

INNOVATIVE MECHANISMS OF MANAGEMENT OF MODERN EDUCATION SYSTEMS: FOREIGN APPROACHES**Nazarov Sarvarbek Madaminjonovich**

“University of Economics and Pedagogy”

(non-governmental higher education institution)
Senior Lecturer of the Department of “Economics”.

Tel: +99899 326 77 54

E-mail: nsarvarbek13@gmail.com**Abstract**

This scientific article studies the specific features of management mechanisms in the education system of different countries, their institutional structure and effectiveness based on comparative analysis. In particular, the experiences of Finland, South Korea and Singapore are used to analyze centralization and decentralization, school autonomy, quality assessment and control systems. The results of the study show that effective education management is based on a balance between central standards and local autonomy. The thesis also compares the reforms being implemented in the education system of Uzbekistan with foreign experience and develops scientifically based proposals and recommendations for its improvement.

Keywords

Education system, management mechanisms, decentralization, centralization, school autonomy, education policy, quality assessment, KPI, foreign experience, digitalization, education reforms

Introduction. Effective management of the education system is a strategic development factor for every society. In recent decades, many countries have restructured their education policies, providing school autonomy and introducing new mechanisms to ensure quality. According to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), since the 1980s, countries such as Australia, Canada, Finland, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom have carried out profound reforms to decentralize school governance to the local level, delegating decision-making powers over curricula and financial and human resources to schools and local communities. However, the responsibility for monitoring the quality of education at the national level and setting standards still remains with central authorities.

This thesis analyzes the governance mechanisms in the education system of different countries (Finland, South Korea, Singapore and other OECD countries), their strengths and weaknesses, and compares them with the experience of Uzbekistan.

Methods. The study was conducted based on the analysis of regulatory and legal documents and a review of scientific literature. First of all, analytical reports, methodological recommendations and recommendations of international organizations such as OECD, EU Eurydice, NCEE and UNESCO on education policy, governance mechanisms and quality assessment systems were used. Statistical data were studied comprehensively. Information on quality assurance in Finland was obtained from the Eurydice portal and the materials of the Finnish National Agency for Education. Information on local autonomy and education management in South Korea was obtained from UNESCO Education Profiles and the Korean “Local Education Autonomy Law”. Information on the Singapore education system was analyzed from NCEE (National Center on Education and the Economy) reports. Also, analytical

tables in the OECD report “How decentralized are education systems” and official statistical documents of Finland, Singapore and Korea were studied.

During the analysis, systematic and comparative approaches were used: the governance structures, the main decision-making levels in education policy (central, regional, local, school) and quality assurance mechanisms in each country were compared, and their similarities and differences with reforms in the education system of Uzbekistan were analyzed.

Results. The process of modernization of management in the education system of Uzbekistan is being implemented in stages on the basis of the Law “On Education” adopted in 2020 and Decrees No. PF-51, PF-76 and PF-190 approved by the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. These regulatory and legal documents are aimed at deepening institutional reforms in education management, ensuring the integration of state and public administration, introducing independent mechanisms for assessing the quality of education, and increasing management efficiency based on KPIs.

The analytical report of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development entitled “How decentralized are education systems” notes that since the 1980s, many countries have been observing a trend towards decentralizing education management, that is, granting schools institutional autonomy. However, the level of responsibility for the socio-economic outcomes of decisions varies significantly across countries. According to the report, schools make an average of 63 percent of decisions on the organization of the educational process at the local level, but only 20 percent of these decisions are made on the basis of full autonomy. This situation indicates the dominance of a limited decentralization model in educational management. At the same time, key decisions on personnel policy, curriculum development and strategic planning in most cases remain within the competence of central management bodies, which serves to ensure uniform standards and quality control in the education system.

The Finnish education system is known worldwide for its high performance and equity. In the 1990s, the management of education in Finland was transferred from the central ministry to local schools and municipalities. Schools have gained broad authority over the recruitment of teachers, the adaptation of curricula to local conditions, and the allocation of resources. Quality assurance in Finland is not focused on “control” but on advice and continuous improvement: school inspections were abolished in the early 1990s. Education providers are responsible for assessing the quality of their own activities and for self-evaluation; at the same time, they are obliged to participate in regular external evaluations. National-level evaluations are carried out by the Finnish Centre for Educational Evaluation (FINEEC); the results of the evaluations are used not for ranking schools, but for improving the educational process.

According to the National Center for Education and the Economy (NCEE) in the United States, there are three main institutions governing the Finnish education system: the Ministry of Education and Culture oversees general policy and funding; the National Agency for Education (EDUFI) develops national curricula and implements policy; and the Center for Educational Evaluation conducts independent evaluations. More than 300 municipalities are responsible for the day-to-day management of schools, the allocation of funds, and the recruitment of staff; they can also delegate these powers to their schools. Only 2 percent of schools in Finland are private, the rest are publicly funded.

Although South Korea's education system has historically been centralized, the Local Education Autonomy Law, passed in 1991, gave local governments significant authority. This law gave 17 provincial and 176 district education boards the authority to set educational policies that are important to their communities. Each district has a superintendent who oversees and coordinates the operation of preschool, elementary, and secondary schools. While private kindergartens and schools, as well as foreign schools, are allowed to operate in Korea, they must adhere to the national curriculum and meet standards set by local superintendents.

Local education boards have the authority to evaluate and report on the performance of public and private schools.

Singapore's education system is known for its high performance, and its governance model is largely centralized. The NCEE analysis shows that the Ministry of Education (MOE) oversees all levels of education from kindergarten to higher education, appointing teachers and principals. Schools are grouped into clusters by area; each cluster is led by a superintendent who supports the ministry's policies at the local level and brings schools together to share experiences. In Singapore, the quality assurance process begins with school self-assessments and development plans based on the School Excellence Model; every six to seven years, ministerial teams visit schools and review the assessment results.

The ministry's Higher Education Group manages the Technical Education Institute and higher education institutions, giving them wide autonomy to monitor quality. Singapore is also a leader in the application of digitalization and artificial intelligence to the educational process: digital education plans have been developed since 1997, and the 2023 plan "Transforming Education through Technology: Masterplan 2030" focuses on digital literacy, personalized learning, and digital support for teachers.

Table 1

"Educational Management in Foreign Countries"

№	Country	Governance model	Key mechanisms/principles
1	Finland	Devolution and trust (decentralization)	Broad autonomy for schools and municipalities; self-evaluation and external evaluation by FINEEC; high trust in teachers
2	South Korea	Medium-centralized, but local autonomy	The Local Education Autonomy Law gives local education authorities the power to set policies; superintendents supervise schools; schools follow the national curriculum; assessment results are published by local authorities.
3	Singapore	Centralized governance and cluster model	The Ministry of Education (MOE) governs education at all levels. It appoints teachers and principals; schools are grouped into clusters and operate under the supervision of a superintendent; schools self-evaluate and undergo external evaluation by the ministry every 6–7 years.
4	OECD General Trends	Decisions are moving to the local level, but central standards are maintained	63% of decisions on the educational process are made locally, but only 20% with full autonomy; many decisions on personnel and planning remain at the central level.

Discussion. The results of the analysis show that there are several common principles for the management of the education system in foreign experience.

First, Finland and other Scandinavian countries transfer management to municipalities and manage schools on the basis of the principle of “trust and professionalism”; teachers are given wide autonomy, provided that they are highly qualified. This approach allows you to adapt curricula to local needs and stimulate innovation. The Finnish experience shows that combining self-assessment and external evaluation, focusing on development goals rather than ratings, increases effectiveness.

Secondly, the example of South Korea shows a model based on central standards, but giving wide powers to local authorities. In Korea, the 1991 “Local Education Autonomy Law”

made it possible to adapt education policy to community needs and adapt the educational process to local conditions. At the same time, the national curriculum, quality control, and assessment system remain under central control, which ensures stability in state policy and uniformity in the quality of education.

Third, Singapore's education system is highly centralized, with the ministry having the authority to appoint teachers and principals, approve curricula, and conduct examinations. However, even in this model, school development plans are supported by cluster superintendents, schools self-assess, and there is a focus on improving teacher skills through digitalization. Such centralized governance allows for rapid implementation of reforms, digitalization, and artificial intelligence in the short term, but it can limit the scope for independent decision-making by schools.

OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) data show that decentralization can have a positive impact on student outcomes, but at the same time, school principals are burdened with increased responsibility and central authorities must retain control over educational standards and assessment processes. Therefore, it is important to find a balance between centralization and decentralization in effective governance.

Taking into account foreign experience, the following recommendations can be made to further improve the education system in Uzbekistan:

1. Gradual expansion of municipal and school autonomy. Based on the Finnish experience, local authorities and schools could be given broader powers to organize the educational process, recruit personnel, and manage financial resources. Along with these powers, schools should introduce self-evaluation methods and develop development plans based on the results of external evaluation. Markaziy standartlar va baholash tizimini mustahkamlash.

2. The experience of countries such as Korea and Singapore shows that setting curricula and implementing quality control at the central level serves to maintain the uniformity of educational quality. The National Agency for Education Quality Assurance of Uzbekistan can use the practices of Finland and Singapore (development-oriented assessment, not rating) in developing external evaluation mechanisms.

3. Piloting the superintendence and cluster approach. In Singapore, superintendents are strengthening collaboration between schools and implementing ministry initiatives at the local level. In Uzbekistan, clusters of several schools could be formed to share experiences and develop a support system.

4. Digitalization and the use of artificial intelligence. Singapore's experience shows that digital learning platforms and AI tools can empower teachers to enhance their individual approach and make data-driven decisions. Uzbekistan's work on the integration of "digital diary" and education statistics is an important step in this direction; the introduction of AI tools may also be envisaged in the future.

Conclusion. Analysis of foreign experience shows that effective management of the education system relies on multi-factor institutional mechanisms. In particular, in modern approaches, education management is carried out through a functional balance between state and public institutions, an independent and impartial system of quality assurance, and data-driven management based on digital technologies.

Scientifically, this situation can be explained within the framework of the theory of institutional economics: efficiency in the education system is determined not only by the distribution of resources, but also by the mutual compatibility and effective functioning of management institutions. In this regard, the Finnish model, based on the concept of "trust and

professional autonomy”, provides teachers and schools with a high level of independence, which serves to improve the quality of human capital and stimulate innovative approaches.

The experience of South Korea demonstrates a hybrid management model, that is, a combination of centralized standards and local autonomy is provided. This approach allows you to adapt the content of education to regional needs while maintaining institutional stability. In the Singapore model, centralized management is reinforced by a strong digital infrastructure, cluster system and strategic planning mechanisms, which allows achieving high results in the short term.

The results of the study show that the most effective management model is not absolute centralization or complete decentralization, but their optimal combination. This concept is interpreted in modern scientific literature as “adaptive governance” or “multi-level governance”.

The reforms being implemented in the education system of Uzbekistan are taking shape in accordance with these international trends. In particular, the integration of state and public administration, the establishment of independent assessment agencies, the assessment of school principals based on KPIs and the introduction of digital platforms are important manifestations of systemic changes.

At the same time, the following scientifically based areas will be of priority for further improvement of educational management in the future:

- ensure an institutional balance between local autonomy and central control;
- develop independent and transparent mechanisms for assessing the quality of education;
- introduce a decision-making system based on digital technologies and artificial intelligence;
- ensure management efficiency by improving the quality of human capital.

In conclusion, it can be noted that improving the management of the education system is not limited to organizational reforms, but requires the comprehensive development of institutional, digital and human capital factors.

REFERENCES

1. Republic of Uzbekistan. Law "On Education". - Tashkent, 2020.
2. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Decree No. PF-51 "On measures to radically improve the education system". - Tashkent, 2023.
3. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Decree No. PF-76 "On measures to improve the management of the preschool and school education system". - Tashkent, 2024.
4. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Decree No. PF-190 "On increasing the efficiency of management and expanding digitalization in the education system". - Tashkent, 2025.
5. Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Resolutions and regulatory legal acts in the field of education.
6. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. How decentralized are education systems? – Paris: OECD Publishing.
7. UNESCO. Education Profiles: Republic of Korea. - Paris: UNESCO.
8. National Center on Education and the Economy. Singapore Education System Analysis Reports.
9. Eurydice Network. Finland Education System Overview.
10. Finnish Education Evaluation Center. Education Evaluation in Finland.
11. Government of the Republic of Korea. Local Education Autonomy Law. - 1991.