ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ VOLUME 5 ISSUE 7 JULY 2026

INSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATIONS AND GOVERNANCE MECHANISMS FOR DEVELOPING THE HUMAN CAPITAL OF GIFTED YOUTH IN UZBEKISTAN

Khasanova Ch

Master; Leading Specialist, Unit for Implementing the "President's Gifted Children" Initiative, Agency for Specialized Educational Institutions

DOI: 10.67620/sai.57b0011

ABSTRACT

This article examines the formal institutional design of Uzbekistan's system for identifying, developing, and supporting gifted youth. A structured qualitative document analysis was conducted using seven core national legal instruments in force on 1 January 2026, together with official institutional sources. The analysis maps four principal institutional actors, a coordinating layer, and an adjacent public-administration actor across five functions: identification, development, transition to foreign education, return and professional utilization, and information management. Five governance risks are identified at the level of regulatory design: overlapping eligibility routes for overseas support, fragmented information resources, unevenly specified responsibility during the school-to-university transition, weak continuity provisions for pupils who leave specialized institutions, and the absence of a shared system-level accountability framework. The article corrects two common interpretive errors. The statutory ratio of 1:15 applies to school advisers assigned to National Programme participants, whereas the 14 chief advisers coordinate adviser activity at regional level; the two groups cannot be used to calculate a 107:1 workload. Likewise, the annual quota of 200 places from 2027 equals 13.3% of the maximum annual Grade 9 intake of 1,500 only as a nominal ratio, not as an observed transition rate. A staged governance model is proposed: clarify priority and continuity rules, establish a data-exchange protocol based on a single participant identifier, and introduce shared outcome indicators. The findings concern de jure institutional design and require subsequent empirical validation.

ACCEPTED

02.08.26

Keywords: *gifted youth; institutional analysis; horizontal governance; human capital; inter-agency coordination; Uzbekistan.*

CC BY

1. Introduction

The development of gifted young people is inherently cross-sectoral. Identification normally begins in school, but the relevant trajectory may later include specialized education, international examinations, admission to foreign universities, scholarship financing, return obligations, employment, and long-term professional development. No single institution can govern this entire trajectory effectively without structured links to other institutions. The policy field therefore has the characteristics of a horizontal or cross-cutting governance domain: responsibilities are distributed among organizations that operate under different legal mandates, budgets, reporting lines, and information systems.

Uzbekistan has substantially expanded its institutional capacity in this field since 2019. Presidential Schools were formalized through a dedicated regulatory framework; the Agency for Youth Affairs was established in 2020; the network and regulation of specialized schools were expanded in 2022; and major reforms in 2025 reorganized the El-yurt umidi Foundation and introduced the President's Gifted Children initiative and its National Programme. These reforms created substantial capacity for early identification, specialized instruction, overseas education, and the return of scholarship holders. At the same time, institutions created through separate instruments do not automatically operate as a single system. Integration requires explicit rules on responsibility, priority, information exchange, continuity, and shared outcomes.

The governance problem examined in this article is therefore not whether individual institutions possess useful mandates. The central question is whether the formal rules connect the stages of the gifted-youth trajectory into a coherent institutional pathway. A system may contain strong organizations and generous instruments while still producing gaps at the boundaries between them. Such gaps may appear when two institutions are authorized to support similar candidates without a priority rule, when each organization maintains its own information resource, or when the formal responsibility of one actor ends before another actor's responsibility begins.

The article has three objectives. First, it maps the principal actors and the functional distribution of their mandates. Second, it identifies governance risks that arise from omissions, overlaps, or weak connections in the formal regulatory design. Third, it proposes an implementable integration model and a set of indicators that can later be populated with administrative data. The study does not claim to measure actual implementation, candidate behavior, institutional performance, or employment outcomes. It examines the de jure architecture in force on 1 January 2026 and treats identified gaps as hypotheses and formal design risks that require empirical verification.

Three research questions guide the analysis: (1) How are responsibilities for identification, development, overseas education, return, and information management distributed among the principal actors? (2) Which connections between these functions are explicitly regulated, and where do formal overlaps or omissions remain? (3) Which corrective measures can be implemented through administrative clarification, and which require broader inter-agency or presidential-level reform?

2. Literature Review and Analytical Framework

The institutional approach provides the first foundation for the analysis. North (1990) defines institutions as the formal and informal rules that structure interaction. This distinction is essential in regulatory research because a formal rule does not necessarily describe actual organizational practice. Scott's (2014) three-pillar framework further distinguishes regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive dimensions. The present study focuses primarily on the regulative pillar: legally stated authority, procedures, reporting relationships, and obligations. The findings should therefore be read as an assessment of formal design rather than a complete assessment of institutional performance.

The second foundation is the literature on horizontal coordination. Peters (1998) argues that coordination across organizations is among the most persistent challenges of public administration because agencies protect their mandates, resources, and policy identities. Hood's (1991) analysis of New Public Management helps explain why specialization may increase organizational focus while simultaneously weakening cross-organizational continuity. A policy field can become more technically capable but more fragmented if each specialized body optimizes its own outputs without responsibility for the complete trajectory of the target population.

Whole-of-government and joined-up-government approaches emerged as responses to this fragmentation. Christensen and Laegreid (2007) emphasize shared objectives, information, and accountability, while Pollitt (2003) warns that structural reorganization alone rarely produces integrated processes. Bouckaert, Peters, and Verhoest (2010) distinguish hierarchical, market, and network

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

coordination mechanisms and show that public systems normally combine them. For the gifted-youth field, hierarchy is visible in presidential and cabinet acts, while network coordination is required for data exchange, candidate handovers, and shared monitoring across organizational boundaries.

Strategic talent-management theory adds a third perspective. Collings and Mellahi (2009) argue that strategically important talent pools require differentiated institutional arrangements rather than ordinary human-resource procedures. At national level, Khilji, Tarique, and Schuler (2015) propose a macro perspective in which education, labor markets, migration, and public policy jointly shape a talent ecosystem. This perspective is directly relevant to gifted youth: the value of early identification is not realized at the moment of selection but through continuity from education to advanced training and productive employment.

On the basis of this literature, the article defines an institutional connection as a formal rule that links at least two actors, stages, datasets, or accountability processes. A governance risk is identified when one of three conditions is present: (a) a required function is not assigned to any actor; (b) two or more actors have materially similar mandates but no priority, referral, or information-sharing rule is specified; or (c) actors report outputs independently but no shared outcome framework connects their activities. This definition deliberately avoids treating every organizational overlap as a failure. Overlap may provide redundancy or wider access; it becomes a governance risk only when the rules for managing it are absent or unclear.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The study uses structured qualitative document analysis. Documentary analysis is appropriate when the research question concerns formally assigned authority, institutional status, procedural requirements, and legally defined relationships (Bowen, 2009). Content analysis strengthens this design by requiring explicit units of analysis, predefined analytical questions, and traceable links between conclusions and source provisions (Krippendorff, 2018; Mayring, 2014).

The analysis was designed as a legal-institutional mapping exercise rather than a quantitative content study. The original manuscript reported 148 coded rules, 41 linkage rules, and a 91.4% intra-coder agreement rate, but no clause-level dataset or recoding file was supplied. Those numerical claims have therefore been removed. The revised study reports only results that can be traced to identified legal provisions and provides a clause-level evidence map in Appendix A. No inter-coder or intra-coder reliability coefficient is claimed.

The temporal cutoff is 1 January 2026. Consolidated versions of legal instruments effective on that date were used. Amending instruments were not counted as separate empirical documents when their changes were already incorporated into a consolidated act. For example, PF-197 is treated as contextual evidence for amendments affecting public-administration internships and the El-yurt umidi relationship, not as a second independent source for provisions already incorporated into the relevant consolidated text. This rule prevents double-counting.

3.2 Corpus Selection and Version Control

A document was included when it met all of the following criteria: it was a national-level legal act; it established or materially regulated an institution or programme connected to gifted youth; it contained provisions relevant to at least one of the five functional stages; and it was in force on the cutoff date. Purely technical staffing or financial amendments were excluded unless they changed an institutional mandate. The resulting core corpus contains seven instruments. Later amendments and contextual acts were used only to interpret the consolidated texts and were not counted as additional core documents.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Table 1. Legal corpus and analytical treatment

Instrument	Institutional purpose	Relevant functions	Analytical status
PF-86 (15 May 2025)	President's Gifted Children initiative and National Programme	Identification; school advisers; platform; 200 annual overseas-education quotas from 2027	Core
PF-77 (5 May 2025)	Reorganization and scholarship rules of the El-yurt umidi Foundation	Overseas education; competitions and non-competitive routes; return and service obligations; scholarship-holder data	Core
PF-61 (26 March 2025)	Youth-policy measures, including the Yorqin iste'dod project	Social targeting and the policy origin of the later National Programme	Core
PF-106 (14 April 2022)	Expansion of the specialized-school network	Institutional development of specialized education	Core
CMR No. 526 (25 June 2019)	Regulation on Presidential Schools	School status, admission, curriculum, and graduation arrangements	Core
CMR No. 233 (5 May 2022)	Regulation on specialized boarding schools and specialized schools	Admission, educational stages, class size, progression, and removal rules	Core
CMR No. 550 (11 September 2020)	Regulation on the Agency for Youth Affairs	General youth-policy coordination, international participation, and the Youth Register	Core
PF-197 (29 October 2025)	Public-administration reform and internship coordination	Context for the adjacent role of the Management Efficiency Agency	Contextual; not separately counted

Note. CMR = Cabinet of Ministers Resolution; PF = Presidential Decree. Consolidated versions effective on 1 January 2026 were used. Amendments incorporated into consolidated texts were not double-counted.

3.3 Analytical Procedure

The unit of analysis was a provision or a semantically independent part of a provision. Each relevant provision was entered into an evidence matrix and examined through seven categories. The categories were used as analytical questions rather than as a basis for numerical frequency claims.

Table 2. Analytical framework

Category	Operational question
Institutional status	Which body is established, subordinated, or authorized?
Target population and coverage	Which age, educational stage, or candidate group is covered?
Function	Does the provision concern identification, development, overseas education, return, or information?
Decision authority	Who selects, approves, finances, monitors, or reports?
Connection rule	Is referral, data exchange, priority, or joint decision-making specified?
Continuity	Does the provision preserve support or records when a participant changes stage or institution?
Accountability	Is the result measured only at departmental level or through a shared outcome?

The analysis proceeded in four steps. First, actors and their legal mandates were mapped. Second, provisions were reorganized by function to reveal how the same stage was regulated across institutions. Third, potential gaps were identified using the operational definition stated above. Fourth, each proposed finding was checked against the legal text and classified according to evidence strength, system reach, and level of remedy. Numerical parameters in the acts were used only where the denominator and institutional meaning were clear. The study therefore distinguishes a statutory quantity from an observed outcome.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

3.4 Trustworthiness and Limitations

Trustworthiness is supported through source restriction, version control, clause-level traceability, and negative-case reasoning. Where the evidence did not justify a conclusion, the claim was narrowed. For example, the existence of several information systems does not prove that data are never exchanged in practice; it establishes only that a comprehensive exchange protocol was not identified in the selected legal corpus. Similarly, overlapping eligibility does not prove double financing; it establishes the need for a published priority and deduplication rule.

The study has four limitations. First, it is a de jure analysis and cannot establish actual organizational practice. Second, the legal landscape is dynamic; findings are tied to the 1 January 2026 cutoff. Third, foreign cases are illustrative rather than a systematic comparative dataset. Fourth, the document analysis was conducted by a single author, so interpretive decisions remain open to independent replication. These limitations are addressed by providing explicit source mappings and by framing the results as governance risks and empirically testable propositions.

4. Results

4.1 Institutional Field

The formal field is better described as four principal actors, one inter-agency coordinating layer, and one adjacent public-administration actor rather than as five equivalent institutions. The Research and Practical Centre operates within the Agency and should not be counted as an independent actor. Likewise, the Management Efficiency Agency has a specific role in public-service internship coordination but does not govern the entire gifted-youth system.

Table 3. Institutional actors and structures

Actor or structure	Coverage	Relevant mandate	Status in the field
Agency for Specialized Educational Institutions	Grades 5-11 and National Programme participants	Specialized schools, admission, school advisers, supplementary preparation, school-level information	Principal actor
Research and Practical Centre under the Agency	Applicants and pupils within the Agency system	Assessment, methodological support, and international assessment cooperation	Internal specialized structure
El-yurt umidi Foundation	Applicants to foreign study and internships; scholarship holders	Scholarship selection, financing, database maintenance, return and service obligations	Principal actor
Agency for Youth Affairs	Young people generally	Unified youth-policy coordination, international competitions and broad overseas-education support mandate; Youth Register	Principal actor with broad mandate
National Council and Republican Commission under PF-86	President's Gifted Children initiative	Strategic direction, inter-agency coordination, and quota-related decisions	Coordinating layer
Management Efficiency Agency	Public servants and public-sector talent	Demand formation and coordination for public-service internships; career-development interface	Adjacent actor

4.2 Functional Governance Mechanisms

Identification. The system contains several legitimate identification mechanisms serving different purposes. Specialized schools use entrance examinations for school admission. PF-86 authorizes the annual selection of up to 1,500 Grade 9 graduates for the National Programme. The El-yurt umidi Foundation applies scholarship eligibility and selection procedures to candidates already seeking foreign study or internships. These are not identical processes, but they create multiple candidate records that may later refer to the same person.

Development. Development functions are concentrated at school level. Presidential and specialized schools provide differentiated curricula, international programmes, advanced subject instruction, and supplementary courses. Under PF-86, National Programme participants are assigned to school advisers and

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

receive additional preparation through a dedicated platform during Grades 10 and 11. The statutory maximum ratio of participants to a school adviser is 1:15. PF-86 separately establishes a group of 14 chief advisers to coordinate the activity of school advisers across the regions. The chief advisers and school advisers perform different functions, so the number 14 cannot be used as the denominator for calculating direct participant caseload.

Overseas education. PF-77 and PF-86 establish several routes with different eligibility conditions. PF-77 provides open scholarship competition routes for candidates admitted to eligible top-ranked institutions. It also provides non-competitive routes for candidates with full tuition grants at top-300 institutions and for graduates of Presidential, creative, and specialized schools admitted to top-20 bachelor's programmes with at least 50% tuition support. PF-86 provides 200 annual quotas from 2027 for graduates of the Al-Beruniy school and National Programme participants admitted to top-100 institutions with at least 50% tuition support. These instruments can serve complementary groups, but some candidates may satisfy more than one route.

Return and professional utilization. The most developed formal return mechanism is attached to El-yurt umidi support. PF-77 establishes continuous service periods of two years after a targeted internship, five years after a bachelor's degree, three years after a master's degree, and five years after doctoral study, together with contractual and reimbursement consequences. Comparable follow-up obligations are not uniformly stated for all participants of the wider President's Gifted Children community. This difference does not necessarily indicate a defect, because the programmes have different purposes, but it limits system-wide tracking of long-term outcomes.

Information management. The legal framework refers to several information resources, including the El-yurt umidi scholarship-holder database, the Youth Register, the dedicated National Programme platform, and the initiative's community platform. The acts establish these resources for distinct purposes. The selected corpus does not specify a complete participant-level data architecture connecting school identification, programme participation, scholarship support, return, and employment. The formal issue is therefore not the existence of databases but the absence of a clearly documented end-to-end exchange and governance protocol.

Table 4. Principal formal routes for overseas-education support

Route	Principal eligibility	Procedure	Responsible mechanism
PF-77: full tuition grant route	Admission to an eligible top-300 institution with full tuition covered	Non-competitive scholarship support for transport and living costs, subject to the Foundation's rules	El-yurt umidi Foundation
PF-77: specialized-school graduate route	Graduate of a Presidential, creative, or specialized school; top-20 bachelor's admission; at least 50% tuition grant	Non-competitive scholarship route	El-yurt umidi Foundation
PF-77: open competition	Admission to an eligible top-300 institution and compliance with competition requirements	Testing/interview and selection within approved quotas	El-yurt umidi Foundation
PF-86: National Programme quota	Al-Beruniy school graduate or National Programme participant; top-100 admission; at least 50% tuition grant	Up to 200 annual quotas from 2027; selection applies when eligible candidates exceed 200	Ministry of Economy and Finance and El-yurt umidi Foundation under PF-86

Note. The Agency for Youth Affairs has a broad coordination mandate but is not classified here as a separate scholarship-financing route because the reviewed regulation does not define a comparable operational scholarship mechanism.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

4.3 Governance Risks in the Formal Design

Table 5. Governance risks identified at the level of formal design

Governance risk	Documentary basis	Careful interpretation
R1. Overlapping eligibility routes	A candidate may satisfy both PF-77 and PF-86 conditions. The selected corpus does not state a single cross-instrument priority or deduplication rule.	Potential inconsistent treatment or duplicate administrative processing; actual double financing is not established.
R2. Fragmented information architecture	Four information resources are established for different functions, but an end-to-end participant identifier and exchange protocol are not specified in the core acts.	System-level trajectories and outcomes may be difficult to reconstruct; actual data exchange must be tested empirically.
R3. Uneven transition responsibility	PF-86 provides advisers and preparation for National Programme participants, while comparable application support is not clearly assigned for all gifted pupils outside that programme.	Access to structured transition support may vary by programme membership; actual support coverage is unknown.
R4. Weak continuity after school exit	The specialized-school regulation provides grounds for removal, but the reviewed corpus does not establish a system-wide soft-exit and follow-up pathway.	Previously identified talent and support history may not remain visible across institutions; actual school practice is unknown.
R5. Fragmented system-level accountability	Actors have separate mandates and reporting relationships, while no shared outcome framework links identification to later education, return, and employment.	Departmental output optimization may not reveal whole-trajectory performance.

4.4 Correct Interpretation of the Quantitative Parameters

The legal acts contain several quantitative parameters, but they must be interpreted according to their institutional meaning. PF-86 authorizes the annual selection of up to 1,500 Grade 9 graduates for the National Programme and, from 2027, 200 annual overseas-education quotas for eligible graduates and participants. The calculation 200/1,500 = 13.3% is arithmetically correct. It is only a nominal quota-to-maximum-entry ratio, however, because the numerator and denominator refer to different stages and eligibility conditions. It is not an observed transition rate, and it does not demonstrate that 86.7% of participants receive no subsequent support.

The adviser provisions require an equally important distinction. The 1:15 maximum applies to school advisers who work directly with National Programme participants. The 14 chief advisers coordinate adviser activity at regional level. Dividing 1,500 participants by 14 chief advisers produces a mathematically correct but institutionally invalid ratio. A valid workload indicator requires administrative data on the actual number of school advisers and the number of participants assigned to each adviser.

The revised analysis therefore uses statutory quantities as design parameters, not as empirical performance measures. Where an outcome cannot be calculated from available integrated data, the baseline is reported as 'not currently measurable' rather than zero.

Table 6. Correct interpretation of selected statutory parameters

Parameter	Statutory value	Valid interpretation
Maximum annual National Programme intake	Up to 1,500 Grade 9 graduates	Scale parameter for entry into the programme; not the number seeking foreign study
Annual PF-86 foreign-study quota from 2027	200 eligible participants/graduates	Nominally 13.3% of the maximum annual intake, but not an observed transition rate
School adviser ratio	No more than 15 participants per school adviser	Direct participant-support standard; actual compliance requires adviser assignment data
Chief adviser group	14 positions	Regional coordination of school advisers; not a direct caseload denominator
El-yurt umidi service periods	2, 5, 3, and 5 years by programme type	Formal return and utilization mechanism for Foundation-supported participants

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

5. Discussion

The findings show a system with substantial institutional capacity but incomplete integration. The principal strengths are clear: specialized educational institutions operate under dedicated rules; the National Programme introduces structured identification and school-level support; the El-yurt umidi Foundation has differentiated scholarship routes and enforceable return obligations; and several information platforms already exist. The challenge is therefore not institutional absence. It is the design of the interfaces between strong but separately regulated components.

This pattern is consistent with the coordination literature. Specialization can improve expertise and operational focus while producing gaps at organizational boundaries (Hood, 1991; Peters, 1998). The whole-of-government perspective suggests that integration depends less on creating another organization than on shared objectives, data, and accountability (Christensen & Laegreid, 2007). In the present case, adding a new coordinating body without clarifying referral, priority, and information rules could increase formal complexity rather than reduce it.

The overlap between PF-77 and PF-86 should not be described simply as duplication. The routes serve partially different policy goals and candidate groups. Redundancy can increase access and resilience. The governance requirement is a transparent rule for candidates who satisfy more than one route: which instrument has priority, which expenses may be financed under each route, how the participant is recorded, and how duplicate public financing is prevented. The appropriate target is therefore not zero overlapping eligibility but 100% of overlapping cases resolved under a published rule and 0% duplicate financing.

The information issue is similarly nuanced. The existence of separate systems is not inherently inefficient. Specialized databases may be necessary for operational security and purpose limitation. Integration should not mean unrestricted centralization of personal data. A more appropriate model is a federated information architecture using a single participant identifier, defined data fields, role-based access, lawful exchange, and an auditable record of transfers. Such a model would preserve institutional ownership while enabling trajectory reconstruction and system-level analysis.

The transition-support issue requires empirical caution. PF-86 clearly establishes adviser support for National Programme participants. The formal gap concerns gifted pupils outside that programme, not an absolute absence of application support. Schools, families, private providers, or local programmes may already provide assistance. A subsequent study should therefore measure who receives portfolio development, examination preparation, application counselling, recommendation support, and financial guidance, and whether access differs by region, school type, gender, socioeconomic status, or programme membership.

The soft-exit proposal responds to a continuity problem rather than questioning academic standards. Specialized schools require mechanisms to maintain programme quality, and removal provisions may be legitimate. The issue is whether leaving a specialized institution should erase the participant's prior identification and support history. A soft-exit protocol could retain the record, document the reason for departure, provide referral to an alternative programme, and establish a limited follow-up period. This would protect both institutional standards and the state's earlier investment in identifying talent.

Finally, accountability should move from institutional outputs to trajectory outcomes. Current actors can report admissions, scholarships, competitions, school results, returns, or employment within their own mandates. A system-level framework would not replace those indicators. It would add a small shared set: continuity of records, equitable access to transition support, resolution of overlapping eligibility, completion of overseas study, return, sector-relevant employment, and long-term contribution. These outcomes can only be measured after information governance is clarified.

5.1 Illustrative International Comparison

The international comparison is deliberately limited to three illustrative cases and uses only claims supported by official sources. It is not a matched comparative study and does not rank national systems.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Its purpose is to identify design options that may inform domestic reform. The source base comprises the Singapore Ministry of Education's programme overview (2026), the Republic of Korea's Gifted Education Promotion Act and Enforcement Decree (2000/2023), the Daryn Centre's institutional description (n.d.), and the official Bolashak programme update (Center for International Programs, 2025).

Table 7. Illustrative international design features

Case	Documented design feature	Relevance and limitation
Singapore	The Ministry of Education uses a centrally administered two-stage identification process and an enriched programme for intellectually gifted pupils. The current GEP is being replaced from 2027, demonstrating that even centralized models evolve.	Central standards can coexist with periodic redesign; the Singapore model does not address the full overseas-study and return trajectory.
South Korea	The Gifted Education Promotion Act establishes a central committee, regional committees, formal selection structures, gifted institutions, research institutes, student records, and an integrated database framework.	Statutory coordination and integrated records provide a useful model for connecting multiple institutions while preserving regional implementation.
Kazakhstan	The Daryn Centre describes a unified national system for identifying and supporting gifted children, while the Bolashak mechanism operates as a separate overseas-scholarship institution.	School-level coordination and overseas scholarship may remain institutionally separate; their interface must be examined rather than assumed.

6. Proposed Governance Model

The proposed model has three stages. Stage I clarifies rules that can be corrected without building a new information system. Stage II creates the legal and technical basis for governed data exchange. Stage III introduces outcome-based management after reliable linked data become available. The stages are sequential because digitizing ambiguous rules would reproduce ambiguity electronically.

Table 8. Staged implementation roadmap

Stage	Measures	Responsible actors	Expected result
Stage I: regulatory clarification (0-12 months)	Publish a cross-instrument priority and financing rule; define transition-support responsibility; introduce a soft-exit and referral procedure	National Council, El-yurt umidi Foundation, Agency for Specialized Educational Institutions, relevant ministries	Clear treatment of overlapping cases and continuity at institutional boundaries
Stage II: governed information exchange (6-24 months)	Adopt a single participant identifier, minimum shared dataset, data-quality standards, lawful exchange protocol, and role-based access	Agency for Youth Affairs, Agency for Specialized Educational Institutions, El-yurt umidi Foundation, digital-government bodies	Reconstructible trajectories without unnecessary centralization of all operational data
Stage III: shared outcome management (18-36 months)	Overlay a concise system-level dashboard on existing departmental reporting and commission annual independent review	National Council and designated analytical operator	Assessment of continuity, equity, return, employment, and long-term yield

6.1 Monitoring Indicators

Baselines should be populated only when the necessary administrative data exist. A missing integrated record is reported as 'not currently measurable,' not as 0%. Targets below are proposed management targets and should be validated during implementation planning.

Table 9. Proposed monitoring indicators

Indicator	Formula	Baseline status	Proposed target
1. Record linkage rate	Participants with successfully linked records across relevant systems / participants requiring linkage x 100	Not currently measurable	>=95% after Stage II
2. Trajectory continuity	Participants with no unexplained break in the recorded pathway / total tracked participants x 100	Not currently measurable	>=90%

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Indicator	Formula	Baseline status	Proposed target
3. Overlap resolution	Candidates eligible under two or more routes resolved under the published priority rule / all overlapping cases x 100	Not recorded	100%
4. Duplicate public financing	Overlapping cases receiving duplicate financing for the same eligible expense / funded overlapping cases x 100	Not measured	0%
5. Transition-support coverage	Graduates receiving documented application support / eligible graduates x 100	Measurable only for defined programmes	>=80% system-wide
6. School-adviser caseload	Assigned participants / active school advisers	Requires assignment data	<=15 participants per adviser
7. Soft-exit continuity	Departing pupils with a documented referral and follow-up plan / all relevant departures x 100	Not currently specified	>=95%
8. Return and sector employment	Supported graduates employed in an agreed relevant sector within 12 months / supported graduates completing study x 100	Partly measurable within El-yurt umidi	Target to be set after baseline
9. Long-term system yield	Participants in highly qualified employment at cohort year N+10 / identified cohort x 100	Not currently measurable	First valid result at N+10 for the first fully linked cohort

7. Empirical Verification Agenda

The legal analysis generates propositions that should be tested with administrative and field data. The first priority is a record-linkage pilot using a small, lawfully authorized sample from the Agency, the Youth Register, and the El-yurt umidi Foundation. The pilot should measure match rates, missing identifiers, duplicate records, and the proportion of participants whose pathway can be reconstructed without manual case collection.

The second priority is a transition-support study covering graduates of Presidential schools, specialized schools, National Programme participants, and comparable gifted pupils outside the National Programme. A standardized survey and administrative audit should measure examination preparation, portfolio development, university application support, recommendation letters, scholarship guidance, and associated household expenditure.

The third priority is process tracing of overlapping overseas-education cases. Rather than assuming conflict, researchers should identify candidates who met two or more routes, document how each case was resolved, and test whether decisions were consistent. The fourth priority is a cohort study of pupils leaving specialized institutions, including reasons for departure, referral, subsequent school placement, educational outcomes, and continued participation in talent-development programmes.

Finally, system-level accountability should be tested through a reporting-form audit. Departmental indicators should be mapped against the proposed shared outcomes to identify which measures already exist, which can be calculated through linkage, and which require new data collection.

8. Conclusion and Recommendations

Uzbekistan has created a substantial institutional foundation for developing gifted youth. The formal framework supports specialized schooling, national identification, individualized preparation, several overseas-education routes, scholarship administration, and return obligations. The revised analysis does not portray the system as institutionally weak. It identifies the need to connect strong components through clearer interface rules.

Five governance risks are supported at the level of formal design: overlapping eligibility routes without a single cross-instrument priority rule; fragmented information architecture; unevenly specified responsibility for the transition to foreign university; limited continuity provisions when pupils leave specialized institutions; and fragmented system-level accountability. These findings do not demonstrate implementation failure. They identify issues that should be clarified and empirically tested.

The headline quantitative provisions must be interpreted carefully. The 200 annual quotas from 2027 equal 13.3% of the maximum annual intake of 1,500 only as a nominal comparison between different

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

stages. The 1:15 ratio applies to school advisers, whereas the 14 chief advisers coordinate adviser activity; no 107:1 direct caseload or 7.1-fold overload can be inferred from those provisions.

The following measures are recommended:

- Adopt a published priority, cost-allocation, and deduplication rule for candidates who qualify under more than one overseas-education route.
- Assign explicit responsibility for the school-to-university transition and define the minimum package of application support available across eligible programmes.
- Introduce a soft-exit protocol that preserves records, documents reasons for departure, and provides referral to an alternative developmental pathway.
- Develop a federated information architecture based on a single participant identifier, a minimum shared dataset, lawful exchange, role-based access, and audit logs.
- Create a concise system-level dashboard that complements departmental indicators and measures continuity, equitable access, completion, return, employment, and long-term contribution.
- Publish clause-level evidence and administrative indicator definitions so that future evaluations are reproducible and independent of the original analyst.

Implementation should proceed in stages. Regulatory clarification can begin immediately, while data integration and long-term outcome measurement require legal, technical, and privacy safeguards. The principal contribution of this article is therefore a corrected and reproducible framework for moving from a collection of institutional mandates toward an integrated system of strategic talent development.

Ethics and Data Availability Statement

The study used publicly accessible legal and institutional documents and did not involve human participants or personal data. The clause-level evidence map used in the analysis is reproduced in Appendix A. Future research using administrative records must obtain the necessary institutional authorization and comply with applicable data-protection requirements.

REFERENCES

1. Bouckaert, G., Peters, B. G., & Verhoest, K. (2010). The coordination of public sector organizations: Shifting patterns of public management. Palgrave Macmillan. https://link.springer.com/book/10.1057/9780230275256
2. Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. Qualitative Research Journal, 9(2), 27-40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027
3. Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2019, June 25). Resolution No. 526: On approval of the Regulation on Presidential Schools. https://lex.uz/docs/-4387224
4. Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2020, September 11). Resolution No. 550: On approval of the Regulation on the Agency for Youth Affairs. https://lex.uz/docs/4993790
5. Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2022, May 5). Resolution No. 233: On approval of the Regulation on specialized boarding schools and specialized schools. https://lex.uz/uz/docs/5992874
6. Christensen, T., & Laegreid, P. (2007). The whole-of-government approach to public sector reform. Public Administration Review, 67(6), 1059-1066. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00797.x
7. Collings, D. G., & Mellahi, K. (2009). Strategic talent management: A review and research agenda. Human Resource Management Review, 19(4), 304-313. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.04.001
8. Khilji, S. E., Tarique, I., & Schuler, R. S. (2015). Incorporating the macro view in global talent management. Human Resource Management Review, 25(3), 236-248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2015.04.001
9. Krippendorff, K. (2018). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology (4th ed.). SAGE. https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/content-analysis/book258450

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

10. Mayring, P. (2014). Qualitative content analysis: Theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution. Beltz. https://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/handle/document/39517
11. Ministry of Education, Singapore. (2026). Gifted Education Programme: Overview. https://www.moe.gov.sg/education-in-sg/our-programmes/gifted-education/overview
12. North, D. C. (1990). Institutions, institutional change and economic performance. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511808678
13. Peters, B. G. (1998). Managing horizontal government: The politics of co-ordination. Public Administration, 76(2), 295-311. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9299.00102
14. Pollitt, C. (2003). Joined-up government: A survey. Political Studies Review, 1(1), 34-49. https://doi.org/10.1111/1478-9299.00004
15. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2022, April 14). Decree No. PF-106: On expanding the network of specialized schools within the Agency for Specialized Educational Institutions. https://lex.uz/uz/docs/-5960622
16. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2025a, March 26). Decree No. PF-61: On measures to implement the tasks identified during the President's open dialogue with young people. https://lex.uz/uz/docs/-7451522
17. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2025b, May 5). Decree No. PF-77: On additional measures to support the education of talented specialists abroad, develop their professional skills, and provide incentives. https://lex.uz/docs/7520253
18. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2025c, May 15). Decree No. PF-86: On measures to implement the President's Gifted Children initiative. https://lex.uz/en/docs/7533279
19. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2025d, October 29). Decree No. PF-197: On organizing the civil service on the basis of new approaches and forming a professional and performance-oriented corps of civil servants. https://lex.uz/acts/-7587464?ONDATE=29.10.2025%2000
20. Republican Scientific and Practical Centre Daryn. (n.d.). About the centre. https://daryn.kz/en/about-center/
21. Republic of Korea. (2000, as amended through 2025). Gifted Education Promotion Act. https://elaw.klri.re.kr/eng_mobile/viewer.do?hseq=71732&key=2&type=sogan
22. Republic of Korea. (2023). Enforcement Decree of the Gifted Education Promotion Act. https://elaw.klri.re.kr/eng_service/lawViewTitle.do?hseq=64374
23. Scott, W. R. (2014). Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities (4th ed.). SAGE. https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/institutions-and-organizations/book237665
24. The Center for International Programs. (2025). Amendments to the rules for selecting applicants for the Bolashak international scholarship. https://bolashak.gov.kz/en/allnews/vnesenie-izmenenij-v-pravila-otbora-pretendentov-dlya-prisuzhdeniya-mezhdunarodnoj-stipendii-bolashak

Appendix A. Clause-Level Evidence Map

The appendix lists the principal provisions supporting the central findings. It is intended to make the analytical chain transparent and to replace unsupported aggregate coding counts.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Table A1. Evidence supporting the principal findings

Provision or source	Documented content	Analytical use
PF-86, para. 6(a)	Up to 1,500 Grade 9 graduates selected annually	Maximum programme-entry parameter; not an overseas-study denominator
PF-86, para. 6(b)	Participants assigned to school advisers; maximum ratio 1:15	Direct support standard applies to school advisers
PF-86, paras. 9-10	Group of 14 chief advisers coordinates school advisers across regions	Chief advisers are not the direct participant-caseload denominator
PF-86, para. 8	200 annual quotas from 2027 for eligible top-100 admissions with at least 50% tuition grant	Separate later-stage quota; 13.3% is only a nominal comparison with 1,500
PF-77, relevant scholarship provisions	Top-300 full-grant route, top-20 specialized-school graduate route, and open competition route	Creates multiple routes with partially overlapping eligibility
PF-77, service-obligation provisions	Service periods differentiated by internship and degree level	Strong formal return and utilization mechanism within the Foundation
CMR No. 233, admission and progression provisions	Specialized-school stages, class size, progression and removal grounds	School quality control is formalized; system-wide soft-exit referral is not identified
CMR No. 550, Agency for Youth Affairs regulation	Broad coordination mandate and Youth Register information system	Relevant coordination and data asset; not evidence of a separate scholarship-financing route
PF-77, PF-86, and CMR No. 550 considered together	Several databases/platforms are established for different purposes	An end-to-end participant identifier and exchange protocol are not specified in the core corpus
All core instruments considered together	Departmental mandates and outputs are specified	No shared whole-trajectory outcome framework was identified in the selected corpus

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ