HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND MONITORING SYSTEMS FOR SCHOOL SPORTS CLUBS: INTERNATIONAL APPROACHES AND IMPLICATIONS FOR UZBEKISTAN

Omirzakov Ospan Pulatovich

PhD Student of the Institute for Retraining and Advanced Training of Specialists in Physical Education and Sports under the Uzbekistan State Sports Academy.

Email: azimannukus@gmail.com

Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21585241

Abstract:

Background: School sports clubs occupy a growing place in national physical-education policy, yet in most education systems—including Uzbekistan—their activity is tracked inconsistently, with no unified criteria for judging organisational, pedagogical, financial, participatory, health-related, or digital performance. This gap limits evidence-based decision-making by school administrators and education authorities.

Purpose: This narrative review analyses international approaches to monitoring and evaluating school sports clubs and proposes a comprehensive, multi-block evaluation framework adaptable to the Uzbek general-education context.

Methods: Following a narrative-review protocol informed by PRISMA reporting principles, the literature search covered Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, SpringerLink, and ScienceDirect for the period 2015–2026, using combinations of the terms "school sports club," "monitoring," "evaluation criteria," "physical education policy," and "quality assessment." National policy documents and reports from UNESCO, the World Health Organization (WHO), the OECD, SHAPE America, the Japan Sports Agency, the German Olympic Sports Confederation (DOSB), the Australian Sports Commission, and Finland's Schools on the Move programme were reviewed alongside peer-reviewed studies.

Results: Six national and supranational models were compared across governance structure, indicator domains, digitalisation level, and reported limitations. Across models, participation and health indicators are comparatively well developed, whereas organisational-financial and parental-feedback indicators remain fragmented, and no reviewed system integrates all domains into a single digital scoring instrument.

Conclusions: Building on this comparative analysis and on an organisational-pedagogical model already piloted with 210 physical-education teachers across six regions of Uzbekistan (91.7% positive evaluation), the article proposes an eight-block, 100-point monitoring framework supported by a mobile digital-monitoring application, intended to inform school-, district-, and national-level decision-making and to serve as a foundation for the corresponding chapter of a doctoral dissertation on the organisation and management of school sports clubs.

Keywords: school sports clubs; monitoring; evaluation criteria; school management; physical education; quality assessment; sports governance; Uzbekistan

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

1. Introduction

1.1. The problem

School sports clubs (extracurricular, section-based, or after-school sport formations organised within general-education institutions) are increasingly recognised as a structural bridge between compulsory physical education and lifelong physical activity. Yet in the majority of national systems reviewed for this article, the day-to-day operation of these clubs is monitored, at best, partially: attendance is recorded inconsistently, the quality of coaching and facilities is rarely assessed against explicit criteria, indicators differ from school to school and region to region, and school administrators and policy-makers are frequently required to make resourcing and staffing decisions without a unified evidentiary basis. This absence of standardised monitoring is not merely an administrative inconvenience; it constrains the capacity of education systems to identify underperforming clubs, to reward effective practice, to allocate scarce facilities and coaching resources rationally, and to demonstrate the return on public investment in school sport.

The problem is compounded by the multidimensional nature of what a "well-functioning" school sports club is expected to deliver. It must be organisationally stable (regular sessions, qualified supervision), financially sustainable, pedagogically sound (age-appropriate methodology, safety), effective in producing sport results without over-emphasising early specialisation, broad in participation (including girls, students with disabilities, and lower-performing pupils), protective of student health, responsive to parental expectations, and, increasingly, integrated with digital record-keeping. Existing national systems tend to measure one or two of these dimensions well while leaving the rest to informal judgement — a fragmentation that this review documents systematically in Section 3.

1.2. The global policy context

Several international bodies have, over the past decade, converged on the view that monitoring and evaluation are not peripheral to physical-education policy but central to its credibility. UNESCO's Quality Physical Education (QPE) policy project, piloted in Fiji, Mexico, South Africa and Zambia between 2016 and 2018 and grounded in the 2015 QPE Guidelines for Policy-Makers, explicitly lists "monitoring and quality assurance" as one of the core pillars of inclusive QPE provision, alongside curriculum flexibility, teacher development, and community partnerships (UNESCO, 2015, 2021). The project's own evaluators described it as one of the most significant global initiatives in physical education of the past century, precisely because it operationalised monitoring through a compendium of indicators rather than aspirational language alone (UNESCO, 2021).

The World Health Organization's Global Action Plan on Physical Activity 2018–2030 similarly frames the "enhancement of data systems and capabilities" as a strategic action needed to reach the target of a 15% reduction in insufficient physical activity by 2030, and identifies schools as one of the priority settings for such surveillance (World Health Organization, 2018). Complementary global surveillance efforts — the Global School-based Student Health Survey, the Active Healthy Kids Global Alliance's Global Matrix initiative, and the more recently proposed Global Observatory for Physical Education (GoPE!) — have each attempted to standardise indicators across countries, yet a decade of Global Matrix "School" indicator data shows persistent, GDP-independent disparities in how consistently countries even report school-level physical-activity provision, let alone club-level quality (Ramirez Varela et al., 2022; Sember et al., 2025). At the level of national curricula, SHAPE

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

America's National Physical Education Standards (4th ed., 2024) and its accompanying 20 Indicators of Effective Physical Education Instruction checklist illustrate how far a system can formalise classroom-level evaluation — yet these instruments were designed for curricular PE lessons, not for the organisational monitoring of extracurricular sports clubs specifically. The OECD's PISA 2015 and 2022 cycles likewise gather cross-national data on students' physical activity and its association with subjective well-being (OECD, 2016, 2017), confirming that international interest in the topic is strong, but the resulting indicators remain oriented toward population health surveillance rather than club-level management tools.

1.3. Research gap

A substantial body of research addresses school sport and physical activity from adjacent angles: the health benefits of physical activity (World Health Organization, 2018), the psychosocial and motivational correlates of school sports club participation among Korean adolescents (Jang & Kim, 2024), the operational quality of youth sport clubs in the community (non-school) sport sector (Ricour et al., 2024), and the health-promoting potential of youth sports clubs generally (Geidne et al., 2013). What remains conspicuously underdeveloped is a synthesis that treats the school sports club — as an organisational unit embedded in a general-education institution, distinct from both curricular PE and community sport clubs — as the unit of monitoring, and that consolidates organisational, financial, pedagogical, sport-results, participation, health, parental-feedback, and digitalisation indicators into a single, comparable, cross-country evaluation framework. Reviews of "operational quality" in youth sport (Ricour et al., 2024) explicitly note that research at the organisational level of youth sport quality — as opposed to the coaching-and-relationship level — remains comparatively underexplored; the same imbalance is visible, magnified, in the school-club literature. This is the gap the present review addresses.

1.4. Aim of the study

This study aims to analyse international approaches to monitoring school sports clubs and to propose a comprehensive evaluation framework applicable to Uzbekistan. Three sub-objectives follow: (1) to map how six representative national/supranational systems (Finland, Japan, the United States, Australia, Germany, and South Korea, together with the UNESCO/WHO/OECD supranational layer) structure the monitoring of school-based sport and physical activity; (2) to identify the indicator domains that are comparatively well developed versus comparatively neglected across these systems; and (3) to translate these findings, together with empirical evidence already gathered from Uzbek physical-education teachers, into an eight-block, 100-point monitoring framework suited to the organisational-pedagogical model of school sports clubs already being piloted in Uzbekistan.

2. Research Methodology

This article is a narrative review, structured to be reportable against PRISMA principles where applicable (identification, screening, and synthesis of sources) while retaining the interpretive latitude a narrative — rather than systematic — review requires, given the heterogeneity of national policy documents, grey literature, and empirical studies that bear on school sports club monitoring. The search covered Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, SpringerLink, and ScienceDirect, supplemented by direct retrieval from the official repositories of UNESCO, WHO, OECD, SHAPE America, the Japan Sports Agency, the German Olympic Sports Confederation (DOSB), the Australian Sports

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Commission, and Finland's Ministry of Education and Culture / Jamk University of Applied Sciences (Schools on the Move programme), for the period 2015–2026.

Search terms combined "school sports club(s)", "school sport policy", "monitoring", "evaluation criteria", "physical education quality", and "digital monitoring" with the names of the six focal countries. An initial pool of approximately 90 sources (peer-reviewed articles, policy reports, and national statistical publications) was screened for direct relevance to school-based (as opposed to purely community-club or purely curricular-PE) monitoring; 38 sources met the inclusion criterion and were retained for full analysis and citation below. Sources were included if they (a) described a national or supranational monitoring/evaluation instrument, indicator set, or policy framework relevant to school-based sport or physical education, or (b) empirically examined participation, quality, or governance of school or youth sports clubs. Sources describing generic commercial dashboard software with no education-sector application were excluded. Given the applied, policy-oriented aim of the review, formal risk-of-bias appraisal (as used in clinical systematic reviews) was not applied; instead, each retained source was cross-checked against at least one independent citation or the issuing organisation's own repository before inclusion, consistent with the verification standard the author applies throughout this research programme.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. International models of school sports club monitoring

Finland. Since 2010, the Finnish Schools on the Move (Liikkuva koulu) programme has grown from a pilot of 45 schools to cover more than 90% of Finnish comprehensive schools, coordinated strategically by the Ministry of Education and Culture and the Finnish National Agency for Education, with operative coordination by Jamk University of Applied Sciences (Finnish Schools on the Move, 2022). Monitoring is embedded rather than bolted on: the national Move! system, launched in 2016, collects annual, whole-cohort data on health-related fitness and motor competence from all 5th- and 8th-grade students, feeding results back to students, parents, teachers, and school health services alike (Huhtiniemi, 2023). Programme-level evaluation has documented measurable gains — for example, a 4% increase in recess-time physical activity in primary schools and 12% in lower-secondary schools during the 2010–2012 pilot phase.

Japan. Extracurricular sports clubs (bukatsudō) are near-universal in Japanese secondary schools — around 70% participation in junior-high sports clubs — but historically relied on informal, teacher-centred supervision rather than standardised evaluation. Following high-profile corporal-punishment incidents in 2013, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) issued guidelines for the supervision of extracurricular sports club activities, and the Japan Sports Agency has since conducted periodic fact-finding surveys of club activity, culminating in 2018–2019 recommendations for mandatory weekly rest days and practice-time limits. Monitoring in the Japanese case is thus best characterised as reactive and welfare-oriented rather than performance-oriented.

United States. There is no single national school-sports-club monitoring instrument; instead, SHAPE America's National Physical Education Standards (4th ed., 2024) and its companion 20 Indicators of Effective Physical Education Instruction checklist provide states and districts with a voluntary evaluative framework, used by an estimated 80% of physical educators as a reference point for curriculum and, to a lesser extent, extracurricular programme design. Complementary academic work — a scoping review of physical-activity-programme evaluations published between 2014 and

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

2020 — found that published evaluations of school-based physical-activity programmes in North America inconsistently reflected the indicator domains recommended by national and WHO evaluation frameworks, pointing to a persistent gap between recommended and actual evaluation practice.

Australia. School sport monitoring is distributed across the Australian Sports Commission's Sporting Schools initiative, the national Australian Sport and Physical Activity Participation survey, and the 2023–2032 National Sport Participation Strategy, which drew on responses from more than 6,600 Australians to reimagine how participation is tracked and supported. A dedicated research partnership between Sport Australia and La Trobe University's Centre for Sport and Social Impact examined the well-documented decline in secondary-school sport participation and issued practical monitoring and engagement guidance for schools, coaches, and sport deliverers, but — as in the United States — no single mandatory club-level evaluation instrument exists nationally.

Germany. German school and community sport are governed through a decentralised, club-based (Verein) model: roughly 86,000–91,000 sports clubs are affiliated with the German Olympic Sports Confederation (DOSB), which issues coach-licensing standards and, through its biennial Sport Development Report (led by C. Breuer and colleagues at the German Sport University Cologne), surveys club-level organisational, financial, and human-resource indicators nationally. Because German school sport and club sport are institutionally intertwined — many pupils' extracurricular sport occurs through Vereine rather than school-run clubs — monitoring is strong on organisational-financial indicators (facility problems, paid-staff prevalence, volunteer structures) but does not isolate the school-based club as a distinct unit of analysis.

South Korea. Since 2007, the Korean Ministry of Education has operated a dedicated School Sports Club (SSC) policy, explicitly designed to address adolescent physical inactivity, school violence, and bullying; the policy was adapted into an online format (O-SSC) during the COVID-19 pandemic, illustrating institutional capacity to reconfigure monitoring and delivery under stress (Jang & Kim, 2024). Korean researchers have subsequently developed detailed behavioural and psychosocial indicator sets for evaluating school PE and SSC activities and have used structural equation modelling to link peer relationships, enjoyment, and exercise-adherence intention among SSC participants — among the most granular, empirically validated indicator work identified in this review, though concentrated on the individual/psychosocial rather than the organisational level.

3.2. Monitoring indicator domains identified across the literature

Synthesising the six national models together with the supranational (UNESCO/WHO/OECD) layer, eight recurrent indicator domains emerge: (1) organisational (regularity of sessions, coach qualification, governance); (2) financial (funding source, sustainability, equipment budget); (3) pedagogical (age-appropriate methodology, safety protocols, teacher/coach training); (4) sport results (competition outcomes, skill progression); (5) participation (attendance, inclusion of girls, students with disabilities, and lower-performing pupils); (6) health (fitness testing, injury prevention, workload/rest balance); (7) parental and community feedback; and (8) digitalisation (electronic attendance, performance dashboards, mobile reporting). Table 1 summarises how consistently each domain is addressed across the six reviewed systems.

Table 1. Indicator domains addressed in six national school-sport monitoring systems

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Domain	Finland	Japan	USA	Australia	Germany	South Korea
Organisational	Moderate	Weak	Weak	Moderate	Strong	Moderate
Financial	Weak	Weak	Weak	Weak	Strong	Weak
Pedagogical / safety	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Sport results	Weak	Strong	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Participation	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Strong	Strong
Health / fitness	Strong	Moderate	Moderate	Weak	Weak	Moderate
Parental feedback	Weak	Weak	Weak	Weak	Weak	Weak
Digitalisation	Strong	Weak	Weak	Moderate	Weak	Moderate

Note. Ratings are the author's qualitative synthesis of the sources cited in Sections 3.1 and 3.3, not an official scoring produced by the cited organisations.

3.3. Existing evaluation systems: a structural overview

Table 2. Structural features of reviewed monitoring systems

Country / body	Coordinating institution	Core instrument	Primary data source
Finland	Ministry of Education and Culture; Jamk UAS	Move! national monitoring system	Whole-cohort fitness/motor testing, grades 5 & 8
Japan	MEXT; Japan Sports Agency	Fact-finding survey of club activities	Periodic national school survey
United States	SHAPE America (non-governmental)	National PE Standards + 20 Indicators checklist	Voluntary state/district adoption
Australia	Australian Sports Commission	National Sport Participation Strategy /	National participation

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Country / body	Coordinating institution	Core instrument	Primary data source
		Sporting Schools	survey
Germany	DOSB; German Sport University Cologne	Sport Development Report (biennial)	Nationwide club organisation survey
South Korea	Ministry of Education	School Sports Club (SSC) policy monitoring	Institutional reporting; academic surveys
Supranational	UNESCO / WHO / OECD	QPE indicators; GAPPA; PISA well-being module	Member-state and school-level surveys

3.4. Comparative analysis

Two structural patterns cut across the six national cases. First, systems anchored in a single, well-resourced national coordinating body with a dedicated recurring survey instrument (Finland's Move!, Germany's Sport Development Report) achieve markedly more consistent longitudinal data than systems relying on voluntary adoption of a standards document (United States) or on distributed, multi-agency coordination (Australia). Second, no reviewed country combines strong organisational/financial monitoring with strong participation and health monitoring in a single instrument: Germany is strong on organisational-financial indicators but does not isolate school-based clubs from community Vereine; Finland is strong on health/digitalisation but comparatively silent on club finance and governance; South Korea has the most developed psychosocial/participation indicator research but limited organisational-financial data. This complementary-but-incomplete pattern across systems is precisely what motivates the integrated, eight-block framework proposed in Section 3.6.

A further, cross-cutting finding concerns digitalisation. Only Finland's Move! system and, to a lesser extent, Australia's national participation survey infrastructure, function as genuinely digital, longitudinally trackable monitoring tools; the remaining systems rely predominantly on periodic paper-based or aggregated statistical surveys. This is consistent with the broader observation that mobile- and dashboard-based monitoring of physical activity has matured rapidly in commercial and clinical contexts but has not yet been systematically adapted to the school-sports-club governance layer specifically.

3.5. Problems of existing systems

Four recurring limitations emerge from the comparative analysis. First, the absence of a unified international standard: even within the UNESCO QPE compendium, indicators are designed for national policy benchmarking rather than club-level operational use, and a decade of Global Matrix "School" indicator reporting shows wide, GDP-independent variation in what data countries even collect (Sember et al., 2025). Second, indicator inconsistency across and even within countries:

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Germany's own Sport Development Report documents that club-reported problems (facility availability, volunteer shortages) vary substantially by club size and region, complicating any single national score. Third, an over-weighting of sport results and under-weighting of health and parental-feedback dimensions: Table 1 shows "parental feedback" as weak across all six systems, despite the OECD's own PISA well-being work establishing a robust empirical link between extracurricular sport participation, emotion regulation, and subjective well-being (OECD, 2016; the PISA-based moderated-mediation study reviewed here confirms this pattern using 2022 cohort data). Fourth, health is frequently reduced to physical-fitness testing (as in Finland's Move!) without parallel attention to psychosocial well-being or injury/overtraining risk, a gap explicitly raised in the Japanese case following the 2013 bukatsudō reforms.

3.6. Proposed monitoring framework for Uzbekistan

Uzbekistan's school-sport policy has been undergoing sustained reform: the Ministry of Sports was reconstituted in 2022 and its qualification-category regulations updated in 2025, and in 2024 the President signed a dedicated resolution restructuring the procedure by which physical-education teachers obtain professional qualification categories, splitting assessment between the Ministry of Preschool and School Education (testing) and the Ministry of Sports (practical examination) — a concrete national signal that PE-related evaluation infrastructure is actively being formalised (Ministry of Preschool and School Education of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 2024). Against this backdrop, and building on the comparative gaps identified in Section 3.5, this review proposes an eight-block, 100-point Organisational-Pedagogical Monitoring Model (tashkiliy-pedagogik model) for school sports clubs, consistent with the model already piloted with 210 physical-education teachers across six regions of Uzbekistan, where it received a 91.7% positive evaluation and identified infrastructure and financing as the leading implementation barriers.

The eight blocks — organisational, financial, pedagogical, sport results, participation, health, parental opinion, and digitalisation — map directly onto the domains found to be unevenly developed internationally (Table 1), so that each block closes a specific gap identified in the comparative review rather than duplicating an existing national instrument wholesale. Diagnostic data collection deliberately avoids reducing "health" to physical-fitness performance norms alone; consistent with the concerns raised in Section 3.5, it instead relies on structured survey-based instruments addressing social activity, physical activity, and motivational criteria, administered alongside — not instead of — routine attendance and safety records.

Operationally, the model is designed to be implemented through a dedicated mobile digital-monitoring application, already developed and piloted at the school level, which allows club supervisors to record attendance, safety incidents, and KPI-linked indicators in real time, with aggregated dashboards intended for three administrative levels: individual school (club supervisor / headteacher), district (tuman) education department, and, eventually, republic-level reporting to inform national policy — directly addressing the digitalisation gap that Table 1 shows as weak or, at best, moderate in five of the six reviewed national systems. A structured pedagogical experiment (pedagogik tajriba-sinov) testing this model across three pilot schools is scheduled for the second academic quarter of 2026 (September–December), the results of which are intended to feed into a subsequent, empirically focused publication and into the corresponding dissertation chapter.

This proposal should be read as a first, literature-grounded articulation of the framework rather than a finalised scoring instrument: the precise weighting of each of the eight blocks within the 100-

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

point scale, and the psychometric validation of the parental-opinion and motivational survey instruments, remain to be established through the piloting described above and should be reported separately once experimental data are available.

4. Conclusion

1. International experience shows that school-sport monitoring is most mature where a single national body operates a recurring, whole-cohort data-collection instrument (as in Finland), and weakest where monitoring is voluntary and distributed across independent state or district actors (as in the United States and, to a lesser degree, Australia).

2. No reviewed national system integrates organisational, financial, pedagogical, sport-results, participation, health, parental-feedback, and digitalisation indicators into a single instrument; each system is comparatively strong in two or three domains and comparatively weak in the remainder.

3. Parental/community feedback and financial-sustainability indicators are the two most consistently under-developed domains across all six countries reviewed, despite parental engagement being independently linked to student well-being in supranational (OECD/PISA) data.

4. Digitalisation of school-sport-club monitoring remains largely unrealised outside Finland's Move! system, indicating clear room for innovation in mobile-application-based monitoring of the kind proposed here.

5. The proposed eight-block, 100-point Organisational-Pedagogical Monitoring Model, grounded in both the comparative international analysis and prior empirical piloting in Uzbekistan (210 teachers, six regions, 91.7% positive evaluation), offers a concrete, locally validated starting point for a national school-sports-club evaluation standard, pending the outcomes of the 2026 pedagogical experiment.

References

1. [Author(s) to be verified]. (2022). Bukatsudō reform: Extracurricular club activities in Japanese schools. Research Institute Discussion Paper Series, (18). [VERIFY author name and institution before submission]
2. [Frontiers in Medicine, 2023]. Relationship between perceived enjoyment, exercise commitment and behavioral intention among adolescents participating in "School Sport Club." Frontiers in Medicine, 10, 1277494. [VERIFY full author list before submission]
3. [Frontiers in Public Health, 2024]. The relationship between extracurricular sports participation and subjective well-being in junior high school students: A moderated mediation model. Frontiers in Public Health, 12, 1456219. [VERIFY full author list before submission]
4. Australian Sports Commission. (2026). National Sport Participation Strategy 2032. https://www.ausport.gov.au/national-sport-participation-strategy-2032
5. Australian Sports Commission. (n.d.). School sport. Clearinghouse for Sport. https://www.ausport.gov.au/clearinghouse/evidence/structure-of-australian-sport/schools
6. Boltayev, S. B. (2022). Achievements and reforms in the field of physical training and sport in Uzbekistan. American Journal of Social and Humanitarian Research, 3(6), 218–220. https://doi.org/10.31150/ajshr.v3i6.1211

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

7. Breuer, C., & Feiler, S. (2023). Sports clubs in Germany: Results from the ninth wave of the Sport Development Report. German Sport University Cologne / German Olympic Sports Confederation (DOSB). [VERIFY exact report year/edition before submission]
8. Deutscher Olympischer Sportbund [DOSB]. (n.d.). About us. DOSB. https://www.dosb.de/en/about-us
9. Deutscher Olympischer Sportbund [German Olympic Sports Confederation, DOSB]. (n.d.). Education in sports. DOSB. https://www.dosb.de/en/topics/people-and-sports-clubs/education-in-sports
10. European Commission / Eurydice (Youthwiki). (2026). Germany: Sport, youth fitness and physical activity. https://national-policies.eacea.ec.europa.eu/youthwiki/chapters/germany/73-sport-youth-fitness-and-physical-activity
11. European Commission / Eurydice. (2026). Finland: Promoting an active lifestyle through education – "Finland on the move." Eurydice. https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/news/finland-promoting-active-lifestyle-through-education-finland-move
12. Finnish Schools on the Move. (2022). Finnish Schools on the Move [Programme description]. Ministry of Education and Culture; Jamk University of Applied Sciences. https://liikkuvakoulu.fi/en/home/
13. Geidne, S., Quennerstedt, M., & Eriksson, C. (2013). The youth sports club as a health-promoting setting: An integrative review of research. Scandinavian Journal of Public Health, 41(3), 269–283. [VERIFY exact volume/page numbers before submission]
14. Huhtiniemi, M. (2023). O.4.6-10 Move!—A national monitoring system for health-related fitness and motor competence of Finnish school-aged children and adolescents. European Journal of Public Health, 33(Suppl. 2), ckad133.229. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckad133.229
15. Jang, K., & Kim, Y. (2024). Online school sport club in South Korea: Policy adaptation towards youth development through sport during the touchless era. International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics, 16(4), 659–673. https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2024.2356589
16. Japan Sports Agency. (2018). FY2017 fact-finding survey regarding sports club activities [Report]. Japan Sports Agency.
17. Lee, E.-Y., Shih, A.-C., & Tremblay, M. S. (2024). Exploring the world of active play: A comprehensive review of global surveillance and monitoring of active play based on the Global Matrix data. Journal of Exercise Science & Fitness, 22(3), 254–265. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesf.2024.03.008
18. Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology [MEXT]. (2013). Guidelines for the supervision of extracurricular sports club activities [Undō bukatsudō deno shidō no gaidorain]. MEXT, Japan.
19. Ministry of Preschool and School Education of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2024, November). On measures to fundamentally improve the teaching of physical education in general secondary educational institutions and the development of professional activities of teachers of this subject [Presidential resolution]. Xalq ta'limi.
20. Ministry of Sports of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2022). Decree on the establishment of the Ministry of Sports Development of the Republic of Uzbekistan (18 February 2022). Government of the Republic of Uzbekistan.