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

INSTITUTIONAL ARCHITECTURE AND COORDINATION RISKS IN UZBEKISTAN'S SYSTEM FOR DEVELOPING THE HUMAN CAPITAL OF GIFTED YOUTH

Khasanova Charosoy

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

DOI: 10.67620/sai.57b0018

ABSTRACT

Uzbekistan has created a dense set of institutions for identifying gifted pupils, educating them in specialized settings, supporting admission to foreign universities, financing study abroad, and organizing return and employment. The rapid growth of this field has produced substantial capacity, but the legal instruments were adopted at different times and assign related functions to bodies with distinct reporting lines. This article examines the institutional architecture in force on 1 January 2026 through a structured analysis of ten republican legal instruments, comprising eight primary acts and two amending acts. The study separates policy coordination from programme operation, maps responsibilities across six stages of the participant pathway, and records both evidence of linkage and documentary silence. Five coordination risks are identified: overlapping eligibility routes for foreign-study support without an explicit cross-instrument priority rule; incomplete interoperability across participant information systems; uneven allocation of university-application support; removal from a specialized school without a specified developmental follow-up procedure; and the absence of a common outcome framework spanning identification, education, foreign study, return, and employment. Two numerical claims made in an earlier version are corrected. The ratio of 200 foreign-study quotas to the maximum annual National Programme intake of 1,500 is only a nominal ratio and cannot be interpreted as observed coverage. The 14 Chief Advisers coordinate school advisers and cannot be used to calculate the participant-to-adviser caseload. A non-arithmetic prioritization method is therefore used, based on documentary strength, policy consequence, and feasibility of remedy. Comparative reference points from the Republic of Korea, Israel, Kazakhstan, and Singapore are used to identify design options rather than to rank national systems. The article proposes a three-stage reform sequence: legal clarification, data governance and interoperability, and outcome-based management. A revised monitoring framework specifies valid denominators, distinguishes unavailable baselines from zero values, and treats numerical targets as matters for post-baseline policy decision.

ACCEPTED

06.08.26

Keywords: *institutional analysis; horizontal coordination; gifted youth; talent development; education governance; Uzbekistan.*

CC BY

1. Introduction

Policies for gifted youth cut across organizational and sectoral boundaries. Identification usually begins during compulsory schooling, while later stages involve advanced instruction, university admission, scholarships, mobility, employment, and long-term professional development. Each stage may be governed by a different body, financed through a different budget, and reported through a separate administrative chain. The quality of the system therefore depends not only on the capacity of individual institutions but also on the rules that connect them.

Uzbekistan has expanded this field rapidly since 2019. Presidential Schools were regulated in 2019; the Youth Affairs Agency received a broad youth-policy coordination mandate in 2020; the network of specialized schools was enlarged in 2022; and 2025 brought the reorganization of the El-yurt umidi Foundation, the launch of the President's Gifted Children initiative, the National Programme for prospective applicants to foreign universities, and the creation of the Al-Beruni International Boarding School. These measures established new selection procedures, forms of academic support, scholarship routes, advisory positions, databases, councils, and commissions [10-19].

Institutional growth does not automatically produce an integrated policy pathway. An applicant may pass through several systems whose rules were written for different purposes. The same organization may act as funder in one process and database operator in another. A body that coordinates policy may be mistaken for a scholarship operator, while a technical centre within an agency may be treated as an independent actor. Such classification errors obscure where responsibility is genuinely assigned and where it remains uncertain.

The research question is: how are responsibilities for gifted-youth development distributed in Uzbekistan's legal framework, and which coordination risks can be demonstrated from the text of the instruments in force on 1 January 2026? Three subsidiary questions follow. First, which bodies coordinate policy and which operate programmes? Second, what formal links connect identification, development, foreign-study support, return, and employment? Third, which proposed reforms can be justified without treating documentary silence as proof of implementation failure?

The contribution is both substantive and methodological. Substantively, the article offers a corrected institutional map and a reform sequence grounded in the legal architecture. Methodologically, it replaces unsupported quantitative assertions with bounded documentary findings. The analysis does not claim that every legal ambiguity produces a failure in practice. It identifies points where implementation evidence is needed and states the conditions under which each finding could be confirmed or rejected.

2. Theoretical framework and related literature

Institutional analysis begins with the distinction between formal rules and actual conduct. North described institutions as the constraints that structure interaction, while Scott separated regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive elements [1,2]. A legal document is therefore a primary source for the formal allocation of authority, but it cannot by itself establish how consistently that authority is exercised. This distinction is essential in a policy field where administrative practice may compensate for gaps in written rules.

The coordination literature explains why formally competent organizations may still produce fragmented results. Peters linked horizontal coordination problems to organizational interests and the defence of jurisdiction [3]. Hood's account of New Public Management showed how specialization and agency autonomy can sharpen responsibility within organizations while weakening connections between them [4]. Whole-of-government reforms emerged partly as a response to that fragmentation. Christensen and Laegreid emphasized shared goals, information, and accountability, whereas Pollitt warned that structural reorganization often leaves operating processes unchanged [5,6]. Bouckaert, Peters, and Verhoest distinguished hierarchical, market, and network mechanisms and argued that real administrative systems combine them [7].

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Talent management adds a pathway perspective. Collings and Mellahi treated talent systems as differentiated architectures rather than extensions of ordinary personnel administration [8]. Khilji, Tarique, and Schuler located talent development within a wider ecosystem linking education, labour markets, and mobility [9]. For gifted youth, this means that school selection, enriched education, international study, and professional utilization should be examined as connected transitions. A gap at a transition may matter more than a well-designed programme within a single stage.

The present study uses two concepts. An institutional allocation is a formal assignment of a function to a named body. A coordination risk is a documentary condition that may hinder continuity across bodies or stages. It may take one of four forms: overlapping eligibility without a cross-instrument resolution rule; a transfer of responsibility without a specified handover; an information link without an operational exchange protocol; or a system-wide goal without a common outcome measure. These are risks in legal design, not findings of administrative misconduct.

3. Materials and methods

3.1 Research design

The study employs structured qualitative document analysis. Regulatory and organizational documents can serve as an independent empirical source when the question concerns formally stated purposes, powers, procedures, and reporting relationships [20]. Content analysis requires an explicit unit of analysis, a predetermined category scheme, and a record that connects interpretations to source passages [21,22]. The method used here is closer to a doctrinal institutional map than to frequency-based text mining: the analytical weight of a provision depends on the authority and function it establishes, not on the number of times a word appears.

The unit of analysis is a provision, subparagraph, or annex entry that assigns a function, defines eligibility, creates a body or information system, imposes an obligation, or requires interaction with another actor. Each relevant provision was entered in an extraction matrix with the following fields: legal source and version; actor; target group; stage of the pathway; decision power; financing or support mechanism; information or reporting requirement; cross-actor link; and interpretive note. Appendix A reproduces the evidence log used for the principal findings.

3.2 Corpus and version control

The corpus contains ten republican instruments: eight primary acts and two amending acts. Inclusion required a direct connection to the identification, education, foreign-study support, coordination, information management, return, or employment of gifted youth. Consolidated legal texts were read as they stood on 1 January 2026. Where the current LexUZ page displays a later amendment, the amendment was excluded if its effective date fell after the cut-off. For example, the amendment to a PF-86 priority criterion that entered into force on 1 February 2026 was not treated as operative on 1 January 2026. This rule prevents a current webpage from silently changing the historical corpus.

Table 1.

Legal corpus and role in the analysis

Instrument	Date	Status in corpus	Principal relevance
Presidential Decree PF-86	15 May 2025	Primary	President's Gifted Children initiative; National Programme; Al-Beruni School; National Council; Republican Commission; adviser structure; 200 annual quotas from 2027
Presidential Decree PF-77	5 May 2025	Primary	El-yurt umidi Foundation; scholarship routes; selection; scholarship-holder database; return and service obligations
Presidential Decree PF-61	26 March 2025	Primary	Bright Talent project and measures connected with overseas study and return support
Presidential Decree PF-106	14 April 2022	Primary	Expansion and governance of the specialized-school network
Presidential Decree PF-197	29 October 2025	Amending	Management Efficiency Agency role in public-service training and monitoring; amendments affecting El-yurt umidi arrangements

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Instrument	Date	Status in corpus	Principal relevance
Cabinet Resolution No. 526	25 June 2019	Primary	Regulation of Presidential Schools and admissions
Cabinet Resolution No. 233	5 May 2022	Primary	Regulation of specialized schools, educational stages, class size, progression, and removal
Cabinet Resolution No. 550	11 September 2020	Primary	Youth Affairs Agency status and coordination mandate
Cabinet Resolution No. 130	28 February 2025	Amending	Terminological and organizational amendments affecting the school regulations
Cabinet Resolution No. 797	17 December 2025	Amending	Amendments to regulations for creative and specialized schools

3.3 Analytical categories and decision rules

Table 2.

Analytical categories

Code	Question applied to each provision	Use in the analysis
A1 Actor and status	Which body, unit, school, council, commission, or fund is named, and is it independent or subordinate?	Prevents a subordinate service unit from being counted as an independent policy actor.
A2 Population and stage	Which pupils, graduates, candidates, scholarship holders, specialists, or public servants are covered?	Tests whether apparently similar rules apply to the same population.
A3 Function	Does the provision concern identification, development, application support, financing, study abroad, return, employment, information, or oversight?	Maps the participant pathway.
A4 Decision authority	Who selects, approves, funds, supervises, or resolves exceptions?	Separates coordination from operational decision making.
A5 Information and reporting	What database, platform, report, monitoring duty, or exchange requirement is specified?	Identifies continuity and accountability mechanisms.
A6 Cross-actor link	Does the provision require cooperation, integration, approval, referral, or handover?	Distinguishes a formal linkage from parallel activity.
A7 Counterevidence	Does another provision partly close the apparent gap?	Reduces one-sided interpretation and records uncertainty.

A coordination risk was recorded only when the relevant instruments interact at the same transition and no explicit rule in the corpus resolves the issue. The absence of a rule was not treated as proof that administrators have no informal procedure. Each finding is assigned a documentary strength: strong, when the relevant legal boundary and missing procedure are directly visible; moderate, when the finding depends on reading several instruments together; and provisional, when implementation data are essential.

The study was conducted by a single author. No inter-coder reliability coefficient is reported. A second reading was used to check the extraction matrix, but repeated coding by the same researcher cannot substitute for independent coding. Reproducibility is supported instead through exact provision references, explicit decision rules, and the inclusion of counterevidence. Future work should have a second coder review the full matrix and should publish the machine-readable extraction file.

3.4 Scope and limitations

The analysis is confined to formal institutional design. It does not measure how many pupils receive support, whether databases are already connected in practice, how decisions are made in individual cases, or whether graduates meet service obligations. Legal silence may be filled by internal instructions, contracts, or administrative routines outside the selected corpus. The comparative section is illustrative and does not claim causal identification. Finally, the author's institutional position may improve access to terminology and context while also creating a risk of confirmation bias. The positionality statement at the end of the article records this limitation.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

4. Institutional architecture

4.1 School-level identification and specialized education

The Agency for Specialized Educational Institutions is the principal system manager at the school stage. Presidential Schools and specialized schools are educational providers within its system rather than separate national policy actors. Cabinet Resolution No. 526 regulates the Presidential Schools, including admissions, international programmes, and the possibility of international qualifications. Cabinet Resolution No. 233 regulates specialized schools in the exact sciences for grades 5-11 and natural sciences for grades 7-11, with a maximum of 24 pupils per class [14,16]. PF-106 provides the broader policy basis for expanding the network [19].

PF-86 added the Al-Beruni International Boarding School and a National Programme for up to 1,500 grade 9 graduates per year. Programme participants are attached to school advisers during grades 10 and 11, receive additional instruction through a dedicated platform, and may attend short courses aligned with foreign university requirements. The legal ratio of participants to one school adviser is no more than 15. The same decree created 14 Chief Adviser posts to coordinate the work of school advisers across the regions, along with a six-person initiative unit in the Agency's central apparatus [10].

These two adviser categories must not be conflated. School advisers provide direct support and are subject to the 1:15 ratio. Chief Advisers are regional coordinators. Since the corpus does not state the total number of school-adviser posts actually filled, the participant caseload cannot be calculated from the 14 Chief Adviser posts. Any staffing assessment requires payroll and assignment data, not a division of programme participants by regional coordinators.

4.2 Foreign-study support and the El-yurt umidi Foundation

PF-77 reorganized the El-yurt umidi Foundation and gave it a broad mandate: targeted internships, professional orientation, scholarship selection, financing of study abroad, monitoring during study, a scholarship-holder database, and support after return. The Foundation is an operator and funder, not merely a coordinating platform. Its Management Board determines scholarship fields and quotas, while an open competition uses tests and interviews. The decree also requires non-state representation in the competition commission and the recording and online publication of interviews [11].

The return mechanism is formalized through contracts. The required continuous service periods are two years for a targeted internship, five years for a bachelor's degree, three years for a master's degree, and five years for doctoral study. Breach may lead to recovery of twice the Foundation's expenditure. Following the October 2025 amendment, the Management Efficiency Agency coordinates and monitors the creation of conditions for the professional use and career development of returning specialists in the public-service sphere [11,12].

PF-77 also requires a Unified Automated Information System integrated with the Presidential Golden Fund platform. This provision is important because it contradicts a blanket claim that all information resources are legally isolated. The more precise finding is that one bilateral integration requirement exists, while the selected corpus does not establish a field-wide data-governance protocol linking the National Programme, school records, scholarship administration, and post-return employment records.

4.3 Youth-policy coordination

The Youth Affairs Agency has a broad coordination mandate. Cabinet Resolution No. 550 directs it to coordinate work connected with sending gifted young people to leading foreign universities and participation in international competitions, and to support intellectual development. The wording is a coordination function. It does not, in the cited provisions, create a separate scholarship route with its own eligibility conditions, quota, payment rules, or selection operator [18]. It should therefore not be counted as a fifth funding channel alongside El-yurt umidi and PF-86 scholarship mechanisms.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

The distinction matters for governance design. A coordinator may request information, align activities, or monitor implementation without selecting scholarship winners. Treating every broad mandate as an operational channel inflates the number of overlaps and makes the actor map less accurate.

4.4 Strategic and oversight bodies

PF-86 created a National Council and a Republican Commission for the President's Gifted Children initiative. The Council sets strategic direction, while the Commission supports implementation and control. The El-yurt umidi Management Board governs the Foundation's scholarship and financial decisions. The Youth Affairs Agency coordinates youth policy, and the Management Efficiency Agency has responsibilities related to public-service training and career monitoring. These bodies operate at different levels and for partly different populations. The issue is not their number alone, but whether their interfaces, escalation rules, and shared reporting obligations are clear.

Table 3.

Actors classified by governance role

Actor or structure	Governance role	Population or stage	Key legal basis
Agency for Specialized Educational Institutions	System manager and programme operator	School-stage identification, specialized education, National Programme support	PF-86; PF-106; CMR 526; CMR 233
Presidential and specialized schools; Al-Beruni School	Educational providers	Grades 5-11 or programme-specific cohorts	CMR 526; CMR 233; PF-86
School advisers	Direct transition-support providers	National Programme participants in grades 10-11; Al-Beruni pupils under its model	PF-86
Chief Advisers	Regional coordination of school advisers	Fourteen regions	PF-86, paras. 9-10
El-yurt umidi Foundation	Scholarship operator, funder, database operator, return-contract administrator	Applicants, scholarship holders, interns, graduates	PF-77
Youth Affairs Agency	Youth-policy coordinator	Young people generally	CMR 550
National Council and Republican Commission	Strategic direction and oversight	President's Gifted Children initiative	PF-86
Management Efficiency Agency	Public-service training coordination and career monitoring	Public servants and relevant returning specialists	PF-197 amendments; PF-77 as amended

5. Functional analysis of the participant pathway

5.1 Identification and development

The legal framework contains several identification processes, but they are not interchangeable. Entrance examinations for Presidential and specialized schools select pupils for particular educational institutions. The National Programme examination identifies up to 1,500 grade 9 graduates with potential for foreign higher education. El-yurt umidi selection concerns candidates who already meet programme-specific requirements for study abroad. The coexistence of different assessments is not itself a flaw: each serves a different stage and purpose. A coordination question arises only when results or participant records should pass from one stage to another.

Development mechanisms are stronger within defined programmes. Specialized schools provide subject-focused curricula and regulated class sizes. PF-86 adds school advisers, a dedicated platform, short-term study, portfolio support, and foreign-university preparation for National Programme and Al-Beruni participants. The legal design is therefore differentiated rather than uniform. The policy question is whether comparable transition support is available to gifted graduates who fall outside those cohorts.

5.2 University-application support

The earlier formulation of a complete responsibility vacuum between school graduation and admission to a foreign university is too broad. PF-77 assigns the Foundation professional-orientation functions, and PF-86 assigns advisers to National Programme participants. The corpus nevertheless does

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

not clearly designate a body responsible for universal, structured application support for all graduates of Presidential, creative, and specialized schools. Scholarship rules generally require evidence of admission, while the most detailed preparation provisions are tied to specific cohorts. The resulting risk is uneven access, not total institutional absence.

This finding is moderate rather than conclusive. It can be tested through graduate surveys, school-adviser staffing records, application-support logs, and interviews with programme operators. Evidence that all relevant graduates receive a defined package of counselling, examination preparation, recommendation support, and application review would weaken or remove the finding.

5.3 Routes for foreign-study support

PF-77 and PF-86 create several operational routes. The Youth Affairs Agency mandate is excluded from this table because it is coordinative. The routes differ by ranking threshold, grant condition, population, and method of selection.

Table 4.

Operational routes for foreign-study support

Route	Eligibility trigger	Population	Selection or award method	Legal basis
PF-77 full-tuition grant route	Admission with full tuition coverage to a top-100 institution	Eligible candidates across degree levels, subject to programme rules	Award without tests within approved quota procedures	PF-77, para. 10(e)(i)
PF-77 limited-cost route	Admission with full tuition coverage to a top-300 institution	Eligible candidates	Support without tests for international travel and living costs	PF-77, para. 10(e)(ii)
PF-77 specialized-school graduate route	Bachelor's admission to a top-20 institution with at least 50% tuition grant	Graduates of Presidential, creative, and specialized schools	Award without tests within quota procedures	PF-77, para. 10(e)(iii)
PF-77 open competition	Admission to an eligible institution, generally within top-300 or an approved specialist list	Bachelor's, master's, and doctoral candidates	Document review, tests, and interview	PF-77 and annexed competition regulation
PF-86 National Programme quota	From 2027, admission to a top-100 institution with at least 50% grant	Al-Beruni graduates and National Programme participants	Up to 200 quotas; internal priority rules if eligible applicants exceed quota	PF-86, para. 8

A candidate may meet the conditions of more than one route. A graduate of a specialized school who also participated in the National Programme and obtained a 50% grant at a top-20 university could fall within both PF-77 and PF-86. Both routes are connected to the El-yurt umidi funding system, which may allow the Foundation to prevent duplicate awards administratively. The selected acts, however, do not state a cross-instrument priority rule for resolving such dual eligibility. The legal risk is inconsistent treatment or delayed case resolution, not a demonstrated instance of double financing.

5.4 Return, service, and professional utilization

Return and service are most developed in the El-yurt umidi system. Contractual service periods, employer duties, monitoring, and financial consequences create a clear accountability chain. The Community established under PF-86 has a different purpose: networking, exchange, and mobilization of intellectual potential. A voluntary community and a contractual service system need not be identical. The coordination issue is whether community participation, scholarship records, and employment outcomes can be linked for system-level analysis while respecting their different legal bases.

5.5 Information and accountability

The legal framework contains several information components: school and admissions records; the National Programme platform; the El-yurt umidi scholarship-holder database; the Unified Automated Information System and its required integration with the Presidential Golden Fund platform; and employment or monitoring records held by employers and public-administration bodies. The existence of these components is a strength. The unresolved question is field-wide interoperability: the corpus does not

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

set out a common participant identifier, data dictionary, exchange frequency, lawful-access roles, error-correction process, retention period, or responsibility for producing cross-stage outcome reports.

Departmental accountability is also present. Each actor reports within its own legal structure. What is not clearly identified is a shared outcome framework that follows a cohort from identification through professional utilization. This does not mean that no performance indicators exist anywhere in government. It means that the selected instruments do not provide a common set of cross-agency outcome measures for the gifted-youth pathway.

6. Documented coordination risks

Table 5.

Coordination risks, evidence, and limits of inference

Code	Coordination risk	Documentary evidence	Counterevidence or limitation	Strength
R1	Overlapping eligibility routes lack an explicit cross-instrument priority rule.	PF-77 top-20 route and PF-86 top-100/50% quota can cover the same specialized-school graduate.	The same Foundation is involved in financing and may apply internal controls. No actual duplicate payment is shown.	Moderate
R2	Interoperability is incomplete across the full participant pathway.	Several platforms and databases are created for different stages; no field-wide protocol is specified.	PF-77 requires integration between the Unified Automated Information System and the Presidential Golden Fund platform, so complete isolation is not established.	Strong
R3	Structured university-application support is unevenly allocated.	Detailed adviser support is tied to National Programme and Al-Beruni cohorts; scholarship rules often begin after admission.	PF-77 includes professional orientation, and schools may provide support outside the acts.	Moderate
R4	Removal from a specialized school is not paired with a specified developmental follow-up procedure.	CMR 233, para. 33 lists removal after sustained academic decline despite individual work but does not specify retention of the giftedness record or an alternative plan.	General education transfer occurs in practice; the finding concerns the absence of a specialized follow-up rule in this regulation.	Strong
R5	No common outcome framework spans identification, study, return, and employment.	The instruments assign departmental duties and databases but do not state a unified cohort outcome framework.	Other government reporting instruments outside the corpus may contain relevant indicators.	Moderate

6.1 What the documentary numbers show - and what they do not show

PF-86 sets a maximum annual National Programme intake of 1,500 and, from 2027, up to 200 foreign-study quotas for Al-Beruni graduates and National Programme participants. The arithmetic ratio is 200/1,500, or 13.3%. This figure is not an observed coverage rate. The denominator is a maximum rather than an actual cohort, it excludes Al-Beruni graduates, and eligibility requires qualifying admission and grant conditions. The ratio can be reported only as a nominal comparison between two ceilings stated in the decree.

The adviser figures are similarly limited. PF-86 requires no more than 15 programme participants per school adviser and creates 14 Chief Advisers to coordinate school advisers. It does not state the total number of school advisers. The actual staffing ratio is therefore unavailable from the legal corpus. Dividing 1,500 participants by 14 Chief Advisers compares different roles and produces an invalid caseload estimate.

Zero values also require care. The absence of a clause in the selected corpus is not a measured zero in implementation. For example, "no field-wide data protocol identified" is a documentary finding; it is not equivalent to "zero data exchange." Baselines for trajectory continuity, application support, and employment should be marked unavailable until administrative records are examined.

6.2 Prioritization without an artificial index

An arithmetic mean of ordinal scores can create a false appearance of precision. The revised prioritization uses three separate judgments: documentary strength, policy consequence if the risk materializes, and feasibility of remedy. No weighted index is calculated. The categories guide sequencing rather than claim statistical measurement.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Table 6.

Qualitative priority matrix

Risk	Documentary strength	Potential policy consequence	Likely remedy	Priority
R4 Specialized-school exit follow-up	Strong	Loss of continuity for a previously identified pupil	Agency regulation or amendment to school regulation; standard exit plan and record retention	Immediate
R1 Dual eligibility across scholarship routes	Moderate	Unequal treatment, delay, or duplicate commitment	Joint rule of the Foundation and Agency; amendment or unified award regulation	Immediate
R3 Uneven application support	Moderate	Access may depend on school or family resources	Define minimum service package and responsible provider; collect baseline data	Near term
R2 Field-wide interoperability	Strong	Trajectory cannot be reliably reconstructed or evaluated	Cabinet-level data-governance decision, technical standards, privacy controls, phased integration	Strategic
R5 Common outcome framework	Moderate	Departmental optimization may obscure pathway outcomes	Shared indicator charter and reporting cycle after data integration	Strategic

7. Comparative reference points

The international material is used to identify design options, not to score countries. The cases differ in population, legal tradition, educational structure, and the relationship between school-level gifted education and overseas scholarships. Each comparison is therefore limited to a specific institutional feature.

Table 7.

Selected international design features

Jurisdiction	Verified design feature	Relevance to Uzbekistan	Caution
Republic of Korea	A dedicated statute assigns national and local policy responsibilities, establishes promotion committees and research institutes, and provides for integrated gifted-education databases.	Shows how data governance and institutional linkage can be stated in primary legislation.	The Korean framework concerns gifted education broadly and does not replicate Uzbekistan's scholarship and return system.
Israel	The Ministry of Education operates a national identification process with staged testing and recognizes later identification of pupils whose abilities emerge at different times.	Supports a developmental approach and the possibility of re-entry or later identification rather than a single irreversible selection point.	Implementation is embedded in Israel's own school system and should not be copied mechanically.
Kazakhstan	The Daryn Centre acts as a system link for identifying and supporting gifted children; the Bolashak scholarship separately regulates return and work obligations.	Shows that school-level talent support and overseas scholarship governance may remain institutionally distinct if their interfaces are explicit.	The two systems serve different populations and legal purposes.
Singapore	The centralized Gifted Education Programme is being replaced from 2027 by broader school-based provisions and centre-based advanced modules, with repeated identification opportunities.	Illustrates periodic redesign to widen access while retaining specialist provision.	The reform was announced after the Uzbekistan corpus cut-off and is used only as a later comparative reference point.

Three lessons follow. First, data integration requires an assigned operator and a legal purpose; a general instruction to cooperate is insufficient. Second, identification systems should accommodate developmental variability and preserve the possibility of later support. Third, scholarship return obligations and school-level gifted education can remain separate, but participant handovers and outcome reporting must be designed deliberately.

8. Reform model

The reform sequence should follow institutional dependencies. Legal ambiguity should be reduced before databases are connected, because digitizing inconsistent rules merely reproduces the inconsistency. Outcome reporting should follow data integration, because cross-stage indicators cannot be calculated reliably from incompatible departmental records.

8.1 Stage I: legal clarification and service continuity (0-12 months)

The first stage requires four measures. A cross-instrument priority rule should resolve dual eligibility under PF-77 and PF-86 before a financial commitment is made. The Agency and Foundation

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

should define a minimum university-application support package and specify which graduates are entitled to it. The specialized-school regulation should require a documented transition plan when a pupil is removed for academic reasons. Finally, the National Council should approve a short coordination charter that distinguishes strategic, operational, financial, and monitoring decisions and identifies the escalation route for unresolved inter-agency cases.

8.2 Stage II: data governance and interoperability (6-24 months)

Technical integration should begin with governance rules. A Cabinet-level decision should designate a data operator or a federated governance arrangement, define the lawful purposes of data use, assign access rights, establish a common participant identifier, and approve a minimum data set. The protocol should cover correction of inaccurate records, consent or other lawful grounds where required, retention periods, cybersecurity, audit logs, and procedures for linking school, scholarship, and employment records. A pilot can begin with National Programme participants and El-yurt umidi scholarship holders before expansion to the wider specialized-school system.

8.3 Stage III: outcome-based management (18-36 months)

Once reliable linkage is possible, the National Council should approve a shared outcome framework. Departmental indicators should remain in place, but a small set of pathway indicators should be reported jointly. The purpose is not to rank bodies against one another. It is to show where participants leave the pathway, which groups receive support, how long transitions take, and whether overseas education contributes to employment in relevant sectors.

Table 8.

Implementation roadmap

Measure	Lead and partners	Instrument	Timing	Output
Cross-instrument priority rule for dual scholarship eligibility	El-yurt umidi Foundation; Agency; Ministry of Economy and Finance	Unified award rule or amendments to PF-77/PF-86 implementation regulations	0-6 months	One documented route and financing decision per candidate
Minimum application-support service and coverage rule	Agency; schools; Foundation	Cabinet or ministerial regulation with service standard	0-12 months	Defined support package, eligible population, provider, and record
Specialized-school transition plan after removal	Agency	Amendment to CMR 233 or agency regulation	0-6 months	Retained record, family consultation, referral, and follow-up date
Coordination charter for councils, commission, Foundation, Youth Affairs Agency, and Management Efficiency Agency	National Council	Approved inter-agency regulation	0-12 months	Decision hierarchy, meeting cycle, escalation, and reporting duties
Common identifier and data-exchange protocol	Designated data operator; Agency; Foundation; relevant digital and youth-policy bodies	Cabinet resolution and technical standard	6-24 months	Pilot interoperable participant record
Shared outcome framework	National Council; methodological support from the Agency's research and assessment capacity	Joint indicator charter	18-36 months	Annual pathway report with disaggregated results

9. Monitoring framework

The monitoring framework corrects three recurring measurement errors: an unavailable baseline is not zero; an eligibility ratio is not an outcome rate; and overlapping eligibility is not itself a failure. Indicators should be disaggregated by sex, region, school type, socioeconomic status where lawful and available, disability status where appropriate, and programme route. Numerical targets should be set only after a baseline study, except where the desired standard is legal compliance, such as zero duplicate financing.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Table 9.

Revised monitoring indicators

No.	Indicator	Formula or decision rule	Data source	Baseline treatment	Interpretation
1	Identification reach	Unique pupils recorded in at least one eligible identification process / clearly defined eligible population x 100	Integrated or linked administrative records; population data	Calculate after denominator and deduplication rules are approved	Measures reach, not giftedness prevalence.
2	Trajectory continuity	Participants with linked records at all required transition points / participants due to make those transitions x 100	Linked participant record	Unavailable until linkage pilot	A missing record is distinguished from an unsuccessful transition.
3	Resolution of multiple eligibility	Cases with more than one eligible route resolved before award / all multiple-eligibility cases x 100; duplicate financing incidents reported separately	Foundation award system and PF-86 quota records	Begin once common matching rule is active	Target for resolved cases should be 100%; target for duplicate financing is zero.
4	Application-support coverage	Graduates receiving the defined minimum support package / graduates eligible for that package x 100	School and adviser logs	Baseline survey and records audit required	Denominator must match the legal entitlement.
5	School-adviser staffing compliance	Participants assigned to each actual school adviser; share of advisers at or below 15 participants	Staffing and assignment records	Cannot be calculated from Chief Adviser posts	Tests compliance with the legal ratio.
6	Continuity after specialized-school removal	Removed pupils with documented transition plan and follow-up / pupils removed for academic reasons x 100	School records and receiving-school confirmation	Collect after procedure is introduced	Measures continuity, not reversal of the removal decision.
7	Return and relevant employment	Graduates employed or engaged in an approved relevant activity within 12 months / graduates due to return x 100	Foundation, employer, and public-administration records	Define approved activity and exceptions before calculation	Should be reported by scholarship route and degree level.
8	Long-term pathway yield	Cohort members in defined high-skill or priority-sector roles at year N+k / original identified cohort x 100	Longitudinal linked data	First result depends on cohort year and chosen k	A long-term indicator; not suitable for annual attribution to one body.

10. Discussion

The revised analysis changes the interpretation of the institutional field in several ways. First, the problem is not a simple absence of coordination. The legal framework already contains high-level councils, coordinating mandates, a scholarship database, an integration requirement, contractual return obligations, and a regional adviser structure. The central issue is the uneven specificity of the interfaces. Some transitions are governed by detailed rules; others rely on broad cooperation clauses or programme-specific arrangements.

Second, multiple routes should not be equated with fragmentation. Differentiated routes may be justified by degree level, university ranking, grant size, policy priority, or target population. The governance risk appears when one person qualifies under more than one route and the system lacks a transparent rule for choosing the applicable route. A unified regulation need not abolish differentiated support. It should make the relationship among the routes intelligible.

Third, the field should be evaluated through continuity rather than institutional volume. The number of schools, scholarships, platforms, councils, or posts does not show whether a participant can move from identification to professional contribution without avoidable loss of information or support. The proposed indicators therefore focus on handovers, assignment, resolution, and follow-up. They also avoid interpreting missing data as poor performance before the reporting system exists.

Fourth, the exclusion rule in specialized schools raises a design question rather than a claim that academic standards should be abandoned. Specialized schools require progression rules, and sustained underperformance may justify transfer. The missing element is a developmental handover: the record of earlier identification, the support already provided, the reason for transfer, and an alternative plan should not disappear when institutional enrolment ends. The Israeli emphasis on later identification and developmental variability provides a useful reference point, but the recommended procedure rests primarily on continuity and administrative fairness.

Fifth, the return-and-service mechanism is one of the strongest parts of the system. The reform agenda should preserve it while improving the connection between scholarship records, employers, career monitoring, and the broader talent community. A common outcome framework would allow decision

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

makers to examine not only contractual compliance but also the quality of professional placement and the contribution of trained specialists over time.

The proposed sequence is deliberately conservative. It does not call for a new super-agency. The existing National Council can set common rules; the Agency and Foundation can retain their operational mandates; the Youth Affairs Agency can continue policy coordination; and the Management Efficiency Agency can perform its public-service functions. Integration can be achieved through clear interfaces, data governance, and shared outcomes without erasing institutional specialization.

11. Conclusion

Uzbekistan's legal framework for gifted-youth development contains substantial institutional capacity. Specialized schools, Presidential Schools, the Al-Beruni School, the National Programme, El-yurt umidi scholarships, return obligations, advisory structures, and high-level coordinating bodies cover most stages of the pathway. The framework is neither empty nor wholly fragmented.

Five coordination risks remain visible at the documentary level. Eligibility under PF-77 and PF-86 may overlap without an explicit cross-instrument priority rule. Data integration is partly mandated but does not yet amount to a field-wide governance protocol. Detailed application support is concentrated in specific cohorts. Removal from a specialized school is not paired with a defined developmental follow-up procedure. Departmental accountability is not supplemented by a common pathway outcome framework.

The evidence must be interpreted within limits. The 13.3% figure is a ratio between two legal ceilings, not an observed coverage rate. The 14 Chief Advisers are coordinators and cannot serve as the denominator for the 1:15 school-adviser ratio. Documentary silence does not establish zero implementation. These corrections narrow the claims but strengthen their credibility.

A workable reform path consists of legal clarification, data governance, and outcome-based management. The immediate tasks are a dual-eligibility rule, a minimum application-support standard, and a transition plan for pupils leaving specialized schools. Interoperability should follow through a common identifier and a legally defined data protocol. Shared outcome reporting should be introduced only after reliable linkage is possible. Empirical research should then test the documentary risks using candidate records, staffing data, process tracing, graduate surveys, and employment outcomes.

Declarations

Positionality and conflict of interest

The author is employed by the Agency for Specialized Educational Institutions and works in the unit implementing the President's Gifted Children initiative. The analysis is based on publicly available legal instruments, and the interpretations are the author's own. Institutional familiarity may assist interpretation of administrative terminology but may also create confirmation bias. To reduce that risk, the article distinguishes legal evidence from implementation claims, records counterevidence, and avoids reporting unsupported performance estimates.

Ethics statement

The study uses public legal and policy documents and does not involve human participants or personal data. Ethics committee approval was not required for the documentary analysis.

Data availability

The legal sources are publicly available through the official LexUZ database and the institutional websites listed in the references. The clause-level evidence log supporting the principal findings is reproduced in Appendix A. A machine-readable coding file should accompany any journal submission that requires open research materials.

REFERENCES

1. North, D. C. (1990). Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511808678
2. Scott, W. R. (2014). Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities (4th ed.). SAGE.
3. 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

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

4. Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? Public Administration, 69(1), 3-19. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00779.x
5. 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
6. Pollitt, C. (2003). Joined-up government: A survey. Political Studies Review, 1(1), 34-49. https://doi.org/10.1111/1478-9299.00004
7. Bouckaert, G., Peters, B. G., & Verhoest, K. (2010). The Coordination of Public Sector Organizations: Shifting Patterns of Public Management. Palgrave Macmillan.
8. 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
9. 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
10. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Decree No. PF-86 of 15 May 2025, On Measures to Implement the "President's Gifted Children" Initiative. LexUZ. https://lex.uz/uz/docs/7533279 (version rule applied as of 1 January 2026).
11. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Decree No. PF-77 of 5 May 2025, On Additional Measures to Support the Education of Gifted Specialists Abroad, Develop Their Professional Skills and Provide Incentives. LexUZ. https://lex.uz/en/docs/7520253
12. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Decree No. PF-197 of 29 October 2025, amendments concerning public-service governance and related El-yurt umidi arrangements. Historical consolidated view: https://lex.uz/acts/-7587464?ONDATE=29.10.2025%2000
13. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Decree No. PF-61 of 26 March 2025, On Measures to Implement Tasks Defined During the President's Open Dialogue with Youth. LexUZ. https://lex.uz/docs/7451522?otherlang=1
14. Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Resolution No. 526 of 25 June 2019, On Approval of the Regulation on Presidential Schools. LexUZ. https://lex.uz/en/docs/4387224
15. Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Resolution No. 130 of 28 February 2025, amendments concerning teacher certification and regulations in the preschool and school education system. LexUZ. https://lex.uz/en/docs/7409825
16. Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Resolution No. 233 of 5 May 2022, On Approval of the Regulation on Specialized Boarding Schools and Specialized Schools in the System of the Agency for Specialized Educational Institutions. LexUZ. https://lex.uz/uz/docs/5992874
17. Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Resolution No. 797 of 17 December 2025, On Approval of Certain Regulatory Legal Acts in the Field of Creative Schools. LexUZ. https://lex.uz/docs/7926881?otherlang=1
18. Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Resolution No. 550 of 11 September 2020, On Approval of the Regulation on the Youth Affairs Agency. LexUZ. https://lex.uz/en/docs/4993790
19. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Decree No. PF-106 of 14 April 2022, On Expanding the Network of Specialized Schools in the System of the Agency for Presidential Educational Institutions. LexUZ. https://lex.uz/docs/5960622?otherlang=1
20. Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. Qualitative Research Journal, 9(2), 27-40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027
21. Krippendorff, K. (2018). Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology (4th ed.). SAGE.
22. Mayring, P. (2014). Qualitative Content Analysis: Theoretical Foundation, Basic Procedures and Software Solution. Klagenfurt. https://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/handle/document/39517

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

23. International Organization for Standardization. (2018). ISO 31000:2018 Risk Management - Guidelines. Geneva: ISO. https://www.iso.org/standard/65694.html
24. Republic of Korea. Gifted Education Promotion Act, current English text. Korean Legislation Research Institute. https://elaw.klri.re.kr/eng_mobile/viewer.do?hseq=71732&key=2&type=sogan
25. Ministry of Education, Israel. Identification of gifted and outstanding pupils; national identification guidance and school responsibilities. https://mosdot.education.gov.il/students/gifted/find-gifted/ (accessed 5 August 2026).
26. Republican Scientific and Practical Center Daryn, Kazakhstan. About the Center. https://daryn.kz/en/about-center/ (accessed 5 August 2026).
27. Center for International Programs, Kazakhstan. Work Obligations under the Bolashak Scholarship. https://bolashak.gov.kz/index.php/en/vypuskniku/trudovaya-otrabotka (accessed 5 August 2026).
28. Ministry of Education, Singapore. Gifted Education Programme. https://www.moe.gov.sg/education-in-sg/our-programmes/gifted-education (updated 11 March 2026; accessed 5 August 2026).
29. Ministry of Education, Singapore. (2026, March 3). Learning Together with Different Strengths and Needs: Refreshed Approach to Support Primary School Students with Academic Strengths and Talents. https://www.moe.gov.sg/news/press-releases/20260303-learning-together-with-different-strengths-and-needs

Appendix A. Clause-level evidence log for principal findings

The table records the provisions relied on for the institutional map and risk findings. It is not a substitute for a full machine-readable coding file, but it allows readers to trace the main interpretations to legal text.

Table A1.

Evidence log

Source and provision	Extracted rule or function	Analytical use
PF-86, paras. 2-4	Creates the initiative, Community, National Council, and implementation arrangements.	Strategic and coordinating architecture.
PF-86, para. 5	Establishes the Al-Beruni School, adviser and teacher ratios, portfolio support, and institutional autonomy.	School-level development model.
PF-86, para. 6	Selects up to 1,500 grade 9 graduates annually; assigns participants to school advisers at a maximum 1:15 ratio; provides platform-based and short-course support.	National Programme pathway and adviser distinction.
PF-86, para. 8	Provides up to 200 annual foreign-study quotas from 2027 for Al-Beruni graduates and National Programme participants meeting admission and grant conditions.	Nominal 200/1,500 ratio and overlap with PF-77 routes.
PF-86, paras. 9-10	Creates 14 Chief Adviser posts to coordinate school advisers and a six-person initiative unit.	Chief Advisers are coordinators, not direct caseload advisers.
PF-86, para. 12	Creates the Republican Commission for implementation and control.	Oversight architecture.
PF-77, para. 2 and Foundation regulation	Assigns targeted internships, professional orientation, scholarship-holder database, return support, and related functions.	Foundation role extends beyond post-admission financing.
PF-77, para. 10(e)(i)-(iii)	Creates no-test routes based on top-100 full tuition grants, top-300 full tuition grants with limited costs, and top-20 partial grants for specified school graduates.	Operational foreign-study routes.
PF-77, competition regulation	Provides open competition, document review, tests, interviews, and quota allocation.	Separate operational route; transparency rules.
PF-77, para. 13	Sets service periods, employer responsibilities, Management Efficiency Agency monitoring, and double reimbursement for breach.	Return and professional-utilization mechanism.
PF-77 implementation measure on information system	Requires a Unified Automated Information System integrated with the Presidential Golden Fund platform.	Counterevidence to complete database isolation; basis for partial interoperability finding.
CMR 550, Regulation, youth-policy functions	Coordinates work connected with sending gifted youth to leading foreign universities and supports intellectual development.	Classified as coordination, not a scholarship channel.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Source and provision	Extracted rule or function	Analytical use
CMR 233, paras. 28-31	Defines grades, class size, curriculum, and progression in specialized schools.	School-stage development framework.
CMR 233, para. 33	Allows removal after sustained decline in ranking and academic performance despite individual work, including two consecutive quarters at grade 3 in specialist subjects.	Basis for the specialized-school exit continuity finding.
PF-197 amendments and PF-77 as amended	Assigns Management Efficiency Agency functions in public-service training and monitoring of career use.	Clarifies the sixth governance role without treating it as a school-stage actor.
Korean Gifted Education Promotion Act	Provides statutory coordination bodies, research institutes, linkages across school levels, and integrated gifted-education databases.	Comparative data-governance reference point.
Israel Ministry of Education guidance	National staged identification and recognition of later identification or developmental variation.	Comparative reference for re-entry and developmental continuity.
Daryn and Bolashak official sources	Separate school-level gifted-support centre and overseas scholarship return obligations.	Comparative reference for explicit interfaces between distinct systems.
Singapore MOE 2026 reform	Transition from the existing GEP to wider school-based and centre-based provisions with repeated identification opportunities.	Later comparative reference for periodic redesign and broader access.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ