Edukasi Islami: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam, VOL: 15/No: 04 **P-ISSN: 2252-8970**
DOI: 10.30868/ei.v15i04.11070 **E-ISSN: 2581-1754**

Date Received	**:**	**October 2026**
Date Revised	**:**	**November 2026**
Date Accepted	**:**	**November 2026**
Date Published	**:**	**November 2026**

MANAGING TEACHING QUALITY THROUGH CONTINUOUS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT: A COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY OF TWO PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN INDONESIA

Kiswantoro Deddy[1]
Universitas Islam Nusantara, Indonesia (410381042210 87@uninus.ac.id)

R. Supyan Sauri
Universitas Islam Nusantara, Indonesia (supyansauri@uninus.ac.id)

Kata Kunci:
Manajemen mutu; Kinerja mengajar dosen; Penjaminan mutu pendidikan tinggi; Peningkatan mutu berkelanjutan; Plan–Do–Check–Act (PDCA).

ABSTRAK

Latar Belakang: Mutu pembelajaran di perguruan tinggi berkaitan dengan keterhubungan antara sistem penjaminan mutu institusi, praktik mengajar dosen, dan evaluasi proses pembelajaran. **Tujuan Penelitian**: Penelitian ini menganalisis pengelolaan mutu pembelajaran melalui peningkatan mutu berkelanjutan di Universitas 'Aisyiyah Yogyakarta (UNISA) dan STIKes dr. Sismadi. **Metode**: Penelitian menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dengan desain studi kasus instrumental. Data dikumpulkan melalui wawancara, observasi, dan dokumentasi dengan melibatkan ketua program studi, dosen, dan mahasiswa. Data ditafsirkan berdasarkan empat dimensi, yaitu perencanaan, pelaksanaan, evaluasi, dan tindak lanjut. **Hasil**: Kedua institusi menghubungkan perencanaan kurikulum dan capaian pembelajaran dengan strategi pengajaran, penilaian, serta evaluasi institusional. UNISA menekankan pembelajaran kolaboratif, koordinasi program, dan dukungan digital melalui LENSA UNISA, sedangkan STIKes dr. Sismadi menonjolkan integrasi teori, simulasi, penilaian praktik, dan pembelajaran klinis. Evaluasi memanfaatkan umpan balik mahasiswa, rubrik, pemantauan pembelajaran, informasi LMS, supervisi klinis, dan studi pelacakan lulusan. Tindak lanjut mencakup pengembangan dosen, penyesuaian kurikulum, pembaruan bahan ajar, dan peningkatan sarana pembelajaran. **Kesimpulan**: Penelitian menyusun kerangka analitis berbasis PDCA yang menekankan integrasi lintas dimensi, meliputi koordinasi antara standar institusi, keputusan pedagogis, interpretasi beragam bukti evaluasi, dan respons tindak lanjut. Kerangka ini merupakan sintesis analitis dari dua kasus, bukan instrumen tervalidasi untuk mengukur kinerja dosen atau hasil pembelajaran.

[1] Correspondence author: 41038104221087@uninus.ac.id

Keywords:
Quality Management; Lecturers' Teaching Performance; Higher Education Quality Assurance; Continuous Quality Improvement; Plan–Do–Check–Act (PDCA).

ABSTRACT

Background: Teaching quality in higher education is associated with the relationship between institutional quality assurance systems, lecturers' teaching practices, and the evaluation of learning processes. **Purpose of the Study**: This study analyzes the management of teaching quality through continuous quality improvement at Universitas 'Aisyiyah Yogyakarta (UNISA) and STIKes dr. Sismadi. **Methods**: This study employed a qualitative approach with an instrumental case study design. Data were collected through interviews, observations, and documentation involving programme heads, lecturers, and students. The data were interpreted based on four dimensions: planning, implementation, evaluation, and follow-up. **Results**: Both institutions connect curriculum planning and learning outcomes with teaching strategies, assessment, and institutional evaluation. UNISA emphasizes collaborative learning, programme coordination, and digital support through LENSA UNISA, whereas STIKes dr. Sismadi focuses on the integration of theory, simulation, practical assessment, and clinical learning. Evaluation draws on student feedback, assessment rubrics, learning monitoring, LMS information, clinical supervision, and graduate tracer studies. Follow-up activities include lecturer development, curriculum adjustment, teaching material updates, and improvements to learning facilities. **Conclusion**: This study develops an analytical framework based on the PDCA cycle that emphasizes cross-dimensional integration, encompassing coordination between institutional standards, pedagogical decisions, the interpretation of diverse evaluation evidence, and follow-up responses. The framework represents an analytical synthesis of the two cases rather than a validated instrument for measuring lecturer performance or learning outcomes.

A. INTRODUCTION

The quality of higher education depends not only on institutional standards and accreditation but also on the extent to which these commitments shape lecturers' teaching practices and students' learning experiences. Higher education institutions are expected to prepare graduates with disciplinary knowledge, practical competencies, critical thinking, and the capacity to respond to professional demands. In Indonesia, Law No. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education positions quality assurance as an integral element of higher education governance (Indonesia, 2012). The central concern, therefore, is not simply whether quality standards have been formulated, but how they are translated into curriculum planning, teaching, assessment, and subsequent improvement. Lecturers occupy a central position in this process; nevertheless, the quality of their teaching is also conditioned by curriculum design, academic leadership, institutional resources, assessment arrangements, and opportunities for professional development. In this study, "lecturers' teaching performance" refers to the institutionally organized work through which lecturers plan, conduct, assess, and improve teaching, rather than an individual performance score or a direct measurement of lecturer effectiveness.

In this study, teaching quality is examined through the teaching-related work of lecturers within institutional quality management, rather than through individual performance scores or standardized measurements of each lecturer's competence. Lecturers' teaching performance refers to the connected practices of planning and delivering learning activities, aligning teaching strategies with intended learning outcomes, assessing student learning, and using evaluation findings to inform

subsequent improvement. The primary unit of analysis is therefore institutional management practice and its relationship with lecturers' teaching activities. This distinction recognizes that teaching quality is shaped by lecturers' pedagogical capabilities as well as curriculum arrangements, academic coordination, quality assurance mechanisms, and institutional support.

Total quality management (TQM) provides a useful perspective for examining these relationships because it emphasizes coordinated organizational processes, stakeholder participation, and continuous improvement. Nasim et al. (2020), in their systematic review of TQM research in higher education, identified the need for a holistic understanding of quality management, particularly the interaction between lecturers and institutional conditions in developing-country contexts. Jasti, Venkateswaran, Kota, et al. (2022) reviewed TQM models, frameworks, and implementation tools, while Jasti, Venkateswaran, & Kota (2022) examined implementation barriers, stakeholder expectations, and accreditation. Taken together, these studies indicate that quality management cannot be reduced to the adoption of a procedure or instrument. Its educational significance depends on how institutional expectations, academic responsibilities, and teaching practices are connected in everyday programme delivery.

This systems perspective is also relevant to internal quality assurance at programme level. Pham et al. (2022), through a case study of Vietnamese higher education, examined the implementation of internal quality assurance in academic programmes. Mwila (2025) investigated quality assurance frameworks in private universities in Tanzania, including faculty qualifications, curriculum, and infrastructure. These studies provide a basis for examining quality management through the organizational arrangements that support educational delivery rather than treating institutional quality as an administrative designation. They also indicate why institutional context matters: quality assurance is enacted through the interaction of people, procedures, and educational resources, and those interactions may differ across disciplinary settings.

The Plan–Do–Check–Act (PDCA) cycle offers an analytical basis for examining continuous improvement through four connected dimensions: planning, implementation, evaluation, and follow-up. Planning establishes learning objectives, teaching strategies, assessment criteria, and resource requirements. Implementation translates these decisions into learning activities and lecturer–student interactions. Evaluation considers teaching practices and available evidence of learning in relation to intended objectives, while follow-up uses the resulting interpretation to inform subsequent decisions. The cycle is not merely a sequence of administrative stages: its educational value depends on the connections between them. Evaluation that produces reports but does not shape teaching decisions may meet procedural requirements while leaving instructional practice unchanged.

Krooi et al. (2024) conceptualized internal quality assurance through three interconnected dimensions—purpose, people, and process—and emphasized alignment between institutional objectives, stakeholder responsibilities, and quality assurance procedures. Their review also identified limitations in the evidence concerning the impact of internal quality assurance on educational quality. Tavares et al. (2017) similarly found that academics' perceptions of internal quality assurance may involve both increased awareness of teaching quality and concerns about bureaucracy. Staff involvement and the use of quality information for improvement were associated

with more positive perceptions of changes in teaching and learning. In the Indonesian context, Mu'alimin (2026) emphasizes needs-based training, external professional development, collaborative discussion, and management involvement in adaptive quality management. These studies draw attention to the conditions under which quality assurance becomes educationally consequential: procedures must be connected to academic judgment, institutional support, and the improvement of teaching.

Lecturers' professional expertise constitutes another important dimension of teaching quality. University teaching involves educational design, assessment and feedback, academic coordination, and continuing professional development in addition to classroom delivery. van Dijk et al. (2020), in their systematic review of university teacher expertise, identified interconnected domains of academic work, including teaching, educational design, assessment, educational leadership, scholarship, and professional development. Their synthesis suggests that the management of teaching performance should attend to the development and application of pedagogical capabilities as well as the completion of assigned duties. This perspective also helps distinguish the individual lecturer's work from the institutional arrangements that enable or constrain it.

Professional development is particularly relevant when it responds to identified needs and informs subsequent teaching practice. Muammar & Alkathiri (2022), examining 2,330 cases involving participants in higher education professional development programmes, identified programme relevance, achievement of objectives, and the capabilities of academic developers as factors associated with participant satisfaction. Phuong and Duong (2022) approached faculty development through a competency-based framework, emphasizing the capabilities that professional development is intended to support. Murtonen et al. (2024) examined the relationship between regulation, teacher learning, and student-centred teaching, while Soares et al. (2024) explored an interdisciplinary and interinstitutional approach to faculty development. Together, these studies indicate that teaching improvement requires development opportunities that connect pedagogical learning, professional needs, and institutional collaboration.

Evaluation alone, however, does not guarantee improvement. Tep (2024), in a qualitative case study of teacher education institutions in Cambodia, examined how faculty evaluations could identify strengths, inform instructional improvement, and support professional development planning, while also identifying limitations in evaluation processes and institutional support. This distinction between accountability and development is important: evaluation becomes an administrative exercise when its findings do not lead to constructive feedback, relevant professional learning, or reflection on teaching practices. The relationship between evaluation and follow-up therefore deserves attention as a central mechanism within continuous improvement.

Another challenge is distinguishing evidence about teaching processes from evidence about learning outcomes. Curriculum reviews, lecturer evaluations, student feedback, learning management systems, and graduate tracer studies provide different kinds of information and cannot be treated as interchangeable indicators. Chiappe et al. (2023) examined assurance of learning in relation to curricular alignment. Noda (2022) highlighted the importance of evidence concerning student learning outcomes and the balance between accountability and professional judgment in external quality assurance. Hernández-Campos et al. (2025) proposed standardized scales for direct

measurement of learning outcomes in engineering programmes, while Naim et al. (2025) examined an information-systems-based model for assessing programme learning outcomes. Although these studies address different contexts, they reinforce the need to align each form of evidence with the specific outcome or process it is intended to illuminate.

This distinction also sets a boundary on what can be concluded about institutional improvement initiatives. Lecturer training, curriculum revision, clinical simulation, digital learning platforms, and assessment procedures may support teaching quality, but their presence alone does not establish that graduate competence has improved or that a particular intervention caused such improvement. A defensible analysis must distinguish the activities undertaken by institutions, their relationship with teaching practices, and the evidence available about learning outcomes. This distinction is especially important in qualitative case analysis, where the interpretation of institutional processes should remain proportionate to the information available.

These issues provide the context for examining STIKes dr. Sismadi in Bogor Regency and Universitas 'Aisyiyah Yogyakarta (UNISA). The two institutions offer analytically contrasting settings for considering how teaching quality is organized: the reported practices at UNISA include curriculum discussions involving lecturers and external stakeholders, the formulation of graduate learning outcomes, digital learning support through LENSA UNISA, and monitoring by the institutional quality assurance body. At STIKes dr. Sismadi, the reported practices include integrating theoretical and practical learning, clinical simulation, practical competency assessment, and discussions concerning teaching and curriculum development. The contrast is relevant because it makes visible how a shared quality-improvement logic is adapted to different educational demands, particularly broad programme-based learning and health sciences education. The comparison is analytical rather than evaluative; it does not rank the institutions or presume that their outcomes are equivalent.

Although previous research has examined TQM frameworks, internal quality assurance, lecturer expertise, professional development, and learning-outcome assessment, these strands address different parts of the quality management process. The analytical issue pursued here is how these elements are connected across the teaching improvement cycle and how those connections take shape in different institutional contexts. The two cases make it possible to examine both common institutional functions—curriculum alignment, teaching implementation, evaluation, and follow-up—and context-specific ways of carrying them out. The study therefore does not claim that the four stages themselves are new. Its contribution lies in interpreting cross-dimensional integration: whether institutional standards, lecturers' pedagogical decisions, multiple forms of evidence, and subsequent institutional responses operate as a connected process.

Accordingly, this study examines how teaching quality is managed through continuous quality improvement at STIKes dr. Sismadi and Universitas 'Aisyiyah Yogyakarta. Total quality management (TQM) and the Plan–Do–Check–Act (PDCA) cycle serve as interpretive perspectives for analyzing four interconnected dimensions: planning, implementation, evaluation, and follow-up. The study develops an analytical synthesis of how these dimensions relate to one another in two distinct private higher education settings. Its contribution is not a replacement for PDCA, but a context-sensitive elaboration of the institutional relationships that give the cycle practical

meaning: coordination among academic actors, alignment between teaching and disciplinary learning requirements, interpretation of different forms of evidence, and the translation of evaluation into subsequent action. In relation to Islamic education and educational management, the analysis speaks to the institutional responsibility to organize educators' professional work and maintain the quality of learning; it does not assume that the two cases constitute equivalent examples of Islamic higher education or that specifically religious practices were empirically examined.

B. METHOD

This study employed a qualitative approach using an instrumental case study design to examine the institutional management of teaching quality in private higher education. A qualitative approach was appropriate because the inquiry focused on institutional practices and the ways teaching-related work was organized within specific academic settings. The primary unit of analysis was institutional management practice and its relationship with lecturers' teaching activities, not the measurement or ranking of individual lecturers through standardized performance indicators. Lecturers' teaching performance was considered through the planning, delivery, assessment, and improvement of teaching as these activities were situated within institutional quality processes. The two institutions functioned as bounded cases through which the broader issue of continuous quality improvement in teaching quality was examined. This instrumental orientation is consistent with case study inquiry that uses a bounded case to develop understanding of an issue beyond the case itself (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Stake, 1995).

The study focused on two institutions: STIKes dr. Sismadi in Bogor Regency and Universitas 'Aisyiyah Yogyakarta (UNISA). The cases were considered together because they provide different educational contexts for examining the same institutional issue. At UNISA, the inquiry considered curriculum planning, collaborative learning, programme coordination, and digital learning support. At STIKes dr. Sismadi, the focus also included the integration of theoretical instruction, practical learning, simulation, and clinical education. The case boundaries are therefore the institutional arrangements and teaching-related practices described for these two institutions, rather than individual lecturer careers or a statistical comparison of institutional performance. Their comparison supports analytical transfer through the identification of shared processes and context-dependent differences, not statistical generalization.

The participants comprised programme heads, lecturers, and students. These participant categories represented three complementary positions in the management of teaching: academic coordination, instructional planning and implementation, and students' learning experiences. Programme heads contributed perspectives on academic management, lecturers on teaching-related practices, and students on learning activities. Considering these perspectives enabled teaching performance to be examined as an institutional and educational process rather than solely as an individual lecturer attribute.

Data were collected through interviews, observation, and documentation. Interviews elicited information about the management of lecturers' teaching performance. Observation provided insight into teaching and learning practices within the institutional settings, including classroom activities, student participation, and practical instruction where relevant. Documentation complemented these sources with

information concerning curriculum planning, instructional activities, assessment, quality assurance, and institutional follow-up. Taken together, the three techniques enabled the institutional practices to be considered from the perspectives of participants, observed learning activities, and documentary records, consistent with qualitative case study approaches that draw on multiple forms of evidence (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Stake, 1995).

The analysis was organized around four interconnected dimensions: planning, implementation, evaluation, and follow-up. Planning covered curriculum development, learning outcomes, teaching methods, assessment approaches, and lecturer development. Implementation concerned teaching delivery, practical instruction, student participation, and the use of learning technologies. Evaluation addressed the monitoring of teaching processes and the review of student learning through assessment, feedback, and quality assurance activities. Follow-up focused on institutional responses to evaluation, including adjustments to teaching materials, instructional practices, lecturer development, and learning support. These dimensions functioned as analytical categories for interpreting the reported institutional practices; they should not be read as evidence that a formal coding protocol, software-assisted analysis, or a separate thematic validation procedure was undertaken.

The four dimensions provided a common analytical structure for examining both institutions while retaining the context of each case. The interpretation related the practices identified in each institution to planning, implementation, evaluation, and follow-up, and then considered their convergence and divergence. Particular attention was given to the continuity between dimensions: whether planned outcomes were reflected in teaching activities, whether evaluation addressed those activities, and whether follow-up corresponded to the issues identified through evaluation. This systematic organization and interpretation is consistent with qualitative data analysis Miles et al. (2020). The resulting account is a contextual interpretation of institutional practices and does not claim to verify their prevalence across all programmes or establish causal effects.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Findings

The findings from STIKes dr. Sismadi and Universitas ‘Aisyiyah Yogyakarta (UNISA) are organized around four interconnected dimensions of lecturers’ teaching performance: planning, implementation, evaluation, and follow-up. The comparison focuses on how institutional quality expectations are related to teaching practices and how evaluation is connected to subsequent improvement. Across the cases, the common feature is the presence of arrangements for curriculum alignment, teaching delivery, assessment, and institutional review. The differences concern the educational means through which these functions are pursued: UNISA places visible emphasis on collaborative learning and digital learning support, whereas STIKes dr. Sismadi emphasizes the integration of theoretical instruction, simulation, and clinical practice. These findings describe the institutional practices identified in the study and do not establish their frequency, uniformity across all programmes, or measurable effects on student outcomes.

Planning: Aligning Learning Outcomes, Curriculum, and Teaching Design

Planning at UNISA involves coordination among lecturers, programme leaders, practitioners, graduates, and other relevant stakeholders through curriculum workshops and related academic discussions. These activities inform the formulation and review of graduate profiles, course learning outcomes, and programme learning outcomes (Capaian Pembelajaran Lulusan, CPL, and Capaian Pembelajaran Mata Kuliah, CPMK). Tracer studies also provide information for reviewing the relevance of curriculum content to graduate experiences and professional expectations. Planning consequently extends beyond the preparation of individual teaching documents: it involves aligning programme expectations, course objectives, learning activities, and assessment practices.

The use of case-based learning and team-based projects reflects an effort to translate intended outcomes into learning activities that require students to apply concepts, analyse problems, and work collaboratively. The LENSA UNISA learning management system (LMS) provides digital support for teaching materials, learning activities, and assessment. Assessment arrangements include written examinations and Mini Clinical Evaluation Exercises (Mini-CEX), where appropriate to the learning objectives. Lecturer development activities, routine curriculum reviews, and coordination among lecturers, programme leaders, and quality assurance personnel support the alignment of these components. The planning process thus combines curriculum design, pedagogical preparation, assessment, and institutional coordination.

At STIKes dr. Sismadi, planning is oriented towards connecting theoretical knowledge with practical and clinical learning requirements. Curriculum discussions among lecturers take place within a framework informed by the Indonesian National Qualifications Framework (Kerangka Kualifikasi Nasional Indonesia, KKNI). Learning plans incorporate laboratory activities, clinical simulations, and assessments intended to examine students' practical and analytical abilities. Rubrics help make expectations for performance more explicit, while digital modules and online evaluation tools support access to learning resources and assessment activities. Lecturer training is also part of the institution's approach to preparing teaching activities.

The two cases share an emphasis on alignment between learning objectives, teaching methods, and assessment, but they operationalize that alignment differently. UNISA's planning connects programme outcomes with collaborative learning, stakeholder consultation, and digital learning infrastructure. STIKes dr. Sismadi gives particular attention to the relationship between theoretical understanding and practical or clinical performance. The comparison indicates that alignment is not achieved by applying one teaching method across institutions; it requires pedagogical choices to be responsive to the type of learning outcome and the disciplinary setting. This interpretation is consistent with research on student-centred teaching, which emphasizes the importance of regulating and supporting teaching practice rather than assuming that a change in instructional format automatically improves learning (Murtonen et al., 2024).

The planning findings also show why documented learning outcomes and teaching plans should be treated as enabling conditions rather than proof of achievement. The relationship between objectives, learning activities, and assessment must remain visible during implementation and evaluation. For UNISA, the reported

combination of CPL/CPMK, case-based learning, team projects, and Mini-CEX illustrates an effort to connect programme expectations with course activities and assessment. At STIKes dr. Sismadi, laboratory activities, clinical simulations, and rubrics reflect the need to align learning design with practical and analytical capabilities. Studies of learning-outcome measurement similarly emphasize explicit criteria and consistent mechanisms for assessing intended outcomes at course and programme levels (El Marsafawy et al., 2022).

Implementation: Translating Teaching Plans into Learning Experiences

At UNISA, teaching implementation combines face-to-face instruction with student-centred activities, including group discussion, jigsaw learning, projects, case-based learning, and the use of digital learning resources. Lecturers function as facilitators who organize learning activities, guide discussion, and provide feedback. LENSA UNISA supports the distribution of materials, communication, assignment submission, and feedback. The platform is part of the teaching environment rather than a substitute for pedagogical interaction. Its educational value depends on how lecturers integrate digital activities with the objectives and demands of each course.

The implementation process at UNISA is linked to monitoring by the Badan Penjaminan Mutu (BPM), or Quality Assurance Agency. Monitoring and assessment rubrics provide institutional mechanisms for considering whether teaching practices correspond to the planned learning design. Their significance lies in the relationship between institutional review and lecturers' decisions in the classroom. Monitoring can identify whether planned activities are being carried out, but it should not be equated with direct evidence of improved learning. Its contribution depends on whether the information identifies relevant issues and can be interpreted by lecturers and programme leaders in ways that inform teaching adjustments.

At STIKes dr. Sismadi, implementation emphasizes the integration of theoretical instruction with practical exercises and clinical simulation. Anatomy models, procedural simulations, small-group discussions, and clinical case activities give students opportunities to apply knowledge to situations resembling professional practice. Clinical practice reports and community health projects provide additional opportunities to connect classroom learning with practical tasks. Lecturers monitor learning activities and prepare evaluation reports as part of the teaching process. The emphasis on simulation and practical application is consistent with the need to assess not only what students know but also how they interpret and apply knowledge in context.

The contrast between the cases concerns pedagogical emphasis rather than the presence or absence of quality management. Both institutions use structured teaching activities, assessment practices, and monitoring arrangements. UNISA's implementation combines collaborative learning and LMS-supported instruction, whereas STIKes dr. Sismadi places greater emphasis on the relationship between theoretical concepts, simulated procedures, and clinical practice. These differences reflect the distinct demands of the learning environments: digital collaboration can support discussion and teamwork, while practical and clinical learning requires opportunities to apply knowledge under appropriate supervision. Neither approach is inherently superior; their suitability depends on intended outcomes, disciplinary context, available resources, and lecturers' capacity to facilitate and assess learning.

These findings place lecturer competence within an institutional context. Effective teaching requires more than subject knowledge; it also involves designing learning activities, facilitating student participation, providing constructive feedback, and assessing performance in ways that align with learning objectives. The contrast between UNISA's use of collaborative and digitally supported activities and STIKes dr. Sismadi's simulation-oriented teaching illustrates that these capabilities are exercised in context-specific ways. A systematic review of university teaching expertise identifies multiple dimensions of academic teaching rather than a single characteristic that can explain teaching quality (van Dijk et al., 2020; Warta et al., 2024). Research on professional development likewise suggests that programmes need to address lecturers' educational needs and actual teaching responsibilities rather than rely exclusively on generic training activities (Leatemia et al., 2023; Mishra et al., 2022).

Evaluation: Using Evidence to Review Teaching and Learning

At UNISA, evaluation draws on several sources of information, including BPM monitoring, student satisfaction surveys, tracer studies, lecturer performance reports, classroom observations, assessment rubrics, and data generated through LENSA UNISA. The evaluation process considers teaching methods, assessment practices, and the extent to which learning activities correspond to CPL and CPMK. Classroom observations examine the relationship between actual teaching activities and the semester learning plan (Rencana Pembelajaran Semester, RPS). Rubrics are used to examine dimensions such as the clarity of argumentation, creativity, and analytical ability, while student feedback provides an additional perspective on learning experiences.

LMS data, including access frequency, participation in online discussions, and quiz results, can help lecturers identify patterns of engagement and assessment performance. These indicators, however, represent different aspects of learning and should not be treated as interchangeable measures of learning outcomes. Accessing a platform does not necessarily demonstrate conceptual understanding, and participation in a discussion does not automatically establish analytical competence. Digital indicators are most informative when interpreted alongside assessment evidence, classroom observations, and the learning objectives that the indicators are intended to represent. Research on LMS-based learning-outcome assessment similarly highlights the need to align system functionality with explicit assessment criteria (El Marsafawy et al., 2022).

At STIKes dr. Sismadi, evaluation includes semester meetings involving lecturers and programme leaders, review of teaching methods and student participation, tracer studies, direct supervision of clinical practice, and rubric-based assessment. Student feedback and the analysis of submitted tasks and learning results provide additional information for reviewing teaching activities. Direct supervision of clinical practice is particularly relevant because practical performance may involve dimensions that cannot be adequately captured through written examinations alone. Assessment must therefore be aligned with the type of competence being examined, including the ability to apply knowledge and perform relevant tasks.

Across the two cases, evaluation is not confined to a single end-of-semester measure. It combines formal assessment, feedback, observation, and institutional review, although the specific emphases differ: UNISA draws on LMS information and

programme-level feedback, while STIKes dr. Sismadi includes direct supervision of clinical practice and practical competency assessment. This multiplicity of evidence can provide a broader understanding of teaching and learning, but it also requires careful interpretation. Quality assurance becomes less useful when indicators are collected without specifying what each can legitimately establish. Work on assurance of learning emphasizes the importance of connecting assessment evidence with the learning outcomes that institutions intend to demonstrate (Chiappe et al., 2023; Hernández-Campos et al., 2025).

The findings also indicate that student feedback and tracer studies serve different purposes. Student feedback can inform understanding of teaching experiences and course delivery, whereas tracer studies can provide information about graduates' experiences after completing their programmes. At UNISA, tracer information is reported as an input to curriculum review; at STIKes dr. Sismadi, tracer studies are considered alongside semester meetings, student surveys, and clinical supervision. Neither source alone establishes that a particular teaching intervention caused an improvement in graduate competence. Their value lies in contributing complementary perspectives to programme review, with conclusions remaining proportionate to the scope and quality of the information collected.

Follow-up: Converting Evaluation into Improvement

At UNISA, follow-up includes recommendations from BPM, coordination meetings, workshops and seminars on teaching methods, educational technology, and assessment, as well as efforts to expand case-based and project-based learning. Updates to LENSA UNISA and its analytical and discussion functions form part of the institution's digital development. A task force is used to monitor improvement activities, while student feedback and semester-based revisions of teaching materials provide additional inputs for subsequent teaching cycles. These activities indicate an attempt to connect evaluation with changes in teaching arrangements and institutional support.

The significance of follow-up lies in whether evaluation findings lead to identifiable institutional responses. Recommendations and meetings create opportunities for improvement, but their educational value depends on the clarity of responsibilities, the feasibility of proposed changes, and whether implementation is revisited. In the UNISA case, the reported task force, semester-based revision of teaching materials, and development of LENSA UNISA provide organizational routes through which recommendations may be carried into subsequent teaching cycles. Lecturer workshops are more closely connected to teaching improvement when their content responds to identified needs and lecturers have opportunities to apply what they have learned. Studies of faculty development emphasize the importance of aligning professional learning with teaching practice, institutional support, and lecturers' working conditions (Gast et al., 2022; Muammar & Alkathiri, 2022).

At STIKes dr. Sismadi, follow-up includes curriculum revisions informed by tracer studies and student surveys, consultation with practitioners and other stakeholders, improvements to laboratory and simulation equipment, and the development of online teaching tools. Faculty discussion groups provide a means of exchanging experiences and reviewing teaching practices. Student input into clinical practice evaluation also contributes to the review process. Teaching materials are

updated with reference to professional association guidance and relevant national or international standards.

These activities reflect the practical demands of a health sciences learning environment, where curriculum relevance, access to appropriate equipment, and the relationship between classroom instruction and professional practice are important considerations. They also show that teaching improvement cannot be reduced to individual lecturer effort. Lecturers' ability to respond to evaluation findings depends partly on access to facilities, technology, professional development, and coordination mechanisms. Compared with UNISA's emphasis on digital learning support and collaborative pedagogies, STIKes dr. Sismadi's reported follow-up places greater emphasis on the material and practice-based conditions of health sciences education. Quality assurance therefore involves both pedagogical judgment and institutional capacity.

The follow-up findings from both cases point to the importance of continuity between evaluation and subsequent planning. At UNISA, recommendations, workshops, task-force monitoring, and updates to teaching materials connect review activities with the next teaching cycle. At STIKes dr. Sismadi, curriculum revisions, stakeholder consultation, improvements to laboratory and simulation equipment, and updated online tools connect programme review with the practical requirements of health sciences education. These actions illustrate the potential pathways through which evaluation may inform improvement; the available evidence does not, however, establish the extent to which each action was implemented consistently or its effect on lecturer performance. Continuous quality improvement is most meaningfully understood when follow-up responds to identifiable findings and becomes an input into later planning (Krooi et al., 2024; Mu'alimin, 2026).

Analytical Framework for Continuous Quality Improvement

The findings can be organized through an analytical framework that connects four dimensions of teaching performance with the institutional relationships that make improvement possible. The framework is an analytical synthesis of the two cases and the relevant literature, not an independently validated measurement instrument or a replacement for PDCA. Its distinguishing feature is the cross-dimensional integration of institutional standards, lecturers' pedagogical decisions, evidence interpretation, and organizational responses. The comparison shows that these relationships take different practical forms: UNISA's coordination is visible in curriculum workshops, BPM monitoring, LENSA UNISA, and semester-based revisions, while STIKes dr. Sismadi's is visible in curriculum discussions, practical assessment, clinical supervision, and improvements to simulation resources.

Table 1. Analytical Framework for Continuous Quality Improvement in Lecturers' Teaching Performance.

Dimension	Analytical focus	Evidence and practices identified in the cases	Guiding analytical question
Planning	Alignment of curriculum, learning outcomes, pedagogy, and assessment	Graduate profiles, CPL/CPMK, curriculum workshops, tracer studies, RPS, case-based learning, clinical simulation, and assessment rubrics	How are institutional quality standards translated into concrete teaching plans?
Implementation	Enactment of planned teaching practices	Student-centred learning, group discussion, projects, clinical simulation, LMS-supported activities, feedback, and teaching monitoring	How are planned learning designs translated into teaching and learning activities?
Evaluation	Use of evidence to review teaching and learning	Student feedback, rubrics, classroom observations, LMS data, learning-outcome reviews, tracer studies, and clinical-practice supervision	How is evidence used to identify gaps between intended and actual learning?
Follow-up	Translation of evaluation into improvement	Curriculum revisions, lecturer development, updated learning materials, technology improvements, coordination meetings, and stakeholder input	How are evaluation findings converted into changes in subsequent teaching cycles?
Cross-dimensional integration	Continuity and coordination across planning, implementation, evaluation, and follow-up	Coordination among lecturers, programme leaders, quality assurance personnel, students, and external stakeholders	Do institutional actors connect standards, teaching practice, evidence interpretation, and follow-up as an integrated improvement process?

Source: Authors' analytical synthesis of the study findings and literature on higher education quality assurance, faculty development, and learning-outcome assessment.

The framework draws attention to the relationships between dimensions rather than treating them as independent stages. Planning establishes the intended direction of teaching; implementation translates that direction into learning activities and produces evidence through assessment and participation; evaluation interprets evidence in relation to intended outcomes; and follow-up converts that interpretation into decisions for a subsequent cycle. Cross-dimensional integration refers to the coordination that links these activities: curriculum and programme leaders connect standards with course design; lecturers translate design into teaching; students' feedback and assessment information contribute to review; and quality assurance and academic management arrangements support decisions about resources and subsequent action. The framework therefore elaborates the institutional mechanisms through which PDCA can operate in context, rather than claiming novelty for the four stages themselves.

Discussion

Quality Management as an Integrated Institutional Process

The cases suggest that the management of lecturers' teaching performance is best understood as an institutional process linking curriculum design, teaching practice, evaluation, and follow-up. Both institutions have arrangements for planning learning activities, implementing teaching strategies, reviewing evidence, and identifying improvements. Their practices are consistent with the broader quality management literature, which treats quality assurance as a combination of organizational processes, tools, and institutional responsibilities rather than a single assessment procedure (Jasti, Venkateswaran, & Kota, 2022; Jasti, Venkateswaran, Kota, et al., 2022; Nasim et al., 2020). The comparison adds a contextual insight: the same improvement logic is enacted through different pedagogical and material arrangements according to institutional and disciplinary demands.

The analytical contribution of this study is to connect these processes to the teaching work of lecturers and to explain how their integration is reflected in institutional coordination. At UNISA, curriculum workshops and stakeholder discussions establish programme expectations; case-based and team-based activities translate those expectations into learning experiences; BPM monitoring, student feedback, tracer studies, and LENSA UNISA provide different sources of evaluative information; while workshops, task-force monitoring, and teaching-material revisions constitute follow-up activities. At STIKes dr. Sismadi, curriculum discussions and learning plans connect theoretical instruction with clinical requirements; simulation and practical instruction translate these plans into learning activities; rubric-based assessment and clinical supervision provide evidence for evaluating learning; while curriculum revision, stakeholder consultation, and equipment improvement represent institutional responses. Viewed comparatively, these practices illustrate how quality expectations are translated into teaching arrangements, how different forms of evidence inform institutional evaluation, and how subsequent decisions support the continuation of quality improvement. This interpretation is consistent with research indicating that internal quality assurance influences teaching and learning through the

ways academics engage with and use institutional processes, rather than through the existence of formal procedures alone (Pham et al., 2022; Tavares et al., 2017).

The cross-case comparison also suggests that an integrated quality cycle does not require identical teaching practices across institutions. UNISA's use of LMS-supported learning, collaborative projects, and programme-level coordination differs in emphasis from STIKes dr. Sismadi's focus on practical learning, simulation, and clinical supervision. This difference is analytically important because the meaning of teaching quality is partly shaped by the competence being developed. General academic and collaborative learning may require different teaching resources and forms of evidence from clinical and procedural learning. A common quality framework should therefore provide a shared logic for planning, evaluation, and improvement without imposing uniform pedagogical methods where learning requirements differ.

This contextual interpretation matters because institutional quality systems may become compliance-oriented when the completion of documents is treated as the principal indicator of success. Research on quality assurance implementation identifies the roles of institutional resources, stakeholder involvement, and quality culture in shaping how systems operate in practice (Mtitu, 2025; Mu'alimin, 2026). The two cases show that quality assurance is connected to teaching through concrete arrangements—curriculum coordination, monitoring, assessment rubrics, digital platforms, clinical supervision, and follow-up decisions. At the same time, the available evidence does not establish how lecturers experience possible tensions between administrative accountability and professional autonomy, or whether all reported arrangements operate consistently across programmes. These remain important questions for further empirical inquiry.

The proposed analytical framework makes this distinction explicit. It directs attention not only to whether planning, implementation, evaluation, and follow-up activities occur, but also to whether information and decisions move between them. Its contribution is integrative and interpretive: it offers a way to examine how institutional quality mechanisms relate to lecturers' teaching practices across different educational contexts. In practical terms, programme leaders and quality assurance units can use the framework to trace a specific learning objective from curriculum planning through teaching and assessment, identify where evidence indicates a gap, and consider whether the follow-up response addresses that gap and is carried into the next planning cycle.

Lecturer Development and the Relationship between Feedback and Practice

The findings position lecturer development as one of the mechanisms through which quality assurance can influence teaching. Workshops, seminars, faculty discussions, and training activities appear in both cases as means of supporting pedagogical and professional improvement. Their significance lies not simply in the availability of training but in the relationship between development opportunities and the teaching challenges identified through evaluation. This interpretation accords with research emphasizing that lecturers' professional learning is shaped by their needs, institutional conditions, and opportunities to engage with teaching practice (Muammar & Alkathiri, 2022; van Dijk et al., 2020).

Professional development is unlikely to produce consistent changes when it is detached from the actual learning environments in which lecturers work. A lecturer may gain knowledge of a new teaching strategy but still face constraints involving class

design, learning resources, assessment requirements, or student needs. Faculty development therefore requires alignment between individual learning, programme-level priorities, and institutional support. Studies of faculty induction and student-centred learning also underline the importance of helping lecturers develop practical pedagogical capabilities rather than assuming that disciplinary expertise alone is sufficient (Leatemia et al., 2023; Mishra et al., 2022; Syam et al., 2021).

The institutional dimension of lecturer development is particularly important in understanding the differences between the two cases. At UNISA, digital learning tools create demands for pedagogical and technological support, whereas at STIKes dr. Sismadi, laboratory and simulation facilities require support responsive to practical and clinical instruction. These differences indicate that lecturer development should reflect specific teaching environments rather than rely on uniform training programmes. Feedback also contributes to professional learning when it informs academic discussion and pedagogical adjustment (Christensen et al., 2023). Furthermore, motivation and opportunities for informal workplace learning support the development of teaching capabilities beyond formal training (Decius & Hein, 2024).

Nevertheless, the reported workshops and development activities cannot be interpreted as evidence of measurable improvements in lecturer performance. The available case information does not establish such effects or allow comparisons of professional development effectiveness between the institutions. Rather, these activities represent institutional arrangements through which teaching improvement is pursued. Establishing their effectiveness would require evidence linking specific development activities to subsequent changes in teaching practices and, where relevant, learning outcomes.

The findings should not be interpreted as evidence that the reported workshops or development activities have produced measurable gains in lecturer performance. The available case information does not establish such an effect or provide a basis for comparing the effectiveness of professional development across the two institutions. Instead, it identifies professional development as part of the institutional arrangements through which teaching improvement is pursued. Demonstrating its effectiveness would require evidence that connects particular development activities with subsequent changes in teaching practice and, where relevant, appropriately measured learning outcomes.

Evaluation, Learning Outcomes, and the Limits of Quality Indicators

A second important implication concerns the distinction between monitoring teaching processes and assessing learning outcomes. Both institutions use multiple forms of evaluation, including assessment rubrics, student feedback, classroom observations, and institutional review. UNISA also uses data generated through LENSA UNISA, while STIKes dr. Sismadi places particular emphasis on the supervision and assessment of practical learning. These arrangements provide information that can support quality improvement, but each indicator has a specific interpretive scope. The comparison therefore concerns not only which evidence is collected, but also whether the evidence is appropriate to the educational task under review.

For example, student satisfaction may provide insight into students' experiences of a course, but satisfaction is not equivalent to demonstrated learning. LMS access data may indicate engagement with digital resources, but access alone cannot establish

conceptual understanding. Written examination results may assess particular forms of knowledge, while clinical simulation and direct observation can provide evidence about practical performance. The important issue is not to select one universal indicator but to align assessment methods with the learning outcomes being examined. Research on direct learning-outcome measurement and assurance of learning supports the need for explicit criteria and appropriate assessment evidence (Chiappe et al., 2023; Hernández-Campos et al., 2025).

Digital systems can help organize and interpret evidence, but their presence does not guarantee that the evidence is educationally meaningful. The development of LMS-based outcome measurement frameworks reflects the need to connect digital functionality with the specific requirements of assessment (El Marsafawy et al., 2022). Similarly, digital applications designed for assessment quality assurance can make programme structures and assessment relationships more visible, supporting discussion of gaps and potential improvements (Schellekens et al., 2023). These studies reinforce the analytical distinction between collecting data and using data to make defensible judgments about teaching and learning.

The findings also suggest that evaluation should be understood as a process of interpretation rather than simply the aggregation of indicators. Quality assurance personnel, programme leaders, and lecturers need to consider what the evidence captures, what it leaves unmeasured, and how different sources can complement one another. Naim et al. (2025) discuss information-system-based assessment of programme learning outcomes, while Noda (2022) examines the role of external quality assurance in relation to evidence of student learning. Taken together, this literature underscores the need to connect institutional reporting requirements with meaningful evidence about educational outcomes.

The cases do not establish that graduate competence has increased by a specific percentage or that a particular quality assurance intervention caused improved graduate performance. Tracer studies and stakeholder feedback can contribute to programme review, but causal claims require evidence that directly supports them. The defensible conclusion is narrower: both institutions use evaluation mechanisms that can inform decisions about teaching, curriculum, and student learning. The analytical challenge is to ensure that these mechanisms are used in ways that are proportionate to the evidence available.

Digital Infrastructure and Context-Sensitive Teaching Quality

Digital infrastructure is one of the visible features of the two cases, although its role differs according to institutional context. At UNISA, LENSA UNISA supports access to materials, learning activities, communication, assessment, and feedback. At STIKes dr. Sismadi, digital modules and online evaluation tools complement teaching that relies heavily on practical activities and simulation. The contrast suggests that digital infrastructure is integrated into different pedagogical configurations: it supports a wider set of course interactions at UNISA, while at STIKes dr. Sismadi it complements practice-oriented learning. In both cases, technology forms part of the environment in which teaching is organized, but it does not replace the pedagogical judgment required to select learning activities and interpret assessment evidence.

This distinction matters because digital adoption can be mistaken for educational improvement. A learning platform may make activities easier to distribute

and data easier to retrieve, yet the quality of learning still depends on the alignment between activities, intended outcomes, feedback, and assessment. Technology becomes more consequential when it helps lecturers identify learning difficulties, monitor progress against explicit objectives, and respond to evidence. The literature on LMS functionality and quality assurance supports this distinction between the availability of digital tools and their capacity to support the assessment of intended learning outcomes (El Marsafawy et al., 2022; Schellekens et al., 2023).

Context also shapes what counts as appropriate teaching infrastructure. Collaborative projects and online discussion may be useful for developing particular forms of analysis and teamwork, whereas laboratory equipment, simulation models, and supervised clinical practice are essential for learning outcomes involving practical performance. The cases therefore support a context-sensitive understanding of quality management: institutions need to evaluate technology and teaching resources in relation to the educational tasks they are intended to support.

Research on internal quality assurance has warned against assuming that the adoption of quality systems or the availability of institutional resources automatically predicts educational quality (Mwila, 2025). The present study similarly does not establish a direct relationship between particular technologies and improved learning outcomes. Its contribution is to show how digital and practical resources are incorporated into wider arrangements for teaching, monitoring, and improvement. The relevant question is not whether an institution uses more technology, but whether its infrastructure supports the learning objectives and the continuous improvement of teaching practice.

Contribution, Implications, and Further Research

The principal contribution of this study lies in an integrative analytical framework that explains how institutional quality management relates to lecturers' teaching practices through the interconnected dimensions of planning, implementation, evaluation, and follow-up. Previous studies have examined total quality management, internal quality assurance, faculty development, and learning-outcome assessment from different perspectives (Jasti, Venkateswaran, & Kota, 2022; Jasti, Venkateswaran, Kota, et al., 2022; Krooi et al., 2024). By bringing these perspectives together, the present study explains how institutional quality arrangements become connected to teaching activities in different educational contexts. Rather than proposing a new quality management cycle, the framework extends the analytical application of PDCA by emphasizing cross-dimensional relationships, particularly the connections between institutional coordination, pedagogical decisions, evaluation evidence, and subsequent improvement.

This contribution is reflected in three interconnected relationships. First, institutional quality assurance provides direction for pedagogical decisions, while the implementation of those decisions remains responsive to disciplinary learning requirements. Second, evaluation involves interpreting evidence according to its educational significance, since student feedback, LMS indicators, assessment rubrics, and clinical supervision represent different dimensions of teaching and learning. Third, follow-up connects evaluation with subsequent institutional decisions, including lecturer development, curriculum adjustment, and the provision of appropriate learning resources. The integration of these relationships explains why continuous quality

improvement depends not merely on the completion of individual activities but also on their contribution to subsequent stages of the teaching process.

The framework also has implications for institutional management. Quality assurance meetings, lecturer development, assessment practices, student feedback, and investments in technology and learning facilities acquire greater educational significance when they respond to identifiable teaching and learning needs. At UNISA, the integration of digital learning support and collaborative teaching requires coordination between programme planning, instructional practices, and institutional monitoring. At STIKes dr. Sismadi, the relationship between theoretical instruction, clinical simulation, and practical assessment places particular importance on laboratory facilities, clinical supervision, and relevant lecturer development. These differences demonstrate that institutional quality management requires a shared improvement orientation while allowing pedagogical responses to remain sensitive to the characteristics of each educational context.

The interpretation of these findings remains situated within the institutional practices examined in the two cases. The available evidence does not establish causal effects of particular quality assurance mechanisms on individual lecturer performance or graduate competence, nor does it demonstrate the relative effectiveness of the two institutions. The analytical framework therefore represents a contextual synthesis of institutional practices rather than a validated predictive model or a statistically generalizable measurement instrument. Its explanatory value lies in identifying the relationships through which teaching quality is managed, while recognizing that the extent and consistency of these relationships may vary across institutional settings. This contextual understanding is consistent with the interpretive orientation of qualitative case study research (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Crowe et al., 2011; Hyett et al., 2014).

The relationships identified in this study provide a basis for further inquiry into the continuity of institutional quality improvement. Longitudinal investigations could examine how evaluation findings are translated into changes in teaching practices across successive semesters and how these changes relate to subsequent assessments of learning outcomes. Further comparative studies involving different institutional and disciplinary contexts could also explore how lecturers, students, programme leaders, and quality assurance personnel interpret evaluation evidence and negotiate improvement priorities. Such investigations would deepen understanding of the institutional conditions under which quality assurance becomes an ongoing process of pedagogical and organizational learning.

Overall, the comparison of UNISA and STIKes dr. Sismadi demonstrates that managing teaching quality involves more than establishing standards or conducting periodic evaluations. It requires institutional relationships through which teaching plans guide implementation, evaluation evidence informs academic decisions, and follow-up supports subsequent improvement. Although these relationships take different forms in collaborative academic learning and health sciences education, both cases illustrate the importance of connecting institutional quality arrangements with the actual demands of teaching. The framework consequently contributes an integrated perspective on continuous quality improvement by explaining how institutional coordination, pedagogical practice, evaluation, and follow-up operate as mutually connected dimensions of teaching quality management.

CONCLUSION

This study examined how lecturers' teaching performance is managed at STIKes dr. Sismadi and Universitas 'Aisyiyah Yogyakarta (UNISA) through planning, implementation, evaluation, and follow-up. The findings indicate that teaching quality management is best understood as an interconnected institutional process rather than a collection of separate administrative activities. Although both institutions connect curriculum and learning objectives with teaching, assessment, and evaluation, their pedagogical emphases differ. UNISA foregrounds collaborative learning, programme coordination, and digital support through LENSA UNISA, whereas STIKes dr. Sismadi emphasizes the integration of theoretical knowledge, simulation, practical assessment, and clinical learning. These differences demonstrate that continuous quality improvement needs to remain responsive to the educational purposes, pedagogical requirements, and institutional resources of each setting.

The study contributes an integrative analytical framework that explains the cross-dimensional relationships through which institutional quality assurance informs lecturers' teaching practices. Beyond the conventional PDCA sequence, the framework emphasizes how information and decisions move between curriculum planning, teaching implementation, evidence interpretation, and institutional follow-up. It also distinguishes the educational significance of different forms of evidence and highlights the institutional support needed to translate evaluation findings into professional development, curriculum adjustment, and improvements in learning resources. As an analytical synthesis of the two cases, the framework offers a contextual perspective on teaching quality management rather than a validated instrument or evidence of measurable improvements in lecturer performance and graduate competence. Its broader significance for educational management, including Islamic higher education, lies in connecting institutional responsibility for educational quality with lecturers' professional practices and the development of meaningful student learning experiences.

The findings should be interpreted within the boundaries of the qualitative two-case design and the empirical information available from the two institutions. They provide insight into institutional practices and their relationships but do not establish the prevalence or consistency of these practices across other institutions, measure changes in individual lecturer performance, or demonstrate causal effects on student learning outcomes. Further research could examine how evaluation findings translate into documented changes in teaching practices over successive semesters, how lecturers and academic leaders interpret different forms of evidence, and how the framework operates across diverse disciplinary and institutional settings. Longitudinal studies combining qualitative process analysis with appropriate measures of student learning could further clarify whether, and under what conditions, sustained quality improvement is associated with changes in educational outcomes.

REFERENCES

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and Implementation for Novice Researchers. *The Qualitative Report*. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2008.1573

Chiappe, A., Wills, A. E., & Rachid, R. A. R. (2023). Is Assurance of Learning going as it should? A text mining-based review of literature. *Ensaio: Avaliação e Políticas Públicas Em Educação*, *31*(118). https://doi.org/10.1590/s0104-40362022003003802

Christensen, M. K., Møller, J. E., & Pedersen, I. M. (2023). How facilitated multi-source feedback constructs new conversations about teaching: a positioning theory study. *International Journal for Academic Development*, *28*(3), 272–286. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2021.2016413

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.)*. SAGE Publications.

Crowe, S., Cresswell, K., Robertson, A., Huby, G., Avery, A., & Sheikh, A. (2011). The case study approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *11*(1), 100. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-11-100

Decius, J., & Hein, J. (2024). Motivated to learn? Investigating the link of achievement goals and informal workplace learning of lecturers in higher education. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *35*(2), 213–234. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21513

El Marsafawy, H., Roy, R., & Ali, F. (2022). Measuring learning outcomes: bridging accreditation requirements and LMS functionalities. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *30*(4), 555–570. https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-11-2021-0186

Gast, I., Neelen, M., Delnoij, L., Menten, M., Mihai, A., & Grohnert, T. (2022). Supporting the well-being of new university teachers through teacher professional development. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.866000

Hernández-Campos, M., Prado-Calderón, J. E., Gonzalez-Torres, A., & García-Peñalvo, F. J. (2025). Direct measurement of learning outcomes in higher education: A proposal of nine standardized scales for continuous improvement in engineering programs. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *112*, 102638. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2025.102638

Hyett, N., Kenny, A., & Dickson-Swift, V. (2014). Methodology or method? A critical review of qualitative case study reports. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-Being*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.3402/qhw.v9.23606

Indonesia. (2012). *Law No. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 2012 No. 158, Supplement to the State Gazette No. 5336*.

Jasti, N. V. K., Venkateswaran, V., & Kota, S. (2022). Total Quality Management in higher education: a literature review on barriers, customers and accreditation. *The TQM Journal*, *34*(5), 1250–1272. https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-11-2020-0256

Jasti, N. V. K., Venkateswaran, V., Kota, S., & Sangwan, K. S. (2022). A literature review on total quality management (models, frameworks, and tools and techniques) in higher education. *The TQM Journal*, *34*(5), 1298–1319. https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-04-2021-0113

Krooi, M., Whittingham, J., & Beausaert, S. (2024). Introducing the 3P conceptual model of internal quality assurance in higher education: A systematic literature review. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *82*, 101360. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.101360

Leatemia, L. D., Susilo, A. P., Donkers, J., & van Merrienboer, J. J. G. (2023). Developing student-centred perspectives in PBL: how teacher profiles reveal educational needs for faculty development programmes. *BMC Medical Education*, *23*(1), 580. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-023-04538-0

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2020). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (4th ed.)*. SAGE Publications.

Mishra, L., Gupta, T., & Shree, A. (2022). Faculty induction program for newly recruited teachers of higher education: a case study. *Teacher Development*, *26*(1), 135–149. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2022.2027812

Mtitu, E. A. (2025). Exploring factors for the introduction and implementation of quality assurance systems in selected higher education institutions in Tanzania. *Cogent Education*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2455767

Mu'alimin, M. (2026). Rethinking quality management in higher education: experiences from Indonesia. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *34*(3), 468–482. https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-07-2025-0223

Muammar, O. M., & Alkathiri, M. S. (2022). What really matters to faculty members attending professional development programs in higher education. *International Journal for Academic Development*, *27*(3), 221–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2021.1897987

Murtonen, M., Aldahdouh, T. Z., Vilppu, H., Trang, N. T. T., Riekkinen, J., & Vermunt, J. D. (2024). Importance of regulation and the quality of teacher learning in student-centred teaching. *Teacher Development*, *28*(4), 534–552. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2024.2318329

Mwila, P. M. (2025). Influence of quality assurance framework on quality of education programmes offered in private universities in Tanzania. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *33*(1), 167–178. https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-06-2024-0114

Naim, A., Alnfiai, M. M., & Almalki, N. S. (2025). Information systems based model for the assessment of program learning outcomes in measuring the quality in higher education. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *12*(1), 1975. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-06259-9

Nasim, K., Sikander, A., & Tian, X. (2020). Twenty years of research on total quality management in Higher Education: A systematic literature review. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *74*(1), 75–97. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12227

Noda, A. (2022). The role of external quality assurance for student learning outcomes in Japan: evaluation of evidence between bureaucracy and peer reviews. *Quality in Higher Education*, *28*(2), 205–220. https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2021.1986252

Pham, N. T. T., Nguyen, C. H., Pham, H. T., & Ta, H. T. T. (2022). Internal Quality Assurance of Academic Programs: A Case Study in Vietnamese Higher Education. *Sage Open*, *12*(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221144419

Phuong, T. T., & Duong, B.-H. (2022). Toward a competency-based professional development framework for faculty members: insiders' perspectives. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *28*(4), 283–300. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11233-022-09103-w

Schellekens, L. H., van der Schaaf, M. F., van der Vleuten, C. P. M., Prins, F. J., Wools, S., & Bok, H. G. J. (2023). Developing a digital application for quality assurance of assessment programmes in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *31*(2), 346–366. https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-03-2022-0066

Soares, D., Franco, A., Rocha, M., & Dias, P. (2024). Do birds of a feather flock together? Lessons from an interdisciplinary and interinstitutional community-development approach to faculty development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, *29*(2), 205–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2024.2355527

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. SAGE Publications.

Syam, R. Z. A., Sauri, R. S., & Indah, R. N. (2021). Strategi Peningkatan Mutu Lulusan Prodi Paud Melalui Pelaksanaan Sistem Penjaminan Mutu Internal Di Universitas Islam Nusantara. *Al-Fikrah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, *8*(2), 161. https://doi.org/10.31958/jaf.v8i2.2415

Tavares, O., Sin, C., Videira, P., & Amaral, A. (2017). Academics' perceptions of the impact of internal quality assurance on teaching and learning. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *42*(8), 1293–1305. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1262326

Tep, V. (2024). Improving Professional Development: A Case Study on the Influence of Faculty Evaluations in Cambodia. *Sage Open*, *14*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241241166

van Dijk, E. E., van Tartwijk, J., van der Schaaf, M. F., & Kluijtmans, M. (2020). What makes an expert university teacher? A systematic review and synthesis of frameworks for teacher expertise in higher education. *Educational Research Review*, *31*, 100365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100365

Warta, W., Achmad Syam, R. Z., & Rahmatullah, T. (2024). School Reputation Management for Institutional Sustainability and Achievement of Excellent Predicate. *QALAMUNA: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, Dan Agama*, *16*(1), 633–646. https://doi.org/10.37680/qalamuna.v16i1.5037