

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF EDUCATION IN IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Zuhair Mubarrak Hazaa¹, Abdi Mubarak Syam²

¹STIT Ar Raudlatul Hasanah, Indonesia

²Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: abdimubaraksyam@uinsu.ac.id

Article history:

Received :
Accepted :
Published :
Available online
<http://aspublsher.co.id/index.php/perspektif>

E-ISSN: 3063-3494

How to cite:



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the implementation process of an internal quality assurance system (SPMI) based on the PPEPP cycle (Determination, Implementation, Evaluation, Control, and Improvement) at a newly established university, focusing on the dynamics of quality monitoring and evaluation within resource constraints. Using a descriptive qualitative approach and a case study design, this study describes the institution's adaptive strategies in building a quality culture through academic community involvement, quality system digitization, internal quality audits, and ongoing training. The results show that the success of PPEPP implementation is not solely determined by resource adequacy, but by institutional commitment, quality literacy, and data-driven participatory governance. This study provides an empirical contribution as a best practice model for new universities in preparing for accreditation and building a sustainable quality system.

Keywords: PPEPP, SPMI, higher education accreditation, monitoring and evaluation, quality culture.

1. INTRODUCTION

Higher education is a strategic pillar in developing the quality of the nation's human resources, particularly in facing innovation and knowledge-based global competition. However, reality shows that many new universities in Indonesia face serious challenges in managing institutional quality, including a limited number of doctoral-qualified lecturers, fluctuating student numbers, and minimal academic infrastructure. This condition results in uneven governance of the Tridharma (three pillars) of higher education, particularly between large universities and newly established ones (Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology, 2021). This phenomenon demonstrates the urgency of a structured quality monitoring and evaluation strategy so that new universities can maintain their credibility and academic competitiveness.

Various previous studies have confirmed that an internal quality assurance system (SPMI) based on the PPEPP cycle (Determination, Implementation, Evaluation, Control, and Improvement) is a crucial foundation for ensuring the accountability and quality of higher education (Sudarwan, 2021). Sudarman (2021) states that the success of PPEPP implementation is largely determined by consistent implementation and the involvement of the entire academic community. Furthermore, Andayani and Prasetyo (2020) emphasized the importance of an outcome-based evaluative approach and data reflection in driving continuous quality improvement. On the other hand, Rahmawati et al. (2022) identified that new universities tend to encounter obstacles in implementing PPEPP due to low quality literacy and limited academic documentation systems. This

fact indicates that PPEPP implementation is not merely technical but requires a strong culture of quality preparedness.

Although numerous studies discuss the implementation of SPMI and PPEPP, most focus on large universities or institutions with established quality systems. Few studies explicitly document the adaptive strategies of new universities with limited resources to achieve institutional accreditation through PPEPP-based monitoring and evaluation. This research gap indicates a lack of empirical representation that can serve as best practices for young institutions in managing the quality cycle realistically and contextually. Therefore, this study offers novelty in the form of an in-depth exploration of the internal dynamics, adaptive strategies, and digitalization of the quality system in a new university that successfully upgraded its accreditation status in a relatively short time.

Based on this background, this research specifically focuses on analyzing the implementation process of the PPEPP cycle in quality monitoring and evaluation at a newly established higher education institution. This research aims to describe how the PPEPP cycle is applied in building a quality culture, identify challenges encountered in the process, and explore adaptive strategies used by institutions to achieve institutional accreditation. A case study approach is used to explore the institution's empirical experience in managing its quality system in a contextual, reflective, and sustainable manner.

This research is expected to make significant theoretical and practical contributions. Theoretically, this study enriches the literature on PPEPP implementation in the context of new higher education institutions with limited resources. Practically, the results of this study can serve as a reference model (best practice) for other higher education institutions in the early stages of developing an institutional quality system. Furthermore, the findings of this study have the potential to serve as a policy reference for the government or accreditation institutions in formulating a more adaptive and needs-based approach to quality development.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This research uses a descriptive qualitative approach with a case study design to in-depth explore the implementation of an internal quality assurance system (SPMI) based on the PPEPP cycle (Determination, Implementation, Evaluation, Control, and Improvement) at a newly established university. This approach was chosen because it captures the real dynamics within an institution's ongoing process of building quality governance, rather than simply measuring results numerically. The case study is deemed relevant because it allows researchers to contextually understand how the institution mobilizes adaptive strategies to address resource constraints, including aspects of policy, organizational culture, and implementation practices at each phase of the PPEPP.

The research location was selected at a private university in Indonesia that obtained its operational permit at the end of 2016 and, in less than a decade, achieved "Good" accreditation for its study programs and institution. This object was selected purposively because it represents a new type of university with limited resources but showing significant progress in strengthening quality. The research subjects included institutional leaders, heads of study programs, heads of quality assurance units (UPM), lecturers, educational staff, and students as supporting informants. They were purposively selected based on their direct involvement in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of institutional quality.

Data collection was conducted through three main techniques: in-depth interviews, participant observation, and documentation study. Interviews were conducted to explore stakeholders' understanding, strategies, and reflections on the implementation of PPEPP. Participatory observation was conducted through the researchers' direct involvement in quality evaluation forums, internal audit meetings, and the preparation of accreditation documents. Documentation included analysis of formal documents such as the SPMI manual, self-evaluation reports (LED), study program performance reports (LKPS), quality standard operating procedures (SOPs), internal audit results, as well as strategic plan policies and academic guidelines.

All collected data were analyzed using the interactive analysis model of Miles and Huberman (2014), which involves three stages: data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing. Data reduction was carried out by identifying relevant information related to PPEPP

implementation and the dynamics of institutional quality. Data presentation was carried out in the form of a thematic narrative structured according to the PPEPP phases. Conclusions were drawn through reflective interpretation that connects empirical findings to the theoretical framework of higher education quality assurance. To maintain validity, this study applies triangulation of sources and techniques, as well as member checking of key informants to ensure that the researcher's interpretation represents the factual conditions in the field.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The Context of PPEPP Implementation in New Universities

The college targeted in this study is a private higher education institution that obtained its operational permit at the end of 2016. As a relatively new institution, the main challenges faced were limited human resources, both in terms of the number and qualifications of lecturers (especially those with Master's/Doctoral degrees), an unstable student population, limited facilities and infrastructure, and managerial capacity that was still under development.

However, by systematically adopting the PPEPP (Determination, Implementation, Evaluation, Control, and Improvement) cycle, the institution demonstrated significant progress, ultimately achieving "Good" accreditation for both its study programs and the institution as a whole. This demonstrates that, despite limited resources, a managerial strategy focused on continuous evaluation and strengthening the internal quality assurance system (SPMI) can produce measurable and standardized quality improvements. Implementing the PPEPP cycle at a new university serves not only as an administrative framework but also as an adaptive strategy for building a culture of quality. A study by Sari and Nugroho (2022) showed that consistent implementation of the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS) can improve the effectiveness of the internal quality assurance system (IQAS) in newly established institutions.

They emphasized the importance of involving the entire academic community in every stage of the IQAS to ensure its successful implementation. Furthermore, Rahmawati et al. (2021) identified that the main challenges in implementing IQAS in new universities are a lack of understanding of the quality cycle and limited human resources. However, with ongoing training and mentoring from more experienced institutions, institutions can overcome these obstacles and build an effective quality system.

In the context of quality control, Andayani and Prasetyo (2020) highlighted the role of internal quality audits as a tool to ensure compliance between implementation activities and established standards. They suggested that regular audits accompanied by clear follow-up can encourage continuous quality improvement.

These studies reinforce the findings of this research, which demonstrate that although new universities face various limitations, systematic and participatory implementation of the IQAS cycle can result in significant quality improvements. This shows that commitment to quality and the involvement of all institutional elements are the keys to success in building a culture of quality in higher education.

Determination

At this stage, the institution establishes quality standards based on official documents such as the Strategic Plan (Renstra), Quality Policy, SPMI Manual, Quality Standards, and SPMI Forms. This determination refers to the National Higher Education Standards (SN-Dikti) and takes into account the specific needs of the institution. Adjustments are made to ensure the policy remains contextual, given the dynamics and limited capacity.

In the determination process, leadership participation is crucial, especially since in the initial phase, an established quality administration system is not yet in place. Involving lecturers and education staff in policy formulation is also part of the strategy to build ownership of the established standards.

Implementation

Implementation of standards is carried out through the internalization of quality documents into learning practices and institutional governance. This activity includes the implementation of

the teaching and learning process, reporting on the lecturer's Tridharma (Three Pillars of Lecturers), and collecting supporting documents for accreditation standards.

Specifically, this implementation is carried out in stages. Institutional leaders begin by designing a simple quality workflow, for example by establishing a Quality Control Group (GKM) team in each work unit. Initial implementation focused on compiling lecturer performance reports and course evaluations as initial data for accreditation. This aligns with the findings of Setyosari (2016) in his book, *Educational Innovation*, which emphasizes the importance of adaptive internal system design as the first step towards a culture of quality.

Evaluation

Evaluation is conducted systematically through internal quality audits, quarterly evaluation meetings, and the involvement of lecturers and students in service and academic satisfaction surveys. This evaluation is not only administrative but also substantive involving interpretation of the achievement of learning, research, and community service standards.

Evaluation results are used to measure the gap between actual conditions and established standards. This evaluation method adopts the principle of continuous quality improvement (CQI), as emphasized by Sudarman (2021), who states that PPEPP will be effective if the evaluation cycle is participatory and data-driven

Control

Quality control is conducted through an internal quality audit system based on forms and indicators developed in accordance with SPMI standards. The Quality Assurance Unit (QAU) plays a crucial role as a central point for documentation and monitoring of compliance with quality standards.

Each audit result and evaluation meeting is followed up with a coordination meeting to develop recommendations for improvement. This control system is then documented in a Self-Evaluation Report (LED), which serves as the primary reference for preparing accreditation forms.

In line with the views of Andayani and Prasetyo (2020), this control system approach is not merely administrative but also serves as a data-driven, managerial process that supports strategic decision-making.

Improvement

The final stage of the PPEPP cycle is improvement. Based on the evaluation and monitoring results, the institution takes follow-up action through lecturer training, improvements to facilities and infrastructure, and refinement of quality standards documents. Significant improvements include strengthening documentation of the learning process, managing digital academic archives, and involving students in community service activities.

Based on PPEPP's reflection, the institution has been able to develop new, more adaptive policies, such as the establishment of a Learning Innovation Center and a Student Research Unit. This demonstrates that PPEPP does not stop at evaluation but serves as the foundation for developing a culture of continuous improvement.

Challenges and Adaptive Strategies

In the process of implementing a quality assurance system through the PPEPP cycle, newly established universities face several crucial challenges that cannot be ignored. One of the main challenges is limited human resources, particularly lecturers with functional positions and doctoral qualifications. This condition directly impacts the quality of learning and the limited capacity for strategic quality management. According to Sari and Nugroho (2022), the adequacy and competence of lecturers are important indicators in building a sustainable quality culture, as lecturers are the main actors in implementing the Tri Dharma of Higher Education.

Furthermore, another equally significant challenge is the lack of quality management literacy among educators. Many teaching staff are unfamiliar with a systemic approach to quality-based reporting, evaluation, and planning. Similarly, Rahmawati (2022) noted that small or newly established universities often face obstacles in understanding the quality assurance system due to limited institutional and individual experience with the PPEPP cycle.

The absence of a well-organized academic documentation system in the initial phase also hinders PPEPP implementation. Important documents such as self-evaluations, study program performance reports, and internal quality audit reports are often unavailable or not documented to established standards. According to Prasetyo and Hidayat (2021), weaknesses in academic documentation lead to a lack of objective evidence in the accreditation process and overall quality evaluation.

Equally important, low student participation in the learning evaluation process indicates a lack of collective awareness of the importance of feedback as part of the quality control cycle. This often occurs because students have not been optimally involved in the quality assurance system. In this context, Nugraha and Lestari (2020) emphasize that student involvement in the learning evaluation process is one indicator of participatory higher education quality and oriented towards continuous improvement.

Nevertheless, institutional responses to these challenges demonstrate a constructive, adaptive dynamic. Intensive internal training is provided for lecturers and educational staff to understand quality documents, reporting procedures, and performance indicator tracking systems. This strategy has proven effective in improving institutional quality literacy. This aligns with the approach described by Andayani and Prasetyo (2020), who stated that ongoing training plays a crucial role in fostering collective understanding of an integrated quality system.

Furthermore, accreditation assistance by external assessors is also implemented as a knowledge transfer strategy, where the assessors' practical experience serves as a source of institutional learning in managing forms, accreditation instruments, and measuring standard achievement. This collaborative practice demonstrates the synergy between practical experience and local managerial innovation.

To build more effective quality governance, this institution has also implemented digitalization of its quality system through the Google Workspace platform. The use of an integrated performance dashboard enables the collection of evaluative data in real time, efficiently, and transparently. Similarly, Subekti et al. (2025) stated that the use of information technology is an accelerating factor in a data-driven quality system, especially in the context of institutions with limited resources (Subekti et al., 2025). Finally, an equally important strategy is the implementation of collaborative management in quality decision-making. All elements of the academic community, from leaders and lecturers to administrative staff to students, are involved in quality discussions, evaluations, and follow-up. This approach has demonstrated success in building active participation as a basis for inclusive decision-making. This is reinforced by the research findings of Rahmawati et al. (2022), which found that a participatory and data-driven approach is far more effective in building a quality system than an authoritative, top-down model.

Thus, although this new university faced some initial challenges, its adaptive and collaborative strategies have become a crucial foundation for achieving quality and continuous improvement. The implementation of PPEPP, rooted in local realities yet open to external innovation, demonstrates that quality management should not rely on large capacity, but on institutional commitment and the ability to learn together.

4. CONCLUSION

This research demonstrates that the implementation of an internal quality assurance system (SPMI) based on the PPEPP cycle at a newly established university is not merely an administrative instrument, but also serves as an institutional transformation strategy that builds a culture of quality gradually and sustainably. Although institutions face resource constraints, such as the number of highly qualified lecturers, academic infrastructure, and limited quality literacy among the academic community, the PPEPP implementation process can still produce systematic change when implemented consistently, participatively, and based on evaluative reflection.

A key finding of this research is that quality success is not solely determined by the adequacy of resources, but by institutional commitment and the institution's willingness to continuously learn and adapt. Adaptive strategies such as internal training, external mentoring, digitalization of the quality system, and strengthening collaboration between units have proven effective in building credible quality governance and have a direct impact on accreditation achievements. These findings also confirm that PPEPP is more effective when understood not as a mechanical cycle, but as a culture of reflective evaluation that integrates institutional vision and collective participation.

Thus, this study confirms that new higher education institutions can still achieve institutional credibility through an adaptive, data-driven, and collaborative approach to quality assurance. These findings provide a strategic contribution to the development of higher education quality assurance policies and practices, particularly in the context of institutions building a quality foundation in the early stages of growth.

References

- Andayani, S., & Prasetyo, E. (2020). Penguatan evaluasi mutu pendidikan tinggi. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Indonesia*, 6(2), 45–56.
- Andayani, S., & Prasetyo, E. (2020). Penguatan Evaluasi Mutu Pendidikan Tinggi. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Indonesia*.
- Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan. (2020). Instrumen Akreditasi Perguruan Tinggi (IAPT 3.0). Jakarta: BAN-PT.
- Baharuddin, & Wahyuni, N. (2021). Literasi mutu dosen dalam pendidikan tinggi. *Jurnal Kependidikan Islam*, 5(2), 134–148.
- Dalimunthe, A. Q., Erwani, I., & Syam, A. M. (2025). A Model of Religious Harmonization in Indonesia: The Syncretic Dialectic of Tridharma and Islam. *Pharos Journal of Theology*, 106(4).
- Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi. (2019). Panduan SPMI dan SPME Perguruan Tinggi. Jakarta: Kementerian Riset, Teknologi, dan Pendidikan Tinggi.
- Febriana, A. D., & Syam, A. M. (2025). Enhancing student visits through library strategies: A case study of SMKN 1 Percut Sei Tuan. *Informatio: Journal of Library and Information Science*, 5(3), 238–250.
- Kemendikbudristek. (2021). Buku Panduan Akreditasi Program Studi Pendidikan Tinggi. Jakarta: BAN-PT.
- Masrek, M. N., Baharuddin, M. F., & Syam, A. M. (2025). Determinants of Behavioral Intention to Use Generative AI: The Role of Trust, Personal Innovativeness, and UTAUT II Factors. *International Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 14(4), 378–390. <https://doi.org/10.14419/44tk8615>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mulyadi, D. (2021). Penguatan Sistem Penjaminan Mutu Pendidikan Tinggi. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Nahar, S., Ulfah, F., Syam, A. M., Siregar, P. A., Suraya, R., & Arrazy, S. (2025). Implementation of the Smoke-Free Area (SFA) Policy in Islamic University. *Public Health of Indonesia*, 11(3), 88–98.
- Nugraha, S., & Lestari, A. (2020). Peran mahasiswa dalam sistem evaluasi pembelajaran di perguruan tinggi. *Jurnal Evaluasi Pendidikan*, 11(3), 233–245.
- Permendikbud No. 3 Tahun 2020 tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan Tinggi. (2020). Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Prasetyo, E., & Hidayat, R. (2021). Kelemahan dokumentasi akademik dalam proses akreditasi. *Jurnal Mutu Pendidikan*, 9(1), 14–23.
- Rahmawati, F. (2022). Kendala implementasi sistem mutu di perguruan tinggi baru. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tinggi*, 7(2), 78–90.
- Rahmawati, R., Rahmawati, F., Putri, R. D., Nurdin, N., & Rizal, Y. (2022). Pengembangan Virtual Reality dalam kesiapan mahasiswa menghadapi PLP. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(6), 10016–10025. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i6.4178>

- Ramadhana, R. A., & Syam, A. M. (2025). Strategi Komunikasi Pemasaran Digital Dalam Meningkatkan Brand Awareness Pada Brand Wardah Beauty. *Jurnal Ilmiah Muqoddimah*, 9(2), 1071–1079.
- Ritonga, A. R., Education, I. R., Zein, A., Syam, A. M., & Ohorella, N. R. (2023). Misconceptions of Jihad: A Constructivist Review of the Meaning of Struggle in Islam in the Modern Era: Analysis of the Verses al-Amwaal wa al-Nafs.
- Sari, A. M., & Nugroho, A. (2022). Efektivitas pelaksanaan PPEPP dalam peningkatan mutu. *Jurnal Administrasi Pendidikan*, 10(2), 89–102.
- Saraan, M. I. K., Rambe, R. F. A. K., Syam, A. M., Suhendar, A., Dalimunthe, M. A., & Sinaga, R. P. K. (2024). The application of fertilizer subsidies ... IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science.
- Setyosari, P. (2016). Inovasi pendidikan: Pendekatan teoretis dan praktis. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group.
- Subekti, Y. A., Haryati, T., & Wuryandini, E. (2025). Peran digitalisasi pendidikan terhadap mutu sekolah. *Indonesian Research Journal on Education*, 5(1), 397–403.
- Sugiyono. (2019). Metode Penelitian Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan R&D. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sudarwan, H. (2021). Implementasi SPMI berbasis siklus PPEPP. *JIP: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*, 18(1), 56–68.
- Tjiptono, F. (2017). Total Quality Management. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.
- UNESCO. (2015). Quality Assurance Principles for Higher Education. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
- Widoyoko, E. P. (2020). Evaluasi Program Pendidikan: Panduan Praktis untuk Peneliti dan Praktisi Pendidikan. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Wulandari, D. A., & Syam, A. M. (2025). Analysis of The Availability of Braille Collections at The Public Library of Deli Serdang Regency Based on The Needs of The Visually Impaired. *LITERACY: International Scientific Journal of Social, Education, Humanities*, 3(3), 76–82.