

6. Гидрология, климатология, су ресурстары экономикасы және т.б. саласындағы ғылыми зерттеулерді дамыту қажет.

Осылайша, Қазақстан Республикасындағы су ресурстарының қазіргі жай-күйі шектелуімен, біркелкі бөлінбеуімен, сапасының нашарлауымен, трансшекаралық ағынға жоғары тәуелділігімен және климаттың өзгеруінің теріс әсерімен сипатталады.

Ел экономикасы мен халқын тұрақты сумен жабдықтауды қамтамасыз ету үшін суды үнемдеу технологияларын енгізу, судың сапасын жақсарту, трансшекаралық ынтымақтастықты дамыту және су ресурстарын басқару жүйесін жетілдіру қажет. Тек кешенді және үйлестірілген тәсілдерді кеңінен енгізу арқылы Қазақстанға су дағдарысын еңсеруге және болашақта су қауіпсіздігін қамтамасыз етуге болады.

Қаржыландыру туралы ақпарат. Бұл зерттеуді Қазақстан Республикасы Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігінің Ғылым комитеті қаржыландырды, «Жамбыл облысының ауыл шаруашылығы саласында трансшекаралық су ресурстарын тиімді пайдалану бойынша шешімдер қабылдаудың ақпараттық-талдау жүйесін әзірлеу» №BR24993128 гранты.

Пайдаланылған әдебиеттер тізімі

1. Анализ экономических инструментов в сфере водоснабжения и водотведения в Республике Казахстан / Под ред. д.э.н. проф. Есекиной Б.К. – Астана, 2016. – 88 с.

2. Концепция развития системы управления водными ресурсами Республики Казахстан на 2024-2030 годы, утвержденная Постановлением Правительства Республики Казахстан от 5 февраля 2024 года №66. – URL: <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/P2400000066> (Дата обращения 29.06.2025).

3. Водный кодекс Республики Казахстан от 9 апреля 2025 года №178-VIII ЗРК. – URL: <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/K2500000178> (Дата обращения 03.07.2025).

4. Комплексный план развития водной отрасли Республики Казахстан на 2024-2028 годы, утвержденная Постановлением Правительства Республики Казахстан от 28 августа 2024 года №694. – URL: <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/P2400000694> (Дата обращения 03.07.2025).

UDC 347.91/.95

ON THE ISSUE OF UNIFORMITY OF JUDICIAL PRACTICE IN RESOLVING CORPORATE DISPUTES ON INVALIDATION OF TRANSACTIONS IN KAZAKHSTAN

Baikenzhina Sh.T., Academician E.A. Buketov Karaganda University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan

Annotation. The article is devoted to the analysis of issues of compliance with the uniformity of judicial practice in Kazakhstan in the resolution of corporate disputes related to the recognition of transactions as invalid. The study examines the legal grounds for invalidating corporate transactions. As a result of the invalidity of the corporate transaction, the key problems arising in the judicial practice of the Republic of Kazakhstan have been identified. When analyzing some cases in civil cases, the approaches of courts to resolving such disputes are analyzed, including civil cases on corporate disputes that were canceled by the cassation instance. A special focus is on the need to ensure legal certainty and predictability of court decisions in order to form a uniform practice and a stable corporate environment. Based on the results of the analysis of judicial practice, recommendations are proposed to improve law enforcement practice to achieve greater uniformity in resolving corporate disputes, which can help increase the confidence of the business community in the judicial system and strengthen the rule of law in the economic sphere. This research was conducted as part of the preparation of a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) and will form the basis for writing a chapter on compliance by courts of the Republic of Kazakhstan with uniform judicial practice in resolving corporate disputes.

Keywords: corporate dispute, uniformity of judicial practice, court, revision of judicial acts, judicial decision

Introduction

The dynamics of the growth of corporate disputes is becoming a noticeable phenomenon in the Republic of Kazakhstan. This can be explained both by the rapid growth of market relations and the transformation of corporate legislation in general. The fairly confident economic development of Kazakhstan generates interest in corporate law and corporate governance.

It should be noted that the law enforcement practice in the field of corporate dispute regulation in Kazakhstan is still at the stage of formation. However, the analysis of judicial practice shows that the number of corporate disputes is growing in an arithmetic progression. In this aspect, the role of specialized inter-district economic courts that consider and resolve corporate disputes becomes much more significant. These courts are primarily aimed at identifying problematic issues in order to make fair, reasoned and high-quality decisions. Corporate disputes require in-depth study of the merits of the cases under consideration, and sometimes special knowledge in various fields of economics, technology, medicine, agriculture and other fields.

Specialized inter-district economic courts were established on February 9, 2002 by Decree of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, which were authorized to consider economic disputes, including corporate ones[1].

According to part 1 of Article 27 of the Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan (hereinafter – CPC RK), specialized inter-district economic courts consider and resolve civil cases on property and non-property disputes, corporate disputes. The parties to the court proceedings are:

- 1) individuals engaged in individual entrepreneurial activity without forming a legal entity;
- 2) legal entities [2].

Accordingly, if the party to the dispute is an individual, then this dispute is not subject to the jurisdiction of a specialized court and is subject to consideration in the district court for civil cases. If the parties to the dispute are non-profit organizations, for example, a state-owned legal entity (state institution, state enterprise, etc.), then such disputes are subject to resolution in specialized economic courts.

Given the growing relevance of corporate disputes, Article 27 of the CPC of the Republic of Kazakhstan gives the concept of these disputes, the composition of the parties to the dispute, and also provides a complete list of possible corporate disputes [3].

In Kazakhstan, the concept of "corporate dispute" at the legislative level has been sufficiently broadly defined in 2 stages. The CPC of the Republic of Kazakhstan from 1999 outlined the range of corporate disputes not as widely as the CPC of the Republic of Kazakhstan from 2015. The new CPC has significantly expanded the categories of disputes resolved by specialized inter-district economic courts and related to corporate ones.

Methods and materials

For a deep understanding of the specifics of corporate disputes on invalidation of transactions, judicial practice was analyzed on an open online Internet resource. Civil cases that were considered by the appellate and cassation instances were studied on the electronic platform of the Judicial Cabinet of the Republic of Kazakhstan. When studying the acts of the courts of the first, appellate and cassation instances, a comparative legal research method was applied. The regulatory framework governing the resolution of corporate disputes in the Republic of Kazakhstan has also been studied.

Results

To date, the bulk of corporate disputes are resolved in court. We suggest skipping the description of procedural and alternative ways to resolve corporate disputes out of court. Because we believe that this area is widely studied by modern civilists and is actively discussed in legal circles. Before turning to the issue of uniformity of judicial practice in resolving corporate disputes on invalidation of transactions in Kazakhstan, we consider it necessary to disclose some definitions such as "uniformity" and "judicial practice".

According to paragraph 4 of the Normative Resolution of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated January 15, 2016 No. 1 "On the right of access to Justice and the powers of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan to review judicial acts", uniformity of judicial practice, characterized by uniform approaches to the interpretation and application of legal norms by courts, is achieved not only through the adoption by the Supreme Court of normative decisions clarifying issues judicial practice, but also as a result of the cassation review of judicial acts of lower courts [4]. Unfortunately, the frequent review of corporate disputes on the invalidity of transactions by the cassation instance suggests that the courts of first instance do not always adhere to the principle of uniformity. There are also many cases when the appellate instance leaves the decision of the court of first instance, but the cassation instance comes to the conclusion about the revision of the primary decisions. When studying court decisions on corporate disputes, we paid special attention to those disputes that were reviewed in whole or in part by the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan, that is, by the cassation instance.

Court decisions on invalidation of transactions in corporate disputes must meet the following key requirements:

1. Stability and consistency. The decisions of the court of first instance should not differ in contrast from the decisions of the court adopted earlier in similar disputes. Also, in the reasoning part of the decision, the judge must justify, argue for this or that opinion.

2. Legality and validity. This norm is also enshrined in the CPC of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The law enforcement practice of Kazakhstan originates from the moment of independence and the establishment of domestic courts, including civil ones. When it comes to corporate disputes, we certainly represent disputes about invalidation of transactions. The most common types of such transactions can be called purchase and sale agreements, gift agreements, lease agreements, contract agreements and other reimbursable types of business transactions. Corporate disputes about the invalidity of transactions often affect the interests of a wide range of persons, namely, company participants, the board of directors, members of the executive body, shareholders, investors, creditors, and even the state apparatus. The main causes of such disputes can be called significant violations of the law, violation of internal local acts, violation of the terms of the contract, non-compliance with the provisions of the constituent documents, as well as conflict of interests.

Paragraph 6 of the Regulatory Resolution of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan "On certain issues of invalidity of transactions and the application by courts of the consequences of their invalidity" dated July 7, 2016 No. 6 clarified that when starting consideration of cases on invalidation of transactions and the application of the consequences of their invalidity, the courts must determine the subject and the basis of the claim on which the plaintiff applies to the court which circumstances relevant to the case have been established and which have not been established, what are the legal relations of the parties, and, depending on this, apply the norms of substantive law, which regulate the disputed legal relationship, and on the basis of these norms to resolve the claim[5].

As a rule, disputes on the recognition of transactions as invalid are of a rather conflicting nature. This is due to the fact that the party to the corporate dispute not only disputes a particular transaction, but also tries to prove in court the illegal actions of the other party. This, in turn, may serve as a transition of this dispute to the plane of criminal law.

Thus, it is possible to identify a step-by-step algorithm of the judge when considering a corporate dispute on invalidation of a transaction. First, the correct definition of the subject and the basis of the appeal to the court. These arguments should be popularly reflected by the plaintiff in the statement of claim. On the basis of the claim, the plaintiff usually refers to the current legislation, justifies which norms of substantive law were violated or not observed. Also, the plaintiff, in a corporate dispute, this is a legal entity, must cite the circumstances of the case in which the court must invalidate the transaction. In turn, the defendant, with his counterarguments, counter arguments, witness testimony and other methods not prohibited by civil procedural legislation, takes actions to convince the judge otherwise. It is in such corporate disputes that we can clearly see the principle of adversarial nature of the parties enshrined in the Code of Civil Procedure.

Based on the above, let's consider the cases on corporate disputes on invalidation of transactions, which we studied in the judicial office <https://office.sud.kz/>. This platform is publicly available if the user has an electronic digital signature for registering a personal account. Since judicial practice is formed on the basis of normative decisions of the Supreme Court, we considered it right to conduct a doctrinal analysis based on the Decisions of the judicial board for civil cases of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

As a first example, we would like to outline the outcome of a civil case that reached the cassation instance. On April 23, 2024, the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan considered a civil case on the claim of the prosecutor of the city of Nur Sultan (Astana) to invalidate the contract of sale of 100% of the share in the authorized capital of Shapagat Communal Market LLP. The agreement was concluded between Astana Social and Entrepreneurial Corporation JSC and Korkem-2005 LLP in 2019. By the decision of the specialized interdistrict economic court of the city of Nur Sultan (now Astana city), the claim was satisfied, court costs were distributed. By the decision of the judicial board for civil cases of the Astana city Court, that is, by the appellate instance, the decision of the court of first instance was left unchanged. Consequently, the appeals board agreed with the conclusions of the court of first instance. Further, the Court of Cassation instance – The Supreme Court overturned the decisions of the previous courts, which satisfied the prosecutor's claim. The Supreme Court found that the violations referred to by the plaintiff had not been proven, and the arguments about underestimating the value of the sale of the object were found to be unfounded. As a result, the court of cassation decided to dismiss the claim for invalidation of the contract and restoration of the parties to their original position [6]. Thus, the cassation judicial board recognized the conclusions of the local courts as inconsistent with the norms of substantive law and the established circumstances of the case.

On January 12, 2024, the Resolution of the Judicial Board for Civil Cases of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan regarding the petition of Altcompanygroup LLP to review the decisions of previous courts established the following. AlmatyCollectionGroup LLP has filed a statement of claim for invalidation of the transaction on the alienation of real estate made between Altcompanygroup LLP and QAZAQ BUILDING MANAGEMENT LLP. The courts of the first and appellate instances satisfied the plaintiff's claims, declaring the transaction invalid. The courts of both instances found that Altcompanygroup LLP failed to fulfill its obligations to the plaintiff and illegally alienated the property. The Supreme Court also refused to review the civil case, having found no significant violations of the norms of substantive and procedural law, which could become the basis for reviewing the corporate dispute. In this regard, the cassation instance concluded that the cassation petition itself does not contain indications of evidence sufficiently refuting the circumstances established in the case [7]. Based on this, it can be concluded that when considering a civil case by the courts of two instances, based on the evidence provided by the parties and other materials collected, all the circumstances of the dispute have been established, and the parties have been given an exhaustive opportunity to present their arguments and materials. Verification of the arguments set out in the cassation petition gives reason to believe that the judicial acts contested by the applicant are motivated and rendered in accordance with the law. Also, the arguments of the cassation petition concerning the assessment of evidence, facts and circumstances of the dispute do not confirm the admission of significant violations of the norms of substantive and procedural law by previous courts.

Consider a corporate dispute where several legal entities participated as defendants. By the resolution of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated January 30, 2024, the dispute between JSC "National Company "Kazakhstan Temir Zholy" (hereinafter - KTZ) and the state institution "Department of Land Relations of Taldykorgan", LLP "Darkhan-Kaysar", as well as the akimat of Taldykorgan was considered. The plaintiff, KTZ, disputed the standard contract for the purchase and sale of a land plot, which was concluded between the Department of Land Relations and Darkhan-Kaysar LLP. The plaintiff motivated his claims by the fact that the station tracks located on the disputed section are part of the mainline railway network and cannot be transferred to private ownership. Before the Supreme Court, the courts of the first and appellate instances declared the contract invalid, but the Supreme Court considered the decisions of previous instances erroneous and overturned these decisions, pointing to the incorrect application of the law. According to the Decision of the cassation instance, Darkhan-Kaysar LLP is the branch owner of the disputed area, its right of private ownership is inviolable and subject to protection. Thus, the Court found that the disputed railway tracks have been privately owned by Darkhan-Kaysar LLP since 2009 and are not part of the mainline network, therefore, their property rights are protected by law. As a result, the Supreme Court refused to satisfy the initial claims of KTZ [8].

The following corporate dispute is notable for the fact that at the stage of the cassation court, the plaintiff waives part of the claims. The Judicial Board for Civil Cases of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan, by a resolution dated June 4, 2024, considered a dispute between the National Bank of the Republic of Kazakhstan and several LLP companies, including PRIME System KZ and Altynstroy Corporation. The courts of the first and appellate instances satisfied the claim, declaring the transactions invalid. However, the Supreme Court overturned these decisions, pointing out that the plaintiff had not provided sufficient evidence of the imaginary or pretended transactions, as well as the absence of legal consequences from the commission of these transactions. The court decided to dismiss the claim of the National Bank and reimburse the defendant's legal expenses [9]. This civil case is notable for several aspects:

1. Challenging transactions based on hypocrisy and pretense. The National Bank of the Republic of Kazakhstan tried to prove that several transactions, including the contract of assignment of the right of claim, transfer and sale of shares in the LLP, were imaginary and fake. These transactions, according to the plaintiff, were made in order to evade obligations. The court case shows the importance of evidence for invalidating transactions on the basis of hypocrisy or pretense.

2. The importance of economic feasibility. One of the key arguments of the National Bank was the lack of economic feasibility of transactions for the parties, which, in his opinion, confirmed their imaginary nature. However, the Supreme Court ruled that the lack of economic benefit is not a sufficient reason to declare the transaction invalid if there is no other evidence of fraud or pretense.

3. The use of the guarantor in transactions. The case involved the issue of fulfillment of obligations on the part of the guarantor — Shadiev O.K., whose actions were also considered in the context of fulfillment of contractual obligations.

The Supreme Court took into account that Shadiyev fulfilled his obligations by paying off the debt, which influenced the refusal to recognize the transactions as invalid.

4. Waiver of claims during the cassation review. During the cassation review, the National Bank waived part of its claims, which also played a role in the final decision of the court.

Thus, the case demonstrates the complexity of corporate disputes related to challenging transactions, especially when it comes to hypocrisy and pretense, and also shows the importance of carefully proving the economic and legal validity of transactions.

Of the above-described cases in four civil cases, the Supreme Court overturned the decisions of previous instances in three disputes. Therefore, it is quite logical to conclude that today the courts of the Republic of Kazakhstan still do not comply with the uniform practice of resolving corporate disputes regarding the recognition of transactions as invalid. An analysis of judicial practice in such disputes shows that cases of cancellation of primary court decisions by the cassation instance are not uncommon. All the above-described decisions were considered in open court. Therefore, they are publicly available to users of the judicial office.

By raising the issue of overturning the decisions of the court of first instance, we in no way question the competence, professionalism and impartiality of the judiciary and do not try to form a critical opinion about their work. Undoubtedly, the workload on the judiciary is only increasing every year. In addition to the growing cases to consider, legislation in one area or another is changing very dynamically. The courts are forced to constantly monitor new changes and additions to legislative acts, update the decisions they make. With such a huge workload, it is not always possible to uniformly interpret and apply certain circumstances affecting the outcome of a corporate dispute. This explains the creation of specialized inter-district economic courts in each regional center and in cities of national importance. Of course, sometimes the outcome of a corporate dispute over the invalidity of a transaction is unprecedented. And then the judge bears the enormous responsibility of forming a new law enforcement practice. All corporate disputes on invalidation of transactions are of a property or material nature. In this regard, the outcome of the decision on such cases sometimes determines the future fate, financial stability and reputation of the company. This, in turn, can lead to a social effect, for example, a reduction in staff, a reduction in the salary fund and the rejection of some social preferences. Therefore, considering such a corporate dispute, the judge must understand the full social responsibility of the outcome of the case.

Unfortunately, Kazakhstan does not keep statistics on the cancellation of court decisions on corporate disputes. At least, we have not been able to find such information in the public domain. This measure is necessary not for any punitive or sanctions purposes, but for a full understanding of the reasons for interpreting the arguments of the parties and the specifics of disputes about the invalidity of transactions. It would also be correct to keep separate statistics or monitoring on judges considering corporate disputes and their cancelled decisions. This measure would be an excellent preventive mechanism for developing uniformity in such disputes.

In many countries, the quality of the judicial system is already being monitored. One of the mechanisms of such control is to conduct an internal audit of court decisions by collecting statistics. Based on the results of such an audit, a rating of judges is formed. Judges' ratings exist in developed countries such as the United States, Great Britain and Germany. For example, in the United States, judicial ratings are generated by private legal websites where authorized users can leave their informed reviews about judges, as well as professional organizations such as the American Bar Association. Also in Germany, the activity of judges is evaluated by a special agency charged with monitoring the effectiveness of justice.

We believe that open statistics on cancellations or corrections of court decisions will allow not only to assess the quality of judges' work, but also to identify systemic law enforcement errors in their activities. The desire to control the quality of the judicial system should not be interpreted as distrust of the judicial system. This mechanism is necessary to develop proposals for the formation of uniform practice in the application of legislation.

If we consider the international practice of resolving corporate disputes and invalidating transactions, then we can refer to the article by U. Bekmirazeva, "The significance of classification of corporate disputes". In particular, the article examines the experience of resolving such disputes between Germany and the United Kingdom. In these countries, disputes on invalidation of transactions arise not only within the corporation, but also between shareholders and other stakeholders. In both Germany and the UK, disputes related to the invalidity of transactions belong to a special category of corporate disputes [10].

The uniformity of judicial practice in corporate disputes, including in terms of invalidation of transactions, should answer the question: why did the court make such a decision when considering this dispute? And in this case, it is the highest instance in the person of the Supreme Court that is called upon to clarify certain norms of law in terms of their enforcement and in order to achieve legal certainty. Thus, the uniformity of judicial practice is associated with the duty of the Supreme Court to interpret certain legal relations consistently. It is also quite logical that the beginning of the text of most Regulatory Decisions of the Supreme Court begins with the following words "For the purpose of uniform and correct application of the current legislation ..."

Conclusion

In conclusion, we would like to note that the problem of uniformity of judicial practice in corporate disputes on invalidation of transactions is an important component not only of corporate law, but also of the entire legal system of Kazakhstan. Unfortunately, there are differences in the approaches of the courts when making decisions. This phenomenon, in turn, creates uncertainty not only for participants in a corporate dispute, but also for civil turnover in general, and also reduces the predictability of court decisions. In the course of the study, we tried to identify the main factors contributing to such discrepancies, among which is the lack of uniform standards for the interpretation of legislative norms and insufficient specification of legal positions.

Based on the above, we believe that in order to increase the level of uniformity of judicial practice in corporate disputes on invalidation of transactions, it is necessary to improve the legislative framework, as well as the active role of not only the cassation instance – the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan, but also the appellate instance. This role is to

formulate explanations and legal positions on complex issues not only of corporate law, but also of the entire civil law. In addition, an important step should be the development of a mechanism for legal continuity in judicial acts, which in turn will create a basis for developing more predictable decisions.

Ensuring the uniformity of judicial practice by the State is an important condition for protecting the rights and legitimate interests of participants in corporate relations. It is also necessary to consider the possibility of enshrining in the Code of Civil Procedure the principle of uniform application of legislation. The introduction of this principle will allow the judiciary to take a more responsible approach to the interpretation of certain legislative norms and to form a stable and uniform law enforcement practice.

References

1. Decree of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 803 dated February 9, 2002. <https://online.zakon.kz/>.
2. The Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan. <https://online.zakon.kz/lawyer?m=s#text=%D0%B3%D0%BF%D0%BA%20%D1%80%D0%BA&spos=1&tSuffix=1&swwhere=3&baseId=1>.
3. Commentary on the Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Astana, 2016. UDC 347 (574). ISBN 978-601-236-042-4. https://online.zakon.kz/Document/?doc_id=32469410&pos=1496;3#pos=1496;3.
4. Regulatory Resolution of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated January 15, 2016 No. 1 "On the right of access to justice and the powers of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan to review judicial acts" (as amended on 01/16/2023). Published: "Kazakhstanskaya Pravda" dated January 28, 2016 No. 17 (28143); IS "Reference Control Bank of the National Bank of the Republic of Kazakhstan in electronic form" October 25, 2016
5. Regulatory Resolution of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated July 7, 2016 No. 6 ON certain issues of invalidity of transactions and the application by courts of the consequences of their invalidity (with amendments and additions as of 10/07/2022). Published: Kazakhstanskaya Pravda dated July 21, 2016 No. 138 (28264); IS "Reference Control Bank NPA RK in electronic form" October 5, 2016
6. Resolution of the Judicial Board for Civil Cases of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated April 23, 2024 No. 6001-24-00-3gp/164. <https://office.sud.kz/>.
7. Resolution of the Judicial Board for Civil Cases of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated January 12, 2024 No. 6001-23-00-3G/6272. <https://office.sud.kz/>.
8. Resolution of the Judicial Board for Civil Cases of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated January 30, 2024 No. 6001-23-00-3GP/583. <https://office.sud.kz/>.
9. The decision of the judicial board on civil cases of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated June 4, 2024 No. 6001-24-00-3gp/252. <https://office.sud.kz/>.
10. U. Bekmirzaeva, The significance of classification of corporate disputes. EURASIAN JOURNAL OF LAW, FINANCE AND APPLIED SCIENCES, Volume 3 Issue 4, April 2023 ISSN 2181-2853 Page 208.

ӘОЖ 371.38

«АДАЛ АЗАМАТ» БАҒДАРЛАМАСЫНЫҢ ҚҰНДЫЛЫҚТАРЫН ДЕКОМПОЗИЦИЯЛАУ НЕГІЗІНДЕ БАСТАУЫШ МЕКТЕПТЕ ОҚУ-ТӘРБИЕ ПРОЦЕСІН БІРТҰТАСТАНДЫРУДЫ ЖҮЗЕГЕ АСЫРУДЫҢ МҮМКІНДІКТЕРІ

Бейсенбаева А.М., академик Е.А. Бөкетов атындағы Қарағанды университеті, Қарағанды, Қазақстан
Асетова Б.Ж., Е академик Е.А. Бөкетов атындағы Қарағанды университеті, Қарағанды, Қазақстан
Айдарбекова К.А., академик Е.А. Бөкетов атындағы Қарағанды университеті, Қарағанды, Қазақстан
Нургазиева Н.М., Астана халықаралық университеті, Астана, Қазақстан

Мемлекет басшысы Қасым-Жомарт Тоқаев 2023 жылғы 17 маусымда Түркістан қаласында өткен Ұлттық құрылтайдың «Адал адам – адал еңбек» атты екінші отырысында болашақ ұрпақты тәрбиелеу мәселесіне ерекше назар аудару қажеттігін атап өтіп, жас ұрпақты адал, отаншыл азамат етіп қалыптастыру, ұлттық бірегейлікті нығайту және қазіргі заманғы қазақстандық қоғамның жаңа құндылықтарын орнықтыру бағытында жүйелі әрі кешенді жұмыс жүргізілу керектігін тапсырды [1].

Осы тапсырма негізінде Қазақстан Республикасы Оқу-ағарту министрлігі 2023–2024 оқу жылында «Біртұтас тәрбие» бағдарламасын әзірлеп, оны мектепке дейінгі ұйымдарда, жалпы білім беретін мектептерде және техникалық және кәсіптік білім беру ұйымдарында пилоттық режимде енгізді. Аталған бағдарлама тәрбиенің мазмұнын ұлттық мүдде, ар-ұят, талап сынды базалық құндылықтарға негіздей отырып жүйелеуді көздейді [2]. Бұл тәсіл тәрбиелік процестің мазмұнын қоғамның рухани-мәдени қажеттіліктерімен үйлестіруге, сондай-ақ өскелең ұрпақтың бойында адамгершілік, азаматтық және патриоттық қасиеттерді қалыптастыруға бағытталған.

2024 жылғы 15 наурызда Атырау қаласында өткен Қазақстан Республикасының Президенті Қасым-Жомарт Кемелұлы Тоқаевтың қатысуымен ұйымдастырылған Ұлттық құрылтайдың «Адал адам – адал еңбек – адал табыс» атты үшінші отырысында Мемлекет басшысы ұрпақ тәрбиесіне кері әсер ететін заманауи сын-қатерлерге назар аударып, бұл үдерістерге қоғам болып бірлесе қарсы тұру қажеттігін ерекше атап өтті. Сонымен қатар, Президент ұлттық сана мен қоғамдық даму тұрғысынан өзекті болып табылатын, ұлттың жаңа келбетін қалыптастыратын құндылықтар жүйесін нақтылап көрсетті [3].