JURNAL PENGABDIAN MASYARAKAT
(BISMA)

Volume 4 Issue 1 (2026), Pages 62-77
Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat (Bisma)
***p*-ISSN 2986-7517, *e*-ISSN 2986-9307**
https://ejournal.darunnajah.ac.id/index.php/bisma
doi: https://doi.org/10.61159/bisma

Quality Assurance Mentoring for Pesantren-Based Higher Education in Preparing for Internationally Standardized Accreditation

Suryadi, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
***Aldo Redho Syam,** Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
Rihlah Nur Aulia, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
Anim Purwanto, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
Syamsul Rizal Mz, Universitas Islam Bogor, Indonesia
Nuril Izzah, Universitas Islam Bogor, Indonesia

*aldoredhosyam@unj.ac.id (corresponding author)

Article Info

Article history:

Received: 21 Jun 2026
Revised: 15 Nov 2026
Accepted: 16 Nov 2026

Keywords: Quality Assurance, International Accreditation, Pesantren-Based Higher Education, Mentoring, Islamic Higher Education

Abstract

This article reports a community service program that mentored Institut Ummul Quro Al-Islami (IUQI) Bogor, a pesantren-based higher education institution, in quality assurance as it prepares for internationally standardized accreditation (AQAS). The Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, ran the program under its 2026 PPM-KPIP partnership scheme, with an on-site session on 9 November 2026 for IUQI's institutional leaders and academic managers. Using a descriptive-qualitative approach, we analyzed the activity news report, the activity poster, the program proposal, and the relevant literature. The mentoring combined three approaches: institutional strategy, study-program quality readiness, and preparation of accreditation instruments. Four follow-up priorities emerged: a readiness map for each study program, a quality-evidence matrix, procedures that ensure evaluation results are acted on, and periodic monitoring by leaders. The poster reports that all five program stages were carried out and lists five outputs: a journal article, a proceedings paper, a news article, a video, and an intellectual property registration. It also states that the program improved the managers' capacity, but no measurement data are available. Follow-up evaluation should assess participants' knowledge, document quality, and whether the practices continue.

To cite this article:

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

A. Introduction

Accreditation is expected to do two things at once: assure the public that minimum standards are met, and push institutions to improve their internal processes. In practice the two do not always go together. External quality assurance clarifies expectations and creates accountability, but it can turn into a periodic documentation exercise when evidence collection is not tied to academic decisions. Dill (2010) shows that a quarter century of experience with external academic quality assurance teaches lessons about the limits of compliance-oriented mechanisms, and Ehren and Visscher (2006) explain that the effect of inspection depends on how the inspected organizations interpret and use the results. More recent work points the same way. Evidence-based accreditation promotes quality improvement when the evidence is absorbed into institutional learning and not treated as an administrative endpoint (Kairanbayev & David, 2025).

Pesantren-based higher education sits where the preservation of Islamic values meets global quality demands. The community service proposal behind this activity describes the situation in Greater Bogor. Several pesantren-based institutions have considerable potential, but their managers still have a limited understanding of international accreditation performance indicators, limited access to technical training and mentoring, too few staff who know the accreditation process, and quality assurance systems that are not yet well organized. This description comes from the situation analysis in the proposal, not from a survey reported in this article. The proposal also treats international accreditation as a tool for improving governance, quality culture, and competitiveness, not merely as a symbol of recognition, and it notes that institutions that do not meet international standards will find it hard to attract international students and join global education networks. Quality in higher education itself rests on organizational culture (Sumarni, Nasir, et al., 2021).

The education quality literature names several interdependent elements. Rubric-based quality assurance can make expectations more transparent and assessment more consistent, but rubrics need shared interpretation, examples of acceptable evidence, and feedback that points toward improvement (Akkoyunlu et al., 2025). Quality-oriented educational management models require alignment among leadership, processes, human resources, and evaluation so that quality assurance becomes part of daily work (Al-Madah, 2026). Studies of total quality management in higher education link quality to data analytics and artificial intelligence (Sun et al., 2025), and other research has developed education quality evaluation systems that combine artificial intelligence and big data (Zhang & Cheng, 2025). Quality also depends on educators' competencies, including research competence, which must be developed and assessed systematically (Sumarni, Akhyar, et al., 2021).

Institutional leaders are central to turning accreditation requirements into improvement. School effectiveness research shows that leadership shapes the organizational conditions in which learning takes place (Hallinger & Heck, 1996). Leadership practices close to teaching and teacher learning have a larger effect than generic leadership approaches (Robinson et al., 2008). Successful leaders combine transformational and instructional strategies (Day et al., 2016), and leadership matters most when it is sensitive to context, builds collective capacity, and keeps the organization focused on learning (Leithwood et al., 2020). All of these findings come from schools. We use them as an analogy for leadership in higher education, not as direct evidence.

Studies in Indonesia add context. Jawas (2017) shows that leadership practices for instructional improvement are shaped by socio-cultural expectations and local relationships. Musthan (2019) discusses an effective leadership model for madrasah principals that combines managerial competence, values, and the ability to move teachers to act, which makes it relevant to Islamic educational institutions. Transformational leadership can strengthen school effectiveness during policy change (Prasetia & Akrim, 2024), and leadership is related to teamwork, work engagement, and teacher creativity (Rais et al., 2022). Mazhabi (2026) shows that adaptive strategy, communication, and trust remain necessary when policy expectations are complex or change quickly.

Accreditation requirements do not enter an institution as rules that apply themselves. They must be interpreted, connected to existing routines, and translated into decisions about what needs to change. Weick (1995) calls this process *sensemaking*, the construction of plausible meaning from ambiguous cues. Spillane et al. (2002) applied the idea to policy implementation and showed that implementers' prior knowledge, beliefs, and organizational context shape how policy messages are understood. Coburn (2005) showed that leaders shape *sensemaking* by selecting messages, framing problems, and providing space for collective interpretation. A lecture that only presents indicators is therefore not enough. Leaders and managers need opportunities to interpret standards, examine concrete evidence, and discuss borderline cases. Honig (2006) sees policy implementation as complex, interactive, and adaptive, while Fullan (2016) stresses that sustained change depends on capacity building, shared meaning, and coherence across levels.

Evidence-based management gives these processes an organizing principle. Data-rich institutions do not simply collect more information. They build routines for selecting, interpreting, discussing, and acting on evidence (Earl & Katz, 2006). Pankowska (2014) links evidence-based management to quality processes in higher education under the Bologna Process, through decisions that rest on systematically organized information. In accreditation preparation, evidence-based practice involves four abilities: recognizing the claim an indicator stands for, choosing relevant and credible evidence, judging the quality and consistency of that evidence, and using that judgment to plan improvement. A digital archive is useful only if it reflects all four. Fairness also needs attention. Accreditation systems can widen gaps when institutions with stronger administrative resources are better able to present convincing evidence (Jumanah et al., 2026).

The activity reported here is a 2026 community service program of the Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Jakarta (UNJ), under its Kemitraan Pemda dan Instansi Pendidikan (PPM-KPIP) partnership scheme, with Institut Ummul Quro Al-Islami (IUQI) Bogor as the partner. The on-site session took place at the IUQI campus on Monday, 9 November 2026, under the theme that gives this article its title. The activity poster and the proposal name AQAS (Agency for Quality Assurance through Accreditation of Study Programmes) as the international accreditation reference, while the news report uses a phrase meaning excellent accreditation of international standard without naming an agency. The proposal also links the activity to UNJ's effort in the *Times Higher Education Impact Rankings*, and the poster lists two relevant Sustainable Development Goals: quality education (SDG 4) and partnerships for the goals (SDG 17).

Existing studies explain leadership, quality assurance, the use of evidence, and policy implementation well, but they do not show how these perspectives are combined in practical mentoring for pesantren-based higher education institutions that are preparing for international accreditation. This article addresses that applied gap by reporting how the mentoring was carried out, analyzing its content, and linking it to the program design in the proposal. Two questions guide the article. First, how was the mentoring carried out and which approaches did it use? Second, which follow-up priorities emerged, how were the five program stages designed in the proposal carried out, and what outputs resulted?

B. Methods

This article takes a descriptive-qualitative approach, in the form of a community service activity report. The object of analysis is the mentoring program at IUQI, with the on-site session of 9 November 2026 as its most fully documented event, together with the program design behind it. The news report and the poster contain no test results, no number of participants by group, and no other quantitative data, so the article includes no statistical analysis and does not measure post-activity impact. The success statement on the poster is treated as the implementers' assessment, not as a measured result.

The activity took place at the IUQI campus, Jalan Mohnoh Nur No. 112, Leuwimekar, Leuwiliang District, Bogor Regency, West Java. The proposal records the distance from UNJ to the partner's site as 71.8 km. The partner is IUQI, including its rectorate and foundation. Participants came from institutional leadership and academic management: the rectorate, the quality assurance unit, faculty leaders, the graduate school, and heads of study programs. The IUQI rector attended together with vice rectors, institutional heads, deans, vice deans, heads of study programs, and institutional quality assurance managers.

Three speakers from the UNJ implementation team presented in sequence, and one moderator led the discussion. The proposal assigns the team leader to lead and coordinate the activity and to liaise

with the partner, lecturer members to deliver training and mentoring and prepare the materials, and student members to support field preparation and documentation.

Four data sources were used. The first is the news report dated 9 November 2026, which is the main source on the on-site session: time, place, participants, material, and follow-up priorities. The second is the activity poster, which summarizes the implementation method, the mapping of program stages and their achievement, the outputs, and the conclusion. The third is the 2026 community service proposal of the Faculty of Education, UNJ, which contains the situation analysis, priority problems, solutions, implementation stages, and the description of the science and technology applied. The fourth is 29 scholarly references: 25 taken from a sample journal article and four from the proposal. Photographs were not used as analytical data.

The analysis followed a pragmatic thematic procedure that draws on Miles et al. (2014). Statements in the news report were broken into units of information, compared to see where they overlapped, and grouped into three approaches to strengthening quality and four follow-up priorities. The groupings were then mapped against the proposal's five program stages and two priority problems. The status of each stage was taken from the poster, and its implementation details were compared with the news report to see which parts are documented and which are only stated. Interpretation followed the naturalistic principle that stresses context and the meanings participants give (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). We also used the utilization-focused orientation of Patton (2015): the value of the analysis lies in its ability to help leaders, partners, and facilitators make concrete decisions about follow-up.

The proposal's program design has five stages: socialization, training, technology application, mentoring and evaluation, and program sustainability. The proposal sets out two learning resources. The first is a 120-hour training module delivered face to face and online. The second is a guide to preparing accreditation documents, in the form of templates and completeness checklists, available as a 30 MB PPT and PDF file. Neither the news report nor the poster describes how the module or guide was used, so both are treated as proposal specifications that have not been assessed. The proposal specifies eight months of implementation for the community service scope. The poster reports that the five stages were carried out without giving the dates of each stage, and only the on-site session of 9 November 2026 is dated.

Reporting is aggregate. The article gives no names of implementation team members and no individual participant data, and speakers are referred to by the order of their presentations.

C. Result and Discussion

Implementation of the Mentoring

The on-site session took place on Monday, 9 November 2026, at the IUQI campus in Bogor. The news report names three aims: to strengthen the institution's readiness to build a quality culture, to organize academic governance, and to develop the evaluation documents needed in the international accreditation process. The program consisted of a meeting between the UNJ team and the IUQI rector and foundation, presentations by three speakers, and a discussion led by a moderator. The report says IUQI's academic community took part, with participants from institutional leadership and academic management, from the rector to heads of study programs and institutional quality assurance managers. The poster summarizes the whole implementation flow in five stages: socialization and coordination, quality assurance training, application of quality technology, mentoring and evaluation, and program sustainability.

Three Approaches to Strengthening Quality

The mentoring material was organized into three approaches, each delivered by a different speaker. Table 1 summarizes the focus of each approach according to the news report and how it

relates to two priority problems in the proposal: understanding of accreditation performance indicators, and structured quality assurance policies and procedures.

Table 1. Three Approaches to Strengthening Quality in the Mentoring

Speaker	Focus	Main Topics According to the News Report	Priority Problem in the Proposal Addressed
First speaker	Institutional strategy	Alignment of vision and quality policy; division of responsibility among units; indicator-based performance evaluation; leadership that drives continuous improvement.	Quality assurance policies that are not yet structured or systematic.
Second speaker	Study-program quality readiness	Alignment of graduate profile, learning outcomes, curriculum, and evaluation process; data-based self-evaluation with input from lecturers, students, graduates, and graduate users.	Understanding of performance indicators and quality assessment criteria for education, and educator performance.
Third speaker	Preparation of accreditation instruments	Mapping of indicators and supporting evidence; standard operating procedures; digital archive organization; gap analysis; data traceability and consistency among policy, implementation, evaluation, and corrective action.	Procedures that are unclear and undocumented, and skills in preparing quality documents.

The first approach treats accreditation as part of developing educational quality, not as administrative compliance. This position agrees with Dill's (2010) warning that external mechanisms do not automatically produce academic quality, and with the finding of Ehren and Visscher (2006) that the effect of inspection depends on how the institution responds. Aligning vision and quality policy and dividing responsibility among units addresses the problem the proposal records, namely quality policy that is not yet structured. Indicator-based performance evaluation gives a basis for decisions, and stronger leadership is a condition for improvement to continue. The leadership literature supports this emphasis. Hallinger and Heck (1996), Robinson et al. (2008), Day et al. (2016), and Leithwood et al. (2020) show, in school contexts, that leadership affects outcomes through goals, professional learning, organizational conditions, and collective capacity. The presence of IUQI's leaders at the activity matters because they decide whether evidence collection is handed down as administrative work or used as a professional conversation about quality. In Islamic educational institutions, values and the ability to move educators also count (Musthan, 2019), and local socio-cultural relations shape how leadership is exercised (Jawas, 2017). Quality improvement also rests on organizational culture (Sumarni, Nasir, et al., 2021), which does not form through issuing documents alone.

The second approach moves to the study-program level, where evidence of academic performance is produced. Alignment among graduate profile, learning outcomes, curriculum, and evaluation process lets quality claims be traced from goals to results. A self-evaluation that includes the voices of lecturers, students, graduates, and graduate users agrees with the naturalistic principle that the meaning of quality is formed by the parties involved (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), and it gives a firmer basis than internal assessment alone. Rubrics can help align judgments, but only when their users interpret them the same way (Akkoyunlu et al., 2025). Two managers reading the same indicator may choose different evidence because they understand the requested claim differently. Discussion of example evidence and borderline cases therefore belongs in follow-up mentoring. Using data for quality evaluation, including data analytics and intelligent evaluation systems (Sun et al., 2025; Zhang & Cheng, 2025), can be a medium-term direction as long as institutional capacity allows. Educator competence is also part of study-program quality (Sumarni, Akhyar, et al., 2021). The proposal notes that mechanisms for evaluating educator performance are not yet effective at many universities, so this topic deserves a place in study-program self-evaluation.

The third approach is technical. Mapping indicators and supporting evidence, standard operating procedures, digital archives, and gap analysis answer the most concrete complaint in the proposal: quality assurance documents are not yet organized according to international standards, and procedures are poorly documented. The speaker's emphasis on data traceability and on consistency among policy, implementation, evaluation, and corrective action captures the core of evidence-based management. Data become useful only when they are selected, interpreted, discussed, and acted on (Earl & Katz, 2006; Pankowska, 2014). An institution may hold strategic plans, meeting minutes, survey reports, and activity photographs, but having those files does not automatically support an indicator. A digital archive should be simple and maintainable by the institution. A shared folder with naming rules, access rights, and backups is more sustainable than a complicated application that nobody can maintain. Technology helps with storage and retrieval but does not replace professional judgment.

Four Follow-Up Priorities

From the substance of the mentoring, the news report sets out four follow-up priorities. Table 2 lists them together with the proposal problem each one answers and the evidence that could later be used to assess progress. The last column is the authors' proposal for later reporting, not an achievement that has been reported.

Table 2. Four Follow-Up Priorities and Proposed Evidence of Progress

No.	Priority According to the News Report	Proposal Problem Addressed	Evidence of Progress Proposed for Later Reporting
1	Each study program prepares a readiness map against the relevant criteria, with identification of gaps between actual conditions and the evidence required.	Limited understanding of indicators; documents not yet organized according to standards.	A readiness map for each study program and a list of gaps verified by managers.
2	Quality evidence is organized in a matrix covering indicators, data sources, persons responsible, completeness status, and update deadlines.	Unstructured quality assurance system; weak documentation.	A completed evidence matrix, with a responsible person and update deadline for each indicator.
3	Quality assurance procedures ensure that evaluation results are actually followed up.	Unclear and undocumented procedures.	Approved follow-up procedures and follow-up records for evaluation findings.
4	Institutional leaders monitor periodically so that improvement does not stop after the mentoring.	Program sustainability and commitment to quality.	Schedules and reports of periodic monitoring by leaders.

The second priority deserves a closer look because the evidence matrix can serve directly as a working tool. Table 3 describes the five columns of the matrix according to the news report and the function of each. With this matrix, a digital archive changes from a place that stores files into a management tool: every file is tied to one indicator, one responsible person, and one update deadline.

Table 3. Columns of the Quality Evidence Matrix and Their Functions

Matrix Column (According to the News Report)	Question Answered	Function in Accreditation Preparation
Indicator	What quality claim must be shown?	Prevents evidence from being chosen without a clear link to the claim.
Data source	Where does the evidence come from?	Ensures traceability and makes verification easier.
Person responsible	Who provides and checks the evidence?	Reduces dependence on one person.

Matrix Column (According to the News Report)	Question Answered	Function in Accreditation Preparation
Completeness status	How far has the evidence been collected?	Shows the gaps that need to be closed.
Update deadline	When is the evidence updated?	Keeps evidence current and independent of last-minute preparation before assessment.

The matrix can be complemented by a rubric for assessing evidence quality in a later stage. The authors propose five dimensions: relevance to the indicator, authenticity of the evidence as a reflection of real practice, currency, internal consistency among plan, implementation, and evaluation, and use of the evidence for improvement. These five dimensions tie accreditation preparation to the learning cycle and agree with the condition for an effective rubric, namely interpretation that is calibrated together (Akkoyunlu et al., 2025).

Mapping Against the Program Design

Table 4 maps the five program stages in the proposal against how they were carried out according to the poster and the details documented in the news report of 9 November 2026. The poster reports that all stages were carried out.

Table 4. Mapping of the Five Program Stages Against the Poster and the News Report

Stage	Plan in the Proposal	Implementation According to the Poster and the News Report	Status (Poster)
Socialization and coordination	Initial meeting with the partner; explanation of aims, benefits, and activity plan; input from the partner.	The poster lists socialization and coordination. The news report records a meeting between the UNJ team and the IUQI rector and foundation, and an explanation of the aims: quality culture, academic governance, and evaluation documents.	Carried out
Quality assurance training	Material on performance indicators, processes, policies, and procedures; competent speakers; effectiveness evaluation; 120-hour module.	The poster records training carried out offline and online. The news report records three presentations by three speakers and a moderated discussion. Use of the 120-hour module and the results of any understanding assessment are not detailed.	Carried out (offline and online)
Application of quality technology	Identification of relevant technology; training in its use; mentoring on implementation.	The poster lists the application of quality technology. The news report mentions digital archive organization in the technical material. The tools used and the results of their application are not detailed.	Carried out
Mentoring and evaluation	Joint action plan; mentor or facilitator; periodic evaluation; feedback.	The poster records that this stage focused on preparing the accreditation of IUQI's S1-MPI study program. The news report records the four follow-up priorities as material for an action plan. The form of the mentoring and evaluation is not detailed.	Carried out (accreditation preparation of IUQI's S1-MPI study program)
Program sustainability	Working group at each university; collaboration; regular follow-up activities.	The poster records monitoring of the accreditation results of IUQI's S1-MPI study program. The news report names periodic monitoring by leaders as a priority. The formation of a working group and follow-up activities are not detailed.	Carried out (monitoring of accreditation results of IUQI's S1-MPI study program)

Outputs of the Activity

The poster records five outputs and evidence items, shown in Table 5, and marks all of them as achieved. It gives no links, numbers, or registration status beyond what appears in the table, so this article reports them as listed and does not verify them.

Table 5. Outputs and Evidence of the Activity According to the Poster

Output	Venue or Evidence	Status
National journal with ISSN (mandatory)	Bisma: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat (Sinta 6)	Listed
Article in international seminar proceedings	Proceeding of ICOP 2026, Vol. 3, No. 1	Listed
Online mass media article	wartaprima.com	Listed
Community service video	TikTok (Puber.ID)	Listed
Intellectual property rights (HKI)	Not detailed on the poster	Registered

Analysis/Discussion

How the Three Approaches Work Together

The three approaches work as one sequence because they were delivered in a forum that gave room for discussion. According to the news report, the discussion let participants connect international accreditation requirements to concrete needs at the faculty and study-program level. This matters for *sensemaking*. Accreditation indicators are formal cues whose practical meaning is not always clear (Weick, 1995), participants' understanding is shaped by prior knowledge and organizational context (Spillane et al., 2002), and leaders shape collective interpretation through the way they frame problems (Coburn, 2005). One session of presentations and discussion is not enough to produce shared meaning, but it brought together, in one forum, the parts of the institution that must work together. Because implementation is interactive and adaptive (Honig, 2006), and sustained change needs capacity building, shared meaning, and coherence across levels (Fullan, 2016), follow-up has to be designed as a repeated process, not a single event.

Reading the Four Priorities

The news report states that the four priorities are a formulation of directions for improvement drawn from the mentoring material, not a claim that all readiness maps, procedures, or self-evaluation reports were completed on the day of the activity. Finishing the documents and measuring readiness require data verification, assignment of work units, and follow-up evaluation by IUQI's managers. This article follows that limit. Reading the four priorities as finished work would mislead readers and managers, because what is reported so far is agreement on direction. The poster adds that the mentoring and evaluation stage focused on preparing the accreditation of IUQI's S1-MPI study program, so the first three priorities can be read as work continued in that program, although the poster does not detail the documents produced.

What the Stage Mapping and the Outputs Show

The mapping shows how the poster and the news report relate. The poster states that all five stages were carried out and describes the last two in terms of IUQI's S1-MPI study program, which suggests that the mentoring moved from general preparation toward a specific program. The news report documents the first two stages in the most detail and records the others only as directions or priorities. This gap between statement and detail is normal for a publicity poster. It also defines what later reports should supply: the list of documents prepared, mentoring records, and the results of

monitoring. The poster does not give the accreditation outcome or rating of the S1-MPI program, so this article draws no conclusion about assessment results. The same goes for the poster's statement that the mentoring improved the managers' capacity. It is the implementers' judgment. Without pre- and post-training tests, rubric scores, or a later review, it cannot yet tell us how large the change in knowledge or product quality was. For this reason the mentoring needs to continue, with mentors who work with managers on real documents, periodic evaluation, and working groups that take responsibility for sustainability.

Follow-Up Evaluation, Equity, and Limitations

Follow-up reports should separate five levels of evidence. Attendance and task completion show participation. Pre- and post-training tests, which the proposal already plans, show change in knowledge. Rubric scores for the readiness maps and the evidence matrix show product quality. Action plans with responsible persons and deadlines show application at the organizational level. A review about three months later shows whether the routines last. Participant attendance and satisfaction are useful process measures but do not prove that managers can prepare better evidence. The proposal also targets policy documents and reports being accepted in an international accreditation evaluation. That target depends on external judgment, so later reports should keep internal readiness apart from the result of external assessment, as the news report stresses.

Fairness matters within a single institution. Study programs and faculties at IUQI may differ in the number of lecturers, evaluation experience, and digital readiness. Jumanah et al. (2026) warn that accreditation systems can interact with resource gaps, and Mazhabi (2026) shows the need for adaptive leadership when formal expectations meet uncertain local conditions. Mentoring should therefore be differentiated. Study programs with limited resources can start from the most urgent indicators and prepare realistic improvement plans, without being expected to produce the same portfolio in the same time. For UNJ, the activity fits its commitment to quality education and partnerships, as the proposal describes in connection with the *Times Higher Education Impact Rankings*. This article does not claim any effect of the activity on those rankings.

This report has four limitations. First, the data come from a news report and a poster, which were written to publicize the activity and not as evaluation instruments, so the article contains no participant counts, test results, or observations of existing documents, and the statement of improved capacity comes from the poster. Second, the proposal covers pesantren-based higher education institutions in Greater Bogor, while the reported activity centers on IUQI and only the 9 November 2026 session is dated. Third, the poster names AQAS as the reference, while the news report uses a phrase meaning excellent accreditation of international standard, so the article does not assess how well the material fits the AQAS criteria. Fourth, some authors belong to the implementation team and the partner, so an independent assessment of the results needs to be made at the evaluation stage. Later reports can address these limitations through transparent participant data, pre- and post-training test reports, rubric scoring procedures, examples of improved documents, and evidence of follow-up.

Within these limits, the report offers two contributions. The first is a picture of three-layer quality assurance mentoring that brings institutional strategy, study-program quality, and accreditation instruments into one forum for leaders and academic managers of pesantren-based higher education institutions. The second is a status mapping that separates the poster's statements of achievement from the documented implementation detail, so that claims stay in proportion to the data. The main idea is simple: accreditation readiness is made up of several abilities that must work in coordination, namely interpreting standards, mobilizing people, preparing and judging evidence, organizing information, recognizing gaps, and keeping up improvement routines.

D. Conclusion

Quality assurance mentoring for pesantren-based higher education toward internationally standardized accreditation (AQAS) combined three approaches: institutional strategy, study-program quality readiness, and preparation of accreditation instruments. IUQI's leaders and academic managers took part, and the mentoring helped them connect international accreditation requirements to the needs of faculties and study programs.

Four follow-up priorities emerged from the mentoring: a readiness map for each study program, a quality-evidence matrix, procedures that ensure evaluation results are acted on, and periodic monitoring by leaders. They are directions for improvement, not evidence that the documents are finished. The poster reports that all five program stages were carried out, from socialization and coordination to monitoring of the accreditation results of IUQI's S1-MPI study program, and it lists five outputs. The implementers judge that the mentoring improved the quality assurance capacity of IUQI Bogor's managers and prepared strategic steps toward internationally standardized accreditation in a planned, structured, and sustainable way.

Later reports should include participant numbers, pre- and post-training test results, rubric scores for document quality, details of the documents produced in the mentoring and evaluation stage, the completion status of the readiness maps and evidence matrix, and a follow-up review about three months later. External assessment results, if any, should be reported separately. Readiness for internationally standardized accreditation should in the end be shown by teaching quality that can be demonstrated, evaluation that is used to make decisions, and consistent improvement, not by documents gathered shortly before an assessment.

Acknowledgments: The authors thank the Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, for institutional support in preparing and carrying out this community service program, and the leaders and academic community of Institut Ummul Quro Al-Islami Bogor for their welcome and participation.

Conflicts of Interest: Some of the authors took part in implementing the activity, and others are affiliated with the partner institution; this relationship is discussed under the limitations of the study. The authors declare no other conflict of interest.

Author contributions: To be completed by the authors.

Funding: This activity was carried out under the 2026 community service scheme Kemitraan Pemda dan Instansi Pendidikan (PPM-KPIP) of the Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Jakarta. The funding contract number will be added when the funding record is available.

E. References

Akkoyunlu, B., S. Bardakcı, S. A. Yıldırım, M. D. Avşaroğlu, G. Uludağ, A. Koçer, and M. Elmas. "Developing and Validating a Rubric-Based Approach to Quality Assurance in Turkish Higher Education." *Evaluation and Program Planning* 113 (2025): Article 102673. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2025.102673.

Al-Madah, R. "A Systematic Review of Design and Implementation of Quality-Oriented Educational Management Models in Pharmacy Education." *Journal of Advanced Pharmacy Education and Research* 16, no. 2 (2026): 75–84. https://doi.org/10.51847/ZYtmX3vLho.

Coburn, C. E. "Shaping Teacher Sensemaking: School Leaders and the Enactment of Reading Policy." *Educational Policy* 19, no. 3 (2005): 476–509.

Day, C., Q. Gu, and P. Sammons. "The Impact of Leadership on Student Outcomes: How Successful School Leaders Use Transformational and Instructional Strategies to Make a Difference."

Educational Administration Quarterly 52, no. 2 (2016): 221–58. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616863.

Dill, D. D. "We Can't Go Home Again: Insights from a Quarter Century of Experiments in External Academic Quality Assurance." *Quality in Higher Education* 16, no. 2 (2010): 159–61. https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2010.485725.

Earl, L. M., and S. Katz, eds. *Leading Schools in a Data-Rich World: Harnessing Data for School Improvement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, 2006.

Ehren, M. C., and A. J. Visscher. "Towards a Theory on the Impact of School Inspections." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 54, no. 1 (2006): 51–72.

Fullan, M. *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2016.

Hallinger, P., and R. H. Heck. "Reassessing the Principal's Role in School Effectiveness: A Review of Empirical Research, 1980–1995." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 32, no. 1 (1996): 5–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X96032001002.

Honig, M. I., ed. *New Directions in Education Policy Implementation: Confronting Complexity*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006.

Jawas, U. "The Influence of Socio-Cultural Factors on Leadership Practices for Instructional Improvement in Indonesian Schools." *School Leadership & Management* 37, no. 5 (2017): 500–519. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2017.1366440.

Jumanah, J., A. Nugroho, D. T. Ratnasari, and B. D. Suseno. "Bridging the Gap: Enhancing Educational Equity and Accreditation Systems in Urban-Rural Disparities." *Ianna Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 8, no. 1 (2026): 748–64. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17751351.

Kairanbayev, N., and S. A. David. "General Trends on the Impacts of Evidence-Based University Accreditation on Quality Assurance Enhancement." *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education* 14, no. 3 (2025): 1939–48. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v14i3.31271.

Leithwood, K., A. Harris, and D. Hopkins. "Seven Strong Claims about Successful School Leadership Revisited." *School Leadership & Management* 40, no. 1 (2020): 5–22.

Lincoln, Y. S., and E. G. Guba. *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1985.

Mazhabi, Z. "Investigating Leadership Attributes and Strategies during Times of Crisis and Educational Change: A Story of Public Primary School Principals in Lombok, Indonesia." *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 54, no. 4 (2026): 1310–45. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432241300280.

Miles, M. B., A. M. Huberman, and J. Saldaña. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2014.

Musthan, Z. "An Effective Leadership Model for Madrasah Principals in Indonesia." *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* 27, no. 1 (2019): 133–47.

Pankowska, M. "Evidence Based Management for Bologna Process Support." In *Information Systems Development: Transforming Organisations and Society through Information Systems; Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Information Systems Development, ISD 2014*, 123–30. 2014. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-38865-1_54.

Patton, M. Q. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2015.

Prasetia, I., and Akrim. "Transformational Leadership: A Force for School Effectiveness in the Era 'Freedom of Learning.'" *Journal of Logistics, Informatics and Service Science* 11, no. 6 (2024): 332–42. https://doi.org/10.33168/JLISS.2024.0619.

Rais, S., B. Rubini, and Herfina. "Increasing Teacher Creativity through Strengthening Transformational Leadership, Teamwork, and Work Engagement." *Pegem Egitim ve Ogretim Dergisi* 12, no. 1 (2022): 232–41. https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.12.01.24.

Robinson, V. M. J., C. A. Lloyd, and K. J. Rowe. "The Impact of Leadership on Student Outcomes: An Analysis of the Differential Effects of Leadership Types." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 44, no. 5 (2008): 635–74.

Spillane, J. P., B. J. Reiser, and T. Reimer. "Policy Implementation and Cognition: Reframing and Refocusing Implementation Research." *Review of Educational Research* 72, no. 3 (2002): 387–431.

Sumarni, S., M. Akhyar, M. Nizam, and H. Widiyastono. "A Review of the Development, Assessments, Success Driving Factors of Teacher's Research Competencies." In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Learning Innovation and Quality Education*, 1–6. 2021.

Sumarni, S., M. Nasir, A. R. Syam, and E. S. Ampry. "Improving Education Quality Improvement through Organizational Culture." In *Prosiding Seminar Nasional & Internasional*. 2021.

Sun, X., Y. Yang, and Q. Du. "Advancing Total Quality Management in Higher Education through AI and Big Data Analytics." *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence* 36, no. 9–10 (2025): 896–918. https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2025.2495103.

Weick, K. E. *Sensemaking in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1995.

Zhang, C., and P. Cheng. "An Intelligent Evaluation System of Education Quality Based on the Collaboration of Artificial Intelligence and Big Data." In *Proceedings of 2025 4th International Conference on Big Data, Information and Computer Network (BDICN 2025)*, 841–45. 2025. https://doi.org/10.1145/3727353.3727488.