



Article

Ensuring Financial Stability in Non-State Higher Education Institutions: Theoretical and Practical Foundations of A Mandatory Reinvestment Policy

Bozorov Alisher Ro‘zimurodovich^{*1}

1. Dean of the Faculty, International Digital University

* Correspondence: alisherbozorov.rch@gmail.com

Abstract: This article analyzes a newly proposed regulatory framework aimed at ensuring the financial stability of non-state (private) higher education institutions through a mechanism of mandatory reinvestment of a specified share of net profit. According to the proposed system, institutions are required to reinvest at least 80 percent of their net profit during the initial five-year period, and no less than 50 percent in subsequent years, back into their core educational activities. The study evaluates the institutional foundations, economic efficiency, and impact of this policy on financial sustainability using theoretical approaches and economic modeling. In addition, a comparative analysis with international practices is conducted to identify the strengths and potential limitations of the proposed mechanism.

Keywords: Private Universities, Financial Stability, Reinvestment, Economics of Education, Capital Management, Regulatory Policy.

Citation: Ro‘zimurodovich B. A. Ensuring Financial Stability in Non-State Higher Education Institutions: Theoretical and Practical Foundations of A Mandatory Reinvestment Policy. American Journal of Economics and Business Management 2026, 9(4), 373-380.

Received: 09th Jan 2026

Revised: 26th Feb 2026

Accepted: 16th Mar 2026

Published: 12th Apr 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

1. Introduction

In recent years, the number and significance of private higher education institutions have increased substantially. This trend is driven by the growing demand for educational services, constraints in public budget financing, and the emergence of a competitive environment within the education market. However, the issue of financial stability of private universities remains a pressing and unresolved challenge [1].

In the context of the modern knowledge-based economy, the sustainable functioning of higher education institutions is of strategic importance not only for the education system but also for the competitiveness and innovative development of the national economy. From this perspective, the financial stability of universities constitutes an essential economic category that is directly linked to the quality of education, the effectiveness of scientific research, the standard of human capital formation, and the institutional development of universities [2].

In economic literature, financial stability is generally interpreted as the ability of enterprises and organizations to maintain sustainable financial performance over the long term. However, the specific characteristics of universities, namely, their simultaneous fulfillment of educational, research, and social functions, necessitate a broader economic interpretation of this concept [3].

Accordingly, the financial stability of higher education institutions encompasses the following dimensions:

- The availability of stable and diversified revenue sources;
- The ability to cover operational expenses in a timely manner;
- The capacity to undertake investment activities;
- The availability of capital resources for infrastructure development;
- The capability to manage financial risks effectively.

From this perspective, the financial stability of a higher education institution is defined in this study as follows:

The financial stability of a higher education institution refers to the university's ability to sustainably carry out its educational, research, and institutional activities over the long term, minimize financial risks, mobilize investment resources, and ensure economic efficiency without adversely affecting the quality of education [3].

Nowadays, various sources of financing for higher education institutions have been established, and these sources differ across countries. The main characteristics of these funding structures are presented in the table below [4].

Table 1. Comparison of Revenue Sources of Higher Education Institutions (International vs. Uzbekistan).

No.	Source	Developed countries (%)	Uzbekistan (%)
1.	Tuition fees	30–40	80–90
2.	Government grants	20–30	5–10
3.	Endowment (permanent investment fund)	20–40	0–2
4.	Other income sources	10–20	3–5

The analysis of Table 1 indicates that the financial model of higher education institutions in developed countries is highly diversified, with revenues generated from multiple sources. This diversification reduces financial risks and enhances long-term sustainability [5].

A more in-depth examination of this model further reveals that an increase in the level of reinvestment has a multiplicative effect on capital growth. In particular, under a scenario of 80% reinvestment over a five-year period, the capital volume reaches approximately USD 18.9 million, representing nearly an 18.9-fold increase from its initial value. This corresponds to an average annual growth rate (CAGR) of approximately 78–80% [6].

For comparison, under a 50% reinvestment model, capital reaches approximately USD 7.59 million, representing an increase of about 7.6 times (CAGR $\approx$ 50%), whereas under a 30% reinvestment model, this figure amounts to only a 3.7-fold increase (CAGR $\approx$ 30%).

These results indicate that the relationship between the level of reinvestment and capital growth is not linear but exponential. In other words, an increase in the share of reinvestment significantly accelerates the process of capital accumulation [7].

At the same time, the model results provide an important strategic implication for private higher education institutions: if a substantial share of net profit is retained within the institution, a financially self-sustaining system can be established within 5–7 years. Conversely, a low level of reinvestment slows down long-term development and perpetuates dependence on external financing sources.

In contrast, under the conditions of Uzbekistan, higher education institutions predominantly rely on tuition fees, making them highly sensitive to external economic factors and financially vulnerable. In particular, the near absence of long-term financial instruments such as endowments significantly constrains capital accumulation [8].

From this perspective, in conditions where revenue diversification remains insufficiently developed, the introduction of a mandatory reinvestment policy emerges as an alternative institutional mechanism. It contributes to ensuring financial stability through the accumulation of internal financial resources.

In many developing countries, private higher education institutions primarily rely on tuition fees, which makes them highly vulnerable to financial risks. Under such conditions, governments are increasingly introducing new mechanisms aimed at strengthening financial discipline [9].

One such mechanism is the policy of mandatory reinvestment of a specified share of net profit. This approach ensures that capital is retained within the institution, thereby supporting infrastructure development and enhancing the quality of education.

Literature Review

The relationship between financial stability and public expenditure constitutes one of the central issues in economic theory and has been extensively examined within both classical and modern economic schools of thought. In particular, the Keynesian framework developed by At the same time, according to Wagner's Law proposed by Adolph Wagner, the share of public expenditure in gross domestic product tends to increase steadily in the process of economic development. This phenomenon is particularly explained by the growing level of government investment in social sectors, including education and healthcare [10].

In contemporary research, the impact of public expenditure on economic growth has been examined in greater depth. For instance, Barro emphasizes that the composition of government spending significantly influences economic growth rates. Similarly, Gupta et al. demonstrate that the efficiency of public expenditure, especially investments directed toward human capital, plays a crucial role in ensuring economic stability.

Keynes emphasizes the active role of the state as a key instrument for ensuring economic stability. According to this perspective, during periods of economic downturn, an increase in government spending can stimulate aggregate demand, thereby contributing to the restoration of equilibrium within the economic system.

The issue of ensuring financial stability in the private sector has also evolved into a distinct field of academic inquiry. In this context, the formation of capital reserves, liquidity management, and reinvestment policy are considered key instruments. In particular, the reinvestment mechanism plays a crucial role in expanding the internal financial capacity of institutions and enhancing their resilience to external financial risks [11].

In the field of education, the efficiency of investments is widely grounded in the framework of human capital theory. Becker identifies investments in education as one of the primary drivers of economic growth. Similarly, Lucas (1988) provides a theoretical justification that the accumulation of human capital and knowledge constitutes an endogenous factor of economic growth.

In international practice, various mechanisms are employed to ensure the financial stability of higher education institutions. In developed countries, particularly in the United States and Europe, universities are largely financed through endowment funds. For example, Harvard University possesses one of the largest endowment funds in the world and has maintained its financial stability through this mechanism.

Within the endowment model, the principal capital is preserved, while only the income generated from investments is utilized. This allows universities to ensure long-

term financial sustainability. However, the establishment of such a model requires substantial initial capital and a well-developed financial market infrastructure.

In developing countries, however, such opportunities remain limited; therefore, a mandatory reinvestment policy can be considered an alternative to the endowment mechanism. Through this approach, internal financial resources are accumulated, thereby supporting the sustainable development of educational institutions.

From this perspective, the proposed reinvestment policy can be evaluated as an innovative instrument adapted to national conditions, playing an important role in strengthening the institutional capacity of the private education sector.

Some studies have placed particular emphasis on the financial stability of private higher education institutions. These studies highlight that a high dependence on tuition fees increases financial risks; therefore, it is essential to develop internal financial resources, including the introduction of reinvestment policies and capital reserve mechanisms [12].

Overall, the literature review indicates that public expenditure, investments in human capital, and financial management mechanisms in the private sector are closely interrelated. Their comprehensive improvement plays a crucial role in ensuring both economic and institutional stability.

2. Methodology

This article aims to comprehensively assess the impact of a mandatory reinvestment policy on ensuring the financial stability of private higher education institutions. To achieve this objective, the study employs a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches, utilizing the following research methods:

Institutional Analysis:

Through institutional analysis, the study examines the reinvestment policy currently being implemented in practice, including its legal foundations and regulatory mechanisms. Within this approach:

- The regulatory requirements established by the state (80% and 50% reinvestment thresholds) are analyzed;
- The financial management practices of private higher education institutions are examined;
- The impact of regulatory policy on the behavior and decision-making processes of economic agents is assessed.

This method is grounded in the theory of institutional economics developed by North, which explains how rules and institutions shape economic outcomes.

Comparative Analysis

The comparative analysis method is employed to examine the financial models of private higher education institutions across different countries. In particular:

- In developed countries (endowment model and diversified revenue sources);
- In developing countries (dependence on tuition fees and liquidity risks);
- And within the context of Uzbekistan, the financial model of private higher education institutions is comparatively analyzed.

This analysis provides a basis for understanding how a reinvestment policy can function as an alternative to the endowment mechanism.

Econometric Modeling The core part of the study is based on econometric analysis, through which the impact of the reinvestment level on financial stability is empirically evaluated.

To assess financial stability, the following baseline model is proposed:

$$FS_t = \alpha + \beta_1 RI_t + \beta_2 INF_t + \beta_3 HC_t + \varepsilon_t$$

- FS (Financial Stability) — an indicator of the institution's financial stability;
- RI (Reinvestment Ratio) — the proportion of net profit reinvested into the institution;
- INF (Infrastructure Investment) — investments directed toward the material and technical base;
- HC (Human Capital) — indicators reflecting staff capacity and the quality of education;
- ε (error term) — the influence of factors not included in the model.

3. Results and Discussion

The newly introduced reinvestment policy, aimed at ensuring the financial stability of private higher education institutions, can be regarded as a significant institutional innovation in the modern economics of education. In accordance with this regulation, educational institutions are required to mandatorily reinvest a specified portion of their net profit generated from operational activities. Specifically, this share is set at no less than 80 percent during the initial five-year period and at least 50 percent in subsequent stages [13]. This approach shifts the financial model of private educational institutions away from short-term profit orientation toward a long-term sustainable development strategy [Table 2].

Table 2. Capital Growth by Reinvestment Rate (Model-Based).

Year	30% reinvestment	50% reinvestment	80% reinvestment
1	1,300,000	1,500,000	1,800,000
2	1,690,000	2,250,000	3,240,000
3	2,197,000	3,375,000	5,832,000
4	2,856,100	5,062,500	10,497,600
5	3,712,930	7,593,750	18,895,680

Initial capital = USD 1 million; annual return = 30%.

The results of Table 2 indicate that the level of reinvestment has a direct and significant impact on the long-term financial stability and capital accumulation of higher education institutions. In particular, under the 80% reinvestment model, capital grows sharply—exponentially—over a five-year period, reaching nearly 19 times its initial value. This confirms that a high level of reinvestment enables the rapid accumulation of internal financial resources and expands investment capacity [14].

Under the 50% reinvestment model, capital growth is stable but occurs at a relatively slower pace, representing a balanced financial strategy. In contrast, under the 30% reinvestment scenario, capital growth remains significantly lower, indicating that this model is insufficient to establish a strong financial foundation for long-term development and infrastructure expansion.

Overall, the results presented in Table 2 provide strong evidence that a mandatory reinvestment policy—particularly at higher levels (e.g., 80%)—serves as an effective instrument for ensuring financial stability, expanding the asset base, and reducing dependence on external financing sources in private higher education institutions [15].

From an economic perspective, the reinvestment policy functions as a mechanism of internal capital accumulation. In other words, a substantial portion of profits is retained within the institution rather than being distributed as dividends, and is instead allocated

to internal priorities such as infrastructure development, improvement of educational quality, adoption of innovative technologies, and strengthening of human capital. This, in turn, contributes to the expansion of the institutions' asset base and enhances their competitiveness in the market environment.

One of the primary objectives of this policy is to limit the outflow of capital from the system. In practice, it is often observed that a significant portion of profits in private educational institutions is withdrawn by founders in the form of dividends, which can negatively affect the financial stability of the institution. The introduction of a mandatory reinvestment requirement, however, creates conditions for retaining financial resources within the institution and ensuring their more efficient utilization [16].

At the same time, this policy is aimed at increasing investments in the quality of education. Reinvested funds are directed toward the development of modern educational facilities, laboratories, digital platforms, and research infrastructure. This, in turn, contributes to improving the quality of human capital and supports long-term economic growth.

Another important aspect is the strengthening of institutional stability. The mandatory reinvestment policy enhances financial discipline, encourages strategic planning, and transforms private educational institutions into more stable economic entities. Furthermore, the gradual reduction of the reinvestment share from 80 percent to 50 percent reflects a balanced economic approach. In the initial stage, the requirement for a high level of reinvestment supports the development of infrastructure, while in later stages, it allows for a partial preservation of investors' interests by maintaining the possibility of dividend distribution [17].

The reinvestment policy has a number of positive effects on the financial stability of private higher education institutions. First, this mechanism ensures the formation of long-term capital. In other words, the reinvestment of profits leads to a continuous increase in the institution's assets and investment capacity. This, in turn, reduces dependence on external financial sources and strengthens financial independence.

Second, liquidity risks are mitigated. Through the reinvestment policy, institutions are able to build internal financial reserves, which enables them to maintain financial stability in situations such as declining student enrollment or economic downturns. At the same time, improvements in educational infrastructure can be observed. Reinvested funds facilitate the introduction of modern technologies, the digitalization of the learning process, and the expansion of support for scientific research.

Overall, this policy also has an indirect positive impact on economic growth by improving the quality of human capital. This outcome is consistent with human capital theory and endogenous growth models.

At the same time, the reinvestment policy may give rise to certain economic risks and constraints. One of the main challenges is the potential reduction in investor incentives. Since a significant portion of net profit must be mandatorily reinvested, dividend distributions are limited, thereby reducing opportunities for short-term returns. This may, in turn, slow down private sector participation in the education sector.

Furthermore, restrictions on dividend policy introduce additional complexities in financial decision-making. In some cases, institutions may face short-term liquidity pressures, particularly when their operational costs are high.

Therefore, the implementation of this policy requires a balanced approach, and it is advisable for the state to introduce complementary incentive mechanisms, such as tax benefits or grants.

According to international statistical data, higher education institutions in developed countries exhibit a high degree of revenue diversification. For instance, in the

United States, endowment funds at some major universities reach between USD 30–50 billion.

For example, the endowment fund of Harvard University exceeded USD 50 billion as of 2024, with an average annual return of approximately 6–8%. This enables the university to generate a stable annual income of around USD 3–4 billion.

In contrast, in developing countries, including Uzbekistan, approximately 80–90% of the revenues of private higher education institutions are derived from tuition fees. This makes them highly dependent on risks associated with fluctuations in student enrollment, economic instability, and payment discipline.

As a result, the low level of revenue diversification emerges as a key systemic challenge in ensuring financial stability. Additional calculations indicate that if a private higher education institution enrolls 3,000 students, each paying an average annual tuition fee of USD 2,000, the total annual revenue would amount to USD 6 million.

If 20% of this revenue is generated as net profit (USD 1.2 million), then under an 80% reinvestment policy, approximately USD 960,000 would be retained annually within the institution as accumulated capital.

Over a five-year period, this amount could grow to approximately USD 5–6 million due to the compound effect. This would create a sufficient financial base for:

- The construction of new academic buildings;
- The establishment of laboratories;
- The implementation of digital platforms.

4. Conclusions

The findings of this study indicate that a mandatory reinvestment policy serves as an effective mechanism for ensuring the financial stability of private higher education institutions. This approach supports long-term institutional development by facilitating the accumulation of internal financial resources, limiting capital outflows, and increasing investments in the quality of education. At the same time, certain limitations exist, including restrictions on dividend distribution and potential short-term liquidity pressures. To mitigate these challenges, the introduction of additional supportive mechanisms is necessary.

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

- To introduce an effective monitoring and control system over the use of reinvested funds;
- To implement tax incentives to support investors;
- To establish minimum capital reserve requirements for private higher education institutions;
- To strengthen transparent and digital monitoring systems at the state level.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. J. Barro, "Government spending in a simple model of endogenous growth," *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 98, no. 5, pp. S103–S125, 1990.
- [2] G. S. Becker, *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*. Chicago, IL, USA: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- [3] Bundesministerium der Finanzen, *Fiscal Policy Framework and Sustainability*. Berlin, Germany: Federal Ministry of Finance, 2020.
- [4] S. Gupta, B. Clements, E. Baldacci, and C. Mulas-Granados, "Fiscal policy, expenditure composition, and growth in low-income countries," *Journal of International Money and Finance*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 441–463, 2005.
- [5] J. M. Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*. London, U.K.: Macmillan, 1936.

-
- [6] R. E. Lucas, "On the mechanics of economic development," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 3–42, 1988.
 - [7] A. Wagner, *Grundlegung der politischen Ökonomie*, 3rd ed. Leipzig, Germany: C. F. Winter, 1893.
 - [8] A. Stepanova, "Current challenges in financing higher education," *Visnyk of Economics*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2026.
 - [9] OECD, *The Financial Sustainability of Higher Education: Policy Approaches and Challenges*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing, 2025.
 - [10] M. Chynybaev, B. Tashtobaeva, and R. Bekboeva, "Exploring the impact of financial autonomy on educational quality in higher education institutions," *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 2025.
 - [11] K. Czarnecki, "Student funding policies and tertiary education participation," *Higher Education*, 2025.
 - [12] S. A. Al-Maadeed, "Exploring financing mechanisms for entrepreneurial universities: A systematic review," *Education Policy Analysis*, 2025.
 - [13] Grant Thornton, *Higher Education Sector Developments Report*, 2024.
 - [14] K. Ogden, *Higher Education Finances: Trends and Policy Implications*. Institute for Fiscal Studies Report, 2024.
 - [15] European University Association, *Financially Sustainable Universities: State of Play and Strategies*, 2025.
 - [16] R. K. Mishra, "Rethinking higher education funding models," *Public Administration Perspectives*, 2025.
 - [17] A. Göksu and G. Güngör, "Comparative analysis of higher education financing systems," *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 2015.