IMPROVING MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCY IN NON-STATE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS: PRACTICAL APPROACHES AND SOLUTIONS

Do`stova Dilafro`z Eshmamatovna
Master's Student, Management (Educational Management)
Bucheon University in Tashkent, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
Nargiza Fatkhullayevna Abdunazarova
Scientific Supervisor Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor.

ABSTRACT. Efficient management is central to the educational quality, financial sustainability and public credibility of non-state educational institutions. This paper examines how strategic planning, distributed leadership, workforce development, digital administration and accountable decision-making can be combined into a practical improvement system. A qualitative, literature-based synthesis is conducted with reference to international school-leadership research and Uzbekistan's education governance context. The main contribution is a management efficiency matrix linking six operational priorities with feasible actions and illustrative monitoring indicators. A staged institutional improvement cycle is also proposed to translate assessment findings into decisions and follow-up. The matrix is intended for contextual adaptation and pilot evaluation; no new institutional survey, experimental intervention or evidence of its measured effectiveness is claimed. The paper argues that efficiency should be understood as the responsible use of resources in pursuit of equitable educational outcomes rather than cost reduction alone.

Keywords: non-state education; educational governance; management efficiency; strategic planning; distributed leadership; quality assurance; digital management; Uzbekistan.

1. INTRODUCTION

Non-state educational institutions expand the range of educational services and create additional opportunities for innovation, institutional autonomy and responsiveness to learners. At the same time, they must balance educational objectives with budgetary constraints, staffing needs, parental expectations and regulatory duties. Administrative growth does not automatically generate effective governance: a larger enrolment or a more extensive portfolio of programmes may increase managerial complexity without improving learning conditions.

In Uzbekistan, the Law "On Education" No. ZRU-637 provides a legal framework for educational organisations, including non-state providers, subject to the applicable

licensing or notification arrangements and educational requirements (Republic of Uzbekistan, 2020). This context makes it important to distinguish managerial discretion from institutional accountability. A non-state institution may be financially independent in some decisions while still carrying public obligations concerning educational provision, learners' rights and transparent service delivery.

The purpose of this paper is to identify practical management approaches that can strengthen organisational functioning without separating efficiency from educational quality. Three questions guide the analysis: which management functions deserve priority; what forms of evidence can inform improvement; and how might managers organise changes through a realistic, repeatable process? The discussion addresses non-state educational institutions generally while recognising that appropriate procedures differ across preschool, school, vocational and higher education settings.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL BASIS

Management efficiency in education is not synonymous with maximising financial returns or minimising expenditure. It concerns the extent to which managerial structures enable an institution to accomplish educational goals, make defensible decisions and allocate limited resources responsibly. The World Bank (2018) distinguishes the provision of schooling from actual learning; this distinction also cautions against using enrolment, infrastructure or administrative compliance as complete proxies for educational success. The governance literature therefore supports multidimensional evaluation rather than reliance on one performance metric.

Pont, Nusche and Moorman (2008) identify school leadership as a policy lever for improving the conditions of teaching and learning. Spillane (2006) further conceptualises leadership as distributed across people, routines and organisational tools. For non-state providers, this implies that founders, directors, academic managers and teachers should have explicit decision rights. Strategic direction and financial oversight must be coordinated with professional judgement about curriculum, assessment and student support.

Performance measurement can be structured around several institutional perspectives. Kaplan and Norton (1992) show the limitations of evaluating organisations through financial measures alone; their balanced-scorecard logic is useful as a general management analogy, although educational indicators require sector-specific adaptation. UNESCO (2017) emphasises that accountability is effective when responsibilities are clear and evaluation supports institutional improvement rather than simplistic blame. On this basis, management efficiency should be assessed jointly through educational quality, staff capacity, resource stewardship, stakeholder trust and compliance.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study adopts a qualitative conceptual design. It synthesises selected sources on educational leadership, organisational learning, performance measurement and accountability, together with the legal context for non-state education in Uzbekistan. Sources were selected for their direct relevance to practical institutional management; this is not a systematic review or a statistical comparison of educational institutions. The reasoning proceeds from identifying recurring governance functions to specifying corresponding management actions and the types of evidence administrators could realistically collect.

The proposed approaches were evaluated conceptually against four criteria: educational relevance, operational feasibility, institutional accountability and adaptability to different types of providers. No primary data were collected, no individual institution was assessed and no causal claim is made about the effects of the proposed interventions. The resulting matrix and implementation cycle are presented as testable management proposals, not as an established assessment scale.

4. RESULTS: PRACTICAL APPROACHES AND SOLUTIONS

4.1. Six interconnected management priorities

The conceptual analysis identifies six mutually reinforcing priorities. Strategic planning links the mission of an institution to a limited number of achievable objectives. Academic quality governance ensures that administrative decisions support instruction, assessment and learner development. Human resource management coordinates recruitment, induction, professional development and retention. Digital administration enables reliable records and timely communication. Financial stewardship protects continuity of educational services. Finally, stakeholder accountability converts feedback and compliance evidence into documented improvement decisions.

Table 1. Proposed matrix of management efficiency measures

Management priority	Practical management action	Illustrative monitoring evidence
Strategic planning	Set annual priorities; assign owners; review an action plan each term.	Achievement of milestones; timely completion of decisions.
Academic quality	Use lesson/programme review, mentoring and learner-support audits.	Documented corrective actions; teaching-quality review findings.

Management priority	Practical management action	Illustrative monitoring evidence
Personnel management	Map staff skills; provide induction and peer learning; clarify roles.	Staff retention; development participation; role clarity.
Digital administration	Maintain secure student and staff records; streamline workflows.	Processing time; data completeness; unresolved service requests.
Financial stewardship	Align budgets with learning needs; review procurement and risks.	Budget variance; continuity of critical educational inputs.
Accountability	Collect structured feedback; report responses and safeguards.	Response closure; stakeholder feedback; compliance follow-up.

4.2. From monitoring to managerial action

A workable improvement process should begin with a diagnostic review of existing practices rather than the introduction of a large number of indicators. Managers can select two or three priority problems—such as delayed responses to parents, inconsistent induction of new teachers or incomplete learning-support documentation—and identify responsible staff, an achievable target and a review date. A brief action plan can then connect evidence, resources and professional responsibilities. Importantly, a measure should be retained only when it informs a plausible management decision.

For example, an institution concerned about teacher turnover could review exit feedback, workloads and mentoring arrangements before choosing a response. Staff retention may be described as the number of teachers remaining at the end of a defined period divided by the number employed at its beginning, with adjustments for planned contracts and staffing changes. This indicator alone cannot explain why teachers leave. It should therefore be interpreted alongside qualitative staff feedback and contextual factors, rather than used to evaluate individuals punitively.

4.3. A staged implementation cycle

The proposed cycle consists of five stages: (1) establish a baseline from institutional records and stakeholder feedback; (2) prioritise a small number of changes using risk, cost and educational importance; (3) assign responsibility and implement targeted measures; (4) monitor both implementation and unintended consequences; and (5) revise the plan and document lessons learned. The cycle can be organised around a term or another locally appropriate planning interval. Bryk et al. (2015) demonstrate

the value of disciplined, iterative improvement routines in educational settings, but local pilots remain necessary to establish their practical utility for non-state providers.

4.4. Illustrative institutional application

Consider a hypothetical non-state school in which parents report slow responses to academic enquiries while teachers describe duplicated reporting tasks. The director could begin by mapping the communication workflow, establishing who receives each enquiry and determining whether repeated data entry causes delays. A limited pilot could replace overlapping forms with one access-controlled request log and designate an academic lead to review unresolved cases weekly. At the end of the term, managers would compare response times and unresolved requests with the baseline, while also asking staff whether the revised procedure reduced administrative burden. This scenario illustrates a possible improvement logic; it is not a documented case study or evidence of a successful intervention.

Decision rules should prevent indicators from being mistaken for objectives in themselves. A falling number of complaints, for example, might signal better service or simply reduced confidence in the reporting channel. Similarly, strong budget execution does not demonstrate that learning needs were adequately financed. Evidence should therefore be triangulated across records, staff reflection, learner experiences and stakeholder feedback. Leaders should record the interpretation of each measure, the decision it informed and a date for reassessment. Such documentation makes improvement traceable and allows ineffective actions to be withdrawn rather than repeated.

5. DISCUSSION

The proposed measures have value only if efficiency is interpreted in educational and ethical terms. Faster administrative processing may improve service responsiveness, but a reduction in teacher contact time could undermine the institution's core mission. Likewise, expenditure savings should not compromise inclusion, student welfare or the professional conditions needed for effective teaching. Financial oversight and educational quality assurance must therefore inform one another, while sensitive staff and student information requires appropriate access controls and lawful processing.

Implementation will also differ by institutional size and level. A small learning centre may combine several roles within one management team, whereas a non-state university may need formal academic committees, programme evaluation arrangements and differentiated accountability. Standardised indicators should not be transferred mechanically across such settings. The literature and the Uzbekistan legal framework offer a basis for designing the approach, but neither establishes that the proposed matrix improves measurable outcomes. Future research should pilot the

indicators in different institutional categories, assess their feasibility and validity, and compare changes over time.

A further challenge is the organisational burden of monitoring itself. Small institutions can lose staff time if every managerial question triggers a new reporting form. A proportionate system should therefore use existing records first, avoid duplicate data collection and schedule short evidence reviews linked to decisions. Where digital systems are introduced, managers should verify their reliability, staff readiness, accessibility and data-protection arrangements. These are conditions of responsible implementation, not optional technical additions.

6. CONCLUSION

Management efficiency in non-state educational institutions depends on coherent strategic priorities, leadership responsibilities, competent personnel, reliable digital processes, responsible financial decisions and meaningful accountability. This paper proposes a six-area management matrix and a five-stage improvement cycle to connect these functions with observable institutional actions. Their contribution is methodological and practical: they offer an organising framework for management self-evaluation, not evidence of an already successful intervention. Institutions should adapt the measures to their educational level, legal obligations, size and safeguarding requirements, and subject them to pilot testing before using them for high-stakes judgements.

REFERENCES

1. Bryk, A. S., Gomez, L. M., Grunow, A., & LeMahieu, P. G. (2015). Learning to Improve: How America's Schools Can Get Better at Getting Better. Harvard Education Press.
2. Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1992). The Balanced Scorecard—Measures That Drive Performance. Harvard Business Review, 70(1), 71–79.
3. Pont, B., Nusche, D., & Moorman, H. (2008). Improving School Leadership, Volume 1: Policy and Practice. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264044715-en
4. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2020). Law No. ZRU-637 of 23 September 2020, On Education (as amended). https://lex.uz/docs/5013007
5. Spillane, J. P. (2006). Distributed Leadership. Jossey-Bass.
6. UNESCO. (2017). Global Education Monitoring Report 2017/8: Accountability in Education—Meeting Our Commitments. UNESCO. https://www.unesco.org/gem-report/en/publication/2017/8-accountability-education-meeting-our-commitments
7. World Bank. (2018). World Development Report 2018: Learning to Realize Education's Promise. World Bank.
https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/wdr2018