

## Quality Assurance, Monitoring, and Accreditation in Teacher Professional Education: A Conceptual Study of Relations, Challenges, and Development Directions

*Muhammad Iqbal<sup>1</sup>, Rila Hardiansyah<sup>2</sup>, Ahmad Muslim<sup>3</sup>, M. Rasyid Ridlo<sup>4</sup>*

<sup>1,2,3,4</sup> Mandalika University of Education

\*Corresponding Author e-mail: [muhammadiqbal@undikma.ac.id](mailto:muhammadiqbal@undikma.ac.id)

**Abstract:** *The Teacher Professional Education Program (Program Pendidikan Profesi Guru/PPG) is a strategic instrument within the national education system for producing competent professional teachers. In its implementation, PPG involves various quality mechanisms, including internal quality assurance, monitoring and evaluation (monev), and external accreditation. This conceptual study aims to analyze the position and function of these three quality mechanisms, identify areas of overlapping functions and instruments, and formulate directions for developing a more integrated PPG quality system. Using a critical analysis and theoretical synthesis approach on policy documents, regulations, and scientific literature, this study reveals substantial similarities in the indicators and assessed aspects across quality mechanisms, the dominance of a compliance-based approach oriented towards administrative completeness, and unclear role boundaries between mechanisms. This study also critiques the validity of evaluating the impact of the PPG program, given its relatively short duration (one year), which is theoretically inadequate for measuring substantial impact on teacher or prospective teacher performance. The implications of this study point to the need for a quality system integration oriented towards continuous improvement and outcome-based evaluation with long-term impact.*

**Abstrak:** Program Pendidikan Profesi Guru (PPG) merupakan instrumen strategis dalam sistem pendidikan nasional untuk menghasilkan guru profesional yang kompeten. Dalam penyelenggaraannya, PPG melibatkan berbagai mekanisme mutu yang meliputi penjaminan mutu internal, monitoring dan evaluasi (monev), serta akreditasi eksternal. Kajian konseptual ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis posisi dan fungsi ketiga mekanisme mutu tersebut, mengidentifikasi area tumpang tindih fungsi dan instrumen, serta merumuskan arah pengembangan sistem mutu PPG yang lebih terintegrasi. Dengan menggunakan pendekatan analisis kritis dan sintesis teoretik terhadap dokumen kebijakan, regulasi, dan literatur ilmiah, kajian ini mengungkap bahwa terdapat kesamaan substansial dalam indikator dan aspek yang dinilai antar mekanisme mutu, dominasi pendekatan compliance-based yang berorientasi pada kelengkapan administratif, serta ketidakjelasan batas peran antar mekanisme. Kajian ini juga mengkritisi validitas evaluasi dampak program PPG mengingat durasi program yang relatif singkat (satu tahun) yang secara teoretis tidak memadai untuk mengukur dampak substantif terhadap kinerja guru atau calon guru. Implikasi kajian ini mengarah pada kebutuhan integrasi sistem mutu yang berorientasi pada perbaikan berkelanjutan dan evaluasi berbasis outcome dan dampak jangka panjang.

### Article History

Received: 12-11-25  
Reviewed: 15-12-25  
Published: 21-12-25

### Key Words

*Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Evaluation, Accreditation, Teacher Professional Education, Impact Evaluation.*

### Sejarah Artikel

Diterima: 12-11-25  
Direview: 15-12-25  
Diterbitkan: 21-12-25

### Kata Kunci

*Penjaminan Mutu, Monitoring dan Evaluasi, Akreditasi, Pendidikan Profesi Guru, Evaluasi Dampak.*

**How to Cite:** Iqbal, M., Hardiansyah, R., Muslim, A., & Ridlo, M. R. (2025). Quality Assurance, Monitoring, and Accreditation in Teacher Professional Education: A Conceptual Study of Relations, Challenges, and Development Directions. *Jurnal Diferensiasi: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian, Pengembangan Dan Kajian Kepustakaan Di Bidang Pendidikan*, 1(3), 200-211. <https://balejournal.com/index.php/JDPK/article/view/50>

## INTRODUCTION

### 1. Background

The Teacher Professional Education Program (PPG) holds a strategic position in Indonesia's national education system as the primary instrument for producing professional teachers who meet pedagogical, personality, social, and professional competency standards. Since the enactment of Law Number 14 of 2005 concerning Teachers and Lecturers, PPG has become a mandatory pathway for prospective teachers to obtain an educator certificate, which is formal recognition of their professional competence. In the context of accelerating national education quality improvement, PPG functions not only as a certification program but also as a platform for competency transformation for prospective teachers and in-service teachers who do not yet possess an educator certificate.

The importance of quality assurance in the implementation of PPG cannot be ignored, considering the program's output will directly impact the quality of learning in educational units. Harvey and Green (1993) assert that in the context of higher education, quality can be understood through various dimensions, including excellence, perfection or consistency, fitness for purpose, value for money, and transformation. These five dimensions are relevant in evaluating the effectiveness of PPG as a professional education program oriented towards developing teacher professional competence.

In practice, PPG implementation in Indonesia involves various quality mechanisms operating simultaneously. Internal quality assurance is conducted by the implementing Teacher Training Institutions (Lembaga Pendidikan Tenaga Kependidikan/LPTK) to ensure standard learning processes and outputs are achieved. Monitoring and evaluation (monev) are carried out by the PPG Directorate as a form of program supervision and control from the central government. Meanwhile, PPG program accreditation is conducted by the Independent Education Accreditation Agency (Lembaga Akreditasi Mandiri Kependidikan/LAMDIK) or the National Higher Education Accreditation Board (Badan Akreditasi Nasional Perguruan Tinggi/BAN-PT) as an independent external quality assessment. The simultaneous existence of these three mechanisms raises fundamental questions about the clarity of function, effectiveness, and potential overlaps between mechanisms.

Indications of overlapping functions and instruments between quality mechanisms in PPG can be observed from the substantial similarity of aspects assessed, both in internal quality assurance instruments, monev instruments, and accreditation instruments. All three tend to assess similar aspects such as curriculum, teaching staff, facilities and infrastructure, and program management, albeit from different perspectives and purposes. This condition has the potential to cause negative impacts, including a fragmented quality system, dominance of an administrative approach in quality assurance, excessive burdens for implementing LPTKs, and limited contributions of quality mechanisms to the substantive quality improvement of the PPG program.

### 2. Conceptual Problems

The conceptual problem underlying this study stems from the unclear theoretical relations among quality mechanisms in PPG implementation. Quality assurance, which

conceptually should be internal, continuous, and improvement-oriented (enhancement-based), in practice is often understood and implemented as periodic administrative monitoring activities that are compliance-based. Westerheijden et al. (2007) note that this tendency is a common phenomenon in higher education quality assurance systems, where institutions tend to respond to external accountability demands with procedural compliance approaches rather than substantive improvement.

Monitoring and evaluation in the context of PPG have dual functions that can potentially create ambiguity. On one hand, *monev* serves as a program control instrument (control function) to ensure PPG implementation complies with established standards and regulations. On the other hand, *monev* is also expected to function as a quality assessment instrument (quality assessment function) that produces information for program improvement decisions. In practice, this duality of function is often not clearly differentiated, causing *monev* to be dominated by its control function and contributing less to substantive quality improvement.

Accreditation as an external quality assessment mechanism has a clear role in ensuring public accountability and establishing minimum quality standards for programs. However, in the context of PPG, accreditation often overlaps with other quality mechanisms, especially regarding assessed aspects and requested evidence. Harvey and Williams (2010) note that in many higher education systems, the accreditation process is often perceived by institutions as an administrative burden separate from internal quality assurance activities, rather than as an integral part of a continuous quality improvement cycle.

This unclear conceptual relationship among quality mechanisms has the potential to weaken the overall effectiveness of the PPG quality assurance system. Filippakou and Tapper (2008) argue that an effective quality assurance system requires conceptual clarity regarding the purpose, function, and relations among its components. Without this clarity, various quality mechanisms can operate in isolation, result in duplicated efforts, and fail to contribute synergistically to program quality improvement.

### **3. Study Objectives and Focus**

This conceptual study aims to critically examine the position and function of quality assurance, monitoring and evaluation, and accreditation in the context of PPG implementation in Indonesia. More specifically, this study is directed to analyze forms of functional and instrumental overlaps among quality mechanisms and their implications for PPG quality assurance effectiveness, critique the validity of PPG program impact evaluation considering its relatively short duration, and formulate directions for developing a more integrated and continuous improvement-oriented PPG quality system based on outcomes and long-term impact.

## **STUDY METHOD**

### **1. Type and Approach of Study**

This study is a conceptual study using a critical analysis and theoretical synthesis approach. As a conceptual study, this paper does not aim to collect empirical data from the field but rather to analyze, critique, and synthesize theoretical and policy concepts related to quality assurance, monitoring and evaluation, and accreditation in the context of teacher

professional education. The critical analysis approach is used to examine assumptions underlying various quality mechanisms and identify potential conceptual problems. Meanwhile, theoretical synthesis is used to build a conceptual framework for developing a more integrated PPG quality system.

## 2. Data Sources

Data sources in this study include policy documents and regulations related to PPG, such as the Teachers and Lecturers Law, Ministerial Regulations concerning PPG, and PPG implementation guidelines. Additionally, this study uses applicable PPG quality assurance, monitoring and evaluation, and accreditation instruments. Scientific literature referenced in this study includes publications on quality assurance in higher education and professional education, educational program evaluation, and studies on compliance-based versus enhancement-based approaches in educational quality assurance.

## 3. Analysis Techniques

Analysis techniques used in this study include content analysis of policy documents and quality instruments to identify similarities and differences in substance among quality mechanisms. Comparative conceptual analysis is used to compare the functions, purposes, and approaches underlying each quality mechanism and identify role intersections and overlaps. Conceptual synthesis is used to formulate directions for developing the PPG quality system based on analysis findings and relevant theoretical literature.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Accreditation in Teacher Professional Education

#### a. Quality Assurance in Teacher Professional Education

Quality assurance in the context of higher education and professional education can be understood as a systematic process to ensure that established quality standards can be achieved and maintained consistently. Vlăscianu et al. (2007) define quality assurance as a continuous evaluation process of educational programs or institutions to ensure the achievement of acceptable minimum standards. In a broader perspective, quality assurance encompasses all policies, processes, and actions taken to maintain and improve the quality of education.

The ideal characteristics of quality assurance in teacher professional education should be internal, continuous, and improvement-based. As an internal process, quality assurance is the primary responsibility of the implementing LPTK for PPG to ensure all standard learning processes and outputs are achieved. The continuous nature indicates that quality assurance is not a periodic scheduled activity but a process integrated into the program's daily operations. The improvement-based orientation emphasizes that the main goal of quality assurance is to substantially improve program quality, not merely to meet minimum standards or administrative requirements.

The implementation of quality assurance in the context of PPG in Indonesia is regulated through Regulation of the Minister of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology Number 53 of 2023 concerning Quality Assurance in Higher Education. In

this regulation, PPG quality assurance becomes an integral part of the higher education quality assurance system, which includes internal quality assurance by LPTKs and external quality assurance through accreditation. In practice, PPG-implementing LPTKs are required to have an internal quality assurance system functioning to control and continuously improve the quality of program implementation.

#### **b. Monitoring and Evaluation as a Program Control Instrument**

Monitoring and evaluation (monev) are two different but interrelated concepts in program control and assessment. Monitoring refers to the systematic and continuous process of collecting data and information about program implementation to ensure the program runs according to plan. Evaluation is a systematic assessment process of a program's value or benefits based on specific criteria for decision-making. In practice, these two concepts are often combined in one process called monitoring and evaluation or monev.

The main objectives of monev in the context of PPG are to ensure program implementation complies with established standards and regulations, identify program implementation problems early, collect data and information for improvement decisions, and provide feedback to implementing LPTKs for program quality improvement. The PPG Directorate regularly conducts monev on PPG-implementing LPTKs as a form of program supervision and guidance from the central government.

The character of monev in PPG is periodic and evaluative. Unlike internal quality assurance, which should be continuous, monev is conducted at certain periods, for example, each semester or each year. The evaluative nature of monev is reflected in the assessment of LPTK performance based on established criteria. Monev results are generally used to determine the continuation status of PPG implementation at an LPTK, allocation of PPG participant quotas, and program improvement recommendations.

#### **c. Accreditation as an External Quality Assessment Mechanism**

Accreditation is an evaluation and quality assessment process conducted by an independent external institution to determine whether a program or institution meets established quality standards. The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) defines accreditation as a peer review process to assess the quality of a program or institution based on standards set by the higher education community. In the Indonesian context, PPG program accreditation is conducted by LAMDIK or BAN-PT based on national higher education standards and specific teacher professional education standards.

The main functions of accreditation in the higher education system are to ensure public accountability for the quality of educational programs, establish minimum quality standards that must be met, provide information to stakeholders about program quality, and encourage continuous quality improvement. In the context of PPG, accreditation functions as external validation that a PPG program implemented by an LPTK has met nationally established quality standards and is worthy of producing competent graduates.

The character of accreditation is summative and periodic. The summative nature is reflected in the final assessment that produces a decision about the program's

accreditation status, such as Excellent, Very Good, Good, or Not Accredited. The periodic nature is reflected in the accreditation cycle, which is generally valid for five years before the program needs to apply for re-accreditation. The relation between accreditation and internal quality assurance should be complementary, where accreditation validates the effectiveness of the internal quality assurance system built by the LPTK.

## **2. Overlapping Quality Mechanisms in PPG Implementation**

### **a. Areas of Functional and Instrumental Overlap**

Analysis of PPG quality assurance, monev, and accreditation instruments reveals substantial similarities in assessed aspects. The three quality mechanisms tend to assess similar aspects, including curriculum and learning tools, competency and qualifications of lecturers or instructors, learning facilities and infrastructure, program governance and management systems, and learning processes and field experience practices. This similarity indicates duplication of assessment on the same aspects by different quality mechanisms.

Assessment duplication is particularly evident in the evaluation of inputs, processes, and academic documents. All three quality mechanisms request similar documentation evidence, such as curriculum documents, learning plans, lecturer data, student data, and program governance documents. Consequently, PPG-implementing LPTKs must prepare similar documents for internal quality assurance needs, monev by the PPG Directorate, and accreditation by LAMDIK or BAN-PT. This condition creates a significant administrative burden for LPTKs and potentially diverts focus from substantive quality improvement efforts.

Unclear role boundaries among quality mechanisms are also identified in this study. Internal quality assurance, which should focus on a continuous improvement cycle, is often interfered with by the periodic demands of monev and accreditation. LPTKs tend to prioritize preparing for monev and accreditation visits rather than consistently implementing the internal quality assurance cycle. This condition creates a pattern where quality assurance activities become intensive ahead of monev visits or accreditation assessments but decrease in intensity during other periods.

### **b. Dominance of Compliance-Based Approach**

Analysis of PPG quality assurance practices reveals the dominance of a compliance-based approach across the three quality mechanisms. This approach is marked by a tendency to understand and practice quality assurance as an effort to meet externally set standards and requirements (external compliance), rather than as an internal effort to substantially improve program quality. Harvey and Williams (2010) note that this phenomenon is common in higher education quality assurance systems in various countries, where institutions respond to external accountability demands with procedural compliance.

A focus on document and procedural completeness becomes a dominant characteristic of the compliance-based approach in PPG quality assurance. Quality

assessment tends to be based on the availability and completeness of certain documents rather than on the quality of substance and program impact. LPTKs are encouraged to have curriculum documents, syllabi, lesson plans, evaluation reports, and various other administrative documents considered as evidence of standard fulfillment. This approach ignores the reality that document availability does not always correlate with the quality of implementation and program impact.

The minimal emphasis on program outcome achievements and impact is a logical consequence of the dominance of the compliance-based approach. Existing quality instruments tend to measure inputs (such as lecturer qualifications, facilities, and curriculum) and processes (such as learning implementation and field practice) more, but less on outcomes (such as graduate competencies) and impact (such as graduate performance as teachers in schools). Yet, in the context of professional education, it is precisely outcomes and impact that are the main indicators of program success.

### **c. Implications for the Effectiveness of PPG Quality Assurance**

Overlapping quality mechanisms and the dominance of the compliance-based approach have significant implications for the effectiveness of PPG quality assurance. The administrative burden borne by PPG-implementing LPTKs increases due to the obligation to prepare similar documents for various quality mechanisms. Resources that should be allocated for the substantive development of program quality are instead absorbed to meet the administrative demands of overlapping quality mechanisms.

Space for institutional reflection and learning becomes limited due to excessive focus on administrative compliance. Quality assurance, which should be a reflective process to identify weaknesses and formulate improvements, turns into administrative activities to prepare evidence of compliance. Anderson (2006) notes that under such conditions, quality assurance activities become ritualistic (ritualised compliance) and lose their substantive meaning as an improvement instrument.

The contribution of quality mechanisms to substantial quality improvement of PPG becomes weak due to the above conditions. Various quality mechanisms operating simultaneously do not produce synergistic effects in improving program quality but rather create additive burdens without proportional added value. Filippakou and Tapper (2008) emphasize that the effectiveness of a quality assurance system is highly determined by clarity of purpose, coherence among components, and orientation toward substantive improvement, not merely procedural compliance.

### **d. Critical Analysis of the Validity of PPG Program Impact Evaluation**

One fundamental aspect that needs to be critically examined in the PPG quality assurance system is the validity of program impact evaluation. Impact evaluation refers to the assessment of long-term changes produced by a program on the behavior, performance, or condition of target groups. In Kirkpatrick's (1994) evaluation framework, impact or results constitute the highest level of evaluation, measuring the influence of training on achieving organizational or systemic goals. The critical question that arises is to what extent impact evaluation in the context of PPG has methodological validity, considering the program's relatively short characteristics.

The Pre-Service PPG program in Indonesia is conducted for two semesters or equivalent to one academic year, while In-Service PPG lasts shorter, about one semester or three months. This duration raises fundamental questions about the adequacy of time to produce significant changes in teacher or prospective teacher competence and performance. Literature on teacher professional development consistently shows that changes in teaching behavior and improvement in teacher performance require substantial time and continuous processes. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) assert that effective professional development requires adequate duration, continuity, and integration with workplace practices.

Within Kirkpatrick's four-level evaluation framework, there are different time ranges for measuring each level. Level 1 (reaction) can be measured immediately after training, Level 2 (learning) can be measured at the end of the program, but Level 3 (behavior) and Level 4 (results) require longer time to be observed and measured validly. Sims et al. (2025), in their meta-analysis of teacher professional development, found that changes in teaching behavior require a minimum of 6-12 months after training to be internalized and manifested consistently in practice. For impact on student learning outcomes, the required time is even longer, reaching 1-2 years or more.

The implication of the relatively short duration of PPG is the limited validity of claims about the program's impact on teacher or prospective teacher performance. Evaluations conducted at the end of PPG or immediately thereafter can only measure participants' reactions to the program (Level 1) and mastery of taught knowledge and skills (Level 2). Claims about changes in teaching behavior (Level 3) and impact on student learning outcomes or long-term professional performance (Level 4) cannot be adequately validated within the program's timeframe.

The problem becomes more complex when considering contextual factors that influence teacher performance after completing PPG. Teacher performance in schools is not solely determined by competencies gained through PPG but also by factors such as principal support, school culture, resource availability, workload, and students' socio-economic conditions. Kennedy (2016) emphasizes that attributing changes in teacher performance directly to a specific training program is an oversimplification that ignores the complexity of factors influencing teaching practice.

This critical study does not intend to deny the value and significance of PPG in teacher competency development. The PPG program remains relevant as a foundation for initial professional development for prospective teachers and as a platform for competency improvement for in-service teachers. However, evaluative claims about significant PPG impact on teacher or prospective teacher performance need to be placed in proper perspective. Valid impact evaluation requires a longitudinal design that tracks PPG graduates over an adequate period after they serve as teachers, considering various contextual factors influencing performance.

Recommendations that can be made regarding PPG impact evaluation include developing a systematic and continuous graduate tracking system (tracer study) to collect data on PPG graduate performance in schools. Additionally, an impact evaluation framework needs to be developed that accommodates time dimensions and contextual

factors, not merely measuring satisfaction or knowledge mastery at the program's end. More fundamentally, the PPG quality assurance system needs to acknowledge the limitations of short-term impact evaluation and avoid making excessive claims about the program's contribution to teacher performance or education quality without adequate longitudinal evidence support.

### **3. Directions for PPG Quality System Development**

#### **a. Need for Integration of Quality Mechanisms**

Analysis of overlapping quality mechanisms and dominance of the compliance-based approach indicates an urgent need to integrate various quality mechanisms in PPG. This integration is necessary to reduce duplication and administrative burdens, increase coherence and synergy among quality mechanisms, optimize resources for substantive quality improvement, and strengthen orientation toward program outcomes and impact.

Principles that need to underlie the integration of PPG quality mechanisms include clarity of each mechanism's function to avoid role overlaps. Internal quality assurance must be focused on the continuous improvement cycle, move on program supervision and guidance, and accreditation on external quality validation. The principle of complementarity needs to be applied, where each mechanism has a unique contribution that complements the others, not duplicating the same function. Improvement orientation should be the common goal of all mechanisms, not merely compliance or accountability.

#### **b. Toward Outcome and Impact-Based Quality Assurance**

The limitations of the compliance-based approach indicate the need for a paradigm shift toward outcome and impact-based quality assurance. This approach emphasizes that the quality of a professional education program must ultimately be assessed from the competencies mastered by graduates and their contributions to professional practice in the field. In the context of PPG, this means quality assessment should focus more on graduate competencies as teachers and their impact on student learning in schools.

The relevance of outcome and impact orientation in teacher professional education is very high, considering the main goal of PPG is to produce competent professional teachers. This professional competency manifests in classroom teaching practices, learning management abilities, and contributions to student learning achievements. Schindler et al. (2015) emphasize that in the context of professional education, program quality must be assessed by the extent to which graduates can effectively perform their professional roles in the workplace.

The role of empirical evidence in quality decision-making needs to be strengthened in the PPG quality assurance system. This includes systematic data collection on PPG student learning achievements, tracking graduate performance in schools (tracer study), feedback from stakeholders such as principals and students, and data on graduate impact on student learning outcomes. The use of this empirical evidence enables more objective and real improvement-oriented evidence-based decision-making.

#### **c. Conceptual Framework for PPG Quality System Development**

Based on the analysis conducted, a conceptual framework for developing the PPG quality system can be formulated by placing each quality mechanism in a clear and integrated position and function. Internal quality assurance must be positioned as the core continuous improvement cycle of the quality system. LPTKs are responsible for continuously evaluating and improving the program based on internal data and stakeholder feedback. This cycle includes data-based planning, implementation according to standards, continuous monitoring, periodic evaluation, and follow-up improvements.

Monitoring and evaluation must be positioned as a mechanism for quality reflection and diagnosis that supports the internal improvement cycle. Monev is not merely a supervision activity but a collaborative process between the PPG Directorate and LPTKs to identify improvement challenges and opportunities. Monev results must be communicated constructively and followed up through substantive guidance programs, not merely administrative sanctions.

Accreditation must be positioned as external validation of the quality built through the internal quality assurance system. Accreditation is not a separate process requiring special preparation but recognition of existing good practices. Accreditation instruments must be aligned with internal quality assurance instruments so that documents prepared for internal purposes can be directly used for accreditation needs without duplication.

The relationship among the three quality mechanisms in a coherent system can be described as follows: internal quality assurance operates continuously as the main driver of quality improvement. Monev operates periodically to provide an external perspective, identify guidance needs, and validate the effectiveness of the internal quality assurance system. Accreditation operates in a longer cycle to provide formal recognition of program quality and ensure public accountability. All three mechanisms share the same data and evidence base, thereby reducing duplication and administrative burdens.

## **CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS**

### **1. Conclusion**

This conceptual study reveals that the PPG quality assurance system in Indonesia faces problems of overlapping functions and instruments among quality mechanisms, including internal quality assurance, monitoring and evaluation, and accreditation. These three mechanisms tend to assess similar aspects with similar instruments, resulting in duplicated efforts and excessive administrative burdens for implementing LPTKs. This condition is exacerbated by the dominance of a compliance-based approach that emphasizes procedural compliance and documentation completeness rather than substantive quality improvement.

This study also critiques the validity of PPG program impact evaluation, considering the program's relatively short duration (one year for Pre-Service PPG and three months for In-Service PPG). Based on literature about teacher professional development and Kirkpatrick's evaluation framework, changes in teaching behavior and impact on student learning outcomes require longer time than the program duration to manifest and be

measured validly. Claims about significant PPG impact on teacher performance without adequate longitudinal evidence support constitute an oversimplification that cannot be methodologically justified.

Based on the analysis conducted, this study affirms the importance of an integrated PPG quality system oriented toward continuous improvement and based on long-term outcomes and impact. This integration requires clarity of each quality mechanism's function, the principle of complementarity, and a shared orientation toward substantive improvement. An integrated quality system positions internal quality assurance as a continuous improvement cycle, move as a reflection and diagnosis mechanism, and accreditation as external validation of the built quality.

## 2. Theoretical and Policy Implications

Theoretically, this study contributes to developing understanding about relations among quality mechanisms in the context of professional education. This study strengthens the argument that the effectiveness of a quality assurance system is not determined by the number of operating mechanisms but by clarity of function, coherence among components, and orientation toward substantive improvement. This study also provides a critical perspective on the limitations of impact evaluation in short-duration training programs, which is relevant for developing theories of professional education program evaluation.

Policy implications from this study include the need to review the architecture of the PPG quality assurance system to reduce overlaps and increase synergy among mechanisms. Integrated quality instruments need to be developed so that data and evidence collected for one purpose can be used for others without duplication. PPG impact evaluation policies need to be developed considering adequate time dimensions, including developing systematic tracer study systems to track graduate performance in the long term.

Directions for further research recommended include empirical studies to validate the conceptual findings of this study through field data collection from various PPG-implementing LPTKs. Integrated, outcome, and impact-based PPG evaluation and quality assurance models also need to be developed, which can be piloted and validated through development research. Longitudinal studies on the impact of PPG on teacher performance and student learning outcomes are highly needed to provide valid empirical evidence about program effectiveness in the long term.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, G. (2006). Assuring quality/resisting quality assurance: Academics' responses to 'quality' in some Australian universities. *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(2), 161-173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538320600916767>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
- Filippakou, O., & Tapper, T. (2008). Quality assurance and quality enhancement in higher education: Contested territories? *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62(1-2), 84-100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2008.00379.x>

- Harvey, L., & Green, D. (1993). Defining quality. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 18(1), 9-34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293930180102>
- Harvey, L., & Williams, J. (2010). Fifteen years of quality in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 16(1), 3-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538321003679457>
- Kennedy, M. M. (2016). How does professional development improve teaching? *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 945-980. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626800>
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1994). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Kirkpatrick, J. D., & Kirkpatrick, W. K. (2016). *Kirkpatrick's four levels of training evaluation*. Association for Talent Development.
- Regulation of the Minister of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia Number 53 of 2023 concerning Quality Assurance in Higher Education.
- Regulation of the Minister of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia Number 19 of 2024 concerning Teacher Professional Education.
- Schindler, L., Puls-Elvidge, S., Welzant, H., & Crawford, L. (2015). Definitions of quality in higher education: A synthesis of the literature. *Higher Learning Research Communications*, 5(3), 3-13. <https://doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v5i3.244>
- Sims, S., Fletcher-Wood, H., O'Mara-Eves, A., Cottingham, S., Stansfield, C., Goodrich, J., Van Herwegen, J., & Anders, J. (2025). Effective teacher professional development: New theory and a meta-analytic test. *Review of Educational Research*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543231217480>
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 14 of 2005 concerning Teachers and Lecturers.
- Vlăsceanu, L., Grünberg, L., & Pârlea, D. (2007). *Quality assurance and accreditation: A glossary of basic terms and definitions*. UNESCO-CEPES.
- Westerheijden, D. F., Hulpiu, V., & Waeytens, K. (2007). From design and implementation to impact of quality assurance: An overview of some studies into what impacts improvement. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 13(4), 295-312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13583880701535430>