JURNAL KEPEMIMPINAN & PENGURUSAN SEKOLAH
Homepage : https://ejurnal.stkip-pessel.ac.id/index.php/kp
Email : jkps.stkippessel@gmail.com

p-ISSN : 2502-6445 ; e-ISSN : 2502-6437
Vol. 11, No. 5, October 2026
Page 3878-3899
© Author
Jurnal Kepemimpinan & Pengurusan Sekolah

# FROM EVALUATION TO IMPROVEMENT: ASSESSING QUALITY ASSURANCE FOLLOW-UP IN MADRASAHS

**Muhammad Shodiqul Fikri[1], Nadia Putri Kamila[2], Sabila Qurrota A'yun[3], Oki Dermawan[4], Heru Juabdin Sada[5]**
[1,2,3,4,5] Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung, Indonesia

Email: sabila.bilaq@gmail.com

**DOI:** https://doi.org/10.34125/jkps.v11i5.3868

**Sections Info**

***Article history:***
Submitted: 6 August 2026
Final Revised: 30 September 2026
Accepted: 9 October 2026
Published: 30 October 2026

***Keywords:***
Madrasah
Quality Assurance
Evaluation Follow-Up
Effectiveness Assessment;
Continuous Improvement

***ABSTRACT***

*Quality assurance evaluations in madrasahs are intended to identify institutional weaknesses and guide educational improvement. However, the implementation of follow-up activities does not necessarily demonstrate that the intended improvements have been achieved. This study examines forms of quality assurance follow-up, dimensions of effectiveness, and organizational conditions influencing the implementation and assessment of corrective actions in madrasahs. Using a narrative literature review, the study synthesizes research on internal quality assurance, academic supervision, evaluation influence, and evidence-informed school improvement. The synthesis identifies two interconnected categories of follow-up: professional and pedagogical actions, including coaching, supervision, and professional development; and organizational and managerial actions, including corrective planning, coordination, documentation, and monitoring. To distinguish activity completion from substantive educational change, the study proposes three analytical dimensions of effectiveness: administrative effectiveness, process effectiveness, and outcome effectiveness. Institutional leadership, stakeholder participation, professional competence, resource availability, and monitoring capacity are identified as contextual conditions that may support or constrain follow-up implementation.*

## ABSTRAK

*Evaluasi penjaminan mutu di madrasah bertujuan mengidentifikasi kelemahan kelembagaan dan mengarahkan perbaikan pendidikan. Namun, pelaksanaan kegiatan tindak lanjut belum tentu menunjukkan bahwa perbaikan yang diharapkan telah tercapai. Penelitian ini mengkaji bentuk tindak lanjut penjaminan mutu, dimensi efektivitas, serta kondisi organisasi yang memengaruhi pelaksanaan dan penilaian tindakan perbaikan di madrasah. Dengan menggunakan pendekatan kajian literatur naratif (narrative literature review), penelitian ini menyintesis kajian mengenai sistem penjaminan mutu internal, supervisi akademik, pengaruh evaluasi, dan perbaikan sekolah berbasis bukti. Hasil sintesis mengidentifikasi dua kategori tindak lanjut yang saling berkaitan, yaitu tindakan profesional dan pedagogis berupa pembinaan, supervisi, dan pengembangan profesional; serta tindakan organisasi dan manajerial berupa perencanaan perbaikan, koordinasi, dokumentasi, dan monitoring. Untuk membedakan penyelesaian kegiatan dari perubahan pendidikan yang substantif, penelitian ini mengusulkan tiga dimensi analitis efektivitas, yaitu efektivitas administratif, efektivitas proses, dan efektivitas hasil. Kepemimpinan lembaga, partisipasi pemangku kepentingan, kompetensi profesional, ketersediaan sumber daya, dan kapasitas monitoring diidentifikasi sebagai kondisi kontekstual yang dapat mendukung atau menghambat pelaksanaan tindak lanjut.*

***Kata kunci:*** *madrasah; penjaminan mutu; tindak lanjut evaluasi; penilaian efektivitas; perbaikan berkelanjutan.*

## INTRODUCTION

Quality assurance has become an important component of educational management because it provides a structured basis for examining institutional performance, identifying areas requiring improvement, and maintaining accountability for educational standards. In madrasahs, quality assurance has particular significance because institutional performance encompasses not only academic and organizational requirements but also educational objectives associated with Islamic values, religious learning, and character development. These interconnected responsibilities require madrasahs to examine the quality of their educational processes and institutional management while ensuring that improvement efforts remain consistent with their educational missions. Internal quality assurance systems are intended to support these responsibilities through recurring processes of standard setting, implementation, evaluation, corrective action, and improvement. However, the contribution of such systems to educational quality depends not only on the identification of institutional weaknesses but also on the extent to which evaluation findings are translated into appropriate and assessable follow-up actions.

The relationship between evaluation and follow-up is particularly important because evaluation findings do not automatically produce institutional improvement. Evaluation may identify weaknesses in instructional planning, teacher competence, academic supervision, administrative procedures, or educational services, yet the identification of these weaknesses represents only an initial stage in the improvement process. Institutions must subsequently determine which problems require priority attention, select appropriate corrective strategies, assign responsibilities, and establish mechanisms for monitoring implementation. Even when these activities are completed, questions remain concerning whether the intended changes have occurred. A madrasah may conduct professional development, organize supervision, or revise administrative procedures without generating sufficient evidence that these activities have addressed the weaknesses identified through evaluation. Consequently, the implementation of follow-up actions and the effectiveness of those actions should be treated as related but analytically distinct concerns.

Previous studies provide important insights into internal quality assurance practices within Islamic educational institutions. Husna and Thoyyib (2021), in their examination of internal quality assurance at MA Darul Huda Mayak, discuss quality management processes within an institutional setting informed by pesantren values. Their work highlights the importance of considering institutional characteristics when examining the implementation of quality assurance in Islamic education. More recently, Mutmainnah and Nugraha (2026) examine a PPEPP-based internal quality assurance system at MI Al Jihad and describe follow-up activities involving teacher guidance, collective meetings, workshops, and professional development. Their study also identifies limitations concerning monitoring, performance indicators, and documentation. These findings illustrate the relevance of corrective activities in madrasah quality assurance while raising further questions about the evidence required to assess their effectiveness. The presence of follow-up activities demonstrates institutional responsiveness, but it does not necessarily establish that the intended improvements have been achieved.

Research conducted in related educational settings provides additional perspectives on the organizational conditions associated with quality assurance implementation. Afiralda et al. (2025), through a systematic review of internal quality assurance in Indonesian basic education, identify leadership, stakeholder participation, professional development, and technological support among the themes discussed in the literature. Lestari et al. (2026), in their study of an Islamic junior secondary school, examine institutional planning,

participation, and evaluation within the implementation of internal quality assurance. Although these studies contribute to understanding quality management practices, their institutional contexts and research designs differ. Findings from general basic education or Islamic schools cannot therefore be assumed to describe madrasahs uniformly. Nevertheless, they provide comparative insights into the organizational arrangements through which evaluation findings may be translated into improvement activities and the challenges that may arise when institutions attempt to sustain those activities.

Studies of academic supervision offer a more specific perspective on follow-up actions directed toward instructional improvement. Research by Kasiman et al. (2026) and Nuhuyanan et al. (2026) discusses supervision processes involving observation, feedback, professional assistance, and subsequent changes in teaching-related practices. Murjainah et al. (2024) also report changes in teacher and madrasah principal performance across monitoring and evaluation cycles. Such studies are relevant because they move the discussion beyond the mere existence of institutional procedures toward evidence concerning professional practices and performance indicators. However, academic supervision represents only one possible mechanism of quality assurance follow-up, and the reported changes must be interpreted according to the methods, measures, and institutional contexts of the respective studies. Evidence of improved instructional practices should not automatically be generalized to the effectiveness of an entire internal quality assurance system, nor should changes observed after an intervention be treated as proof of causation without appropriate methodological support.

The distinction between evaluation activities and their consequences can be further understood through broader scholarship on evaluation influence and evidence-informed educational improvement. Henry and Mark (2003) argue that the influence of evaluation extends beyond the direct use of findings and may involve changes in attitudes and actions through different mechanisms. Mark and Henry (2004) further examine the mechanisms and outcomes through which evaluation may influence individual and collective processes. These perspectives suggest that the value of evaluation cannot be adequately determined solely by whether reports have been produced or recommendations have been formally implemented. Schildkamp (2019) similarly emphasizes the importance of connecting educational data with improvement-oriented decision-making through an iterative process involving problem identification, evidence interpretation, action, and subsequent evaluation. Considered together, these contributions provide a theoretical basis for examining quality assurance follow-up as a process connecting evaluation information, institutional action, and evidence of change.

Despite these contributions, the literature considered in this review reveals a continuing need for greater analytical clarity in assessing the effectiveness of quality assurance follow-up. Studies of internal quality assurance frequently discuss institutional procedures, implementation activities, and organizational challenges, while research on supervision may examine changes in professional practices or performance indicators. These different forms of evidence are valuable, but they do not necessarily answer the same question. Documentation showing that corrective activities have been completed differs from evidence that educational practices have changed, and both differ from evidence that targeted quality indicators have improved. Without distinguishing these forms of evidence, assessments of quality assurance follow-up may conflate administrative compliance with substantive educational improvement. The issue is therefore not that previous research has ignored educational effectiveness, but that the literature examined here provides an opportunity to integrate

different types of follow-up evidence within a more explicit analytical structure.

A related concern is the relationship between corrective actions and the organizational conditions under which they are implemented. Institutional leadership, stakeholder participation, professional competence, resource availability, and monitoring capacity may influence how evaluation findings are interpreted, how improvement activities are coordinated, and how evidence of subsequent change is used. These conditions are especially relevant because madrasahs differ in their institutional arrangements, professional resources, educational priorities, and capacities for monitoring improvement. Accordingly, an analytical approach focused exclusively on the completion of corrective activities may overlook the organizational processes that shape their implementation and sustainability. A more integrated perspective is needed to examine follow-up actions, the evidence used to assess their effectiveness, and the contextual conditions that may support or constrain continuous improvement.

To address these concerns, the present study adopts a narrative literature review approach to examine quality assurance follow-up in madrasahs. The study synthesizes relevant research on internal quality assurance, academic supervision, evaluation influence, and evidence-informed school improvement. Its conceptual contribution is twofold. First, it proposes three analytically distinct dimensions of follow-up effectiveness: administrative effectiveness, referring to the planning, implementation, accountability, and documentation of corrective actions; process effectiveness, referring to changes in educational and organizational practices; and outcome effectiveness, referring to changes in targeted educational quality indicators. Second, it develops an Evaluation–Follow-Up–Effectiveness Framework that connects evaluation findings, corrective action planning, follow-up implementation, monitoring and effectiveness assessment, and evidence-informed improvement decisions. The framework is intended as a conceptual basis for institutional reflection and future empirical research rather than as an empirically validated assessment instrument or causal model.

The study is guided by four research questions: (1) What forms of follow-up actions arising from quality assurance evaluations are discussed in the literature on madrasahs? (2) How can the effectiveness of quality assurance follow-up be assessed through administrative, process, and outcome dimensions? (3) What organizational conditions may support or constrain the implementation, monitoring, and sustainability of quality assurance follow-up in madrasahs? (4) How can evaluation findings, corrective actions, monitoring, and evidence of effectiveness be integrated into a conceptual framework for continuous educational improvement? By addressing these questions, the study seeks to clarify the relationship between evaluation and corrective action, provide a differentiated basis for interpreting evidence of follow-up effectiveness, and contribute to discussions of continuous educational improvement in madrasahs.

## RESEARCH METHOD

### Research Design

This study employed a narrative literature review to examine the forms, effectiveness, and organizational conditions of quality assurance follow-up in madrasahs. A narrative review was considered appropriate because the study sought to integrate findings and theoretical perspectives from related but methodologically diverse areas of educational research, including internal quality assurance, academic supervision, evaluation influence, and evidence-informed school improvement. Rather than estimating the effects of a particular intervention or producing an exhaustive account of all available studies, the

review aimed to develop an interpretive synthesis of how evaluation findings are translated into corrective actions and how the effectiveness of those actions may be assessed. The approach also supported the development of a conceptual framework intended to clarify relationships among evaluation, follow-up implementation, monitoring, and institutional improvement.

The review was guided by four research questions concerning the forms of quality assurance follow-up, the dimensions through which its effectiveness can be assessed, the organizational conditions influencing implementation and sustainability, and the integration of these elements into a conceptual framework. These questions informed the organization of the literature synthesis and the interpretation of the reviewed studies. Because the study was conceptual and literature-based, it did not involve primary data collection, intervention implementation, or direct measurement of quality assurance effectiveness in individual madrasahs.

**Literature Sources and Selection**

The literature considered in this review included empirical studies, literature reviews, and theoretical publications relevant to quality assurance evaluation and follow-up in educational institutions. Priority was given to studies examining madrasahs, particularly those addressing internal quality assurance systems, corrective activities, academic supervision, teacher professional development, monitoring, and institutional improvement. Research conducted in Islamic schools and general educational settings was also considered when it offered relevant insights into organizational conditions, evaluation use, or evidence-informed improvement processes. Such sources were used comparatively and conceptually rather than treated as direct evidence of practices across all madrasahs.

Literature selection was guided by topical relevance to the research questions, clarity of the educational setting, and the contribution of each publication to understanding the relationship between evaluation findings, corrective actions, and evidence of improvement. Publications were considered relevant when they addressed at least one of the following areas: implementation of internal quality assurance and its follow-up activities; supervision, professional development, or other corrective practices; organizational factors associated with quality assurance implementation; or conceptual approaches to evaluation influence and educational improvement. Sources that primarily described educational management without a discernible connection to evaluation, follow-up, or improvement were not central to the synthesis. Differences in institutional setting and research design were retained during interpretation to avoid presenting findings from Islamic schools, general schools, and madrasahs as interchangeable.

The review did not employ a registered systematic review protocol, a formal PRISMA-based selection process, or statistical meta-analysis. Accordingly, it does not claim exhaustive coverage of the literature or provide quantitative estimates of the prevalence or effectiveness of particular follow-up practices. The absence of a systematic selection protocol also means that the reviewed publications should be understood as a purposively assembled body of relevant scholarship rather than a comprehensive representation of all available evidence. These methodological boundaries were considered when interpreting the findings and formulating the proposed conceptual framework.

**Data Analysis and Thematic Synthesis**

The selected literature was examined through a thematic and interpretive synthesis organized around the four research questions. The analysis focused on identifying how

previous publications described quality assurance follow-up, what forms of evidence they used to discuss implementation and improvement, and which organizational conditions were associated with corrective practices. Attention was given to differences between studies reporting institutional procedures, studies examining professional practices, and studies presenting changes in educational or organizational performance. These distinctions were important because the existence of corrective activities does not necessarily demonstrate their effectiveness, and evidence of implementation cannot be assumed to establish changes in educational outcomes.

The synthesis was organized into four interrelated thematic areas. The first concerned forms of quality assurance follow-up, including professional and pedagogical actions such as supervision, coaching, and professional development, as well as organizational and managerial actions such as corrective planning, coordination, documentation, and monitoring. The second concerned the assessment of follow-up effectiveness, for which three analytical dimensions were developed: administrative effectiveness, process effectiveness, and outcome effectiveness. The third addressed organizational conditions that may support or constrain implementation, including leadership, stakeholder participation, professional competence, resource availability, and monitoring capacity. The fourth integrated these findings with theoretical perspectives on evaluation influence and data-based educational improvement to inform the development of the proposed conceptual framework.

The analysis distinguished between findings reported in previous studies and interpretations developed through the present review. Descriptions of institutional practices and reported improvements were attributed to their respective sources, while broader categories and relationships were treated as products of conceptual synthesis. In particular, the distinction among administrative, process, and outcome effectiveness was used as an analytical proposition for interpreting different types of evidence rather than presented as a measurement model previously validated across madrasahs. Similarly, relationships among organizational conditions were interpreted as plausible contextual influences unless stronger empirical support was available. This distinction was intended to reduce the risk of treating conceptual interpretations as established empirical findings.

**Conceptual Framework Development and Methodological Boundaries**

The Evaluation–Follow-Up–Effectiveness Framework was developed by integrating the thematic synthesis with theoretical perspectives on evaluation influence and evidence-informed educational improvement. The framework was structured around five interconnected components: evaluation findings, corrective action planning, follow-up implementation, monitoring and effectiveness assessment, and evidence-informed improvement decisions. These components were arranged to illustrate how information generated through quality assurance evaluation may inform corrective actions and how subsequent evidence may guide the continuation or revision of institutional improvement strategies. The three dimensions of effectiveness were incorporated into the monitoring and assessment component to distinguish the completion of corrective activities from changes in educational practices and targeted quality indicators.

Organizational conditions identified in the literature were positioned as contextual influences operating across the framework rather than as additional sequential stages. This arrangement reflects the interpretation that leadership, participation, competence, resources, and monitoring capacity may affect multiple aspects of the improvement process. The framework was therefore intended to provide a coherent analytical structure for examining quality assurance follow-up, not to establish a universal implementation sequence or a causal

explanation of educational improvement.

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the results. First, the narrative review design involves interpretive judgments in literature selection and synthesis, and the absence of an exhaustive search procedure limits claims about the completeness of the evidence base. Second, the reviewed publications vary in educational setting, research design, and the forms of evidence used to discuss improvement, restricting direct comparison across studies. Third, reported changes following supervision or other corrective activities cannot automatically be attributed to those interventions, particularly where study designs do not support causal inference. Finally, the proposed effectiveness dimensions and conceptual framework have not been empirically validated. Their practical applicability, measurement properties, and explanatory value require examination through future research involving madrasahs with different institutional characteristics.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Forms of Quality Assurance Follow-Up in Madrasahs

Quality assurance follow-up represents the institutional response to weaknesses, performance gaps, or improvement priorities identified through educational evaluation. Within madrasahs, follow-up may involve corrective planning, academic supervision, professional development, institutional coordination, and subsequent monitoring. Although these activities are often discussed as components of internal quality assurance, they should not be treated as interchangeable. Evaluation identifies areas requiring attention, whereas follow-up concerns the actions undertaken in response to those findings. The educational significance of follow-up therefore depends not only on whether corrective activities are conducted, but also on whether they are appropriately connected to the problems identified through evaluation. This distinction is particularly relevant in madrasahs, where quality assurance may address instructional performance, institutional management, educational services, and the integration of academic and religious educational objectives.

The literature considered in this review suggests that follow-up actions can be organized into two interconnected categories: professional and pedagogical actions, and organizational and managerial actions. Professional and pedagogical actions concern the improvement of educators' competencies and instructional practices through coaching, academic supervision, training, workshops, professional dialogue, and reflection. Organizational and managerial actions involve corrective planning, coordination of responsibilities, resource allocation, implementation documentation, and monitoring. This classification is an analytical synthesis developed in the present review rather than a categorization explicitly adopted by all previous studies. The two categories are closely related because professional improvement generally requires organizational support, while managerial arrangements become educationally meaningful when they facilitate changes in teaching, learning, and institutional practices.

#### 1.1 Professional and Pedagogical Follow-Up Actions

Professional and pedagogical follow-up actions are particularly relevant when evaluation findings indicate weaknesses in instructional planning, classroom management, teaching strategies, assessment practices, or professional competence. In their study of internal quality assurance at MI Al Jihad, Mutmainnah and Nugraha (2026) discuss teacher guidance, collective meetings, workshops, and training as activities associated with institutional quality improvement. These activities illustrate how evaluation findings may be translated into professional support intended to address identified weaknesses. However, the

implementation of such activities should be distinguished from evidence that they have produced the intended changes in educational practices. The existence of coaching or training demonstrates an institutional response, but further monitoring is needed to assess whether the problems that prompted those activities have been addressed.

Research on academic supervision provides additional insight into professional follow-up in madrasahs. Kasiman et al. (2026), in a multiple-case study of Islamic secondary schools, discuss supervision processes involving planning, classroom observation, feedback, evaluation, and professional assistance. Similarly, Nuhuyanan et al. (2026) examine academic supervision in a Madrasah Tsanawiyah and report practices associated with instructional planning, classroom management, teaching strategies, and assessment. These studies suggest that professional follow-up may extend beyond one-time training activities to include observation, feedback, reflection, and continuing assistance. Such arrangements create opportunities for corrective actions to be connected to specific aspects of teachers' professional practices rather than remaining limited to general recommendations.

Nevertheless, academic supervision should be understood as one mechanism of quality assurance follow-up rather than a substitute for the entire internal quality assurance system. Supervision primarily addresses professional and instructional dimensions of educational quality, whereas institutional quality assurance may also encompass governance, curriculum management, educational services, infrastructure, and administrative standards. Findings from supervision studies are therefore useful for understanding how instructional weaknesses may be addressed through corrective action, but they should not be generalized to every form of institutional quality assurance follow-up.

### 1.2 Organizational and Managerial Follow-Up Actions

Organizational and managerial follow-up actions concern the institutional arrangements through which evaluation recommendations are converted into coordinated improvement activities. These arrangements may include identifying priority problems, formulating corrective action plans, assigning responsibilities, establishing schedules, allocating resources, documenting implementation, and reviewing progress. Such actions are important because quality assurance recommendations may involve several institutional units and require decisions beyond the authority of individual teachers. Without clear coordination, improvement activities may become fragmented, inconsistently implemented, or disconnected from the evaluation findings that initially justified them.

Husna and Thoyyib (2021), in their study of internal quality assurance at MA Darul Huda Mayak, discuss quality management processes within an institution whose educational practices are informed by pesantren values. Their work provides a perspective on how institutional identity and organizational arrangements may shape quality assurance implementation. Lestari et al. (2026), in a study conducted at an Islamic junior secondary school, discuss structured planning, stakeholder participation, and periodic evaluation as elements of internal quality assurance. Although the latter study was not conducted in a formal madrasah setting, it offers a comparative perspective on managerial processes involved in institutional improvement. These studies suggest that corrective follow-up should be examined not only through individual activities but also through the institutional systems that determine how actions are planned, supported, and reviewed.

Documentation and monitoring are particularly important because they connect corrective implementation with subsequent institutional assessment. Mutmainnah and Nugraha (2026) identify limitations concerning monitoring, performance indicators, and documentation in the quality assurance practices examined at MI Al Jihad. These findings

illustrate the possibility that institutions may implement corrective activities without generating sufficient evidence to determine whether the intended improvements have occurred. Documentation recording only the completion of meetings, workshops, or supervision activities may support administrative accountability, but it provides limited information about changes in educational practices or targeted quality indicators. Managerial follow-up should therefore include procedures for recording the original evaluation findings, the rationale for corrective actions, implementation responsibilities, intended indicators, and evidence collected during monitoring.

### 1.3 Integrating Follow-Up Actions with Evaluation Findings

The distinction between professional and managerial follow-up is analytically useful, but the two categories should not be interpreted as independent processes. Professional interventions require institutional decisions concerning priorities, resources, personnel, and monitoring, while managerial procedures require meaningful educational objectives to avoid becoming primarily administrative. For example, when an evaluation identifies weaknesses in instructional assessment, an institution may organize professional development to address the competence gap. The relevance of this action depends on whether the training content responds to the identified problem, whether teachers receive support to apply the intended practices, and whether subsequent monitoring examines the changes targeted by the intervention. The same logic applies to managerial corrective actions: revising institutional procedures may be necessary, but their effectiveness should be assessed in relation to the operational problems they are intended to resolve.

Follow-up practices must also be interpreted in relation to institutional context. Madrasahs differ in governance arrangements, professional capacities, resources, educational priorities, and relationships with surrounding communities. These differences may influence which corrective actions are feasible and how they are implemented. Research conducted in pesantren-based institutions, Islamic junior secondary schools, and Madrasah Tsanawiyah therefore provides complementary perspectives, but the findings cannot automatically be treated as equivalent. A narrative synthesis must preserve these contextual distinctions while identifying common analytical considerations across the literature.

In response to the first research question, quality assurance follow-up in madrasahs encompasses professional-pedagogical and organizational-managerial actions. The former include coaching, supervision, training, feedback, and professional development, while the latter involve corrective planning, institutional coordination, resource allocation, documentation, and monitoring. The central analytical issue is not simply the presence of these activities, but their alignment with evaluation findings and their connection to subsequent assessment. This interpretation provides the foundation for examining how follow-up effectiveness can be assessed.

## 2. Assessing the Effectiveness of Quality Assurance Follow-Up

Assessing the effectiveness of quality assurance follow-up requires a distinction between the implementation of corrective activities and the educational changes those activities are intended to support. Institutional reports may document that training, supervision, meetings, or corrective planning have been conducted, yet such documentation does not necessarily establish that professional practices or educational outcomes have improved. The reviewed literature addresses different aspects of this issue. Studies of internal quality assurance describe institutional procedures and implementation challenges, while research on academic supervision and monitoring discusses changes in professional

practices and performance. Broader scholarship on evaluation influence and evidence-informed decision-making provides a basis for interpreting how evaluation findings may contribute to organizational action and subsequent change (Henry & Mark, 2003; Mark & Henry, 2004; Schildkamp, 2019).

To clarify these distinctions, the present review proposes three analytical dimensions of follow-up effectiveness: administrative effectiveness, process effectiveness, and outcome effectiveness. These dimensions represent different questions about corrective action rather than mutually exclusive stages or empirically validated measurement scales. Administrative effectiveness concerns whether corrective activities are appropriately planned, implemented, and documented. Process effectiveness concerns whether relevant educational or organizational practices change. Outcome effectiveness concerns whether the targeted quality indicators show improvement. The dimensions are interconnected, but evidence supporting one dimension should not automatically be interpreted as evidence supporting another.

### 2.1 Administrative Effectiveness: From Corrective Planning to Implementation Accountability

Administrative effectiveness concerns the institutional capacity to translate evaluation findings into documented and accountable corrective activities. Relevant evidence may include corrective action plans, implementation schedules, assigned responsibilities, supervision records, professional development reports, and monitoring documentation. These records can help determine whether an institution has responded to identified weaknesses and whether planned activities have been carried out. However, administrative effectiveness should not be reduced to the availability of documents alone. A corrective plan may be complete in procedural terms while remaining insufficiently aligned with the evaluation findings that justified it. Assessment should therefore consider the relationship between identified problems, selected actions, implementation responsibilities, and intended indicators of improvement.

Mutmainnah and Nugraha (2026) provide a relevant illustration through their examination of internal quality assurance at MI Al Jihad. Their discussion of follow-up activities and limitations in monitoring, indicators, and documentation suggests that institutional implementation and the availability of effectiveness evidence may not develop at the same pace. Afif et al. (2026), in a qualitative comparative study of teacher evaluation in public and private Madrasah Tsanawiyah, also provide a perspective on differences between compliance-oriented evaluation practices and approaches emphasizing professional dialogue and development. These studies are relevant to the administrative dimension because they direct attention to how evaluation procedures are organized and connected to subsequent action. Nevertheless, they should not be interpreted as establishing a universal relationship between administrative arrangements and educational improvement.

Administrative effectiveness is therefore a necessary object of assessment, but it is not sufficient to establish the broader effectiveness of quality assurance follow-up. Documentation may demonstrate that institutional responsibilities have been fulfilled, while leaving unanswered whether corrective activities have changed the practices or outcomes that evaluation identified as problematic. This limitation provides the rationale for examining process effectiveness as a separate dimension.

### 2.2 Process Effectiveness: Identifying Changes in Educational Practices

Process effectiveness concerns changes in the educational and organizational practices targeted by corrective actions. In instructional settings, relevant changes may involve lesson

planning, classroom management, teaching strategies, assessment procedures, professional collaboration, or the use of feedback. In managerial settings, process changes may involve improved coordination, more consistent implementation of institutional procedures, or more systematic use of evaluation information. Unlike administrative effectiveness, which focuses on the organization and completion of corrective activities, process effectiveness requires evidence that the activities are associated with changes in how educational work is undertaken.

Research on academic supervision offers relevant illustrations. Kasiman et al. (2026) discuss supervision processes involving observation, feedback, evaluation, and professional assistance in Islamic secondary schools. Nuhuyanan et al. (2026) examine supervision practices associated with reported changes in instructional planning, classroom management, teaching strategies, and assessment. These studies suggest that supervision can be examined not only as an activity conducted by school leaders or supervisors but also in relation to subsequent professional practices. However, because academic supervision represents only one mechanism of quality assurance follow-up, its findings should not be generalized to every aspect of institutional quality assurance. Furthermore, reported changes must be interpreted in relation to the research designs and evidence employed in the respective studies.

The process dimension is consistent with scholarship emphasizing that evaluation may influence behavior and organizational action through mechanisms extending beyond the direct use of findings (Henry & Mark, 2003; Mark & Henry, 2004). Applied to madrasah quality assurance, this perspective suggests that corrective activities should be examined in relation to the practices they are intended to change. For example, a workshop addressing assessment weaknesses may be administratively complete once it has been conducted, but evidence of process effectiveness would require examining whether teachers subsequently modify their assessment practices. Such evidence may be obtained through observations, reviews of instructional materials, professional reflections, or other relevant sources. The selection of evidence should correspond to the intended change rather than rely exclusively on participation records.

### 2.3 Outcome Effectiveness: Interpreting Evidence of Targeted Improvement

Outcome effectiveness concerns changes in the educational quality or performance indicators that corrective actions are intended to improve. These indicators may relate to teacher performance, instructional quality, student learning, institutional services, or other priorities established through evaluation. Outcome effectiveness differs from process effectiveness because changes in professional practices do not necessarily demonstrate that broader educational objectives have been achieved. For example, improvements in instructional planning may be relevant to teaching quality, but additional evidence is required to determine whether targeted learning indicators have changed. The distinction is important because quality assurance follow-up should ultimately be interpreted in relation to the problems it seeks to address.

Murjainah et al. (2024) provide a relevant example through their research on monitoring and evaluation involving teachers and madrasah principals. The study reports improvements in performance across implementation cycles, illustrating how follow-up activities may be examined using repeated assessments rather than documentation of activity completion alone. Nevertheless, the interpretation of such findings must remain consistent with the study design and the indicators measured. Changes observed after monitoring or supervision do not automatically establish that the intervention caused those changes,

particularly when alternative explanations have not been adequately examined.

The assessment of outcome effectiveness therefore requires careful attention to indicator selection, the timing of measurement, and the strength of available evidence. Indicators should correspond to the weaknesses identified through evaluation and the objectives established in corrective planning. Where possible, repeated observations or assessments may provide a stronger basis for examining change than a single post-implementation report. Even so, evidence of improvement should be interpreted cautiously when research designs do not support causal attribution. The purpose of the outcome dimension is to clarify what kind of evidence is required to discuss targeted improvement, not to imply that all quality assurance follow-up activities can be evaluated through the same indicators.

**2.4 Integrating the Three Dimensions of Effectiveness**

The three dimensions provide complementary perspectives on the relationship between evaluation findings and educational improvement. Administrative effectiveness establishes whether corrective action has been organized and implemented. Process effectiveness examines whether the targeted practices have changed. Outcome effectiveness considers whether the intended quality indicators have improved. A follow-up activity may demonstrate administrative effectiveness without sufficient evidence of process or outcome effectiveness. Similarly, an observed change in professional practice may be relevant to process effectiveness without establishing that the intended educational outcome has been achieved.

Table 1. Proposed Dimensions and Evidence of Quality Assurance Follow-Up Effectiveness

| Dimension | Assessment focus | Illustrative evidence | Relevant literature | Interpretive boundary |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Administrative effectiveness | Planning, implementation, accountability, and documentation of corrective actions | Corrective plans, schedules, assigned responsibilities, supervision records, implementation reports | Mutmainnah & Nugraha (2026); Afif et al. (2026) | Activity completion does not establish changes in practice or outcomes |
| Process effectiveness | Changes in targeted educational and organizational practices | Classroom observations, revised instructional materials, feedback records, evidence of changed procedures | Kasiman et al. (2026); Nuhuyanan et al. (2026); Henry & Mark (2003) | Changes in practice do not necessarily establish broader educational improvement |
| Outcome effectiveness | Changes in targeted quality or performance indicators | Repeated performance assessments, relevant learning indicators, institutional quality measures | Murjainah et al. (2024); Schildkamp (2019) | Observed improvement does not automatically establish causal attribution |

*Note.* The three dimensions constitute an analytical classification proposed in this review. The cited studies provide relevant perspectives and examples but do not collectively validate the classification as a standardized measurement instrument.

The distinction among these dimensions provides a more precise basis for assessing follow-up than approaches relying solely on evidence of implementation. It also creates a foundation for examining why corrective actions may generate different forms of evidence across institutional settings. Such differences may reflect not only the design of corrective activities but also the organizational conditions under which they are implemented and assessed.

### 3. Organizational Conditions Supporting and Constraining Quality Assurance Follow-Up

The implementation and sustainability of quality assurance follow-up in madrasahs are influenced by organizational conditions that shape how evaluation findings are interpreted, corrective actions are planned, and subsequent improvements are monitored. Although corrective actions may be formally established through institutional quality assurance procedures, their implementation depends on the capacity of educational personnel and institutional units to translate recommendations into coordinated practices. The reviewed literature highlights institutional leadership, stakeholder participation, professional competence, resource availability, and monitoring capacity as relevant conditions. These should not be interpreted as independent determinants of effectiveness whose causal influence has been established across all madrasahs. Rather, they provide an analytical basis for understanding why similar follow-up activities may be implemented differently across institutional settings.

#### 3.1 Institutional Leadership and Improvement-Oriented Coordination

Institutional leadership is important because quality assurance follow-up requires decisions concerning improvement priorities, responsibilities, resource allocation, and the use of evaluation findings. Madrasah leaders are positioned to coordinate corrective activities across educational and administrative units, particularly when identified weaknesses cannot be addressed by individual teachers or staff members. Leadership may also influence whether evaluation results are treated primarily as documentation requirements or as information for institutional learning. Its significance therefore lies not merely in the authority to initiate corrective actions but also in the ability to establish organizational arrangements connecting evaluation findings with feasible improvement strategies.

Afiralda et al. (2025), in their review of internal quality assurance in Indonesian basic education, identify leadership and stakeholder participation among recurring themes in the literature. Although their review is not limited to madrasahs, it provides a comparative basis for considering the organizational role of educational leaders. Taufik and Istikomah (2026) also discuss institutional leadership and quality management as relevant considerations in the madrasah context. Together, these sources suggest that leadership should be examined through its relationship with institutional coordination, clarity of corrective responsibilities, and continuity of improvement activities. However, leadership commitment alone does not establish that corrective actions are effective, particularly when improvement objectives are unclear or implementation resources are insufficient.

Leadership may support follow-up by encouraging the consistent use of evaluation information in institutional decision-making. When evaluation identifies weaknesses in instructional planning, for example, leaders may coordinate professional assistance, establish implementation schedules, and arrange subsequent supervision. The potential value of these decisions depends on whether they respond to the identified problem and whether monitoring provides evidence of subsequent change. Leadership should therefore be

assessed in relation to the processes it facilitates rather than treated as a sufficient explanation for educational improvement.

### 3.2 Stakeholder Participation and Professional Ownership

Stakeholder participation is relevant because quality assurance follow-up often requires the involvement of teachers, educational staff, supervisors, quality assurance teams, and institutional leaders. These groups may contribute different forms of information about institutional weaknesses, the feasibility of corrective actions, and implementation challenges. Participation can support the interpretation of evaluation findings and the development of corrective strategies reflecting institutional needs. However, participation should not be equated with effectiveness merely because stakeholders attend meetings or are formally included in quality assurance activities. Its significance depends on whether their involvement contributes to decisions, implementation, reflection, and subsequent improvement.

Afiralda et al. (2025) highlight stakeholder participation as a relevant organizational theme, while Lestari et al. (2026) describe participatory elements in the implementation of internal quality assurance at an Islamic junior secondary school. The latter study provides a comparative perspective rather than direct evidence from a formal madrasah. These sources indicate the importance of examining participation, but they do not establish that participation necessarily produces improved educational outcomes. A more precise assessment would consider whether stakeholders understand evaluation findings, contribute to corrective planning, undertake relevant responsibilities, and use monitoring information to review implementation.

Professional ownership is closely related to participation because corrective actions frequently require changes in established educational practices. Teachers may be expected to revise instructional plans, adopt different assessment procedures, or participate in reflective supervision. Such changes may be difficult to sustain when professional development is treated only as a formal requirement disconnected from practical needs. Opportunities for dialogue, feedback, and collaborative problem-solving may help align corrective actions with identified professional challenges. This relationship should nevertheless be interpreted as a plausible organizational mechanism rather than a universally demonstrated effect.

### 3.3 Professional Competence and Implementation Capacity

Professional competence influences the feasibility of follow-up because corrective actions often require knowledge and skills extending beyond routine administrative compliance. Educational personnel may need to interpret evaluation findings, identify institutional weaknesses, design improvement activities, implement revised practices, and assess results. Where these capacities are limited, corrective actions may be completed procedurally without adequately addressing the problems that prompted them. Professional development therefore has a dual role: it may constitute a corrective action in response to competence gaps while also strengthening the institutional capacity needed to implement other improvement strategies.

Research on academic supervision provides relevant illustrations. Kasiman et al. (2026) discuss supervision processes involving observation, feedback, evaluation, and professional assistance, while Nuhuyanan et al. (2026) examine supervision practices associated with reported changes in instructional planning, classroom management, teaching strategies, and assessment. These studies suggest that professional support may involve continuing interaction between supervisors and teachers rather than one-time training

activities. Nevertheless, their findings should not be generalized to every component of institutional quality assurance, and reported changes do not establish that similar interventions would produce equivalent outcomes in other madrasahs.

Professional competence also extends to personnel responsible for monitoring and evaluation. Assessing follow-up effectiveness requires the ability to formulate indicators, collect evidence, interpret changes, and distinguish implementation records from evidence of educational improvement. If these capacities are limited, institutions may rely excessively on activity reports that provide little information about the effectiveness of corrective actions. Strengthening professional competence should therefore be considered in relation to both teaching practices and the institutional processes through which follow-up activities are assessed.

### 3.4 Resource Availability and Institutional Feasibility

The implementation of quality assurance follow-up is shaped by the resources available to support corrective activities. Professional development, supervision, instructional improvement, documentation, and monitoring may require time, financial support, facilities, access to information, and personnel with relevant expertise. These requirements vary according to the nature of evaluation findings and the corrective strategies selected. An improvement plan that is appropriate in principle may therefore be difficult to implement consistently when institutional resources are limited or competing responsibilities restrict the time available for follow-up.

Resource constraints should be examined in relation to institutional priorities rather than treated as a uniform explanation for implementation difficulties. Some corrective actions may require substantial financial investment, while others depend more heavily on coordination, professional collaboration, or the revision of existing procedures. Addressing weaknesses in classroom assessment, for example, may involve professional assistance and repeated supervision, whereas improvements in institutional facilities may require different forms of planning and resource allocation. The suitability of a corrective action depends partly on whether its requirements correspond to the institution's operational capacity.

Institutional feasibility is closely connected to leadership and stakeholder participation. Leaders may prioritize corrective actions according to the urgency of identified weaknesses, while teachers and other personnel may provide information about practical implementation requirements. Incorporating these considerations into planning may help institutions establish realistic schedules, assign responsibilities, and select indicators that can be monitored with available resources. Nevertheless, the reviewed literature does not provide sufficient comparative evidence to determine the independent contribution of resource availability to follow-up effectiveness across different madrasahs.

### 3.5 Monitoring Capacity and the Use of Evaluation Evidence

Monitoring capacity connects corrective implementation with the assessment of effectiveness. An institution may conduct training, supervision, or organizational restructuring without generating adequate information about whether the intended changes have occurred. In such circumstances, quality assurance follow-up risks becoming a sequence of completed activities rather than a process of evidence-informed improvement. Monitoring should therefore examine both implementation accountability and changes associated with corrective actions, using indicators corresponding to the weaknesses identified through evaluation.

Mutmainnah and Nugraha (2026) identify limitations in monitoring, performance

indicators, and documentation at MI Al Jihad. These findings illustrate the importance of distinguishing follow-up activities from the institutional capacity to assess their consequences. Lestari et al. (2026) provide a comparative perspective on challenges concerning documentation and the use of evaluation findings in an Islamic junior secondary school. Together, these sources support the relevance of monitoring and evidence use as organizational concerns, although they do not establish that stronger documentation or monitoring necessarily produces improved educational outcomes.

The significance of monitoring can be interpreted through Schildkamp's (2019) discussion of data-based decision-making for school improvement. Applied conceptually to madrasah quality assurance, monitoring should not end with determining whether planned activities have been completed. It should also generate information about changes in educational practices and targeted quality indicators, while recognizing the methodological limitations of attributing observed changes to particular interventions. Monitoring evidence can then inform decisions to maintain, revise, expand, or replace corrective strategies.

Monitoring also depends on other organizational conditions. Leadership may determine whether results are discussed and acted upon, stakeholder participation may influence the quality of information collected, professional competence may affect interpretation, and resource availability may constrain the scope of assessment. Monitoring is therefore not merely a technical procedure but part of a broader institutional process through which evaluation findings are translated into improvement decisions.

### 3.6 Interrelationships Among Organizational Conditions

The organizational conditions identified in the literature are best understood as interconnected influences. Leadership may facilitate coordination and resource allocation, stakeholder participation may improve the relevance and feasibility of corrective actions, professional competence may support implementation and evidence interpretation, and monitoring may provide information for subsequent decisions. Weaknesses in one area may constrain the contribution of others. A well-designed professional development program, for example, may have limited institutional impact if teachers lack opportunities to apply new practices or if monitoring does not examine the intended changes. Similarly, comprehensive evaluation documentation may contribute little to improvement if its findings are not used in corrective planning.

These interrelationships provide a conceptual explanation for why similar follow-up activities may be implemented differently across madrasahs. Institutional governance, educational priorities, professional capacities, available resources, and organizational practices vary, making it inappropriate to assume that a single improvement strategy will operate identically in all settings. The reviewed literature offers relevant examples and theoretical perspectives but does not establish a comprehensive causal model of these relationships.

In response to the third research question, institutional leadership, stakeholder participation, professional competence, resource availability, and monitoring capacity emerge as conditions that may support or constrain quality assurance follow-up. Their significance lies in how they interact with the alignment between evaluation findings, corrective actions, and intended improvements. This interpretation provides the organizational context for the conceptual framework developed in the following section.

## 4. The Proposed Evaluation–Follow-Up–Effectiveness Framework

The preceding synthesis indicates that the relationship between quality assurance

evaluation and educational improvement cannot be adequately understood through the identification of institutional weaknesses or the implementation of corrective activities alone. Evaluation findings become educationally meaningful when they inform relevant institutional responses, while corrective actions require monitoring to determine whether intended changes have occurred. Studies of madrasah quality assurance describe supervision, professional development, corrective planning, and monitoring, whereas broader scholarship on evaluation influence and evidence-informed school improvement explains how evaluation information may contribute to organizational decisions and practices. Drawing on these perspectives, the present review proposes an Evaluation–Follow-Up–Effectiveness Framework connecting evaluation findings, corrective actions, monitoring evidence, and subsequent improvement decisions.

### 4.1 Theoretical Foundations and Conceptual Positioning

The framework is informed by scholarship on evaluation influence and data-based educational improvement. Henry and Mark (2003) argue that evaluation influence extends beyond the direct use of findings and may involve changes in attitudes and actions through different mechanisms. Mark and Henry (2004) further examine the mechanisms and outcomes through which evaluation may influence individual and collective processes. These contributions challenge the assumption that evaluation reports or recommendations are sufficient to demonstrate the practical value of evaluation. Instead, they direct attention to how evaluative information may influence decisions, professional behavior, and organizational activities.

Schildkamp (2019) provides a complementary perspective by discussing data-based decision-making as an iterative process of educational improvement. This perspective emphasizes the relationship between problem identification, evidence interpretation, improvement-oriented decisions, implementation, and subsequent assessment. For madrasahs, it is relevant because internal quality assurance generates information that may be used to establish corrective priorities and guide institutional decisions. Nevertheless, concepts developed in general school improvement research must be interpreted with attention to differences in institutional governance, educational objectives, professional capacities, and resources.

The present framework builds on these perspectives while addressing a more specific analytical concern: how the effectiveness of quality assurance follow-up can be distinguished from the mere implementation of corrective activities. Evaluation influence scholarship provides a basis for considering how findings may shape action, while data-based improvement research emphasizes the iterative use of evidence. The proposed framework integrates these insights with the three effectiveness dimensions developed in this review. Its contribution therefore lies not in introducing an entirely new sequence of educational management activities, but in specifying how different forms of evidence may be used to interpret corrective follow-up within continuous improvement.

### 4.2 Components of the Framework

The framework comprises five interconnected components: evaluation findings, corrective action planning, follow-up implementation, monitoring and effectiveness assessment, and evidence-informed improvement decisions. These components represent a conceptual sequence through which institutional evaluation may be translated into improvement-oriented action and reconsidered in light of subsequent evidence. Although presented sequentially for analytical clarity, the components are intended to operate

iteratively. Information obtained during implementation or monitoring may lead institutions to revise earlier decisions, reconsider the identified problem, or establish new corrective priorities.

The first component, evaluation findings, concerns the identification and interpretation of institutional weaknesses, performance gaps, or unmet quality standards. Findings must be sufficiently specific to inform corrective planning. General statements that educational quality needs improvement may provide limited guidance unless connected to identifiable practices, institutional processes, or performance indicators. This component therefore emphasizes the need to clarify what requires improvement and what evidence supports that judgment.

The second component, corrective action planning, translates evaluation findings into improvement strategies. Planning involves identifying priorities, selecting actions corresponding to identified problems, assigning responsibilities, establishing schedules, considering resources, and determining indicators for subsequent assessment. The relationship between the evaluation finding and the proposed action is particularly important. A corrective strategy may be administratively feasible without addressing the underlying problem, while a relevant strategy may remain difficult to implement if its resource requirements are not considered.

The third component, follow-up implementation, concerns the execution of corrective activities through professional, pedagogical, organizational, and managerial practices. These may include academic supervision, educator coaching, professional development, corrective coordination, and procedural revision. Implementation should be assessed in relation to the corrective plan and original evaluation findings rather than treated as evidence of effectiveness in itself. Activities may be completed without producing intended changes, while implementation difficulties may require institutions to reconsider their initial strategies.

The fourth component, monitoring and effectiveness assessment, examines evidence concerning implementation and subsequent changes. The three dimensions proposed in this review provide its analytical structure. Administrative effectiveness concerns the planning, execution, accountability, and documentation of corrective activities. Process effectiveness concerns changes in targeted educational and organizational practices. Outcome effectiveness concerns changes in the quality or performance indicators that corrective actions are intended to improve. These dimensions are analytically distinct because evidence that an activity was completed is not equivalent to evidence that practices changed, and observed changes in practice do not necessarily establish improvements in broader outcomes. Moreover, improvements observed after an intervention should not automatically be attributed to that intervention without appropriate methodological support.

The fifth component, evidence-informed improvement decisions, concerns how institutions interpret monitoring results and determine subsequent actions. Depending on the available evidence, a corrective strategy may be maintained, modified, expanded, or replaced. Where monitoring indicates that an activity has been completed but intended practices have not changed, institutions may need to reconsider the intervention, implementation conditions, or assumptions underlying the plan. Where relevant changes are observed, further assessment may be needed to determine whether they are sustained and whether targeted quality indicators have improved. This component connects effectiveness assessment with subsequent evaluation and positions follow-up as part of a continuing improvement process.

Table 2. Proposed Evaluation–Follow-Up–Effectiveness Framework

| Component | Principal function | Key analytical question | Illustrative evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| Evaluation findings | Identify institutional weaknesses and improvement priorities | What problem has been identified, and on what basis? | Evaluation reports, supervision findings, performance-gap records |
| Corrective action planning | Translate findings into feasible improvement strategies | Does the planned action address the identified problem? | Corrective plans, assigned responsibilities, schedules, intended indicators |
| Follow-up implementation | Carry out professional and organizational corrective activities | Was the action implemented as intended? | Supervision records, professional development documentation, implementation reports |
| Monitoring and effectiveness assessment | Examine implementation and subsequent changes | What evidence supports administrative, process, or outcome effectiveness? | Activity records, observations of practice, repeated assessments, quality indicators |
| Evidence-informed improvement decisions | Use monitoring findings to guide subsequent action | Should the strategy be maintained, revised, expanded, or replaced? | Review decisions, revised plans, subsequent evaluation priorities |

*Note.* The framework represents a conceptual synthesis developed in the present review. It has not been empirically validated as a causal model or standardized assessment instrument.

### 4.3 Organizational Conditions and Iterative Improvement

The relationships among the five components are influenced by organizational conditions that may support or constrain follow-up. Leadership, stakeholder participation, professional competence, resource availability, and monitoring capacity may shape how findings are interpreted, actions are selected, and evidence of change is used. These conditions are not positioned as additional sequential stages because they may influence the entire improvement process. Leadership may affect corrective priorities and coordination, professional competence may shape implementation and evidence interpretation, and monitoring capacity may determine whether the institution can distinguish completed activities from changes in practices or outcomes.

The framework also recognizes feedback among its components. Monitoring may reveal that the original problem was incompletely understood or that the selected action was insufficiently aligned with the intended improvement. Such findings may require institutions to revisit evaluation assumptions, revise corrective plans, or select different indicators. This iterative orientation is compatible with data-based school improvement as discussed by Schildkamp (2019). The framework's specific emphasis, however, is on interpreting follow-up effectiveness and using evidence generated after corrective action to inform subsequent institutional decisions.

Its applicability must also be considered in relation to the distinctive characteristics of

madrasahs. Institutional quality assurance may encompass academic performance, religious education, character development, professional competence, governance, and compliance with applicable educational standards. These objectives may require different corrective strategies and forms of evidence. The framework therefore does not prescribe uniform indicators for all institutions. Instead, it offers an analytical structure through which madrasahs may connect their evaluation findings with relevant corrective actions and appropriately selected measures of effectiveness.

### 4.4 Conceptual Contribution and Implications for Future Research

The proposed framework makes three related conceptual contributions. First, it clarifies the distinction between institutional responsiveness and demonstrated improvement. A madrasah may respond to evaluation findings through corrective planning, training, supervision, or administrative revision, but the implementation of these actions does not establish that identified problems have been resolved. Second, the framework incorporates three dimensions of effectiveness to distinguish administrative completion, changes in educational practices, and changes in targeted quality indicators. Third, it situates effectiveness assessment within an iterative process in which monitoring evidence informs subsequent institutional decisions. These contributions aim to improve conceptual precision rather than establish the superiority of a particular management model.

The framework also generates propositions for empirical investigation. Clearer alignment among evaluation findings, corrective actions, and success indicators may support more meaningful assessments of follow-up effectiveness. The three dimensions may reveal differences between administrative implementation and substantive educational change that are obscured when institutions rely only on activity-completion reports. Organizational conditions may also influence how consistently monitoring evidence is used to revise corrective strategies and sustain improvement. These propositions should be treated as questions for future research rather than as relationships established by the present narrative review.

Future studies could examine the framework through comparative case studies of madrasahs with different governance arrangements, professional capacities, and resource conditions. Longitudinal research could investigate changes in educational practices and targeted indicators across successive evaluation and follow-up cycles. Quantitative or mixed-methods studies could further examine relationships among organizational conditions, corrective implementation, and improvement outcomes while considering alternative explanations. Such research would help determine whether the proposed framework requires modification and whether its effectiveness dimensions can be operationalized reliably.

Overall, the fourth research question is addressed through an iterative conceptual framework connecting evaluation findings, corrective actions, monitoring, and evidence-informed improvement decisions. The framework integrates the forms of follow-up identified in the first research question, the effectiveness dimensions developed in the second, and the organizational conditions examined in the third. Its principal contribution is to provide a structured basis for interpreting the relationship between evaluation and improvement in madrasahs. Nevertheless, because it is derived from narrative and conceptual synthesis, its practical utility, measurement properties, and explanatory validity remain to be established through empirical research.

## CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

This narrative literature review examined quality assurance follow-up in madrasahs by synthesizing research on internal quality assurance, academic supervision, evaluation influence, and evidence-informed educational improvement. The synthesis indicates that quality assurance follow-up encompasses two interconnected forms of action: professional and pedagogical activities, including supervision, coaching, feedback, and professional development; and organizational and managerial activities, including corrective planning, institutional coordination, documentation, and monitoring. These actions are most meaningfully understood in relation to the evaluation findings they are intended to address rather than as isolated indicators of institutional improvement.

The study's principal conceptual contribution is the distinction among three dimensions of follow-up effectiveness. Administrative effectiveness concerns the planning, implementation, and accountability of corrective activities; process effectiveness concerns changes in targeted educational and organizational practices; and outcome effectiveness concerns changes in relevant quality indicators. This distinction emphasizes that completing corrective activities does not necessarily demonstrate changes in educational practices or improvements in intended outcomes. The synthesis further identifies institutional leadership, stakeholder participation, professional competence, resource availability, and monitoring capacity as organizational conditions that may support or constrain the implementation and sustainability of follow-up. These conditions are interconnected and should be considered when interpreting differences in institutional improvement practices.

Integrating these insights, the study proposes an Evaluation–Follow-Up–Effectiveness Framework linking evaluation findings, corrective action planning, follow-up implementation, monitoring and effectiveness assessment, and evidence-informed improvement decisions. The framework offers a structured conceptual basis for connecting institutional evaluation with continuous educational improvement while distinguishing administrative responsiveness from evidence of substantive change. However, the narrative review design does not support claims of exhaustive literature coverage or causal relationships, and the proposed framework has not been empirically validated. Future research should examine its applicability in different madrasah settings, develop contextually appropriate indicators for the three effectiveness dimensions, and investigate how organizational conditions influence the use of monitoring evidence across successive improvement cycles.

## REFERENCES

Afif, N., Shunhaji, A., & Syaidah, K. (2026). Performance-based teacher evaluation in Indonesian public and private Madrasah Tsanawiyah: A qualitative comparative case study. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan, 18*(1), 495–503. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v18i1.9234

Afiralda, I., Bakri, M., Dewi, M. S., & Ahmad Radzuanuddin, S. N. B. (2025). Internal quality assurance system in Indonesian basic education: A systematic literature review. *IJECA (International Journal of Education and Curriculum Application), 8*(2), 282–296. https://doi.org/10.31764/ijeca.v8i2.32857

Henry, G. T., & Mark, M. M. (2003). Beyond use: Understanding evaluation's influence on attitudes and actions. *American Journal of Evaluation, 24*(3), 293–314. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1098-2140(03)00056-0

Husna, K., & Thoyyib, M. (2021). Sistem penjaminan mutu internal madrasah berbasis nilai-

nilai pesantren di MA Darul Huda Mayak. *Excelencia: Journal of Islamic Education & Management, 1*(1), 29–44. https://doi.org/10.21154/excelencia.v1i01.92

Kasiman, K., Patimah, S., & Murtafiah, N. H. (2026). Instructional supervision and teacher performance improvement: A multiple-case study of Islamic secondary schools. *Tadris: Jurnal Keguruan dan Ilmu Tarbiyah, 11*(2), 764–775. https://doi.org/10.24042/tadris.v11i2.30495

Lestari, W., Jannah, S. R., & Thontawi, M. (2026). Implementasi sistem penjaminan mutu internal (SPMI) di SMP Islam Al Falah Kota Jambi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Madrasah, 11*(1), 231–240. https://doi.org/10.14421/jpm.2026.231-240

Mark, M. M., & Henry, G. T. (2004). The mechanisms and outcomes of evaluation influence. *Evaluation, 10*(1), 35–57. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389004042326

Murjainah, M., Hartati, Y., Fauziah, P. Y., & Wibawa, L. (2024). Peningkatan kinerja guru dan kepala madrasah melalui monitoring dan evaluasi di Madrasah Ibtidaiyah. *Jurnal Inovatif Ilmu Pendidikan, 6*(1). https://doi.org/10.23960/jiip.v6i1.29196

Mutmainnah, S. R. F., & Nugraha, M. S. (2026). Strengthening educational quality through a PPEPP-based internal quality assurance system at MI Al Jihad. *MANAZHIM, 8*(2), 282–299. https://doi.org/10.36088/manazhim.v8i2.6537

Nuhuyanan, W. R., Jumaeda, S., & Maimuna, M. (2026). Improving Islamic education teachers' performance and learning quality through academic supervision in madrasahs. *Al-Iltizam: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam, 11*(1). https://doi.org/10.33477/alt.v11i1.14341

Schildkamp, K. (2019). Data-based decision-making for school improvement: Research insights and gaps. *Educational Research, 61*(3), 257–273. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2019.1625716

Taufik, I., & Istikomah. (2026). The importance of an internal quality assurance system in improving the quality of education in madrasahs. *Indonesian Journal of Innovation Studies, 27*(2). https://doi.org/10.21070/ijins.v27i2.1327

**Copyright holder:**
© Author

**First publication right:**
Jurnal Kepemimpinan & Pengurusan Sekolah

**This article is licensed under:**