

Systematic Organization of Targeted Funding for Improving The Quality of Education

Temurjon K. Komilov

Independent Researcher at the National Research Institute Named After A. Avloni

Abstract: The article examines theoretical approaches to the relationship between education financing and the quality of education, analyzes the debate surrounding these perspectives, and offers opinions on mechanisms for improving education financing. Researchers who focus on the existence or absence of a correlation between education quality and funding levels (or amounts) are generally divided into two groups. Finally, the article presents opinions on the effectiveness of education financing and offers proposals and recommendations for improvement.

Keywords: Quality of education, financing of education, efficiency, quality and financing relationship.

INTRODUCTION

Education is considered an investment in the future because it provides significant economic and social benefits to individuals and societies. At the same time, financing education remains one of the most pressing and controversial issues globally. Since education spending is primarily funded by state budgets, the topic of education financing is widely debated among experts in education and finance.

The main questions in these debates are: How much should be allocated from the state budget to finance education? How should financing be implemented, that is, its mechanism? And most importantly, does the level of financing (more or less) affect the quality of education? Does it increase the quality of education? And we can see disputes over other similar issues.

Stanford University professors E. Hanushek and A. Lindset argue that despite the fact that per-pupil spending in the United States has almost quadrupled (after adjusting for inflation) from 1960 to 2009, educational achievement has remained the same, and argue that there is no benefit in increasing funding for education at the national or state level, and that instead of allocating more money to failing schools, it is necessary to establish funding based on educational outcomes [Hanushek, E. A. *et al.*, 2009].

Russian researchers E. Savitskaya and D. Chertykovtseva support these views. The researchers emphasize that the success and achievement of students do not depend on the ratio of education spending to GDP, the ratio of education spending to total government spending, and whether teachers' monthly salaries are higher

or lower than the average salary in the country [Савицкая, Е. *et al.*, 2013].

To substantiate their opinion, the researchers analyze the financing of education and the cost of education, compare the results of the PISA and TIMSS international tests in Russia and other countries, and note that despite the (albeit small) increase in funding from year to year in Russia, there has been almost no change in the test results. Based on this, the researchers suggest that the decline in the quality of education is not due to the lack of more funding from the state or low teacher salaries, but rather to well-developed educational standards, the curriculum and teaching methods of experienced (qualified) teachers, as well as the independent work of students and the characteristics of the student's family.

The opinions of school students also play a big role in this regard. In particular, a user named Elliot, a high school student in California, posted a post on Quora complaining about his school. According to him, the average SAT score for his school is 589 in English, and the average SAT score for his school is 583, for a total average SAT score of 1172 (For information: the maximum score for SAT English and Math is 800, for a total of 1600). Elliott also notes that this indicator has not changed with the increase in teacher salaries, and that the area where he lives is a wealthy one. He points out that the average SAT score of a school located 10 minutes away from his school is 1500, suggesting that a school's test scores and the quality of education are not related to teacher salaries or the wealth or poverty of the area, but rather to the teaching methods and the work of dedicated, qualified teachers [www.quora.com].

Another group of scientists suggests that the level (amount) of education financing and teachers' salaries have a significant impact on the quality of education. In particular, Russian researcher E. Suslova, in her 2009 article, writes: "Teachers receive low salaries (3.5-4 thousand rubles), which limits the entry of highly qualified young specialists into the education sector. Among other shortcomings, teachers' motivation to increase their labor efficiency and their social status remain low [Коверова, М. И., 2021]." As Suslova E., Koverova M. and others have emphasized, in order to train qualified teachers, it is first necessary to raise the status of teachers and provide them with good material and moral support. Because improving the quality of education also depends on qualified teachers. In addition, today the cost of education is also increasing. In particular, the issues of keeping up with these technological changes, innovation and technological innovations, and their maximum involvement in the educational process are also causing a significant increase in the cost of education. Without these technological changes, it is impossible to create a modern education system and provide sufficient knowledge.

American researchers Carmel Martin, Ulrich Boser, and others emphasize that financing is a central component of ensuring high-quality education and often leads to good results. They cite a 2016 study that shows that between 1990 and 2011, school funding reforms that allocated more money to school districts with higher poverty levels led to some (by a fifth) parity in educational outcomes between students in rich and poor areas [Martin, C. *et al.*, 2018].

Another American scholar, Jackson and Mackiewicz, recently conducted a large and comprehensive study on this. Their study showed that increasing school spending improves student outcomes across a range of outcomes, including test scores, graduation rates, access to higher education, future earnings, and intergenerational mobility [Jackson, C. K. *et al.*, 2021].

Many recent studies have confirmed the relationship between education spending and student achievement. The increase in education spending as a result of education reforms has led to a number of positive outcomes. In particular, (1) test scores have improved, (2) graduates are more likely to enter and successfully complete higher education, (3) economically disadvantaged students have started to earn more as adults, (4)

economic well-being has been passed down from generation to generation, (5) housing prices have risen in some areas as teacher salaries have increased, and (6) this has had a positive impact on economic growth by increasing spending in low-income areas [Lafortune, J., 2022].

The approaches of the two groups we have considered above, although contradictory, converge on one point: *The amount of funds for education is important, but only when it is used effectively.* Indeed, we fully agree with this opinion. If education spending is spent on educational purposes, educational results will definitely be good. It is necessary to create a mechanism for the effective use of education spending. Many scientists are puzzled by this issue. How can we ensure maximum efficiency of education spending? It is advisable to study the experience of countries in this regard.

For example, the Danish government's 2014 Folkeskole reform set three main goals related to student success, equity, and well-being, along with a number of measurable indicators. Achievements on these indicators are monitored for each school and reported to municipalities. Another notable aspect of the Folkeskole reform, which is based on specific objectives, is the teacher development and qualification policy. Accordingly, the goal is to certify 95 percent of teachers in all subjects they teach by 2020. To facilitate this process, the Ministry of Education has introduced additional targeted funding. Evidence-based recommendations should be made on how these funds can be spent. To apply for these funds, municipalities must develop a plan for their use, report on the progress of the work, and return any unspent funds to the ministry by 2020 [Nusche, D. *et al.*, 2016].

In another country, Estonia, all levels of government are actively involved in developing education strategies. By law, the national government, local governments and schools are required to have a strategic development plan. National and local governments are required to have their annual budgets, four-year medium-term expenditure plans and long-term strategic plans, and to conduct their activities in accordance with these plans. School principals are responsible for producing school budgets. Most local authorities operate on a clearly defined budget calendar and report to school principals each spring on the budget limits for the following financial year. These figures are then set in the autumn when they

are more certain. In public schools, school budgets are reviewed by democratically elected boards of trustees, made up of parents, teachers and students, before being finally approved by the local authority. These boards of trustees include external experts and, in the case of vocational schools, representatives from industry. Ultimately, the Ministry of Education approves the budgets of public schools [Santiago, P. *et al.*, 2016].

Some studies emphasize that funding should be based on priorities in education. During the visit of Andreas Schleicher, the founder of the PISA study and Special Advisor on Education Policy to the Secretary-General of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), to Uzbekistan from April 21 to May 7, 2022, when he was asked which area of education would be most effective to allocate more funds to, given Uzbekistan's existing economic potential, Schleicher emphasized quality, stating that quality depends on the knowledge and skills of teachers and that the quality of education can never exceed the quality of teachers [www.gazeta.uz]. In other words, while teacher qualifications and teaching quality increase the quality of education, it is necessary to invest more in teachers, provide them with continuous retraining, professional development, and comprehensive support.

There is a need for a deep study of the mechanisms for the effective spending and use of funds and (mental and physical) resources. This should take into account local conditions and opportunities, the form of governance and the mentality of society, and establish the principles of accountability and responsibility for every sum. All this should be reflected in the form of education strategies, laws and decisions.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the issue of the relationship between education financing and quality indicators is still a matter of debate in the scientific community. Because, although money is important, it is not the only solution. Therefore, issues of efficiency in financing education are gaining great importance. Of course, there are researchers who emphasize that funds in education, regardless of the quality and effectiveness of education, play a large and positive role for society in socio-economic terms. However, this is possible only if the state has sufficient funds and resources. If the state has a budget deficit (which is usually observed in many developing countries), it is unlikely to find additional funds for education. In this case, paying

attention to carefully developed educational priorities and using funds effectively becomes very important.

Thus, achieving success in education depends on having clear goals and priorities, and improving the financing strategy and developing its working mechanism. For this, it is important to ensure the active participation of local authorities and schools in short- and long-term plans and strategies adopted at the state level, and to increase the transparency and accountability of the working mechanism accordingly. It is important to emphasize that all plans and strategies, expenditures and financing mechanisms in education should be aimed at the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of education.

REFERENCES

1. Hanushek, E. A. & Lindseth, A. A. "Performance-based funding." *Defining Ideas*, 1 (2009): 101–105.
2. Савицкая, Е. & Чертыковцева, Д. "Финансирование и качество школьного образования: эконометрический подход." *Вопросы экономики*, 4 (2013): 112–129.
3. How does school funding increase the quality of education of the students of the school? <https://www.quora.com/How-does-school-funding-increase-the-quality-of-education-of-the-students-of-the-school> (Манбага 06.06.2022да эришилган)
4. Коверова, М. И. "Как обеспечить равновысокое качество образования: обзор эффективных механизмов." *EdPolicy.ru* (2021). <https://edpolicy.ru/kak-obespechit-ravnovysokoe-kachestvo-obrazovania-obzor-jeffektivnyh-mehanizmov>.
Иқтибос манбаси: Сулова, Е. "Счастливы́й круг. Хороший учитель достоин хорошей зарплаты." *Учительская газета* (2009).
5. Martin, C., Boser, U., Benner, M. & Baffour, P. "A quality approach to school funding: Lessons learned from school finance litigation." *Center for American Progress* (2018)
6. Jackson, C. K. & Mackevicius, C. "The distribution of school spending impacts." *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper*, 28517 (2021).
7. Lafortune, J. "Understanding the effects of school funding." *Public Policy Institute of California Report* (May 2022).

8. Nusche, D., Radinger, T., Falch, T. & Shaw, B. "OECD reviews of school resources: Denmark 2016." *OECD Publishing* (2016).
9. Santiago, P, *et al.* "OECD reviews of school resources: Estonia 2016." *OECD Publishing* (2016).
10. «Таълим сифати ҳеч қачон ўқитувчи сифатидан ошиб кетолмайди» — Андреас Шляйхер, 7 июн 2022. <https://www.gazeta.uz/uz/2022/06/07/schleicher/>
11. OECD. Education at a Glance 2021: OECD Indicators. *OECD Publishing, Paris, (2021): 232.*
12. OECD. Education at a Glance 2021: OECD Indicators. *OECD Publishing, Paris, (2021).*
13. Santiago, P, *et al.* "OECD reviews of school resources: Estonia (2016)."
14. UNESCO. "Global Education Monitoring Report-2020." 'Inclusion and education: All Means All'. *Paris, (2020).*
15. Сусллова, Е. "Счастливы круг. Хороший учитель достоин хорошей зарплаты." *Учительская газета* (2009)
16. «Таълим сифати ҳеч қачон ўқитувчи сифатидан ошиб кетолмайди» — Андреас Шляйхер, 7 июн 2022. <https://www.gazeta.uz/uz/2022/06/07/schleicher/>

Source of support: Nil; **Conflict of interest:** Nil.

Cite this article as:

Komilov, T.K. "Systematic Organization of Targeted Funding for Improving The Quality of Education." *Sarcouncil journal of Arts humanities and social sciences* 3.11 (2024): pp 22-25.