

**NON-PROFIT JOINT STOCK COMPANY
"ABAI KAZAKH NATIONAL PEDAGOGICAL UNIVERSITY"**



APPROVED

by the decision of the Board of Directors
non-profit joint stock company "Abai
Kazakh National Pedagogical University"
May "19" 2021, Protocol No.6
Chairman of the Board of Directors
G.I. Issimbaeva



REGULATION

on the assessment of the activities of the Board of Directors, the
Management Board, the Internal Audit Service and the Corporate Secretary
of the non-profit joint-stock company
"Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University"

Almaty, 2021

1. General provisions

1. This Regulation on the assessment of the activities of the Board of Directors, the Management Board, the Internal Audit Service and the Corporate Secretary of the Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University (hereinafter referred to as the Regulation) has been developed in accordance with the current legislation of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Corporate Governance Code of a non-profit joint stock University in the field of higher and postgraduate education, the University Charter and regulates the assessment process.

2. The main objective of the assessment is to improve the performance of the Board of Directors, the Management Board, the Internal Audit Service and the Corporate Secretary.

3. The assessment is carried out by the Board of Directors and allows:

1) determine the strengths and weaknesses (advantages and disadvantages) of the work of the Board of Directors, the Management Board, the Internal Audit Service and the Corporate Secretary;

2) adjust the directions of activities of the Board of Directors, Management Board, Internal Audit Service and Corporate Secretary;

3) determine the effectiveness of the remuneration system for independent members of the Board of Directors, the Chairman and members of the Management Board, the head and employees of the Internal Audit Service and the Corporate Secretary;

4) determine the need for training and advanced training for members of the Management Board, employees of the Internal Audit Service and the Corporate Secretary.

4. The Board of Directors can carry out the following types of assessment:

1) evaluation of own work, members of the Board of Directors, Committees of the Board of Directors;

2) evaluation of the activities of the Management Board and its Chairman;

3) assessment of the activities of the Internal Audit Service and its head;

4) assessment of the activities of the Corporate Secretary.

5. The assessment is carried out by the Board of Directors on an annual basis, taking into account the corresponding assessment of the Committee for Personnel, Remuneration and Social Issues. Assessment methods for Board of Directors are self-assessment or the use of an independent consultant to improve the quality of the assessment. An independent external consultant is engaged at least once every three years.

6. The assessment should be carried out in accordance with the following principles:

1) objectivity;

2) the regularity of the assessment and refinement of the assessment indicators;

3) consistency.

4) realism;

5) confidentiality.

7. The assessment can be carried out by questionnaires and/or with the involvement of persons providing consulting services (hereinafter referred to as the consultant) or in other ways by decision of the Board of Directors.

8. The Corporate Secretary is the person responsible for the annual assessment of the activities of the Board of Directors as a whole and each member, the Management Board as a whole and its Chairman, IAS in general and its head, as well as the Corporate Secretary.

9. The Sole Shareholder can make his own assessment of the Board of Directors independently or with the involvement of an independent consultant. When assessing by the Sole Shareholder, the results of the assessment carried out by the Board of Directors, the results of the University's activities are taken into account.

2. Assessment process

10. The decision to conduct the assessment is made by the Board of Directors. The decision to conduct an assessment determines the timing (schedule) of the assessment, assessment procedure and tools, required resources (materials, information, reports) and other required documents.

11. If a decision is made to engage a Consultant for the assessment, this decision must be supported by a specific justification. In particular, the following cases may be the basis for attracting the Consultant:

- 1) the need for a critical assessment of the activities of the Board of Directors, the Management Board, the Internal Audit Service and the Corporate Secretary;
- 2) lack of effective results of the previous assessment;
- 3) before important corporate events, such as the formation of a new composition of the Board of Directors;
- 4) other cases determined by the decision of the Board of Directors.

12. The assessment is carried out annually following the completion of the audit of the annual financial statements.

13. The assessment process is coordinated by the Chairman of the Board of Directors.

14. The results of the assessment are discussed at a closed meeting of the Board of Directors, which is attended only by members of the Board of Directors and the Corporate Secretary.

15. At this meeting, the members of the Board of Directors should conceptually discuss the activities of the Board of Directors, the Management Board, the Internal Audit Service and the Corporate Secretary and identify the factors that reduced the efficiency of their work, and propose ways to improve efficiency, discuss a number of key problems of management and control over the University's activities.

16. Overall, the assessment process should stimulate discussion:

- 1) the roles and functions of the Board of Directors, its Committees, the Management Board, the Internal Audit Service and the Corporate Secretary;
- 2) duties of the Board of Directors, its Committees, members of the Board of Directors, Management Board, IAS and the Corporate Secretary;



3) priorities for the work of the Board of Directors, its Committees, members of the Board of Directors, Management Board, IAS and the Corporate Secretary;

4) the current procedures for the work of the Board of Directors, including the practice of preparing and holding meetings of the Board of Directors, their regularity, issues of information support for the activities of the Board of Directors;

5) the current position of the University and the prospects for its development;

17. Based on the results of the discussion, feedback is organized, which should be constructive and specific.

18. When discussing the evaluation results of the Management Board and its Chairman, IAS and its head, the evaluated are not present. These persons should not be involved in the process of evaluating their activities.

19. Based on the results of the assessment, the Board of Directors may take the following measures:

1) highlight several main tasks/areas on which the Board of Directors, the Management Board, the Internal Audit Service and the Corporate Secretary should focus;

2) make recommendations to the plans and methods of work of the Board of Directors, members of the Board of Directors, the Chairman and members of the Management Board, the Internal Audit Service and the Corporate Secretary;

3) take into account the results of the assessment when electing the Chairman of the Management Board-Rector and members of the Management Board, the head and employees of the Internal Audit Service, as well as the Corporate Secretary.

20. Forms for the assessment of the members of the Board of Directors are sent by the Corporate Secretary of the University within 3 (three) business days from the date of the decision by the Board of Directors on the assessment.

21. Weaknesses in the work are those criteria according to which the average score was below 2 with a three-point score, with a five-point score below 3, which require attention from the Board of Directors, the Management Board, the Internal Audit Service and the Corporate Secretary.

22. The results of the assessment can be disclosed to the Sole Shareholder of the University upon his request in the manner prescribed by the Charter and internal documents of the University.

23. The Corporate secretary, who organizes and processes the collected information, is responsible for its objectivity and confidentiality.

24. Information on specific results for each type of assessment can be classified as confidential and not subject to disclosure. The independent consultant's report on the assessment results, as well as the questionnaires completed by each member of the Board of Directors, are classified as confidential information and are stored in accordance with the internal documents of the University.

3. Assessment of the activities of the Board of Directors, Committees and members of the Board of Directors

25. The criteria for assessing the activities of the Board of Directors as a whole are:

1) understanding by members of the Board of Directors of their powers and priorities;

2) strategic importance and constructivism in work (the Board of Directors carries out strategic management of the University, is a constructive critic of the Management Board);

3) the influence of the Board of Directors on the mission and development strategy of the university;

4) regular participation of members of the Board of Directors at meetings of the Board of Directors;

5) availability of sufficient opportunities for communication with members of the Management Board of the University, in addition to meetings of the Board of Directors;

6) effective management of the work of the Board of Directors by the Chairman of the Board of Directors;

26. An individual assessment of the activities of the members of the Board of Directors allows them to intensify their participation in the work of the Board of Directors and find opportunities to improve the efficiency of the Board of Directors as a whole.

27. The criteria for assessing the performance of members of the Board of Directors are:

1) professional experience;

2) knowledge of the specifics of the industry;

3) constructive suggestions;

4) strategic vision;

5) attendance at meetings;

6) preparation for meetings;

7) teamwork;

8) active participation in the discussion of issues at meetings.

28. When assessing the activities of the Committee of the Board of Directors, it is recommended:

1) comparison of the Committee's activities with the current Regulations on it;

2) assessment of the compliance of the results of the Committee's activities with the expectations of the Board of Directors.

3) take into account the provision of substantiated recommendations on the discussed issues within the framework of its competence to the Board of Directors;

29. The board of directors in the course of the performance assessment should determine up to three areas on which it is necessary to focus its work in the next year.

30. To assess the performance of the Board of Directors as a whole, the Committees of the Board of Directors and members of the Board of Directors, each member of the Board of Directors shall fill out a questionnaire in accordance with Appendices 1-5.

4. Assessment of the activities of the Board of Directors, Committees and members of the Board of Directors

31. When assessing the activities of the IAS, the compliance of the IAS activities with the approved Regulation on the Internal Audit Service and the compliance of the IAS activities with the effectiveness of the audited departments of the university are taken into account.

32. Evaluation of the activities of the IAS and its head is carried out in order to revitalize and improve the efficiency of its activities.

33. The criteria for assessing the activities of the IAS in general are:

1) independence of IAS from the Management Board and structural divisions of the University;

2) the objectivity of the IAS in the performance of the duties assigned to them;

3) the efficiency of work, expressed in the efficiency of the work of the structural divisions of the University based on the results of the internal audit;

4) efficiency of interaction between IAS and the Management Board of the University;

5) the qualitative level of the composition of the IAS (in terms of the knowledge and experience of its employees);

6) succinct and concise description of the main issues and risks in the reports;

7) the level of conclusions to the agenda items that meet the expectations of the members of the Board of Directors;

8) systematic advanced training by the head of the IAS and his employees.

34. The criteria for assessing the activities of the IAC head are:

1) actual knowledge, experience and skills of the IAS manager;

2) ensuring maximum efficiency of internal audit for the University;

3) constant awareness of the latest changes in the professional field (standards, legislation, etc.);

4) the ability to competently reason the revealed violations during the discussion at the meetings of the Board of Directors;

5) the ability to defend their position;

6) ensuring the timely execution of the Annual Audit Plan;

7) ensuring the competent preparation of the text of the reports;

8) timely submission of quarterly and annual reports to the Board of Directors for consideration.

35. The Audit Committee of the Board of Directors conducts a preliminary assessment of the activities of the Internal Audit Service and its head and submits its results to the Corporate Secretary for a final assessment at a meeting of the Board of Directors.

36. Discussion, generalization, and final assessment of the activities of the Internal Audit Service and its head is carried out by the Board of Directors. To assess the Internal Audit Service as a whole and its head, a questionnaire is filled out in accordance with Appendix 6.

5. Assessment of the activities of the Management Board and the Chairman of the Management Board - Rector

37. The criteria for evaluating the activities of the Management Board are:

1) effective implementation by the Management Board of the University of the tasks assigned to it;

2) availability of actual knowledge, experience and skills of the members of the Management Board, allowing them to exercise effective management of the University;

3) ensuring the unity of goals and objectives in the work of the Management Board of the University;

4) ensuring the quality of materials submitted by the Management Board of the University to meetings of the Board of Directors that meet the requirements of the members of the Board of Directors;

5) provision of reports of the Management Board of the University at meetings of the Board of Directors, which provide sufficiently objective, clear, capacious information for making informed decisions;

6) the ability of the Management Board of the University to take all necessary measures for the high-quality and timely implementation of the Development Strategy of the University;

38. The criteria for assessing the activities of the Chairman of the Management Board are:

1) effective management of the University;

2) timely execution of decisions of the Sole Shareholder and the Board of Directors;

3) the ability to build an effective corporate governance system in the University;

4) ensuring effective interaction with the Sole Shareholder and the Board of Directors;

5) the manifestation of initiative to achieve the set strategic goals;

6) a high level of accountability and timely notification of the Board of Directors about the fulfillment of the assigned tasks;

7) a high level of strategic vision and knowledge of the industry;

8) high level of preparedness for meetings of the Board of Directors;

9) compliance of the behavior of the Chairman of the Management Board with good business practices.

39. To assess the Management Board as a whole and the Chairman of the Management Board-Rector, each member of the Board of Directors, except for the Chairman of the Management Board-Rector, completes a questionnaire in accordance with Appendix 7.

6. Assessment of the activities of the Corporate Secretary

40. When assessing the activities of the Corporate Secretary, the following is carried out:



- 1) comparison of the activities of the Corporate Secretary with the norms of the Charter of the University and the Regulations on the Corporate Secretary;
- 2) assessment of the organization of meetings of the Board of Directors;
- 3) assessment of the performance by the Corporate Secretary of his functional duties;
- 4) assessment of the effectiveness of interaction with the Sole Shareholder and the Board of Directors.

41. The criteria for assessing the activities of the Corporate Secretary are:

- 1) providing detailed explanations to the members of the Board of Directors;
- 2) development of the annual Work Plan of the Committees and the Board of Directors;
- 3) ensuring the implementation of the Work Plan of the Committees and the Board of Directors;
- 4) timely provision of the requested information to the members of the Board of Directors;
- 5) advance the agenda and materials to the members of the Board of Directors;
- 6) clarification to the members of the Board of Directors of the provisions of the documents submitted for consideration by the Board of Directors;
- 7) ensuring control over the implementation of decisions of the Board of Directors;
- 8) ensuring the timely exchange of information between the Board of Directors and the bodies of the University.

42. To assess the Corporate Secretary, each member of the Board of Directors fills out a questionnaire in accordance with Appendix 8.

7. The processing technique and the procedure for considering the assessment results

43. Completed questionnaires are forwarded to the Corporate Secretary.

44. The corporate secretary processes the data received in the questionnaires by:

- 1) calculating the average values of numerical information according to the questionnaire completed by each member of the Board of Directors;
- 2) calculating the overall average value for each of the evaluation criteria (Board of Directors, Committees of the Board of Directors, Management Board, Internal Audit Services and Corporate Secretary), which characterizes the overall performance assessment;
- 3) information about all comments, recommendations and wishes for each object of assessment in such a way that it reflects the entire range of opinions, but without names of the authors.

45. Generalized assessment results and information on risks and development zones are submitted by the Corporate Secretary to the Chairman of the Board of Directors for study and further discussion at a meeting of the Board of Directors.

46. During this meeting, the Chairman of the Board of Directors grants all members of the Board of Directors the right to speak on the assessment results,



collects their proposals on measures aimed at improving the performance of the assessment objects. At the same time, members of the Board of Directors can, if they wish, disclose their anonymity, i.e. to report exactly what ratings, comments and recommendations each of them gave.

47. The decision of the Board of Directors on the directions and specific measures for the development and improvement of the activities of the Board of Directors, members of the Board of Directors, Committees of the Board of Directors, members of the Board of Directors, the Management Board, the Internal Audit Service and the Corporate Secretary shall become the result of consideration of the assessment results at the meeting.

8. Final provisions

48. The criteria for the assessment should be periodically revised to reflect changes in the corporate documents of the University.

49. Approval of the Regulation, as well as the introduction of amendments and additions to the Regulation, including changes in the evaluation criteria, falls within the competence of the Board of Directors.

50. This Regulation comes into force from the date of its approval by the Board of Directors.



Form for assessing the work of the Board of Directors

Instructions for filling!

1. TO BE COMPLETED BY EACH OF THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS IN RESPECT OF CONFIDENTIALITY.

2. On a scale of 1 to 5, mark your opinion on the following questions/statements:

- 1- completely disagree
- 2- rather disagree
- 3- take a neutral position
- 4- rather agree
- 5- completely agree

3. If the application of certain issues, in your opinion, is inapplicable to the University and/or the work in the perspective of which the issue is raised is not established in the University, please make comments/recommendations/suggestions.

4. Based on the results of filling out the questionnaire, the Corporate Secretary displays the total number of responses with a mark from 1 to 5 and calculates the average value of the numerical information, as well as compiles a list of comments, recommendations, wishes, etc.

№	Criteria for evaluation	Score in points	Comments/recommendations/wishes
1.	Members of the Board of Directors understand their competence and priorities		
2.	The Board of Directors demonstrates its strategic importance and constructivism (the Board of Directors carries out strategic management of the university, is a constructive critic of the Management Board)		
3.	Influence of the Board of Directors on the mission and development strategy of the university		
4.	Members of the Board of Directors regularly participate in in-person meetings of the Board of Directors		



5.	Availability of sufficient opportunities for communication with members of the Management Board of the University, in addition to meetings of the Board of Directors	
6.	The Chairman of the Board of Directors effectively manages the work of the Board of Directors	
7.	Please name up to three areas in which you think the Board of Directors should focus its efforts next year.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3.
<p>Average score:</p>		

Handwritten signature

Form for assessing the work of the Audit Committee of the Board of Directors

Instructions for filling:

1. TO BE COMPLETED BY EACH OF THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS IN RESPECT OF CONFIDENTIALITY.
2. On a scale of 1 to 5, mark your opinion on the following questions/statements:
 - 1- completely disagree
 - 2- rather disagree
 - 3- take a neutral position
 - 4- rather agree
 - 5- completely agree
3. If the application of certain issues, in your opinion, is inapplicable to the University and/or the work in the perspective of which the issue is raised is not established in the University, please make comments/recommendations/suggestions.
4. Based on the results of filling out the questionnaire, the Corporate Secretary displays the total number of responses with a mark from 1 to 5 and calculates the average value of the numerical information, as well as compiles a list of comments, recommendations, wishes, etc.

№	Criteria for evaluation	Score in points	Comments/recommendations/wishes
1.	Assistance in the establishment of an effective system of control over the insurance, financial and economic activities of the University		
2.	Paying sufficient attention to monitoring the reliability and efficiency of internal control and risk management systems		
3.	Adequate experience and qualifications of the members of the Committee and making a significant contribution to the work of the Committee		
4.	Obtaining by the members of the Board of Directors of sufficient information from the Committee for informed decision-making on the issues considered by the Committee		
5.	Organization and efficiency of Committee meetings. Conducting meetings of the Committee with a sufficient degree of regularity and duration to discuss issues within its competence		



6.	Paying sufficient attention to the discussion of the plan, resources and powers of the Internal Audit Service of the University, as well as consideration of the reports of the Internal Audit Service		
Average score:			



Form for assessing the work of the HR, Remuneration and Social Issues Committee of the Board of Directors

Instructions for filling!

- 1. TO BE COMPLETED BY EACH OF THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS IN RESPECT OF CONFIDENTIALITY.**
- 2. On a scale of 1 to 5, mark your opinion on the following questions/statements:**
 - 1- completely disagree
 - 2- rather disagree
 - 3- take a neutral position
 - 4- rather agree
 - 5- completely agree
- 3. If the application of certain issues, in your opinion, is inapplicable to the University and/or the work in the perspective of which the issue is raised is not established in the University, please make comments/recommendations/suggestions.**
- 4. Based on the results of filling out the questionnaire, the Corporate Secretary displays the total number of responses with a mark from 1 to 5 and calculates the average value of the numerical information, as well as compiles a list of comments, recommendations, wishes, etc.**

№	Criteria for evaluation	Score in points	Comments/recommendations/wishes
1.	Assistance in establishing an effective system for electing or appointing candidates to the Management Board, the Internal Audit Service, and the Corporate Secretary.		
2.	Development of recommendations on the policy and structure of remuneration for members of the Management Board		
3.	Comparative analysis of the level and policy of remuneration of members of the Management Board and other employees in comparison with similar companies in terms of scale and type of activity and informing the Board of Directors		
4.	Obtaining by the members of the Board of Directors of sufficient information from the Committee for informed decision-making on the issues considered by the Committee		



5.	Adequate experience and qualifications of the members of the Committee and making a significant contribution to the work of the Committee		
6.	Organization and efficiency of Committee meetings. Conducting meetings of the Committee with a sufficient degree of regularity and duration to discuss issues within its competence		
Average score:			



Form for assessing the work of the Strategic Planning Committee of the Board of Directors

Instructions for filling!

1. TO BE COMPLETED BY EACH OF THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS IN RESPECT OF CONFIDENTIALITY.

2. On a scale of 1 to 5, mark your opinion on the following questions/statements:

1- completely disagree

2- rather disagree

3- take a neutral position

4- rather agree

5- completely agree

3. If the application of certain issues, in your opinion, is inapplicable to the University and/or the work in the perspective of which the issue is raised is not established in the University, please make comments/recommendations/suggestions.

4. Based on the results of filling out the questionnaire, the Corporate Secretary displays the total number of responses with a mark from 1 to 5 and calculates the average value of the numerical information, as well as compiles a list of comments, recommendations, wishes, etc.

№	Criteria for evaluation	Score in points	Comments/recommendations/wishes
1.	Preparation of recommendations regarding the development strategy, including issues of efficiency of the University in the long term		
2.	Paying sufficient attention to the consideration of the development strategy and its semiannual refinements		
3.	Providing recommendations on the main types of activities within its competence in accordance with the instructions of the Board of Directors and / or the provisions of the internal documents of the University		
4.	Obtaining by the members of the Board of Directors of sufficient information from the Committee for informed decision-making on the issues considered by the Committee		
5.	Adequate experience and qualifications of the members of the Committee and making a significant contribution to the work of the Committee		

6.	Organization and efficiency of Committee meetings. Conducting meetings of the Committee with a sufficient degree of regularity and duration to discuss issues within its competence	
Average score:		

Form for assessing the work of members of the Board of Directors

Instructions for filling!

1. TO BE COMPLETED BY EACH MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS IN COMPLIANCE WITH CONFIDENTIALITY, INCLUDING THE SELF-ASSESSMENT OF EACH MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

2. On a scale from 1 to 3, mark the score your opinion corresponds to:

1- satisfactory

2 - good

3- excellent

3. Based on the results of filling out the questionnaire, the Corporate Secretary displays the total number of responses with a mark from 1 to 3 and calculates the average value of the numerical information, as well as compiles a list of comments, recommendations, wishes, etc.

FULL NAME of the member of the Board of Directors	Professional experience	Knowledge of university direction specifics	Constructive proposals	Strategic vision	Attendance at meetings	Preparing for meetings	Teamwork	Active participation in discussion of issues at meetings
Member of the Board of Directors 1								
Member of the Board of Directors 2								
Member of the Board of Directors 3								
Member of the Board of Directors 4								
Member of the Board of Directors 5								
Average score:								

Comments of a member of the Board of Directors: in this section, a member of the Board of Directors may note, inter alia, what factors prevent him from showing his skills and knowledge that affect the level of participation at meetings of the Board of Directors, areas (areas) in which he needs to improve his knowledge and etc.

Form for assessing the work of the Internal Audit Service and its head

Instructions for filling!

1. TO BE COMPLETED BY EACH OF THE MEMBERS OF THE AUDIT AND RISKS COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, IN PRIVACY OF PRIVACY.

2. On a scale of 1 to 5, mark your opinion on the following questions/statements:

- 1- completely disagree
- 2- rather disagree
- 3- take a neutral position
- 4- rather agree
- 5- completely agree

3. If the application of certain issues, in your opinion, is inapplicable to the University and/or the work in the perspective of which the issue is raised is not established in the university, please make comments/recommendations / suggestions.

4. Based on the results of filling out the questionnaire, the Corporate Secretary displays the total number of responses with a mark from 1 to 5 and calculates the average value of the numerical information, as well as compiles a list of comments, recommendations, wishes, etc.

Criteria for evaluation		Score in points	Comments/recommendations/wishes
Assessment of the work of the Internal Audit Service			
1.	Independence of IAS from the Management Board and structural divisions of the University		
2.	Objectivity of IAS in the performance of their duties		
3.	Efficiency of work, expressed in the efficiency of work of structural divisions of the University based on the results of internal audit		
4.	Effectiveness of interaction between IAS and the Management Board of the University		
5.	Qualitative level of IAS staff (in terms of knowledge and experience of its employees)		
6.	Capacious and concise description of the main issues and risks in reports		

7.	The level of conclusions to the agenda items that meet the requirements of the members of the Board of Directors		
8.	Systematic advanced training by the head of the IAS and his employees		
Assessment of the performance of the Head of the Internal Audit Service			
1.	Actual knowledge, experience and skills of an IAS leader		
2.	Ensuring maximum efficiency of internal audit for the University		
3.	Constant awareness of the latest changes in the professional field (standards, legislation, etc.)		
4.	Ability to competently argue the violations revealed during the audit during the discussion at the meetings of the Board of Directors		
5.	Ability to defend own position		
6.	Ensuring the timely execution of the Annual Audit Plan		
7.	Ensuring the correct preparation of the text of the reports		
8.	Timely submission of quarterly and annual reports to the Board of Directors for consideration		
Average score:			



Form for assessing the work of the Management Board and its Chairman

Instructions for filling!

1. TO BE COMPLETED BY EACH MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS IN COMPLIANCE WITH CONFIDENTIALITY, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD.

2. On a scale from 1 to 5, mark the score that corresponds to your opinion on the following questions:

1- completely disagree

2- rather disagree

3- take a neutral position

4- rather agree

5- completely agree

3. Based on the results of filling out the questionnaire, the Corporate Secretary displays the total number of responses with a mark from 1 to 5 and calculates the average value of the numerical information, as well as compiles a list of comments, recommendations, wishes, etc.

Criteria for evaluation		Score in points	Comments/recommendations/wishes
Assessment of the Management Board of the University			
1.	Effective implementation by the Management Board of the University of the tasks assigned to it		
2.	Availability of actual knowledge, experience and skills of the members of the Management Board, allowing them to carry out effective management of the University.		
3.	Ensuring the unity of goals and objectives in the work of the Management Board of the Society, command		
4.	Ensuring the quality of materials submitted by the Management Board of the University to meetings of the Board of Directors that meet the requirements of the members of the Board of Directors		
5.	Submission of reports from the Management Board of the University at meetings of the Board of Directors, giving sufficiently objective, clear, capacious information for making informed decisions		
6.	Ability of the Management Board of the University to take all necessary measures for high-quality and timely implementation of the Development Strategy of the University		



7.	Timely and full implementation of instructions from the Board of Directors		
Average score:			
Assessment of the work of the Chairman of the Management Board			
1.	Effective management of the University		
2.	Timely execution of decisions of the Sole Shareholder and the Board of Directors		
3.	Ability to build an effective corporate governance system in the University		
4.	Ensuring effective interaction of the University with the Sole Shareholder and the Board of Directors		
5.	Taking initiative to achieve the set strategic goals		
6.	High level of accountability and timely notification of the Board of Directors about the fulfillment of the assigned tasks		
7.	High level of strategic vision and industry knowledge		
8.	High level of preparedness for meetings of the Board of Directors		
9.	Compliance of the Chairman's conduct with good business conduct practice		
Average score:			

Assessment of the work of the Corporate Secretary

Instructions for filling!

1. **TO BE COMPLETED BY EACH MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS IN COMPLIANCE WITH CONFIDENTIALITY, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD.**
2. **On a scale from 1 to 5, mark the score that corresponds to your opinion on the following questions:**
 - 1- completely disagree
 - 2- rather disagree
 - 3- take a neutral position
 - 4- rather agree
 - 5- completely agree
3. **Based on the results of filling out the questionnaire, the Corporate Secretary displays the total number of responses with a mark from 1 to 5 and calculates the average value of the numerical information, as well as compiles a list of comments, recommendations, wishes, etc.**

№	Criteria for evaluation	Score in points	Comments/recommendations/wishes
1.	Providing detailed explanations to the members of the Board of Directors		
2.	Development of the annual work plan of the Committees and the Board of Directors		
3.	Ensuring the implementation of the Work Plan of the Committees and the Board of Directors		
4.	Timely provision of requested information to members of the Board of Directors		
5.	Advance submission of the agenda and materials to the members of the Board of Directors		
6.	Clarification to members of the Board of Directors of the provisions of documents submitted for consideration by the Board of Directors		



7.	Ensuring control over the implementation of decisions of the Board of Directors		
8.	Ensuring the timely exchange of information between the Board of Directors and the bodies of the University		
Average score:			

