiarism systems
- moderation findings
- student complaints
- QA audits
- post-assessment analytics

All cases must be logged in the Assessment Incident Register.

6. Investigation Procedure

6.1 Initial Review

Academic Lead conducts fact verification

6.2 Evidence Collection

Scripts, logs, recordings, witness statements

6.3 Student Representation

Student given opportunity to respond

6.4 Case Documentation

Formal incident dossier prepared

7. Escalation Authority



Level	Decision Authority
Minor	Academic Lead
Moderate	Assessment Committee
Major	Examination Board

Major cases must be tabled at the Examination Board.

8. Outcomes & Penalties

Possible outcomes include:

- warning
- re-submission
- mark adjustment
- assessment voiding
- suspension from assessment
- award withholding

All outcomes must be:

- ✓ proportionate
- ✓ documented
- ✓ auditable

9. Integration with QA & CAPA

Systemic irregularities trigger:

- CAPA under internal QA
- root cause analysis
- procedural review
- staff training interventions

This links directly to EM5.5 monitoring expectations.

10. Governance Oversight

- Examination Board endorses major decisions
- QA Committee monitors trends
- Academic Board reviews systemic risks

Irregularity data informs policy refinement.

11. Records & Confidentiality

All records are:

- confidential



- access-restricted
- retained under QA document control

12. Review of Procedure

Reviewed biennially or earlier if triggered by:

- integrity breaches
- audit findings
- regulatory change



Appeals & Special Consideration Governance Procedure

1. Purpose

This procedure establishes governance controls for:

- assessment appeals
- deferment requests
- special consideration
- re-sit authorisation

It ensures fair treatment while protecting academic standards.

Developed with reference to:

- EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1D (Results & Appeals)
- EM5.5 Table 5.5A – Appeals Component
- EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1G (Governance Structure)

2. Scope

Applies to all students requesting:

- result review
- marking appeal
- compassionate deferment
- medical re-sit
- assessment reconsideration

3. Appeal Principles

Appeals are governed by:

- fairness
- transparency
- independence
- evidence
- academic integrity

Appeals do not automatically guarantee outcome change.

4. Appeal Grounds

Valid grounds include:

- procedural error
- bias or unfair marking
- administrative irregularity



- documented medical or compassionate hardship

Dissatisfaction alone is insufficient.

5. Appeals Process

5.1 Submission

Student files formal appeal within timeline

5.2 Preliminary Review

Administrative compliance check

5.3 Academic Review

Independent reassessment or moderation

5.4 Appeals Panel Decision

Formal determination issued

6. Special Consideration Framework

Special consideration may be granted for:

- certified illness
- family emergency
- trauma or hardship
- approved accessibility accommodation

Options include:

- deferment
- alternative assessment
- re-sit
- adjusted timeline

7. Examination Board Oversight

The **Examination Board**:

- reviews appeals trends
- endorses high-impact decisions
- monitors fairness consistency
- safeguards award integrity

This ensures institutional accountability.

8. Monitoring & QA Integration

Appeals data feeds into:

- QA trend analysis
- CAPA framework



- curriculum review
- assessment improvement

This aligns with the Evaluation & Review stage of the Curriculum Framework.

9. Documentation & Records

Appeal records are:

- confidential
- audit-traceable
- securely retained

10. Review of Procedure

Reviewed at least every two years or earlier if:

- appeal volume spikes
- systemic risks identified
- audit recommendation issued



Results Ratification & Release Procedure

1. Purpose

This procedure establishes the formal governance controls for the ratification, release, amendment, and protection of student assessment results at Kepler Global Institute (KGI).

It ensures that:

- Assessment outcomes are valid, complete, and standardised;
- Results are formally endorsed prior to release;
- Errors and post-release amendments are tightly controlled; and
- Result data contributes to institutional quality assurance and management review.

This procedure is developed with explicit reference to:

- EM5.5 Clauses 5.5.1D–5.5.1G (Results endorsement, appeals linkage, and governance); and
- EM6.2 Clauses 6.2.1A–6.2.1F (Management Review, CAPA, and governance oversight).

2. Scope

This procedure applies to:

- All assessment results for **all courses and programmes**;
- All modes of delivery (on-site, online, blended);
- All academic cycles, including re-sits and deferred assessments.

3. Guiding Principles

In accordance with EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1A, results management at KGI is governed by the following principles:

- **Accuracy** – results reflect verified assessment outcomes;
- **Integrity** – results are protected from unauthorised alteration;
- **Transparency** – students are informed through formal channels;
- **Accountability** – approval authority is clearly defined; and
- **Auditability** – all actions are documented and traceable.

Results ratification is recognised as a high-risk academic control point.

4. Results Ratification Framework

Results ratification is conducted in accordance with:

- EM5.5 Table 5.5B (Assessment Process Overview – Stage 6: Result Endorsement); and
- The Evaluation & Review stage of the KGI Curriculum Framework.

The framework consists of four controlled phases:

1. Pre-ratification validation
2. Examination Board endorsement



3. Controlled release to students
4. Post-release correction and review

5. Pre-Ratification Validation

Prior to submission to the Examination Board, the Academic and QA teams shall verify that:

- Marking and moderation processes are completed;
- All assessment components are accounted for;
- Grade calculations and weightings are accurate;
- Irregularities, appeals, or special considerations are resolved or flagged.

Supporting documents include:

- Moderation reports;
- Result summary sheets;
- Appeals and irregularities logs (if applicable).

(Ref: EM5.5 Clauses 5.5.1D & 5.5.1F)

6. Examination Board Ratification

6.1 Authority

In accordance with EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1G, the Examination Board has sole authority to:

- Review aggregated assessment outcomes;
- Endorse or withhold results;
- Approve progression and award decisions; and
- Direct corrective actions where anomalies are identified.

6.2 Decision Outcomes

The Examination Board may:

- Approve results for release;
- Request further review or moderation;
- Defer ratification pending investigation; or
- Invalidate affected results.

All decisions are formally minuted.

7. Results Release Control

Following ratification:

- Results are released only through approved institutional systems;
- Release timelines and communication channels are standardised;
- Provisional results are clearly labelled where applicable.

No result may be released prior to Examination Board endorsement.

(Ref: EM5.5 Table 5.5A – Results & Appeals Component)



8. Post-Release Corrections & Amendments

8.1 Permissible Corrections

Post-release amendments are permitted only for:

- Administrative or computational errors;
- Outcomes of approved appeals;
- Resolution of assessment irregularities.

8.2 Approval & Documentation

All corrections must:

- Be approved by the Examination Board (or delegated authority);
- Be supported by documented evidence;
- Maintain version control and audit trails; and
- Be communicated formally to affected students.

Unauthorised alteration of results constitutes a serious governance breach.

9. Integration with Appeals & Special Consideration

Results ratification and release operate in coordination with:

- EB-5 Assessment Irregularities & Misconduct Procedure; and
- EB-6 Appeals & Special Consideration Governance Procedure.

Where appeals or special consideration cases are pending, results may be:

- Withheld; or
- Released conditionally, subject to final determination.

10. Monitoring, Review & Management Oversight

Results data contributes directly to institutional review under EM6.2 Management Review, including:

- Analysis of pass/fail trends;
- Award and progression statistics;
- Appeals and correction frequency; and
- Identification of systemic academic risks.

Findings are:

- Logged into CAPA where required;
- Reviewed by QA and Management Committee; and
- Escalated to the Academic Board for strategic direction.

11. Records & Data Protection

All result records are:

- Confidential and access-restricted;



- Retained in accordance with document control policies; and
- Protected in compliance with data protection requirements.

12. Review of Procedure

This procedure shall be reviewed at least once every two years, or earlier if triggered by:

- Assessment integrity incidents;
- Internal assessment or audit findings;
- Management review outcomes; or
- Regulatory updates.



Certification & Award Validation Procedure

1. Purpose

This procedure establishes the governance framework for validating academic awards prior to certification at Kepler Global Institute (KGI).

It ensures that:

- Only students who have met approved academic requirements receive awards;
- Certification reflects ratified Examination Board decisions;
- Award integrity is protected from administrative or procedural error; and
- Institutional credibility is preserved.

This procedure is developed with explicit reference to:

- EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1A (Assessment integrity and governance)
- EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1E (Assessment plan and Examination Board oversight)
- EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1G (Strategic governance structure)

It operates within the Evaluation & Review stage of the KGI Curriculum Framework.

2. Scope

This procedure applies to:

- All certificates, diplomas, and academic awards issued by KGI;
- All graduating cohorts;
- All re-sit and deferred completion cases.

3. Guiding Principles

Award validation is governed by:

- academic legitimacy,
- Examination Board authority,
- audit traceability,
- student fairness,
- regulatory compliance.

No award may be issued without formal validation.

4. Award Validation Framework

Award validation consists of four controlled stages:

1. Eligibility verification
2. Results confirmation
3. Examination Board endorsement
4. Certification authorisation



This framework ensures that certification is an academic decision, not an administrative act.

5. Eligibility Verification

Academic Services verifies:

- completion of all assessment components;
- satisfaction of progression rules;
- resolution of appeals or misconduct cases;
- fulfilment of attendance or participation requirements (where applicable).

Supporting documents include:

- final result sheets,
- moderation records,
- appeals closure records,
- Examination Board minutes.

(Ref: EM5.5 Table 5.5C – Assessment Plan Oversight)

6. Examination Board Award Endorsement

The Examination Board:

- confirms academic eligibility;
- validates award classification;
- endorses award lists;
- authorises certification.

No certificate may be generated without Examination Board endorsement.

All decisions are minuted and archived.

7. Certification Control

Certificates are:

- generated from controlled award registers;
- serialised and tracked;
- issued under dual authorisation;
- protected against duplication or unauthorised reproduction.

Digital certification follows equivalent security controls.

8. Correction and Revocation

Award corrections or revocations require:

- formal Examination Board approval;
- documented justification;
- version-controlled records;
- reissuance tracking.



Revocation is treated as a high-risk academic event.

9. Governance Oversight

Governance aligns with EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1G:

- Examination Board validates awards
- Academic Board oversees policy direction
- QA Committee audits award integrity
- Management Committee monitors trends

10. Records & Audit Trail

All award validation records are:

- retained under QA document control,
- audit traceable,
- protected for regulatory review.

11. Review of Procedure

Reviewed biennially or triggered by:

- award disputes,
- audit findings,
- certification risks,
- regulatory changes.



Assessment Records Management Procedure

1. Purpose

This procedure establishes the framework for managing assessment records to ensure:

- integrity of academic evidence,
- traceability of student outcomes,
- secure retention,
- controlled retrieval.

Assessment records form the evidentiary foundation of academic awards.

This procedure is aligned with:

- EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1F (Monitoring and Review)
- EM5.5 Clause 5.5.1G (Governance and compliance)
- EduTrust and ERF evidence retention expectations

2. Scope

Applies to all assessment records, including:

- examination scripts,
- assignments,
- grading rubrics,
- moderation reports,
- appeals files,
- award registers,
- assessment analytics,
- Examination Board minutes.

3. Record Classification

Assessment records are classified as:

Academic Evidence Records

(student submissions, marking)

Governance Records

(moderation, Board minutes)

Administrative Records

(appeals, logs, registers)

Each category has defined retention timelines.

4. Retention Framework



Records must be retained:

- for regulatory audit requirements;
- for appeals and disputes;
- for institutional QA review;
- for certification verification.

Retention schedules align with EduTrust evidence expectations.

No academic record may be destroyed without authorisation.

5. Storage & Security Controls

Records are protected through:

- restricted access permissions;
- encrypted digital storage;
- locked physical archives;
- version control tracking;
- access logging.

Assessment evidence is treated as sensitive academic data.

6. Retrieval & Access

Records may be accessed only for:

- appeals and disputes,
- audit and QA review,
- regulatory inspection,
- academic verification.

All access must be logged.

7. Data Integrity Safeguards

Safeguards include:

- checksum or system validation (digital);
- tamper-proof storage (physical);
- dual verification for changes;
- audit trails for retrieval.

Unauthorised alteration constitutes a governance breach.

8. Disposal & Archival

Expired records may be archived or disposed only with:

- QA authorisation;
- documented destruction logs;



- secure disposal methods.

9. Governance Oversight

- QA Committee monitors record control
- Examination Board relies on records for ratification
- Academic Board ensures policy compliance

Assessment records are institutional academic assets.

10. Review of Procedure

Reviewed at least every two years or earlier if triggered by:

- audit findings,
- record breach,
- legal dispute,
- regulatory updates.