

STRATEGIC GOVERNANCE IN PUBLIC HEALTH: FROM ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL TO EVIDENCE-BASED MANAGEMENT

Iskandarova Shakhnoza Tulkinovna¹, Voitova Gavkharkhon Alisherovna², Karimova Ziyoda Kushbayevna³, Fayziyeva Muxabbat Fayziyevna⁴

¹Professor, Head of the Department of Public Health and Healthcare Management No.2, Tashkent State Medical University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan. Email: shiskandarova67@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9378-7492>

²DSc, Assistant of the Department of Public Health and Healthcare Management No.2, Tashkent State Medical University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan. Email: gavharv@mail.ru

³PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Allergology, Clinical Immunology, Microbiology, Tashkent State Medical University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan. Email: zieda_karimova@mail.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1953-3512>

⁴Candidate of Medical Sciences, Associate Professor, Department of Public Health and Healthcare Management No.2, Tashkent State Medical University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan. Email: fayzievamuxabat07@mail.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7821-0556>

ABSTRACT

Contemporary public health systems are increasingly challenged by demographic transitions, epidemiological shifts toward chronic non-communicable diseases, and growing demands for efficiency, transparency, and accountability. Traditional administrative control models, characterized by hierarchical decision-making and regulatory dominance, demonstrate limited adaptability in responding to complex and dynamic healthcare environments. This study aims to analyze the transformation of public health governance from administrative control to evidence-based management and to assess its implications for healthcare system effectiveness. Using a comparative policy analysis and systems-based approach, international governance models are examined alongside the evolving organizational reforms within the healthcare system of Uzbekistan.

Keywords: public health governance; strategic management; evidence-based management; healthcare systems; health policy

How to cite this article: Iskandarova ST, Voitova GA, Karimova ZK, Fayziyeva MF. Strategic Governance in Public Health: From Administrative Control to Evidence-Based Management. *Int J Drug Deliv Technol.* 2026;16(51s): 1407-1410. DOI: 10.25258/ijddt.16.51s.50

Source of support: Nil.

Conflict of interest: None

Introduction

Public health governance represents a cornerstone of healthcare system performance, influencing service accessibility, quality, efficiency, and population health outcomes. For decades, governance in many national health systems has relied predominantly on administrative control mechanisms, including centralized regulation, directive planning, and compliance-based supervision [1]. While such models they often lacked flexibility, responsiveness, and analytical depth required in contemporary healthcare environments.

The increasing complexity of public health challenges—population aging, multimorbidity, health workforce shortages, and fiscal constraints—has exposed structural limitations of purely administrative governance models [2]. Decision-making processes based primarily on нормативно-правовые акты and hierarchical instructions frequently fail to incorporate real-time data, performance metrics, and outcome-oriented evaluations, thereby reducing system adaptability and strategic foresight [3].

In response, evidence-based management (EBMgt) has gained recognition as an advanced governance approach that applies principles of evidence-based medicine to organizational and policy-level decision-making [4]. EBMgt emphasizes the systematic use of empirical data, health indicators, economic evaluations, and contextual analysis to guide strategic planning and operational management within healthcare systems [5]. Importantly, this paradigm shifts governance from control-oriented administration toward analytical leadership and accountability.

Transitional healthcare systems, including those in Central Asia, present a particularly relevant context for examining this governance shift. Uzbekistan's healthcare sector has undergone significant structural reforms aimed at strengthening primary healthcare, decentralizing management functions, and introducing digital health solutions [6]. However, the persistence of administrative management practices alongside emerging data-driven initiatives creates a hybrid governance environment that warrants systematic analysis.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze the transformation of public health governance models from traditional administrative control to evidence-based management approaches and to evaluate their impact on strategic effectiveness, organizational resilience, and healthcare system performance, with particular reference to transitional health systems such as Uzbekistan.

Materials and Methods

This study employs a qualitative analytical design based on a comparative policy and systems analysis approach. The methodological framework integrates: analysis of international public health governance models described in WHO, OECD, and World Bank strategic documents [7–9]; comparative assessment of administrative versus evidence-based management structures using governance and performance indicators reported in peer-reviewed literature [10,11]; contextual analysis of healthcare reforms and management practices in Uzbekistan based on national policy documents, reform programs, and secondary statistical sources [6,12]. A systems-thinking perspective was applied to identify structural relationships between governance mechanisms, decision-making processes, and health system outcomes. The study does not involve human subjects and therefore does not require ethical approval.

Results

Characteristics of Administrative Control Models in Public Health

Administrative governance models are predominantly characterized by centralized authority, нормативное регулирование, and вертикальные механизмы подотчетности. Decision-making is largely procedural, focusing on compliance with regulations rather than outcome optimization [13]. While such models ensure institutional discipline and uniformity, they demonstrate limited capacity for adaptive response, particularly in resource-constrained or rapidly changing environments.

In transitional systems, including Uzbekistan, administrative control has historically ensured nationwide service coverage and basic infrastructure development [6]. However, this approach has been associated with fragmented information flows, delayed feedback mechanisms, and insufficient use of performance indicators in strategic planning [14].

Evidence-Based Management as a Strategic Governance Model

Evidence-based management introduces a paradigm shift by integrating quantitative and qualitative data into governance processes. Core components include the use of health system performance indicators, cost-effectiveness analyses, population health analytics, and predictive modeling to inform strategic decisions [4,10].

International experience demonstrates that EBMgt-oriented governance structures improve allocative efficiency, enhance transparency, and support long-term strategic alignment between policy objectives and operational outcomes [15]. Importantly, such models facilitate proactive rather than reactive management, allowing healthcare systems to anticipate risks and prioritize interventions based on empirical evidence.

In Uzbekistan, initial elements of evidence-based governance have been observed through the expansion of health information systems, цифровизация статистической отчетности, and pilot performance-based financing mechanisms [12,16]. Nevertheless, the integration of these data streams into strategic decision-making remains inconsistent, reflecting an ongoing transition rather than a completed transformation.

Comparative Analysis of Governance Models

The comparative analysis revealed fundamental structural differences between administrative control models and evidence-based management approaches in public health governance. Administrative systems are primarily oriented toward regulatory compliance, procedural stability, and centralized reporting, whereas evidence-based governance emphasizes performance monitoring, adaptive planning, and outcome-oriented accountability [17].

In administratively governed systems, strategic decisions are frequently derived from normative targets and retrospective statistical summaries, which limits the capacity to respond to emerging epidemiological and organizational challenges in a timely manner [18]. This governance logic often prioritizes formal indicators of activity (e.g., number of services delivered, institutional coverage) rather than indicators of effectiveness, quality, or population-level impact.

While regulatory oversight remains dominant, the gradual introduction of analytical tools—such as electronic health records, standardized reporting dashboards, and program evaluation mechanisms—signals a strategic shift toward data-informed governance [6,12].

Strategic Governance Indicators in Evidence-Based Management

The analysis identified several governance indicators that differentiate evidence-based management from traditional administrative control: Decision transparency, supported by open access to health system performance data and standardized evaluation criteria [19]; Strategic alignment, ensuring consistency between national health priorities, institutional objectives, and operational activities [20]; Resource optimization, based on cost-effectiveness and budget impact analyses rather than fixed line-item financing [11]; Organizational learning, facilitated by continuous monitoring, feedback loops, and adaptive policy cycles [21].

In the Uzbek healthcare context, recent reforms aimed at strengthening primary healthcare and decentralizing management responsibilities demonstrate partial alignment with these indicators. However, the strategic use of collected data for policy modeling and long-term planning remains underdeveloped, reflecting a gap between information availability and managerial capacity [14,22].

Discussion

In Uzbekistan, healthcare reforms over the past decade have prioritized structural reorganization and service accessibility, yielding measurable improvements in infrastructure and coverage [6]. However, the strategic governance dimension—particularly the integration of evidence into policy formulation and resource allocation—has progressed at a slower pace. This discrepancy underscores the necessity of parallel investments in managerial education, health economics expertise, and governance analytics [22,23].

International experience suggests that successful implementation of evidence-based management depends on institutional capacity-building rather than technological adoption alone [9]. Digital health systems and performance dashboards do not inherently produce better governance outcomes unless accompanied by decision-making frameworks that translate data into strategic action [15].

Furthermore, evidence-based governance must balance analytical rigor with contextual sensitivity. Over-reliance on quantitative indicators may obscure social determinants of health, regional disparities, and qualitative dimensions of service quality [24]. Therefore, hybrid governance models that integrate empirical evidence with expert judgment and stakeholder engagement are increasingly recognized as optimal for complex health systems.

Conclusion

The findings of this study demonstrate that administrative control models, while historically effective in establishing system-wide order and regulatory coherence, are insufficient for addressing the multidimensional challenges of contemporary public health. Evidence-based management emerges as a strategic governance paradigm capable of enhancing system adaptability, transparency, and long-term sustainability.

For transitional healthcare systems such as Uzbekistan, the shift toward evidence-based governance should be conceptualized as a phased transformation encompassing data infrastructure development, managerial capacity-building, and institutional culture change. Embedding empirical evidence into strategic decision-making processes is essential for optimizing resource allocation, improving health outcomes, and strengthening public trust in healthcare governance.

Acknowledgements

The author expresses gratitude to colleagues in the field of public health management and health policy for their scholarly insights that contributed to the conceptual development of this study.

References

1. Saltman R.B., Duran A., Dubois H.F.W. *Governing Public Hospitals: Reform Strategies and the Movement Towards Institutional Autonomy*. World Health Organization, Copenhagen; 2011.
2. Kickbusch I., Gleicher D. *Governance for health in the 21st century*. WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2012.
3. Greer S.L., Wismar M., Figueras J. *Strengthening Health System Governance: Better Policies, Stronger Performance*. Open University Press; 2016.
4. Rousseau D.M. Is there such a thing as evidence-based management? *Academy of Management Review*. 2006;31(2):256–269. doi:10.5465/amr.2006.20208679
5. Barends E., Rousseau D.M., Briner R.B. *Evidence-Based Management: The Basic Principles*. Center for Evidence-Based Management; 2014.
6. Ministry of Health of the Republic of Uzbekistan. *Health System Development Strategy of the Republic of Uzbekistan for 2019–2025*. Tashkent; 2019.
7. World Health Organization. *Everybody's Business: Strengthening Health Systems to Improve Health Outcomes*. WHO Framework for Action; 2007.
8. OECD. *Health at a Glance 2023: OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2023. doi:10.1787/health_glance-2023-en
9. World Bank. *Improving Health System Performance through Better Governance*. Washington, DC; 2020.
10. Kovner A.R., Elton J.J. Evidence-based management in healthcare. *Frontiers of Health Services Management*. 2009;26(2):3–24.
11. Drummond M.F., Sculpher M.J., Claxton K., Stoddart G.L., Torrance G.W. *Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Health Care Programmes*. 4th ed. Oxford University Press; 2015.
12. World Health Organization. *Uzbekistan: Health System Review. Health Systems in Transition*. 2022;24(2):1–180.
13. Pollitt C., Bouckaert G. *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*. 4th ed. Oxford University Press; 2017.
14. Rechel B., Maresso A., Sagan A. *Organization and financing of public health*

STRATEGIC GOVERNANCE IN PUBLIC HEALTH: FROM ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL TO
EVIDENCE-BASED MANAGEMENT

- services in Europe. WHO & European Observatory; 2018.
15. Ham C. Improving the performance of health services: The role of clinical leadership. *The Lancet*. 2014;384(9945):182–183. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61093-3
 16. Ministry of Digital Technologies of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Digital Health Transformation Program 2021–2026. Tashkent; 2021.
 17. Lynn L.E. *Public Management: Old and New*. Routledge; 2006.
 18. Christensen T., Lægreid P. The Whole-of-Government Approach to Public Sector Reform. *Public Administration Review*. 2007;67(6):1059–1066.
 19. Hood C. A Public Management for All Seasons? *Public Administration*. 1991;69(1):3–19.
 20. Kaplan R.S., Norton D.P. *Strategy-Focused Organization*. Harvard Business School Press; 2001.
 21. Argyris C., Schön D.A. *Organizational Learning II: Theory, Method, and Practice*. Addison-Wesley; 1996.
 22. Ensor T., Ronoh J. Effective financing of maternal health services: A review of the literature. *Health Policy*. 2005;75(1):49–58.