JURNAL KEPENDIDIKAN
PENELITIAN INOVASI PEMBELAJARAN
open access
P-ISSN: 2580-5525
E-ISSN: 2580-5533

Analysis of the 2024 accreditation assessment instrument on school performance based on national education standards

Hironimus Tangi[1]*, Agus Timan[2], Aan Fardani Ubaidillah[2]

[1]Universitas Katolik Widya Mandira Kupang, Indonesia

[2]Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia

hirontangi@unwira.ac.id

OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Tangi, H., Timan, A., & Ubaidillah, A. F. (2026). Analysis of the 2024 accreditation assessment instrument on school performance based on national education standards. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Penelitian Inovasi Pembelajaran*, *10*(1), 10–22. https://doi.org/10.21831/jk.v10i1.85671

Received : 24 May 2025

Accepted : 14 November 2025

Published : 2 May 2026

Abstract:
This study examines the degree to which the 2024 National Accreditation Board for Primary and Secondary Education (BAN-PDM) accreditation instrument fulfils the eight National Education Standards (Standar Nasional Pendidikan/SNP) stipulated in Government Regulation No. 4 of 2022. Employing a qualitative library research method, the study systematically analysed Kepmendikbudristek No. 246/O/2024, Government Regulation No. 4 of 2022, and related policy documents using the READ approach and qualitative content analysis. Findings reveal that of ten benchmark indicators, only two — the Learning Process Standard and the Facilities and Infrastructure Standard — demonstrate adequate SNP alignment. The remaining six standards and the quality assurance mechanism are either partially fulfilled or not fulfilled. The study concludes that the 2024 BAN-PDM accreditation instrument requires comprehensive revision to incorporate explicit indicators for all eight SNP dimensions and to introduce a dedicated school-based quality assurance mechanism grounded in the PDCA cycle. These findings carry implications for Indonesian education policy reform and contribute to international debates on school quality assurance frameworks.

Keywords: national education standards; accreditation instrument 2024; ban-pdm; education policy; school quality assessment

Introduction

Education quality assurance through accreditation has become an increasingly prominent mechanism of educational governance worldwide. The global proliferation of accreditation systems reflects broader trends toward accountability, standardisation, and outcome-based educational management (Harvey & Newton, 2004; Stensaker, 2011). In the context of developing nations and the Global South, however, there is growing critical scholarship questioning whether accreditation instruments adequately capture contextual dimensions of educational quality, including equity, cultural relevance, and community engagement (Tikly, 2011; Unterhalter, 2019). Indonesia, as the world's fourth most populous nation and the largest Muslim-majority country, presents a particularly instructive case study of how nationally designed accreditation frameworks engage with — or fail to engage with — the complex realities of diverse educational institutions spanning urban and remote settings.

The Indonesian education system has undergone significant regulatory reform over the past decade. Government Regulation No. 57 of 2021 on National Education Standards was revised by Government Regulation No. 4 of 2022, which more explicitly aligned national standards with Pancasila values, the Indonesian language, and contemporary societal needs. This revision reflects a broader educational philosophy premised on holistic human development — a framework consistent with both the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Islamic educational tradition's emphasis on tarbiyah (holistic upbringing encompassing intellectual, spiritual, and moral dimensions) (Mujib & Mudzakkir, 2006; Langgulung, 1995). The SNP thus represents not merely a technical regulatory document but an articulation of Indonesia's educational aspirations and values.

In 2024, Kepmendikbudristek No. 246/O/2024 introduced a revised accreditation instrument for primary and secondary schools. This instrument organises the assessment of school quality around four components: (1) Educator Performance in the Learning Process; (2) Principal's Leadership Effectiveness; (3) Quality of Learning Environment; and (4) Graduate/Student Learning Outcome Achievement. While this restructuring reflected the Ministry's intention to simplify and modernise accreditation procedures, it also raised fundamental questions about whether the revised instrument adequately covers all eight SNP dimensions mandated by Government Regulation No. 4 of 2022.

The relationship between accreditation instruments and quality standards is a critical node in educational governance. International research consistently demonstrates that the design and scope of accreditation instruments significantly influence institutional behaviour, resource allocation, and ultimately educational outcomes (Eaton, 2012; Dill, 2007). When accreditation instruments fail to capture established quality standards comprehensively, schools may systematically neglect dimensions not assessed, producing a form of 'accreditation bias' that distorts genuine quality improvement efforts (Harvey, 2004). This concern is particularly salient for Indonesia, where accreditation results are used not only for quality monitoring but also for determining resource entitlements and operational permissions at the school level (Koto, 2024).

The literature on educational standards and accreditation in Southeast Asia and the Global South highlights several systemic challenges: the tendency to adopt Western-derived accreditation models without sufficient contextualisation (Tikly & Barrett, 2011); the risk of reducing complex educational quality to measurable proxies that may not capture holistic development (Biesta, 2009); and the importance of aligning accreditation mechanisms with national curriculum

frameworks to ensure policy coherence (Levin, 2008). In the Indonesian context, empirical studies suggest that accreditation has had mixed effects on school quality, with some research noting improvements in administrative compliance but limited impact on pedagogical quality and student outcomes (Koto, 2024; Bachtiar, 2023).

This study addresses a critical gap in the literature: a systematic, empirically grounded analysis of whether the 2024 BAN-PDM accreditation instrument comprehensively covers all eight SNP dimensions stipulated in Government Regulation No. 4 of 2022. This question has direct policy relevance, as misalignment between the accreditation instrument and the SNP would mean that schools are evaluated against a partial conception of educational quality, potentially undermining the SNP's function as the overarching framework for educational implementation in Indonesia. Answering this question requires not only document analysis but also engagement with theories of policy analysis, evaluation, and educational quality assurance.

The theoretical framework underpinning this study draws on three complementary bodies of theory. First, Ball's (1998, 2006) policy sociology framework — particularly his concepts of policy as text and policy as discourse — provides conceptual tools for understanding how policy documents, such as accreditation instruments, are simultaneously products of complex political processes and performative texts that shape institutional behaviour. Ball's attention to the 'contexts of influence, policy text production, and practice' (Ball, 1998) is especially relevant for analysing how the 2024 accreditation instrument was produced and what institutional logics it embeds. Second, Dunn's (1981) five-stage public policy analysis framework — problem formulation, forecasting, recommendation, monitoring, and evaluation — provides a systematic structure for assessing whether the accreditation instrument reflects sound policy analysis and is likely to achieve its stated objectives. Third, Stufflebeam and Coryn's (2014) CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) evaluation model and their framework of evaluation standards — utility, feasibility, accuracy, accountability, and evaluation capacity — provide criteria for assessing the instrument's quality as an evaluation tool.

Method

This study employs a qualitative library research design (Zed, 2008; Sudaryono et al., 2013), which involves the systematic collection, analysis, and interpretation of documentary sources to generate theoretical and empirical insights. Library research is an established and rigorous methodology in educational policy analysis, enabling in-depth examination of policy texts and their relationships without the constraints of primary data collection (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The approach is particularly appropriate for this study, given that the primary research question concerns the relationship between two formal policy documents — Kepmendikbudristek No. 246/O/2024 and Government Regulation No. 4 of 2022 — which are publicly available, authoritatively produced texts amenable to systematic documentary analysis.

The primary data sources for this study comprise: (1) Kepmendikbudristek No. 246/O/2024, the ministerial decree establishing the 2024 accreditation instrument for primary and secondary education; (2) Government Regulation No. 4 of 2022 on National Education Standards; (3) official BAN-PDM guidelines, manuals, and assessor training materials; (4) Government Regulation No. 19 of 2005, the foundational legal framework for SNP; and (5) a systematic review of peer-reviewed academic literature on school accreditation, educational quality assurance, and

Indonesian education policy published between 2015 and 2025 in Scopus- and Web of Science-indexed journals.

Document analysis followed the READ approach (Ready materials, Extract data, Analyse data, Deliberate conclusions), as adapted for educational policy research (Bowen, 2009). In the Ready phase, thematic areas corresponding to the eight SNP dimensions were defined, and inclusion and exclusion criteria for relevant documents were established. In the Extract phase, structured data extraction instruments were developed, with each component of the 2024 accreditation instrument systematically coded against the relevant SNP articles. In the Analyse phase, qualitative content analysis was applied to examine both manifest (explicit) and latent (implicit) content, assessing the degree of alignment, partial fulfilment, or absence of coverage for each SNP dimension. In the Deliberate phase, interpretive conclusions were drawn from the identified patterns, with particular attention to gaps between the accreditation instrument's scope and the full SNP framework.

The validity and reliability of the analysis were strengthened through the application of two criteria appropriate for qualitative documentary analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985): credibility, ensured through prolonged engagement with primary documents and member checking of interpretive conclusions against the explicit provisions of the SNP; and confirmability, ensured through the maintenance of an audit trail documenting all coding decisions and their evidential bases. Limitations of the study include the inherent constraints of documentary analysis — specifically, the inability to observe how the accreditation instrument is applied in practice, which may differ from its formal design — and the focus on formal policy alignment rather than implementation outcomes.

Finding and Discussion

Findings

The systematic mapping of Government Regulation No. 4 of 2022 articles against the 2024 BAN-PDM accreditation instrument (Kepmendikbudristek No. 246/O/2024) is presented in Table 1. The analysis reveals a fundamental structural disparity: while the SNP establishes eight quality standards through a comprehensive regulatory framework of 33 articles, the 2024 accreditation instrument organises school quality assessment around four components. Of the ten benchmark indicators examined, only two — Learning Process Standards (Articles 10–15) and Facilities and Infrastructure Standards (Articles 25–26) — demonstrate adequate alignment. The remaining eight indicators are either partially fulfilled or absent from the instrument.

Table 1. Matrix of SNP Mapping and 2024 Accreditation Instruments (BAN-PDM)

No.	Article of Government Regulation No. 4/2022	Decree No. 246/O/2024 Accreditation Instruments	Fulfilment Status
1.	Standard Establishment (Art. 3, para. 1–7): Graduate Competency, Content, Process, Assessment, Educator & Personnel, Facilities & Infrastructure, Management, and Financing Standards — to improve quality of education.	Four components: (a) Educator Performance in Learning Process; (b) Principal's Leadership Effectiveness; (c) Quality of Learning Environment; (d) Competency Achievement of Learning Outcomes.	Partially Fulfilled
2.	Graduate Competency Standards (Arts. 4–7): attitude (spiritual, social, national), knowledge	Component A – Educator Performance: (1) socio-emotional support; (2) class management; (3) facilitating academic & character	Partially Fulfilled

	(literacy, numeracy, science, culture, citizenship), and skills (critical thinking, creative, communicative, collaborative).	competencies; (4) student-centered learning.	
3.	Content Standards (Arts. 8–9): scope of material, competency level, and learning load; basic curriculum framework, depth/breadth of material, and time allocation.	Items 1 & 2, Component A: Educators provide socio-emotional support and manage student-centred learning.	Partially Fulfilled
4.	Process Standards (Arts. 10–15): learning planning, implementation, and assessment of the learning process.	Item 2, Component A: Educators manage learning effectively and in a student-centred manner, building fluency, interest, habits, social skills, character, and academic competencies.	Fulfilled
5.	Assessment Standards (Arts. 16–19): formative and summative assessments by educators, education units, government (national assessment, school examination), and community.	Component D – Graduate/Student Learning Outcome: (1) measuring academic achievement via National Assessment (AN); (2) aligning learning with developmental needs.	Partially Fulfilled
6.	Educator and Education Personnel Standards (Arts. 20–24): academic qualifications, pedagogical, personality, social, and professional competencies.	Component B – Principal's Leadership: encouraging a culture of reflection for student-centred learning; transparent and accountable management of human and financial resources.	Partially Fulfilled
7.	Facilities and Infrastructure Standards (Arts. 25–26): facilities supporting active, creative, collaborative, and effective learning; safety; disability-friendly; environmentally sustainable.	Component B, Item 8: Principal leads management of facilities and infrastructure in accordance with learner-centred needs.	Partially Fulfilled
8.	Management Standards (Arts. 27–31): planning, implementation, and supervision of educational activities; school-based management (independence, partnership, participation, openness, accountability).	Component B (Principal's Leadership) and Component C (Learning Environment Climate).	Partially Fulfilled
9.	Financing Standards (Arts. 32–33): investment costs (land, facilities, human resources, working capital) and operational costs (personnel, non-personnel).	Component B, Item 7: Principal manages school budgets involving teacher representatives, school committees, and relevant parties, applying transparent and accountable principles.	Partially Fulfilled
10.	Development, Monitoring, and Reporting of National Education Standards by education units for continuous quality improvement.	No indicator of checking and developing National Education Standards at the education unit level.	Not Fulfilled

Note: SNP = Standar Nasional Pendidikan (National Education Standards).

Discussion

The structural misalignment identified in Table 1 must be understood within the broader context of Indonesian education policy reform and international debates on school quality assurance. The reduction from eight SNP dimensions to four accreditation components reflects the Ministry's deliberate policy choice to simplify and modernise the accreditation framework. However, as the analysis demonstrates, this simplification has come at the cost of comprehensive coverage of the legally mandated standards. This finding resonates with Harvey and Newton's (2004) seminal observation that institutional quality assurance mechanisms frequently privilege 'fitness for purpose' over 'fitness of purpose' focusing on operational efficiency while neglecting deeper questions about the adequacy of educational standards being measured.

The Graduate Competency Standards (SKL, Articles 4–7) present the most complex case of partial fulfilment. Government Regulation No. 4 of 2022 specifies a tripartite model of graduate competency encompassing attitude, knowledge, and skills a framework broadly consistent with international frameworks of competency-based education (OECD, 2019) and with the holistic development objectives of Islamic education (tarbiyah islamiyah), which emphasises the integration of spiritual, intellectual, and practical dimensions (al-Attas, 1980; Langgulung, 1995). The 2024 instrument's Component A assesses educator performance in managing learning processes but does not holistically capture all SKL dimensions. Cucu Atikah and Hany Tutut Handayani (2024) similarly found that Indonesian education policies frequently address learning processes without sufficiently operationalising holistic competency measurement. Internationally, this gap reflects broader challenges in translating competency-based curriculum frameworks into assessment instruments that capture non-cognitive dimensions of student development (Biesta, 2009; Schulz et al., 2018).

Content Standards (Articles 8–9) represent a critical under-addressed dimension. These standards specify the scope of material and competency levels across educational pathways, as well as the functions that are foundational to curriculum coherence and equity across diverse school contexts. International research consistently demonstrates that content standards serve as the primary mechanism for ensuring educational equity across socioeconomic and geographic divides (Darling-Hammond et al., 2019). The 2024 instrument's implicit treatment of content standards — addressed only indirectly through teacher performance and principal curriculum leadership — is insufficient to assess whether schools are providing equitable access to grade-appropriate content, particularly in remote and under-resourced settings. This finding aligns with Tikly and Barrett's (2011) critique of quality assurance frameworks in the Global South that prioritise process over content, potentially perpetuating inequalities in educational opportunity.

The relative alignment of Process Standards (Articles 10–15) with the 2024 instrument's Component A represents the most clearly successful dimension of the instrument. This finding reflects the strong emphasis in contemporary Indonesian education reform on student-centred learning, active pedagogy, and competency-based instruction — approaches aligned with international best practice (Hattie, 2009; Marzano, 2007). Nur Atika Alias and Lumanatul Latifah (2025) confirm that authentic pedagogical assessment remains a strength of Indonesia's evolving accreditation approach. However, even within this dimension, the instrument's focus on educator performance, proxied through principal observation, may

systematically underassess process quality in classrooms where principals have limited pedagogical backgrounds (Bachtiar, 2023).

The partial fulfilment of Assessment Standards (Articles 16–19) represents a significant gap with practical consequences for school quality. The 2024 instrument primarily measures assessment quality through national assessment (AN) outcomes — a high-stakes, externally administered measure — without adequately assessing the internal formative and summative assessment practices that research consistently identifies as the most powerful levers for learning improvement (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). This focus on summative external assessment outcomes, while administratively convenient, risks reducing the assessment culture in Indonesian schools to one oriented toward test performance rather than learning improvement. Abdullah's (2015) analysis of classroom-based assessment in Indonesian religious schools similarly identified a systematic underemphasis on formative assessment because of assessment frameworks oriented toward external examinations.

The partial fulfilment of Educator and Education Personnel Standards (Articles 20–24) requires attention to the evidence on teacher quality as a determinant of educational outcomes. International literature is unambiguous: teacher quality is the most powerful in-school factor influencing student achievement (Hattie, 2009; Rivkin et al., 2005). Government Regulation No. 4 of 2022 specifies four competency dimensions — pedagogical, personality, social, and professional — reflecting a comprehensive model of teacher professionalism consistent with international frameworks (OECD, 2009). The 2024 instrument's assessment of this dimension through the lens of principal leadership and professional development planning is partial and indirect; it does not assess whether individual teachers possess the full range of required competencies or whether pedagogical quality meets specified standards. Bachtiar's (2023) study confirms that all four competency dimensions are empirically necessary to support quality education processes in Indonesian schools.

Facilities and Infrastructure Standards (Articles 25–26) represent one of the two areas of adequate alignment. The 2024 instrument's Component C (Learning Environment Climate) directly assesses the quality and inclusivity of the physical learning environment, and Component B includes specific indicators for principal management of facilities. This alignment reflects the strong evidence base linking adequate physical infrastructure to student achievement and wellbeing, particularly in developing country contexts where infrastructure deficits remain significant (UNESCO, 2022). However, the instrument's focus on management practices rather than objective facility standards means that schools with severely deficient infrastructure may score adequately if principals demonstrate effective management of existing resources — a potential source of measurement distortion (Setia, 2018).

Management Standards (Articles 27–31) present a complex profile of partial fulfilment. The 2024 instrument's Component B captures aspects of school-based management through principal leadership indicators but does not comprehensively assess the five dimensions specified in Government Regulation No. 4 of 2022: independence, partnership, participation, openness, and accountability. International research on school-based management demonstrates that these dimensions collectively determine whether school governance structures enable genuine community participation in educational decision-making (Caldwell, 2005; Daun, 2007). The partial coverage of management standards in the 2024 instrument may therefore inadvertently weaken rather than strengthen the school-based management framework established in Indonesian law. Sianturi et al. (2022) emphasise that data-based reflection and comprehensive accountability for

management are essential for genuine educational quality improvement in Indonesian schools.

Financing Standards (Articles 32–33) receive only indirect assessment through the instrument's requirement for transparent and accountable budget management. The absence of direct indicators for financing adequacy, efficiency of fund allocation, and the impact of financing levels on educational quality represents a significant policy gap. International evidence consistently demonstrates that financing adequacy is a necessary (though not sufficient) condition for educational quality, particularly in resource-constrained environments (Hanushek, 2006). The failure of the 2024 instrument to directly assess financing adequacy may allow schools with structurally insufficient funding to achieve adequate accreditation scores solely through administrative compliance, without addressing the underlying resource constraints that limit educational quality. Zahruddin and Zainul Arifin's (2019) study of school budget management demonstrates that transparent and accountable financial management positively influences educational quality outcomes in Indonesian schools.

The most critical gap identified in this analysis is the complete absence of any indicator in the 2024 instrument addressing the school-based quality assurance mechanism — specifically, the development, monitoring, and reporting of SNP implementation at the education unit level. Government Regulation No. 4 of 2022 establishes this quality assurance function as a distinct and essential component of the SNP framework, requiring schools to implement continuous quality improvement through systematic PDCA (Plan-Do-Check-Act) cycles. The absence of this dimension from the accreditation instrument effectively renders the SNP's quality assurance function invisible to accreditation assessment, removing institutional incentives for schools to engage in systematic self-evaluation and improvement planning. This finding directly challenges the theoretical foundations of the 2024 instrument as an educational evaluation tool. Stufflebeam and Coryn's (2014) CIPP evaluation model requires that evaluation instruments address not only outputs (Products) but also internal quality processes (Processes) and organisational capacity (Inputs). The 2024 instrument's neglect of quality assurance mechanisms fails this standard. Wahyuni and Miyono (2024) similarly find that the absence of Total Quality Management mechanisms in school quality assessment undermines the theoretical coherence and practical effectiveness of evaluation instruments.

Applying Ball's (2006) policy sociology framework, the 2024 accreditation instrument can be understood as a product of competing policy discourses — between a managerial discourse emphasising simplification, efficiency, and principal accountability, and a standards-based discourse emphasising comprehensive quality measurement across all SNP dimensions. The dominance of the managerial discourse in the 2024 instrument's design, reflected in its focus on four components centred on principal leadership and teacher performance, comes at the cost of comprehensive SNP alignment. Ball's (1998) analysis of policy texts as 'interventions in practice' is particularly relevant here: the 2024 instrument, by focusing assessment on principal leadership and teacher performance, constructs a particular performance logic that may shape in ways that prioritize

Ensure accreditation compliance over genuine quality improvement across all SNP dimensions.

From Dunn's (1981) policy analysis perspective, the findings suggest that the five-stage policy analysis cycle was not fully applied prior to the instrument's issuance. Specifically, the problem formulation stage appears to have prioritised administrative simplification concerns over comprehensive SNP alignment; the

forecasting stage does not appear to have adequately modelled the consequences of partial SNP coverage for school quality behaviour; and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for assessing the instrument's SNP alignment were not built into the policy design. Fika et al. (2023) confirm that Dunn's framework requires systematic policy analysis prior to public policy issuance and that socialisation of policy substance must precede implementation — conditions that appear not to have been fully satisfied in the development of the 2024 instrument.

A further dimension of concern relates to the implications of partial SNP coverage for educational equity. Indonesia's education system is characterised by significant spatial inequality, with schools in remote and underserved areas typically having lower levels of teacher qualification, facilities, and financial resources (Suryadarma et al., 2006). If the accreditation instrument does not comprehensively assess all SNP dimensions — particularly Content Standards, Assessment Standards, and Educator Standards — it may systematically fail to identify and address quality deficits in precisely those schools most in need of improvement support. Unterhalter's (2019) capability approach to educational quality in the Global South argues that quality assurance frameworks must be sensitive to structural inequalities that prevent marginalised students from accessing quality education, suggesting that accreditation instruments should incorporate equity dimensions as explicit assessment criteria. This perspective reinforces the need for the revised instrument to include explicit indicators for Content Standards and Educator Standards that are sensitive to contextual variations across diverse school settings.

Conclusion

This study systematically demonstrates that the 2024 BAN-PDM accreditation instrument does not fully meet all eight National Education Standards stipulated in Government Regulation No. 4 of 2022. Of the ten benchmark indicators examined, only two — Learning Process Standards and Facilities and Infrastructure Standards — demonstrate adequate SNP alignment. The remaining standards are either partially fulfilled or absent from the instrument, with the quality assurance mechanism (development, monitoring, and reporting of SNP at the education unit level) representing the most critical gap.

These findings have significant implications for Indonesian education policy. An accreditation instrument that partially measures educational quality against the legally mandated standards undermines the SNP's function as the overarching framework for educational implementation, creates distorted institutional incentives that prioritise accreditation compliance over comprehensive quality improvement, and risks perpetuating inequalities in educational quality across diverse school contexts. The misalignment between the 2024 instrument and the full SNP framework represents not merely a technical policy problem but a fundamental challenge to the coherence and effectiveness of Indonesia's educational quality assurance system.

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are directed to the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology and BAN-PDM: (1) A comprehensive revision of the 2024 BAN-PDM accreditation instrument should be conducted to incorporate explicit indicators for all eight SNP dimensions, with particular priority given to Graduate Competency Standards, Content Standards, Assessment Standards, and Educator and Education Personnel Standards; (2) A dedicated quality assurance component should be introduced, requiring schools to document and implement PDCA cycles for continuous SNP improvement; (3) Equity-sensitive indicators should be developed to assess SNP alignment in schools

serving diverse socioeconomic and geographic contexts; (4) The policy development process for any revised instrument should fully apply Dunn's (1981) policy analysis framework, including systematic problem formulation, impact forecasting, and stakeholder consultation; and (5) Ongoing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms should be established to assess the revised instrument's effectiveness in promoting comprehensive SNP alignment across the full diversity of Indonesian educational institutions.

Future research should examine the implementation of the 2024 instrument in practice, including school-level responses to the four-component framework, the effects of partial SNP coverage on institutional quality improvement efforts, and comparative analysis with accreditation frameworks in other Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) member states. Longitudinal studies examining the effects of instrument revision on school quality outcomes would also provide valuable evidence for the development of evidence-based policy.

Acknowledgments

The authors express their gratitude to Universitas Katolik Widya Mandira Kupang and Universitas Negeri Malang for their institutional support of this research. The authors also thank the anonymous peer reviewers for their constructive feedback, which significantly strengthened this manuscript.

References

Abdullah, R. (2015). The urgency of assessing class-based learning outcomes in IPS subjects at Madrasah Tsanawiyah. Lantanida Journal, 3(2), 148–158. https://doi.org/10.22373/lj.v3i2.1657

Akmalia, R., Simangunsong, A. S., Azzahrah, N., & Halawa, S. (2023). Efforts to improve the quality standards of education at High School Al-Hidayah Medan. Indo-MathEdu Intellectuals Journal, 4(3), 1783–1791. https://doi.org/10.54373/imeij.v4i3

al-Attas, S. M. N. (1980). The concept of education in Islam: A framework for an Islamic philosophy of education. Muslim Youth Movement of Malaysia.

Aminah, R. S. M. M. (2009). Total quality management in improving the quality of education. Journal of Perspective Education Science, 20(1), 1–14.

Bachtiar, M. Y. (2023). Educators and education personnel. Kapalamada Multidisciplinary Journal, 2(02), 125–131. https://doi.org/10.62668/kapalamada.v2i02.431

Ball, S. J. (1998). Big policies/small world: An introduction to international perspectives in education policy. Comparative Education, 34(2), 119–130. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050069828225

Ball, S. J. (2006). Education policy and social class: The selected works of Stephen J. Ball. Routledge.

BAN-PDM. (2024). Accreditation guidelines for primary and secondary education. Kemendikbudristek.

Biesta, G. (2009). Good education in an age of measurement: On the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in education. Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 21(1), 33–46. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9064-9

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5(1), 7–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. Qualitative Research Journal, 9(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Caldwell, B. J. (2005). School-based management. UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.

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

Cucu Atikah, & Hany Tutut Handayani. (2024). Education policy implementation. Scientific Journal of Basic Education, 9(2), 37–48.

Daniel Stufflebeam & Chris Coryn. (2014). Evaluation theory, models, and applications (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2019). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. Applied Developmental Science, 24(2), 97–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791

Daun, H. (2007). School decentralization in the context of globalizing governance: International comparison of grassroots responses. Springer.

Dill, D. D. (2007). Quality assurance in higher education: Practices and issues. In B. McGaw, P. Peterson, & E. Baker (Eds.), International encyclopedia of education (3rd ed.). Elsevier.

Dunn, W. N. (1981). Public policy analysis: An introduction (5th ed.). Pearson.

Eaton, J. S. (2012). An overview of U.S. accreditation. Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

Hamidah D. (2020). Education policy in public policy. Journal of Serunai Educational Administration, 9(1), 34–44. https://doi.org/10.37755/jsap.v9i1.250

Hanushek, E. A. (2006). School resources. In E. A. Hanushek & F. Welch (Eds.), Handbook of the economics of education (Vol. 2, pp. 865–908). Elsevier.

Harvey, L. (2004). The power of accreditation: Views of academics. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 26(2), 207–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080042000218267

Harvey, L., & Newton, J. (2004). Transforming quality evaluation. Quality in Higher Education, 10(2), 149–165. https://doi.org/10.1080/1353832042000230635

Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Kepmendikbudristek No. 246/O/2024 tentang Instrumen Penilaian Akreditasi PAUD, Dikdas, dan Dikmen. (2024). Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi.

Koto, E. (2024). The role of school or madrasah accreditation in improving the quality of Indonesian education. El-Mujtama: Journal of Community Service, 4(3), 596–604. https://doi.org/10.47467/elmujtama.v4i3.1801

Langgulung, H. (1995). Manusia dan pendidikan: Suatu analisa psikologi, filsafat dan pendidikan. Pustaka Al-Husna.

Levin, B. (2008). Curriculum policy and the politics of what should be learned in schools. In F. M. Connelly, M. F. He, & J. Phillion (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of curriculum and instruction (pp. 7–24). SAGE Publications.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. SAGE Publications.

Marzano, R. J. (2007). The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive framework for effective instruction. ASCD.

Mujib, A., & Mudzakkir, J. (2006). Ilmu pendidikan Islam. Kencana Prenada Media.

Nur Atika Alias, Lumanatul Latifah, & Moh. Ainin Shodiqin. (2025). The role of educational assessment and evaluation on school accreditation. Journal of Bintang Education and Language, 3(1), 67–79. https://doi.org/10.59024/bhinneka.v3i1.1134

OECD. (2009). Creating effective teaching and learning environments: First results from TALIS. OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2019). OECD Learning Compass 2030: A series of concept notes. OECD Publishing.

Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia No. 4 Tahun 2022 tentang Perubahan atas Peraturan Pemerintah No. 57 Tahun 2021 tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan. (2022). Lembaran Negara RI Nomor 14 Tahun 2022.

Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. Econometrica, 73(2), 417–458. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0262.2005.00584.x

Rohmawati, T., Deliarnoor, N. A., Redjo, S. I., & Rahmatunissa, M. (2025). Challenges and Opportunities in Pesantren Education Policy Formulation: An Application of William N. Dunn's Framework in West Bandung. Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change, 2835–2840. https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v10i3.2848

Schulz, W., Carstens, R., Losito, B., & Agrusti, G. (Eds.). (2018). Becoming citizens in a changing world: IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2016 International Report. Springer Open.

Setia, R. (2018). The principal's role in developing learning facilities and infrastructure. Al-Mujaddid: Journal of Religious Sciences, 1(1), 110–128.

Sianturi Risbon, Nur Aini, Karina Salsabila Surya, & Khaerunnisa, G. (2022). Standard concept and scope of education management. Journal of Early Childhood Education, 6(2), 62–75.

Stensaker, B. (2011). Accreditation of higher education in Europe — moving towards the US model? Journal of Education Policy, 26(6), 757–769. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2011.584993

Sudaryono, Rahayu, W., & Margono, G. (2013). Pengembangan instrumen penelitian pendidikan. Graha Ilmu.

Sumarsono, C. W., Muchsin, S., & Sunariyanto, S. (2022). Analysis of the public policy implementation model in the village government in Dau District, Malang Regency. Publisia: Journal of Public Administration Science, 7(2), 228–249. https://doi.org/10.26905/pjiap.v7i2.8344

Suryadarma, D., Suryahadi, A., Sumarto, S., & Rogers, F. H. (2006). Improving student performance in public primary schools in developing countries: Evidence from Indonesia. Education Economics, 14(4), 401–429. https://doi.org/10.1080/09645290600854110

Tikly, L. (2011). Towards a framework for researching the quality of education in low-income countries. Comparative Education, 47(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2011.541671

Tikly, L., & Barrett, A. M. (2011). Social justice, capabilities and the quality of education in low income countries. International Journal of Educational Development, 31(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2010.06.001

UNESCO. (2022). Global Education Monitoring Report 2022: Reimagining our futures together — A new social contract for education. UNESCO Publishing.

Unterhalter, E. (2019). The many meanings of quality education: Politics of targets and indicators in SDG4. Global Policy, 10(S1), 39–51. https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12591

Wahyuni, T., & Miyono, N. (2024). Implementation of education quality management and TQM to improve the quality of education in Al Muttaqin Playgroup. Journal of Learning Innovation in Schools, 5(1), 087–094. https://doi.org/10.51874/jips.v5i1.222

Zahruddin, & Zainul Arifin, A. S. (2019). Implementation of the school revenue and expenditure budget plan. Journal of Educational Administration, 26(1), 46–56. https://doi.org/10.17509/jap.v26i1.19847

Zed, M. (2008). Metode penelitian kepustakaan. Yayasan Obor Indonesia.