

Designing an Evidence-Based Training and Mentoring Program for Principals' Performance-Based Accreditation Capacity in Klari District Indonesia

Aldo Redho Syam¹, Supadi¹, Winda Dewi Listyasari¹, Cynthia Mayang Sari¹

¹Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This article reports a preliminary needs assessment and evidence-informed design of a community service program to strengthen primary school principals' capacity to prepare performance-based accreditation evidence in Klari District, Karawang Regency, Indonesia. A descriptive needs-assessment approach was employed through a preliminary survey of 56 school principals, partner consultations, problem mapping, and a focused literature synthesis on accreditation, school leadership, evidence use, and policy implementation. Survey data were summarized using frequencies and percentages, while qualitative information was organized into thematic capacity gaps and translated into an intervention matrix. Forty principals (72%) reported difficulties in preparing accreditation instruments, particularly in interpreting teacher-performance indicators, organizing documentary evidence, and aligning school resources with accreditation standards. Based on these findings, a five-stage intervention was designed, comprising socialization, applied training, technology-supported document preparation, mentoring and evaluation, and sustainability through school working groups. The design includes a 120-hour hybrid module, document templates, checklists, action plans, and rubric-based evaluation. These results represent a diagnosis of needs and a proposed intervention design, not evidence of program effectiveness. Future implementation should assess knowledge gains, document quality, action-plan completion, and three-month sustainability.

 OPEN ACCESS

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 03-08-2026

Revised: 22-08-2026

Accepted: 23-08-2026

KEYWORDS

performance-based accreditation, primary school principals, community service program, evidence-based management, school quality

Corresponding Author:

Aldo Redho Syam
Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
Email: aldoredhosyam@unj.ac.id

Introduction

School accreditation is expected to serve two functions at the same time: assuring the public that minimum standards are met and encouraging schools to improve their internal processes. In practice, these functions do not always reinforce each other. External quality assurance can clarify expectations and create accountability, yet it can also become a periodic documentation exercise if schools do not connect evidence collection with instructional decision-making. Dill (2010) emphasizes that decades of external academic quality assurance have produced important lessons about the limits of compliance-oriented mechanisms, while Ehren and Visscher (2006) show that the effects of inspection depend on how evaluation information is interpreted and used by schools. More recent work similarly argues that accreditation contributes to quality enhancement when evidence is integrated into institutional learning rather than treated as an administrative end point (Kairanbayev & David, 2025).

The shift toward performance-based accreditation increases the importance of valid evidence. Schools are no longer strengthened merely by possessing policy documents; they need to demonstrate that planning, teaching, supervision, professional development, and resource management generate observable improvements. A rubric-based quality-assurance approach can make expectations transparent and support more consistent judgments, but the rubric must be accompanied by shared interpretation, examples of acceptable evidence, and feedback that guides improvement (Akkoyunlu et al., 2025). Quality-oriented educational management models also require alignment between leadership, processes, human resources, and evaluation so that quality assurance is embedded in daily work (Al-Madah, 2026). For primary schools, teacher performance is a particularly important domain because the quality of planning, classroom practice, assessment, reflection, and professional development is closely connected to students' learning experiences.

Principals occupy a central position in converting accreditation requirements into school improvement. Research on school effectiveness has long shown that leadership influences organizational conditions that shape teaching and learning (Hallinger & Heck, 1996). The effects are often indirect, operating through goal clarity, teacher development, organizational culture, and the quality of instructional support. Robinson et al. (2008) found that leadership practices closely connected to teaching and teacher learning tend to have stronger effects on student outcomes than more general leadership approaches. Successful leaders also combine transformational and instructional strategies rather than relying on one model alone (Day et al., 2016). The revised claims synthesized by Leithwood et al. (2020) further indicate that leadership is most consequential when it is responsive to context, builds collective capacity, and focuses the organization on learning.

The Indonesian context makes this leadership role especially significant. Principals work within diverse school conditions, uneven access to professional development, and varying levels of administrative and technological capacity. Jawas (2017) demonstrates that leadership practices for instructional improvement in Indonesian schools are shaped by socio-cultural expectations and local relationships. Musthan (2019) similarly highlights the need for an effective principal leadership model that combines managerial competence, values, and the ability to mobilize teachers. In the era of policy change, transformational leadership can strengthen school effectiveness by building commitment and readiness for new practices (Praselia & Akrim, 2024). Leadership is also linked with teamwork, work engagement, and teacher creativity, all of which are relevant when schools must collaboratively prepare evidence and improve instructional performance (Rais et al., 2022). Studies of Indonesian principals during crisis and educational change show that adaptive strategies, communication, and trust remain indispensable when expectations are complex or rapidly changing (Mazhabi, 2025).

Accreditation requirements do not enter schools as self-executing rules. They must be interpreted by principals and teachers, connected to existing routines, and translated into decisions about what should change. This process is well explained by sensemaking theory. Weick (1995) describes sensemaking as the ongoing construction of plausible meaning from ambiguous cues. Spillane et al. (2002) apply this insight to policy implementation, showing that implementers' prior knowledge, beliefs, and organizational contexts influence how policy messages are understood. Coburn (2005) demonstrates that school leaders shape teachers' sensemaking by selecting messages, framing problems, and organizing opportunities for collective interpretation. Consequently, a workshop that merely presents accreditation indicators is unlikely to be sufficient. Principals need guided opportunities to interpret standards, examine concrete evidence, discuss borderline cases, and practice making judgments.

Implementation also requires structures that connect new knowledge with organizational routines. Honig (2006) argues that education policy implementation involves complexity, interaction, and adaptation rather than linear transmission. Fullan (2016) likewise stresses that sustainable educational change depends on capacity building, shared meaning, and coherence across multiple levels. In accreditation preparation, this means that a principal's individual understanding must be converted into team-based work: teachers need to know what evidence reflects authentic performance, administrative staff need consistent filing procedures, and school improvement plans need to incorporate findings from evidence reviews. Without this conversion, training may improve short-term knowledge but fail to alter school practice.

Evidence-based management provides a useful organizing principle for this conversion. Data-rich schools do not simply collect more information; they develop routines for selecting, interpreting, discussing, and acting on evidence (Earl & Katz, 2006).

Pankowska (2014) similarly links evidence-based management with quality processes by emphasizing decisions grounded in systematically organized information. For accreditation, evidence-based practice involves at least four capabilities: identifying the claim represented by an indicator, selecting relevant and credible evidence, judging the quality and consistency of that evidence, and using the judgment to plan improvement. A document repository is therefore valuable only when it reflects these capabilities. Technology can support storage, retrieval, version control, and collaborative review, but it cannot replace professional judgment.

Equity is another consideration. Accreditation systems may unintentionally widen disparities when schools with stronger administrative resources can present evidence more effectively than schools with limited staff, infrastructure, or training access. Jumanah et al. (2026) draw attention to urban-rural disparities and the need to align accreditation enhancement with educational equity. Capacity-strengthening programs should therefore avoid assuming that all schools begin from the same position. They need differentiated support, accessible templates, realistic evidence standards, and mentoring that helps principals prioritize improvement despite resource constraints.

The proposed community service setting is Klari District, Karawang Regency, West Java. The partner profile identifies 56 public and private primary schools and an equivalent number of principals. A preliminary survey documented in the program proposal found that 40 of 56 principals, or 72%, experienced difficulty preparing performance-based accreditation instruments. The reported difficulties concerned understanding and implementing teacher-performance indicators, organizing documents systematically, and responding to limitations in human resources, facilities, and access to relevant training. These findings suggest that the central problem is not the absence of motivation alone; it is a combination of interpretive, technical, organizational, and resource-related capacity gaps.

Existing studies provide strong explanations of leadership, quality assurance, evidence use, and policy implementation, but they do not by themselves specify how these perspectives can be combined in a practical community service model for Indonesian primary school principals preparing performance-based accreditation evidence. This article addresses that applied gap. It reports the preliminary needs assessment and translates the findings into a five-stage program design that integrates socialization, applied training, technology-supported document preparation, mentoring and evaluation, and sustainability mechanisms. The article asks two questions: What capacity gaps are evident among primary school principals in the partner area, and how can an evidence-based training and mentoring model be designed to address those gaps without reducing accreditation to document compliance?

Methods

This article uses a descriptive, design-oriented community service approach. Its immediate object is not the measurement of post-intervention impact, because the uploaded source is a program proposal rather than a completed activity report. Instead, the analysis focuses on two linked products: a structured diagnosis of partner needs and an evidence-based intervention design. This distinction is important for maintaining factual accuracy. Findings reported in the Result section refer to baseline information and design outputs, not to learning gains or school improvements that have already occurred.

The setting is Klari District in Karawang Regency, West Java, Indonesia. The target group consists of 56 principals representing 56 public and private primary schools. The program partner is Yayasan Ma'had Al Istiqlal Karawang. The preliminary survey documented in the proposal asked principals about difficulties in preparing accreditation instruments based on teacher performance. The available source reports the aggregate result, with 40 of 56 principals indicating difficulty, but does not provide individual level responses or a validated multi-item scale. Therefore, the quantitative analysis is limited to frequency and percentage and does not include inferential statistics.

Four sources of information were used in the design process. First, the preliminary survey provided an initial estimate of the prevalence of the stated problem. Second, the proposal's situation analysis described recurring constraints involving interpretation of indicators, document management, professional development, facilities, and technology. Third, the proposed participation of the partner informed the intended fit between the program and local organizational conditions. Fourth, the 25 references selected for this article were synthesized to connect the local diagnosis with scholarship on accreditation, school leadership, sensemaking, evidence-based management, educational change, and qualitative program design.

The qualitative synthesis followed a pragmatic thematic procedure informed by Miles et al. (2014). Statements in the proposal were condensed into problem units, compared for overlap, and grouped into broader capacity domains. The domains were then displayed in a problem-consequence-response matrix. The interpretation was guided by naturalistic principles that emphasize context and the meaning assigned by participants rather than assuming that a standard operates identically in every setting (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Patton's (2015) utilization-focused orientation was also relevant: the value of the analysis lies in whether it helps principals, partners, and facilitators make concrete decisions about training content, mentoring, and evaluation.

The intervention design was developed through alignment. Each capacity gap was linked to a learning objective, a practical activity, a tangible output, and an indicator of achievement. For example, difficulty interpreting teacher-performance indicators was linked to indicator-mapping exercises and calibration discussions; weak document

organization was linked to evidence matrices, naming conventions, checklists, and a digital repository structure; and limited follow-through was linked to school action plans and mentoring checkpoints. This alignment reduces the risk that training activities become disconnected from the actual accreditation tasks principals must perform.

The program has five stages. Socialization establishes shared goals, clarifies the difference between authentic performance evidence and administrative accumulation, and confirms participant needs. Applied training develops principals' understanding of teacher-performance indicators through explanations, cases, guided analysis, and hands-on document work. Technology-supported applications introduce practical tools for preparing, storing, and reviewing evidence. Mentoring and evaluation support each school in producing an action plan and improving sample evidence portfolio. Sustainability is addressed through school working groups, peer review, periodic workshops, and collaboration with relevant stakeholders.

The proposal specifies two principal learning resources. The first is a 120-hour hybrid module delivered through face-to-face and online activities. It covers contemporary teaching practices, classroom management, teacher-performance indicators, and preparation of accreditation evidence. The second is a digital guide containing adaptable templates and a completeness checklist in presentation and portable document formats. For the article design, these resources are treated not as complete outcomes but as specifications to be produced and tested during implementation.

The evaluation plan uses multiple forms of evidence because knowledge gain alone is insufficient. At the participant level, a pretest and posttest should examine understanding of indicators and evidence quality. At the product level, a rubric should assess whether sample documents are relevant, authentic, current, internally consistent, and connected to improvement actions. At the school level, an action-plan review should examine responsibilities, timelines, and feasible follow-up. A three-month check should determine whether working groups remain active and whether evidence-management routines are used. These measures reflect the principle that accreditation capacity includes interpretation, production, organization, and use of evidence.

To protect participants, reporting should remain aggregate unless explicit consent is obtained for school-level examples. No principal or school is identified in the present analysis. During implementation, facilitators should explain the purpose of data collection, voluntary participation in evaluation, and the use of photographs or documents for publication. The partner should also review the accuracy of contextual descriptions before submission of the final implementation article.

Result and Discussion

The baseline diagnosis shows a substantial capacity need. Of the 56 principals in the partner area, 40 reported difficulty preparing performance-based accreditation instruments. The resulting proportion, 72%, indicates that the problem is not confined to a small number of schools. The proposal associates this difficulty with three immediate areas: limited understanding of teacher-performance indicators, weak organization of supporting documents, and restricted access to training and resources. Because the survey result is aggregate, it cannot show whether all principals experienced the same combination or severity of problems. Nevertheless, it provides a defensible basis for a district-level capacity-strengthening program rather than isolated technical assistance.

The problem analysis produced five related capacity domains. The first is interpretive capacity: principals need to understand what an indicator is intended to demonstrate and how it connects with teacher practice. The second is evidentiary capacity: schools need to distinguish strong evidence from documents that are merely available. The third is organizational capacity: evidence must be stored, updated, and reviewed through clear responsibilities and routines. The fourth is improvement capacity: accreditation findings need to inform supervision, professional development, and school planning. The fifth is contextual capacity: principals must prioritize feasible actions in schools with different human-resource and facility conditions. Table 1 summarizes the relationship between baseline evidence and program priorities.

Table 1. Baseline capacity gaps and training priorities

Capacity domain	Baseline evidence	Accreditation consequence	Priority response
Interpretation of standards	Principals reported difficulty understanding and implementing teacher-performance indicators.	Evidence may be selected without demonstrating the intended performance claim.	Indicator mapping, case analysis, and calibration of judgments.
Evidence quality	Teacher performance was described as insufficiently measured and documented.	Schools may submit incomplete, irrelevant, outdated, or inconsistent evidence.	Evidence criteria, sample analysis, rubric use, and portfolio review.
Document management	Documents were not consistently organized in a systematic structure.	Preparation becomes time-consuming and dependent on individuals.	File architecture, naming rules, checklists, version control, and responsibility mapping.

Capacity domain	Baseline evidence	Accreditation consequence	Priority response
Instructional improvement	Professional development and principal guidance were not fully integrated with accreditation preparation.	Accreditation can remain administrative rather than improving teaching.	Link evidence reviews with supervision, teacher development, and school action plans.
Resources and facilities	Some schools face limited staff, facilities, and access to relevant training.	Schools may struggle to meet or demonstrate standards equitably.	Gap mapping, prioritization, realistic improvement plans, and differentiated mentoring.

The second result is the architecture of the intervention. The five stages are sequential but not strictly linear. Socialization establishes a common language and confirms needs. Training develops conceptual and practical competence. Technology-supported application enables participants to transform understanding into organized evidence. Mentoring provides feedback while schools develop portfolios and action plans. Sustainability mechanisms maintain routines after the facilitated period. Information from mentoring can also lead to revisions in training materials, making the model iterative.

The design deliberately combines individual and organizational learning. Principals attend the training as primary participants, but the required outputs are school based. Each principal is expected to identify a small team, map evidence responsibilities, review a sample of teacher-performance documentation, and prepare a time-bound action plan. This arrangement recognizes that one person cannot sustainably collect, verify, and use all accreditation evidence. It also positions the principal as a coordinator of collective work rather than a solitary document producer.

The proposed 120-hour module provides sufficient space for more than lectures. The module can be organized into guided study, synchronous workshops, hands-on practice, school assignments, mentoring, and reflection. Its content should be structured around tasks that principals actually perform interpreting an indicator, identifying the performance claim, locating evidence sources, checking credibility, documenting gaps, and deciding an improvement action. The digital guide and checklist support consistency, but the training emphasizes that a checklist is a control aid, not a substitute for judgment.

Table 2 presents the alignment between program stages, principal activities, tangible outputs, and indicators. These indicators are framed as implementation targets rather than reported achievements. They are included to make the future activity evaluable and to prevent vague claims of capacity improvement.

Table 2. Five-stage intervention design and intended outputs

Stage	Core activities	Tangible output	Implementation indicator
Socialization and confirmation	Partner meeting, explanation of objectives, validation of needs, and participant orientation.	Confirmed participant list and refined needs map.	Representatives understand the program scope and agree on priority problems.
Applied training	Indicator interpretation, case discussion, evidence analysis, and hands-on preparation.	Completed practice worksheets and draft evidence matrix.	Participants can explain indicator intent and select defensible evidence.
Technology-supported application	Digital folder design, document naming, checklist use, and collaborative review.	School-specific repository structure and document checklist.	Documents can be retrieved, verified, updated, and traced to responsible persons.
Mentoring and evaluation	Portfolio review, feedback clinic, action-plan development, pre/post assessment, and rubric scoring.	Improved sample portfolio and school action plan.	Knowledge and product quality improve against explicit criteria.
Sustainability	Working-group formation, peer review, periodic consultation, and stakeholder collaboration.	School working group and follow-up schedule.	Routines continue and progress is reviewed approximately three months later.

The third result is an evaluation framework that separates participation, learning, product quality, organizational application, and sustainability. Attendance and satisfaction are useful process measures, but they cannot demonstrate that principals can prepare stronger accreditation evidence. The program therefore needs a layered evaluation. Knowledge assessment addresses conceptual understanding. Product assessment examines the quality of an evidence portfolio. Organizational assessment examines whether tasks and routines have been distributed within the school. Follow-up assessment examines whether changes remain in use.

The proposed rubric for document quality should evaluate at least five dimensions. Relevance asks whether the document directly supports the indicator. Authenticity asks whether it reflects actual school practice rather than being created solely for submission. Currency asks whether the evidence is sufficiently recent for the claim. Internal consistency asks whether plans, implementation records, observations, and follow-up tell a coherent story. Improvement asks whether the school has analyzed the evidence and identified a response. These criteria align accreditation preparation with a learning cycle.

Table 3 provides the minimum measurement set recommended for the implementation report. Actual values must be collected during and after the activity. The table is intentionally explicit because the final manuscript should replace proposed indicators with observed data, including sample size, means or proportions, scoring procedures, and follow-up findings.

Table 3. Minimum evaluation framework for program implementation

Evaluation level	Measure	Suggested indicator	Timing
Participation	Attendance and completion of practice tasks	Number and proportion of registered principals completing core sessions and assignments	During training
Knowledge	Pretest and posttest on indicators and evidence criteria	Change in mean score and proportion reaching the competency threshold	Before and after training
Product quality	Rubric score for sample evidence portfolio	Change in relevance, authenticity, currency, consistency, and improvement-use scores	During mentoring and at completion
Organizational application	School action plan and responsibility map	Proportion of schools with named responsibilities, timelines, and feasible priorities	End of mentoring
Sustainability	Working-group activity and document routine	Proportion of schools reporting continued review and updated evidence	Approximately three months after completion

Taken together, the results show that the proposal can support a coherent community service model, but only the baseline need and intervention design are currently evidenced. Claims about effectiveness, improved competence, or completed accreditation documents must await implementation data. This boundary is essential for a credible final article.

The finding that 72% of principals reported difficulty preparing performance-based accreditation instruments reveals a gap between policy expectations and implementation capacity. The number should not be interpreted as a psychometric measure of competence because the source provides only a preliminary aggregate survey. Even so, it indicates that accreditation preparation is experienced as a shared organizational challenge. This supports the choice of a district-level program that builds a common understanding while allowing school-specific mentoring.

The first implication concerns the meaning of quality assurance. External accreditation can stimulate improvement when it generates credible feedback and

internal reflection, but it becomes less useful when schools focus on displaying documents rather than improving underlying practice. Dill (2010) cautions against assuming that external mechanisms automatically produce academic quality. Ehren and Visscher (2006) likewise show that the impact of inspection depends on school responses. The proposed model addresses this risk by requiring principals to connect every document to a performance claim and an improvement decision. In this approach, the evidence portfolio is not the final product; it is a structured representation of what the school does, how it knows, and what it will improve.

A rubric-based approach is particularly relevant. Akkoyunlu et al. (2025) show that rubrics can strengthen quality assurance by clarifying criteria and supporting consistent evaluation. For the Karawang program, a rubric can help principals distinguish a complete file from high-quality evidence. However, a rubric is effective only when users have calibrated interpretations. Two principals may read the same indicator but select different evidence because they understand the expected claim differently. Training should therefore include comparison of sample portfolios, discussion of why certain evidence is stronger, and guided revision. This moves participants from receiving information to exercising professional judgment.

The design also reflects the systemic orientation identified by Al-Madah (2026). Quality-oriented educational management cannot be reduced to one workshop or one administrative unit. Leadership, teacher development, resource management, information systems, and evaluation need to be aligned. The five-stage model responds to this requirement by combining learning resources, digital tools, mentoring, school action plans, and sustainability mechanisms. The model is strongest when each stage produces information for the next stage and when the final action plan reconnects accreditation with teaching and learning.

Leadership scholarship explains why principals are the appropriate primary participants. Hallinger and Heck (1996), Robinson et al. (2008), Day et al. (2016), and Leithwood et al. (2020) converge on the importance of leadership that influences teaching through goals, professional learning, organizational conditions, and collective capacity. Accreditation preparation intersects with all these functions. A principal determines whether evidence collection is delegated as clerical work or used as a professional conversation about teacher performance. The principal also decides whether gaps lead to blame, superficial document creation, or targeted support for teachers. Capacity strengthening should therefore develop instructional and organizational leadership, not merely technical familiarity with forms.

The Indonesian studies reinforce the need for contextualized implementation. Jawas (2017) shows that leadership practices are embedded in socio-cultural relationships; Musthan (2019) emphasizes values and managerial competence; Praselia

and Akrim (2024) connect transformational leadership with school effectiveness; and Rais et al. (2022) demonstrate the relevance of teamwork and work engagement. These findings imply that principals need strategies for engaging teachers, distributing responsibility, and framing accreditation as collective improvement. A rigid, one-directional training model would overlook the relational work needed to change routines. The involvement of school teams and peer review is therefore not an optional addition but a mechanism for implementation.

Mazhabi's (2025) account of principals in Lombok during crisis and educational change adds a further insight: adaptive leadership becomes important when formal expectations meet uncertain local conditions. Schools in Klari are likely to vary in staffing, facilities, digital readiness, and prior accreditation experience. Differentiated mentoring should allow principals to prioritize gaps and sequence actions rather than expecting identical portfolios within the same timeframe. This is also an equity concern. Jumanah et al. (2026) warn that accreditation systems can interact with urban-rural disparities. Support should help resource-constrained schools demonstrate authentic progress and plan feasible improvement, not reward only those with greater administrative capacity.

Sensemaking theory clarifies the mechanism through which the training can influence practice. Weick (1995) suggests that actors construct meaning from cues under conditions of ambiguity. Accreditation indicators are such cues: they are formal statements, but their practical meaning is not always obvious. Spillane et al. (2002) show that implementation depends on cognition and prior knowledge, while Coburn (2005) demonstrates how leaders shape collective interpretation. The proposed case discussions, evidence calibration, and mentoring clinics create social settings where principals can test interpretations. This is more likely to produce shared understanding than a presentation that simply reads the standards.

The role of the facilitator also follows from this perspective. Facilitators should not position themselves solely as experts who provide correct answers. They need to surface participants' assumptions, ask why a document is considered evidence, and guide principals to examine contradictions between plans and practice. Honig (2006) describes implementation as an interactive process, and Fullan (2016) emphasizes shared meaning and capacity building. Accordingly, the workshop should be designed as a sequence of supported problem-solving activities. Participants bring school cases; facilitators help them frame the issue, identify evidence, evaluate its quality, and define an action.

Evidence-based management adds discipline to this process. Earl and Katz (2006) distinguish productive data use from mere data availability. In accreditation preparation, schools may possess lesson plans, attendance sheets, supervision forms, photographs, and meeting minutes, but the existence of these files does not automatically support an indicator. Pankowska (2014) emphasizes evidence-based management as a basis for

decision support. The program's evidence matrix should therefore include the indicator, the claim, the evidence source, the responsible person, the date, a quality judgment, the identified gap, and the improvement response. Such a matrix turns a repository into a management tool.

Technology is useful within this logic but should remain proportionate to school capacity. A simple shared folder with consistent naming, access rules, and backup procedures may be more sustainable than a complex application that schools cannot maintain. The proposal's digital guide and checklist can reduce variation and facilitate retrieval. During training, participants should practice using actual or anonymized school documents so that the technology component remains connected to accreditation reasoning. Technology training that is detached from evidence criteria would address file handling without addressing quality assurance.

The evaluation framework responds to a common weakness in community service reporting: reliance on attendance, satisfaction, and participant testimonials as evidence of success. These data describe participation and reaction, but they do not establish competence. A pretest-posttest comparison can demonstrate knowledge change, while a rubric can demonstrate improvement in products. Action plans provide evidence of organizational translation, and follow-up provides evidence of continued use. This layered approach is consistent with the literature's emphasis on institutional learning and allows the final article to make claims that are proportional to the data.

Sustainability deserves special attention because accreditation preparation can become episodic. Fullan (2016) explains that change is sustained when new practices are integrated into routines and supported by relationships. The proposed school working groups provide a structure for distributing tasks, updating evidence, and reviewing progress. Peer review across schools can also reduce isolation and create local examples. However, sustainability will depend on realistic workload, principal commitment, and continued access to consultation. A three-month follow-up is a minimum; longer observation would provide stronger evidence of routine change.

The proposed design has limitations. First, it is based on a proposal and a preliminary aggregate survey, so it cannot establish causal impact or represent variation among individual schools. Second, the source does not provide item-level survey data, instrument reliability, or direct observations of existing portfolios. Third, the literature synthesis supports the logic of the model but does not validate its effectiveness in Klari. Fourth, the 120-hour specification requires careful scheduling and documentation to ensure that nominal hours correspond to meaningful learning activities. These limitations should be addressed during implementation through transparent participant data, pretest and posttest reporting, rubric procedures, examples of revised products, and follow-up evidence.

Despite these limitations, the design contributes a practical integration of quality assurance, leadership, sensemaking, evidence use, and change management. Its central proposition is that principals' accreditation capacity is not a single skill. It is a coordinated capability to interpret standards, mobilize people, produce and judge evidence, organize information, identify gaps, and sustain improvement routines. A community service program that measures and mentors these capabilities is more likely to support school quality than one focused exclusively on completing forms.

Conclusion

The preliminary needs assessment in Klari District indicates a broad need for capacity strengthening: 40 of 56 primary school principals (72%) reported difficulty preparing performance-based accreditation instruments. The documented problems involve interpreting teacher-performance indicators, selecting and organizing evidence, connecting documentation with professional development, and responding to differences in resources and facilities. These are interdependent leadership and organizational problems rather than a single administrative deficiency.

The resulting evidence-based program design consists of five connected stages: socialization, applied training, technology-supported application, mentoring and evaluation, and sustainability. Its principal products are a 120-hour hybrid module, evidence templates and checklists, a school repository structure, a sample portfolio, an action plan, and a working-group mechanism. The program's distinctive feature is the alignment of each activity with an observable capability and product.

The final implementation article should report actual participant numbers, pretest and posttest results, rubric scores for accreditation evidence, action-plan completion, and approximately three-month follow-up. Until those data are collected, conclusions should remain limited to baseline need and program design. By preserving this distinction, the program can contribute credible evidence about how principal training and mentoring support accreditation as a process of instructional and organizational improvement rather than administrative compliance.

Acknowledgment

The authors acknowledge the Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, and Yayasan Ma'had Al-Istiqlal Karawang for their institutional support in preparing the community service program and facilitating coordination with the intended partner schools. The funding statement and contract number should be added to the final manuscript after the formal award and implementation records are available.

References

Akkoyunlu, B., Bardakcı, S., Yıldırım, S. A., Avşaroğlu, M. D., Uludağ, G., Koçer, A., & Elmas, M. (2025). Developing and validating a rubric-based approach to quality assurance in

- Turkish higher education. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 113, Article 102673. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2025.102673>
- Al-Madah, R. (2026). A systematic review of design and implementation of quality-oriented educational management models in pharmacy education. *Journal of Advanced Pharmacy Education and Research*, 16(2), 75–84. <https://doi.org/10.51847/ZYtmX3vLho>
- Coburn, C. E. (2005). Shaping teacher sensemaking: School leaders and the enactment of reading policy. *Educational Policy*, 19(3), 476–509.
- Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(2), 221–258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616863>
- Dill, D. D. (2010). We can't go home again: Insights from a quarter century of experiments in external academic quality assurance. *Quality in Higher Education*, 16(2), 159–161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2010.485725>
- Earl, L. M., & Katz, S. (Eds.). (2006). *Leading schools in a data-rich world: Harnessing data for school improvement*. Corwin Press.
- Ehren, M. C., & Visscher, A. J. (2006). Towards a theory on the impact of school inspections. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 54(1), 51–72.
- Fullan, M. (2016). *The new meaning of educational change*. Teachers College Press.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980–1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), 5–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X96032001002>
- Honig, M. I. (Ed.). (2006). *New directions in education policy implementation: Confronting complexity*. State University of New York Press.
- Jawas, U. (2017). The influence of socio-cultural factors on leadership practices for instructional improvement in Indonesian schools. *School Leadership & Management*, 37(5), 500–519. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2017.1366440>
- Jumanah, J., Nugroho, A., Ratnasari, D. T., & Suseno, B. D. (2026). Bridging the gap: Enhancing educational equity and accreditation systems in urban-rural disparities. *Ianna Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 8(1), 748–764. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17751351>
- Kairanbayev, N., & David, S. A. (2025). General trends on the impacts of evidence-based university accreditation on quality assurance enhancement. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 14(3), 1939–1948.

<https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v14i3.31271>

- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.
- Mazhabi, Z. (2026). 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(4), 1310-1345. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432241300280>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (3rd ed.)*. Sage.
- Musthan, Z. (2019). An effective leadership model for madrasah principals in Indonesia. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 27(1), 133–147.
- Pankowska, M. (2014). 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* (pp. 123–130). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-38865-1_54
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods (4th ed.)*. Sage.
- Prasetia, I., & Akrim. (2024). Transformational leadership: A force for school effectiveness in the era "Freedom of Learning." *Journal of Logistics, Informatics and Service Science*, 11(6), 332–342. <https://doi.org/10.33168/JLISS.2024.0619>
- Rais, S., Rubini, B., & Herfina. (2022). Increasing teacher creativity through strengthening transformational leadership, teamwork, and work engagement. *Pegem Egitim ve Ogretim Dergisi*, 12(1), 232–241. <https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.12.01.24>
- Robinson, V. M., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674.
- Spillane, J. P., Reiser, B. J., & Reimer, T. (2002). Policy implementation and cognition: Reframing and refocusing implementation research. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(3), 387–431.
- Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Sage.