

Teacher Performance Management for Enhancing Learning Quality in Primary Schools

B Burhanudin and Iim Wasliman

Nusantara Islamic University, Bandung, Indonesia

Corresponding Email: burhanudin@uninus.ac.id

Abstract. The improvement of learning quality in primary schools is often constrained by the lack of an integrated and sustainable teacher performance management system. This study aims to analyze the implementation of teacher performance management in realizing learning quality through four main management functions: planning, organizing, implementation, and evaluation–monitoring. This research employed a qualitative approach with a case study design conducted at SDN 1 Situsari and SDN 2 Situsari. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, participatory observation, and document analysis, then analyzed using the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña. The findings indicate that both schools have implemented teacher performance management systematically, collaboratively, and with a strong orientation toward learning quality. Planning was conducted participatively and based on teacher needs; organizing emphasized clear roles and cross-functional coordination; implementation was carried out through lesson study, peer mentoring, and micro-coaching; while evaluation was conducted formatively and continuously through structured reflection and teacher portfolios. The success of these processes was supported by distributed instructional leadership and a collaborative professional learning culture (KKG/PLC). The implications of this study suggest that effective teacher performance improvement is influenced by the synergy between school management, instructional leadership, and teachers' reflective culture. A participatory, data-driven, and collaborative management model can serve as a framework for developing sustainable teacher professional development policies to enhance learning quality in primary education.

Keywords: Instructional Leadership, Learning Quality, Professional Learning Community, Primary Education, Teacher Performance Management

1 Introduction

Entering the 21st century, primary education institutions are required not only to achieve literacy and numeracy benchmarks but also to ensure learning experiences that are active, relevant, and adaptive[1], [2]. The quality of such learning is largely determined by teachers' performance in designing, implementing, and evaluating instruction. Therefore, schools need to establish a well-planned, measurable, and sustainable management system for improving teacher performance to ensure that

learning quality grows from classroom practice rather than administrative compliance[3]–[5].

At the school level, the management of teacher performance improvement should ideally integrate various instruments academic supervision, performance appraisal, coaching and mentoring, teacher working groups or professional learning communities (KKG/PLC), and data-based follow-up into a unified managerial cycle. The classical management functions (planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling or POAC) provide an operational framework to ensure that performance improvement interventions are directed toward clearly defined indicators of learning quality (Terry/POAC). This framework is highly relevant to the article “Management of Teacher Performance Improvement in Realizing Learning Quality”, which positions teacher performance as the central driver of educational quality[6], [7].

However, in practice, there remains a gap between quality targets and classroom realities. At SDN 1 Situsari and SDN 2 Situsari, the quality of teaching and learning during the first semester of the 2023/2024 academic year was reported to be suboptimal, correlating with issues in teacher performance. Preliminary observations conducted by the researcher on January 20, 2025, at SDN 1 Situsari confirmed the need for a more systematic and consistent management approach to improving teacher performance.

Previous studies have shown that interventions such as collaborative supervision, coaching models (e.g., the GROW model), KKG/PLC activities, and needs-based training contribute positively to teacher competence. However, most research has focused on single methods, while the management of teacher performance improvement as an integrated system from needs mapping, multi-approach intervention design, resource orchestration, and reflective feedback to measurable evaluation and follow-up has not been comprehensively discussed within the Indonesian primary school context[8]–[10].

Addressing this gap, the present study focuses on the management of teacher performance improvement as a strategic mechanism for realizing learning quality at SDN 1 Situsari and SDN 2 Situsari. Specifically, the research aims to (1) describe the current condition of teacher performance and learning quality, (2) analyze the practice of performance management through the POAC framework, and (3) explain how the interconnected stages of planning, organizing, implementation, and controlling carried out by the schools contribute to instructional improvement. Preliminary findings indicate that all four management functions are present, though their implementation remains inconsistent requiring reinforcement in data-based planning, role distribution, classroom intervention execution, and controlling linked directly to learning quality indicators[11], [12].

Thus, this article offers both conceptual and practical contributions: (1) aligning teacher performance improvement interventions within an operational management system; (2) linking the POAC framework with documented practices of coaching, KKG/PLC, supervision, and performance evaluation; and (3) orienting all processes toward measurable classroom learning outcomes rather than administrative compliance. This focus aligns with the objectives of Burhanudin’s research, which seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding and practical solutions for managing

teacher performance improvement in order to enhance learning quality across the two studied primary schools.

2 Method

This study employed a qualitative approach with a case study design. The qualitative approach enabled the researcher to understand and explain phenomena in depth within their natural and social contexts while uncovering the subjective meanings of participants' experiences in the school setting [13]–[15]. The case study design was chosen because it allows a comprehensive understanding of a system or phenomenon in real-life settings, particularly when the boundaries between the phenomenon and its context are not clearly defined.

The study was conducted at two public elementary schools SDN 1 Situsari and SDN 2 Situsari selected purposively for their relevance to the research objectives concerning the management of teacher performance improvement in realizing learning quality. The participants included principals, classroom teachers, and, when relevant, KKG/PLC coordinators actively involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of teacher performance improvement programs.

Data were collected through method triangulation involving in-depth interviews, participatory observations, and document studies. The interviews were designed to obtain rich narratives regarding participants' experiences in planning, organizing, implementing interventions (e.g., coaching/mentoring, KKG/PLC, lesson study), and conducting monitoring and follow-up. Participatory observations were used to directly observe classroom practices and feedback or mentoring sessions. The document study involved the analysis of teacher performance improvement program plans, KKG/PLC agendas, monitoring instruments (observation rubrics, feedback sheets), follow-up reports, and performance evidence (lesson plans, assessment tools, and instructional artifacts) [16], [17].

In qualitative research, the researcher serves as the primary instrument (human instrument) because the researcher's interaction with participants and field contexts is an integral part of the inquiry process [18]–[20]. Supporting instruments such as interview guides, observation sheets, document audit checklists, and field note formats were prepared to ensure clarity and systematic data collection procedures.

The validity of the data was tested using the four trustworthiness criteria proposed by Lincoln and Guba [18], [21]: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Credibility was established through method and source triangulation, member checking of preliminary findings, and limited peer debriefing. Transferability was ensured by providing thick descriptions of the school context, teacher performance improvement programs, and classroom conditions. Dependability and confirmability were strengthened through an audit trail documenting the analytical and methodological decision-making process [22].

Data analysis followed the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña [23], consisting of three stages: **Data reduction** – the selection, coding, grouping, and transformation of raw data into categories or themes representing the management

cycle of teacher performance improvement (planning, organizing, implementation, supervision/evaluation); **Data display** – the presentation of data in structured narratives, comparative matrices between schools or participants, and schematic diagrams illustrating the flow of “performance improvement interventions → learning quality”; and **Conclusion drawing/verification** – iterative analysis to ensure the accuracy and consistency of the findings.

The analysis was conducted concurrently with data collection to allow the researcher to respond adaptively to field dynamics. The study was carried out from February to June 2025, covering preparation (permissions, instrument design), field data collection (interviews, observations, document reviews), and data analysis and reporting. Through this approach, the research aims to provide a substantive contribution to developing contextually grounded and evidence-based management strategies for improving teacher performance in order to enhance learning quality in primary schools.

3 Results

3.1 Planning for Teacher Performance Improvement

Based on findings at SDN 1 Situsari and SDN 2 Situsari, the schools have designed an annual, systematic program to improve teacher performance. The program includes a calendar of activities, measurable success indicators, and monitoring/observation instruments aligned with teachers’ pedagogical competencies particularly lesson planning, classroom management, and assessment of student learning [24]. The indicators are directly linked to instructional quality as the ultimate goal.

Planning activities are carried out participatorily through focused discussion forums involving the vice principal, KKG coordinator, senior teachers, and representatives of classroom teachers. This mechanism is intended to align program priorities with real needs in classrooms while ensuring that selected interventions such as lesson study, peer coaching, and coaching/mentoring are relevant to each teacher’s context.

“We are not merely given targets by leadership. The improvement focus is determined jointly based on our classroom data, and then the schedule and follow-up are arranged so they are realistic and consistent,” (Grade 5 Teacher, interview, 20 March 2025). This quotation illustrates teacher involvement at the planning stage and the strengthening of shared decision making at the school level.

Documentation of the 2024–2025 program obtained by the researcher shows a semester-based activity matrix, observation rubrics aligned with pedagogical competency indicators, planning meeting minutes, and follow-up sheets integrated with KKG agendas. This approach aligns with the principle of distributed instructional leadership, which emphasizes cross-role collaboration to strengthen instructional management[25].

The findings indicate that planning for teacher performance improvement in both schools is systematic and structured. Clear schedules, success indicators, and competency-based observation instruments demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of planning as an instrument for improving instructional quality. These

results support the view of Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon that systematic planning plays a crucial role in sustaining teachers' professional development (Glickman et al., 2001).

Teacher participation in the planning process is an important indicator of the collaborative approach cultivated by the schools. This strategy enhances teachers' sense of ownership and commitment to program implementation while narrowing the gap between policy and classroom practice. Active participation in discussion forums reflects the principles of a professional learning community (DuFour & Eaker, 2009; Hord, 2004) and is consistent with the idea of distributed leadership (Hallinger & Heck, 2010).

The use of standardized observation and monitoring instruments classroom rubrics, feedback templates, and follow-up sheets demonstrates a clear quality orientation. These instruments help make monitoring more objective and focused on core aspects of teaching practice (planning, classroom management, assessment). The literature affirms that instruments aligned with teachers' professional competency frameworks can accelerate improvements in instructional effectiveness and student outcomes (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).

Planning in both schools also links teacher performance indicators to specific time-bound milestones and uses baseline data (observation results, lesson plan reviews, literacy-numeracy attainment) to anchor targets. Consequently, the planning cycle needs mapping, focus setting, intervention design, and follow-up plans remains consistent and can be evaluated periodically.

A participatory and well-documented planning approach fosters a school climate open to continuous improvement. This is crucial for building a collaborative culture which, according to research, is positively correlated with gains in student learning (Louis et al., 2010). At the same time, tidy planning documentation strengthens accountability and transparency in program implementation.

Overall, the planning design for teacher performance improvement at SDN 1 Situsari and SDN 2 Situsari shows a strong alignment between managerial objectives and instructional quality. This foundation provides a springboard for subsequent stages organizing, implementation, and supervision/evaluation so that the entire management cycle of teacher performance improvement yields tangible effects on classroom practice and student learning outcomes.

3.2 Organizing Teacher Performance Improvement

Based on findings at SDN 1 Situsari and SDN 2 Situsari, the organization of teacher performance improvement programs was carried out systematically through the establishment of a clear team structure, defined workflow, and measurable role distribution. Both schools designated the principal and vice principal as the core leadership team, the KKG/PLC coordinator as the program driver, and mentors and class teacher representatives as technical implementers in the field. This structure ensures that each professional development activity has a clear communication line, defined responsibilities, and performance indicators directly linked to teaching quality.

The organizational structure at SDN 1 Situsari emphasized consistency in coordination routines and measurable milestones. Tasks, schedules, and targets were documented in a work matrix specifying who does what, when, and what evidence should be produced. Meanwhile, SDN 2 Situsari adopted a thematic cluster approach each group of teachers was assigned to a mentor focusing on specific areas such as formative assessment or classroom management. Although the approaches differ, both schools demonstrated the same orientation toward improving teacher performance through classroom-based data and student learning outcomes.

Internal coordination forums served as the main vehicle for synergy between roles. At SDN 1 Situsari, coordination took place through a tiered system consisting of weekly meetings for follow-up on mentoring activities, biweekly KKG sessions, and monthly meetings to review progress. At SDN 2 Situsari, coordination was conducted through regular monthly meetings used to discuss teacher progress based on class performance cards. These forums functioned not only as administrative mechanisms but also as collective reflection spaces on teaching practice.

Teacher involvement in the organizational process emerged as one of the main strengths in both schools. Each teacher was given the opportunity to express challenges and co-design follow-up strategies suited to their classroom conditions. “The roles were clearly distributed from the start. We know who coordinates the KKG, who provides classroom mentoring, and who follows up on observation results. That makes every change feel more real in our teaching practice.” (Senior teacher/mentor, interview, 20 March 2025). This quote illustrates the presence of shared responsibility and effective coordination among members of the teacher development team.

Documentation obtained by the researcher shows the existence of an organizational chart, lists of roles and responsibilities, activity schedules, and reporting procedures for mentoring results. In addition, there were verification checklists for KKG products such as lesson plans, assessment rubrics, and observation instruments used jointly by both schools. These documents confirm that the organizational arrangements were not merely conceptual but operational and measurable.

Capacity strengthening for key roles formed an integral part of the organizational process. At SDN 1 Situsari, calibration meetings were held for mentors and observers to align their understanding of observation rubrics and feedback techniques. At SDN 2 Situsari, similar activities took the form of peer sharing sessions among formative assessment facilitators to ensure that assessment instruments aligned with learning indicators. These actions reflect managerial awareness that clarity of roles must be accompanied by a shared understanding of quality standards.

From a resource management perspective, both schools optimized time, budget, and classroom spaces to ensure that professional development activities remained efficient. SDN 1 Situsari scheduled micro-coaching sessions after school hours, while SDN 2 Situsari set aside the second Friday of each month for lesson study and learning reflection. BOS funds were allocated to internal training needs and the procurement of teaching aids that supported active learning strategies. This reflects the implementation of efficient resource management principles within the school management framework.

Organizational arrangements also included data management systems to ensure evidence-based decision-making. SDN 1 Situsari assigned a data steward to compile

observation records, teacher reflections, and classroom artifacts into a digital portfolio. Meanwhile, SDN 2 Sitisari used class quality indicator sheets to monitor teacher progress. Systematic data management enabled both schools to evaluate progress and design more targeted interventions.

Findings indicate that the organizational systems implemented in both schools played a key role in sustaining teacher performance improvement programs. Clear structures, regular coordination, and documented monitoring mechanisms created a culture of collaboration and accountability. This supports Hallinger and Heck's (2010) assertion that organization grounded in collaborative leadership strengthens a school's capacity to manage instruction and enhance student learning outcomes.

Overall, the organization of teacher performance improvement at SDN 1 Sitisari and SDN 2 Sitisari reflects coherence between managerial functions and the goal of improving instructional quality. The differences in working patterns SDN 1 with a hierarchical coordination system and SDN 2 with a thematic cluster model did not diminish the consistency of their direction: ensuring that every teacher development activity translates into improved teaching practice and measurable student achievement.

3.3 Implementation of Teacher Performance Improvement

The implementation of teacher performance improvement at SDN 1 Sitisari and SDN 2 Sitisari was carried out through a series of structured, collaborative, and data-driven professional learning activities. Both schools translated their annual plans into concrete programs consisting of lesson study, classroom mentoring, micro-coaching, and KKG/PLC meetings designed to enhance teachers' pedagogical competence particularly in lesson planning, classroom management, and formative assessment. The implementation phase served as the core of the performance improvement cycle, linking planning to measurable teaching practices.

At SDN 1 Sitisari, the implementation followed a weekly rhythm combining class observations and short mentoring sessions. Teachers were observed during classroom activities, followed by a reflection and feedback discussion using standardized rubrics. The principal and KKG coordinator ensured that each feedback session generated actionable recommendations for teachers to apply in the following week. Meanwhile, SDN 2 Sitisari adopted a block system, where each quarter focused on one thematic area differentiated instruction, formative assessment, and classroom management allowing teachers to deepen specific skills before moving to the next focus area.

The findings show that both schools emphasized practical, contextualized implementation rather than administrative compliance. Each activity was anchored to a real classroom problem identified in the planning stage. Mentoring sessions were designed to address these issues through modeling, co-teaching, and reflection. This practice aligns with the professional learning community (PLC) principle, where continuous dialogue and collaborative inquiry drive improvement (DuFour & Eaker, 2009).

Teacher responses indicate that the implementation process built a strong culture of collaboration and mutual learning. "We feel more confident because the mentoring

sessions focus on what actually happens in our classrooms. When we receive feedback, it's not criticism, but suggestions we can immediately test." (Class teacher, interview, 22 March 2025). This quote illustrates the shift from evaluative supervision toward developmental mentoring, fostering teacher ownership of change.

Documentation analysis revealed evidence of implementation consistency in both schools. SDN 1 Situsari maintained complete observation reports, feedback summaries, and follow-up reflections, while SDN 2 Situsari recorded learning artifacts such as lesson plans, student work samples, and reflection notes in teacher portfolios. These documents demonstrate that every stage of the implementation process observation, feedback, revision, and reapplication was systematically documented to track progress over time.

The role of leadership proved instrumental in maintaining the integrity of implementation. Principals in both schools practiced participatory instructional leadership by engaging directly in classroom visits, facilitating reflection forums, and ensuring that mentoring sessions were conducted on schedule. Such leadership practices correspond to Hallinger's model of instructional leadership, emphasizing the principal's function in supporting teaching and learning quality through collaboration and evidence-based decision-making.

Moreover, the implementation was supported by the use of feedback instruments and structured reflection sheets. Teachers were encouraged to record their learning progress, note specific improvements, and identify aspects that still needed support. The use of these instruments promoted consistency across observations and allowed comparison between planned targets and actual changes in classroom practice. This systematic process mirrors the reflective teaching cycle proposed by Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2001), which positions reflection as a central element of professional growth.

Challenges during implementation were primarily related to time management and varying teacher readiness. Both schools overcame these barriers by conducting micro-coaching sessions lasting 15–20 minutes after school hours and by using peer demonstration lessons to model effective teaching strategies. These adjustments ensured that all teachers could engage meaningfully in the improvement process without disrupting their teaching schedules.

Overall, the implementation phase in SDN 1 Situsari and SDN 2 Situsari demonstrated a consistent alignment between managerial direction and pedagogical improvement. The integration of lesson study, peer mentoring, and reflective practice successfully transformed teacher development from a compliance-based routine into an authentic learning process. The findings confirm that consistent, collaborative, and data-informed implementation of performance improvement programs has a direct impact on teaching quality and student learning outcomes.

3.4 Evaluation and Monitoring of Teacher Performance Improvement

The evaluation and monitoring of teacher performance improvement at SDN 1 Situsari and SDN 2 Situsari were conducted as a continuous, data-based process aimed at ensuring that every professional development activity had a measurable impact on

classroom practices and student learning outcomes. Both schools emphasized that evaluation was not merely the final stage of the management cycle but an integral and iterative process that linked feedback, reflection, and follow-up actions.

At SDN 1 Situsari, monitoring was carried out through periodic classroom observations, progress review meetings, and portfolio assessments. Observation results were documented using standardized rubrics focusing on lesson preparation, instructional strategies, classroom management, and assessment practices. Each observation was followed by a brief reflection meeting where teachers discussed their progress and identified areas requiring further support. In SDN 2 Situsari, monitoring was integrated into the school's dashboard system, where each teacher's progress was tracked through key performance indicators such as attendance consistency, learning documentation, and student engagement metrics.

The evaluation mechanism combined quantitative and qualitative approaches. Quantitatively, both schools used scoring sheets and rubrics to assess teacher growth based on pedagogical competencies. Qualitatively, teacher narratives, classroom artifacts, and reflective journals were analyzed to understand the depth of change in teaching behavior. This approach aligns with Miles and Huberman's (2014) interactive model of data analysis, which integrates data reduction, display, and verification as a recursive process.

The monitoring process also emphasized peer reflection as part of collective evaluation. Teachers were encouraged to discuss the results of classroom observations within their KKG/PLC meetings. These discussions served as platforms for sharing effective strategies and addressing common challenges. "When we reflect together, we realize that most of our challenges are similar, and we can learn from each other's experiences instead of working in isolation." (KKG Coordinator, interview, 24 March 2025). This quote reflects the development of a collaborative learning culture in which evaluation becomes a shared process rather than a hierarchical one.

Documentation obtained from both schools shows that evaluation reports were not limited to descriptive summaries but included clear follow-up recommendations. SDN 1 Situsari used evaluation forms that required teachers to outline specific improvement actions and deadlines, while SDN 2 Situsari compiled reflective reports that were reviewed during quarterly evaluation meetings. These reports provided evidence that monitoring was not only administrative but also developmental in nature.

Leadership played an active role in ensuring the effectiveness of evaluation and monitoring. Principals and vice principals were directly involved in reviewing observation results, guiding reflection meetings, and validating improvement evidence. This practice resonates with the concept of transformational instructional leadership, where leaders act as facilitators of learning and ensure that evaluation feedback is used as a catalyst for professional growth (Hallinger & Heck, 2010).

The findings also reveal that both schools utilized evaluation data to adjust and refine their performance improvement programs. For example, SDN 1 Situsari used reflection outcomes to revise mentoring schedules and simplify observation formats, while SDN 2 Situsari employed data from its dashboard system to realign quarterly focus themes. This evidence-based adaptability shows a mature understanding of evaluation as a feedback loop rather than a summative judgment.

Challenges in evaluation were mostly related to maintaining consistency in data recording and ensuring that feedback was timely and actionable. Both schools addressed these issues by simplifying evaluation instruments, providing time for immediate feedback after observations, and embedding evaluation discussions within KKG sessions. These adaptive strategies helped strengthen the sustainability of the teacher improvement cycle.

Overall, the evaluation and monitoring of teacher performance improvement at SDN 1 Situsari and SDN 2 Situsari reflect a strong commitment to accountability, collaboration, and continuous learning. The integration of systematic observation, reflective dialogue, and evidence-based decision-making illustrates how effective evaluation serves as both a quality control mechanism and a professional learning process. Consistent with the views of Glickman et al. (2001) and Louis et al. (2010), these findings affirm that well-managed evaluation processes contribute significantly to improving teaching performance and, ultimately, to enhancing the quality of learning in schools.

4 Discussion

The findings indicate that the four management functions planning, organizing, implementation, and evaluation–monitoring have collectively shaped an integrated teacher performance improvement system at SDN 1 Situsari and SDN 2 Situsari. The participatory and data-driven planning approach (involving classroom observation results, lesson plan reviews, and assessment evidence) aligns with the principle of evidence-based management and corroborates literature emphasizing that systematic and collaborative professional development planning is more likely to impact real classroom practice rather than merely fulfilling administrative requirements [26]. This supports the notion that structured and continuous professional development planning serves as a foundation for enhancing teacher competency and instructional quality.

The organizational arrangements in both schools characterized by clear role structures, task matrices, coordination rhythms, and data governance reflect collaborative and distributed leadership practices that are empirically linked to school improvement capacity and student learning outcomes. Longitudinal studies by [27]Hallinger and Heck demonstrated that distributed instructional leadership enhances schools' improvement capacity and teachers' instructional practices over time. The implication is that organizational designs that distribute responsibility for professional development among multiple actors (KKG/PLC coordinators, mentors, observers) are more effective than centralized managerial approaches.

At the implementation level, the integration of lesson study, micro-coaching, peer mentoring, and reflective PLC sessions illustrates a shift from one-off training toward sustained, job-embedded professional learning. Darling-Hammond's synthesis of 35 studies[28]–[30] identifies key features of effective professional development: it must be continuous, content-focused, incorporate active learning, ensure coherence between policy and practice, and provide mentoring or coaching support. The implementation

patterns observed in both schools align closely with these features, thereby increasing the likelihood of influencing classroom practice and improving student outcomes.

The role of KKG/PLC as a space for data discussion, reflection, and the production of “ready-to-use artifacts” (lesson plans, rubrics, learning materials) reinforces findings from previous research that professional learning communities foster collective accountability and a focus on student learning results. Foundational PLC literature [31]–[33] highlights three core dimensions focus on learning, collaborative culture, and results orientation all of which were evident in the organizational routines of both schools.

The reflective dimension structured through the observation → feedback → reflection → reapplication cycle illustrates teachers’ growing role as reflective practitioners. Hebert [34] reflection-in-action framework helps explain why small, iterative changes (rapid cycles) are more effective in building teachers’ confidence and competence. Teachers at both schools experienced improvement through immediate application of feedback, creating a dynamic link between professional learning and instructional transformation.

In terms of evaluation and monitoring, the use of standardized rubrics, teacher portfolios, and performance dashboards demonstrates deliberate efforts to connect performance data with follow-up decision-making focusing on formative rather than summative assessment. This approach corresponds with the interactive data analysis model (reduction–display–verification) proposed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña, which emphasizes continuous feedback loops and evidence-based correction throughout the process, not only at its conclusion.

The link between instructional leadership and learning outcomes was also evident in the practices of principals and vice principals who facilitated classroom visits, reflection forums, and quality assurance follow-ups. National survey findings [35], [36] show that leadership variables correlate positively with student achievement, indicating that leadership facilitating coherence between teacher performance goals and instructional quality indicators is crucial to school success.

Overall, these findings reinforce prior empirical evidence that: (i) collaborative and distributed leadership contributes significantly to school improvement capacity, (ii) effective professional development is sustained, content-focused, and supported by coaching or modeling, and (iii) professional learning communities foster collective accountability for student outcomes [37]. The convergence of these three pillars appears to function as the driving mechanism across both case study schools, explaining the consistent alignment observed in the Management of Teacher Performance Improvement in Realizing Learning Quality.

5 Conclusion

The study on the Management of Teacher Performance Improvement in Realizing Learning Quality at SDN 1 Situsari and SDN 2 Situsari concludes that the four management functions planning, organizing, implementation, and evaluation have been implemented in an integrated manner and oriented toward strengthening teachers’

pedagogical competence. Data-driven and participatory planning serves as the foundation for collaborative organization, contextual and reflective implementation, and formative, continuous evaluation. Effective management is characterized by distributed instructional leadership, a professional culture that values collective learning, and evidence-based evaluation mechanisms that connect teacher development with student learning quality. Thus, teacher performance improvement is not merely an administrative agenda but an integral part of a school management system focused on the quality of teaching processes and learning outcomes.

References

- [1] A. Bandur, M. Hamsal, and A. Furinto, "21st Century experiences in the development of school-based management policy and practices in Indonesia," *Educ. Res. Policy Pract.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 85–107, 2022.
- [2] C. Ofita and S. Sururi, "Kompetensi Pedagogik Guru Abad 21 : Tinjauan Peran Guru Menghadapi Generasi Alpha," *J. Tata Kelola Pendidik.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 101–110, 2023, doi: 10.17509/jtkp.v5i2.64847.
- [3] P. Hersey and K. H. Blanchard, "Leadership style: Attitudes and behaviors.," *Train. Dev. J.*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 50–52, 1982.
- [4] G. Gay, *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. teachers college press, 2018.
- [5] Syafaruddin and I. Nasution, *Manajemen Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Quantum Teaching, 2005.
- [6] G. R. Terry, *Azas-azas Management*. Bandung: Alumni, 2019.
- [7] G. R. Terry, *Principles Of Management*. New York: Alexander Hamilton Institute, 1958.
- [8] R. Rasmaladewi, S. Rasyid, and I. Iskandar, "SUPERVISI AKADEMIK KEPALA SEKOLAH BERBASIS COACHING MODEL GROW UNTUK MENINGKATKAN KOMPETENSI PEDAGOGIK GURU SEKOLAH DASAR," *Hijri*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 62–73, 2025, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.30821/hijri.v14i1.21426>.
- [9] Y. O. Pendi, "Merdeka belajar yang tercermin dalam kompetensi profesional guru bahasa inggris SMP Negeri 01 Sedayu," in *Seminar Nasional Pendidikan*, 2020, vol. 1, no. 1.
- [10] M. A. F. Sanjani, M. Mulyadi, and S. Sutiah, "Academic Supervision as a Catalyst for Professional Growth in Schools," *Appl. Community Serv. J.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2025.
- [11] B. J. Caldwell, *School-based management*, vol. 3. International Institute for Educational Planning Paris, 2005.
- [12] H. Aydemir and R. Türkel, "EVALUATION OF QUALITY PRINCIPLES FROM THE ISLAMIC PERSPECTIVE," *Hitit Theol. J.*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2022, doi: 10.14395/hid.1072356.
- [13] J. W. Creswell and V. L. P. Clark, *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage publications, 2017.
- [14] R. K. Yin, *Case study research and applications*. SAGE Publications US., 2017.
- [15] Adrias and A. Ruswandi, *Desain Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Mix Method*. Depok: Rajawali Pers, 2025.
- [16] M. Q. Patton, *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*. Sage publications, 2014.
- [17] A. Tashakkori and J. W. Creswell, "The new era of mixed methods," *J. Mix. Methods Res.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3–7, 2007, doi: 10.1177/2345678906293042.

- [18] Y. Lincoln and B. Guba, "Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications." Inc, 1985.
- [19] E. J. Tisdell, S. B. Merriam, and H. L. Stuckey-Peyrot, *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons, 2025.
- [20] S. B. Merriam and E. J. Tisdell, *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons, 2015.
- [21] M. B. Miles, A. M. Huberman, and J. Saldana, *Qualitative Data Analysis A Methods Sourcebook*, Third Edit. United States of America: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2014.
- [22] A. K. Shenton, "Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects," *Educ. Inf.*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 63–75, 2004.
- [23] M. B. Miles and A. M. Huberman, "Analisis data kualitatif, terj," Jakarta Penerbit Univ. Indones., 2008.
- [24] S. M. Sabrina and A. Aslam, "Analisis peranan kepala sekolah dalam meningkatkan profesional guru di sekolah dasar," *J. Basicedu*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 6265–6271, 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i4.3220>.
- [25] P. Hallinger and R. H. Heck, "Leadership for learning: Does collaborative leadership make a difference in school improvement?," *Educ. Manag. Adm. Leadersh.*, vol. 38, no. 6, pp. 654–678, 2010.
- [26] J. M. Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, *SuperVision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach* (8th ed.). ERIC, 2010.
- [27] P. Hallinger and R. H. Heck, "Collaborative leadership and school improvement: Understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning," *Sch. Leadersh. Manag.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 95–110, 2010, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632431003663214>.
- [28] L. Darling-Hammond and N. Richardson, "Research review/teacher learning: What matters," *Educ. Leadersh.*, vol. 66, no. 5, pp. 46–53, 2009.
- [29] L. Darling-Hammond, M. E. Hyler, and M. Gardner, "Effective teacher professional development," *Learn. policy Inst.*, 2017.
- [30] L. Darling-Hammond, "Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice?," *Eur. J. Teach. Educ.*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 291–309, 2017.
- [31] R. DuFour and R. Eaker, *Professional learning communities at work tm: best practices for enhancing students achievement*. Solution Tree Press, 2009.
- [32] R. DuFour, "What is a" professional learning community"?," *Educ. Leadersh.*, vol. 61, no. 8, pp. 6–11, 2004.
- [33] S. M. Hord, *Learning together, leading together: Changing schools through professional learning communities*. Teachers College Press, 2004.
- [34] C. Hébert, "Knowing and/or experiencing: A critical examination of the reflective models of John Dewey and Donald Schön," *Reflective Pract.*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 361–371, 2015.
- [35] L. W. Fry, "Toward a theory of spiritual leadership," *Leadersh. Q.*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 693–727, 2003.
- [36] K. S. Louis, K. Leithwood, K. L. Wahlstrom, and S. E. Anderson, "Investigating the links to improved student learning," *Wallace Found.*, pp. 2009–2023, 2010.
- [37] A. R. Harkins-Brown, N. Gillon, and A. Schanbacher, "Results of a Competency-Based Approach to Prepare General Educators to Effectively Include Students with Disabilities," *Education Sciences*, vol. 14, no. 5. 2024, doi: 10.3390/educsci14050475.