

RESEARCH

Received: January 27, 2026

Revised: March 3, 2026

Accepted: June 27, 2026

Teacher Capacity Building through Curriculum-Student Affairs Integration: The IKRKT Model

Qurroti A'yun^{1*}, Ilfi Nur Diana² and Akhmad Nurul Kawakip³

***Correspondence:**

Qurroti A'yun
230106310009@student.uin-malang.ac.id

¹Doctoral Program of Islamic Education Management, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia

²Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia

³Department of Islamic Religious Education, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia

Abstract

This article formulates a teacher capacity development model that links individual competence with school organizational performance. The study addresses the tendency of teacher development to remain training-oriented and weakly connected to organizational learning. A qualitative single-case embedded design was employed at SDI Al-Ma'arif 02 Singosari, with curriculum and student affairs as embedded units. Data were collected through interviews, observation, and documents, and analyzed through interactive analysis, within-unit analysis, and cross-unit synthesis. The findings show that capacity development was planned through needs mapping, strategic alignment, governance, curriculum-student affairs integration, and professional learning communities. Implementation involved routine and incidental activities, teacher working groups, supervision, mentoring, workshops, internal-external collaboration, evaluation, reflection, and follow-up. Cross-unit synthesis generated the IKRKT Model, consisting of Integrative, Collaborative, Reflective, Continuous, and Transformative dimensions. The model explains how individual teacher competence can become collective organizational capacity that strengthens educational service quality and school performance.

Keywords: Collective organizational capacity, Curriculum-student affairs integration, IKRKT model, School performance, Teacher capacity building

Introduction

Teacher capacity building is increasingly positioned as a strategic agenda in school management because educational organizations rely on teachers to translate institutional vision into classroom practice, student guidance, and school culture. Contemporary human resource management views development not merely as training but as a system for improving people, work processes, and organizational performance (Armstrong & Taylor, 2023; Dessler, 2020; Noe, 2023). In schools, this logic is strengthened by human resource development theory, which links individual development, organizational development, and performance improvement (Garavan, 1991; Swanson & Holton, 2009).

International literature also shows that professional learning must be coherent, collaborative, practice-based, and sustained if it is to influence teacher practice and student

outcomes (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Day, 1999; Desimone, 2009; Sims & Fletcher-Wood, 2021). The TALIS report and global education discourse similarly emphasize the importance of teacher professional learning, leadership support, and collaborative cultures in improving school quality (OECD, 2020; UNESCO, 2024). However, many teacher development programs remain event-based, training-oriented, and insufficiently linked to organizational routines.

The problem becomes more significant in Islamic elementary schools, where teachers carry instructional, moral, social, and organizational responsibilities. Teachers are expected to design learning, nurture religious and social values, assist student discipline, guide extracurricular activities, and sustain public trust. Therefore, teacher capacity should not be limited to pedagogical competence. It also includes the ability to participate in governance, collaborate across organizational units, reflect on practice, and contribute to school improvement.

Professional capital theory explains that teacher quality emerges through human capital, social capital, and decisional capital (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012). This is reinforced by collaborative professionalism, which argues that teacher development is strongest when professional learning is shared, evidence-informed, and embedded in the organizational culture (Hargreaves & O'Connor, 2018). Communities of practice and professional learning communities further show that teachers learn through participation, shared practice, and collective problem solving (Admiraal et al., 2021; DuFour & Eaker, 2008; Wenger, 1998). Recent studies also confirm that PLCs can strengthen teacher leadership, collaborative conversations, and sustained professional growth (Grimm, 2024; Nguyen, 2023; Wang, 2025).

Previous studies have discussed teacher competence, professional development, teacher performance, and school leadership. Yet, many still focus on individual competence, leadership influence, or isolated professional development activities. Less attention has been paid to how teacher capacity is integrated across curriculum and student affairs and then transformed into collective organizational capacity. This gap is important because school performance is shaped not only by individual teachers but also by the way schools organize learning, internal coordination, student development, and continuous improvement (Alzoraiki et al., 2024; Leithwood et al., 2020; Mansor et al., 2021; Harris & Jones, 2020; Nurrizayani et al., 2024).

This article addresses that gap by examining SDI Al-Ma'arif 02 Singosari, an Islamic elementary school that develops teachers through curriculum and student affairs as two interrelated domains. Curriculum concerns lesson planning, instructional innovation, classroom management, assessment, and academic quality. Student affairs concerns character building, discipline, extracurricular guidance, student achievement, and school culture. The novelty lies in the formulation of the IKRKT Model: Integrative, Collaborative, Reflective, Continuous, and Transformative. The article aims to analyze teacher capacity development through curriculum-student affairs integration and to formulate a model that contributes to Islamic education management and school organizational performance.

Method

This study used a qualitative approach with a single-case embedded design. Qualitative inquiry was selected because the research focused on processes, meanings, routines, and organizational dynamics rather than statistical measurement (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The case was SDI Al-Ma'arif 02 Singosari, while the embedded units were the curriculum unit and the student affairs unit. The embedded case design enabled the researcher to examine each unit in depth and integrate the findings across units (Yin, 2018).

The site was selected purposively because the school has structured teacher development activities, clear curriculum and student affairs coordination, and visible indicators of organizational performance. Informants included the principal, the curriculum coordinator, the student affairs coordinator, and teachers involved in learning, mentoring, extracurricular programs, supervision, and professional development activities.

Data were collected through in-depth interviews, observation, and documentation. Interviews explored needs mapping, policy direction, governance, program design, implementation, evaluation, reflection, and follow-up. Observations focused on learning activities, teacher meetings, professional learning community activities, supervision, and student development programs. Documents included school work plans, supervision notes, training schedules, teacher development records, learning modules, student affairs programs, extracurricular data, school achievements, accreditation records, and student enrolment data.

Data analysis followed the interactive model of Miles et al. (2020), consisting of data collection, data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. Within-unit analysis was used to understand teacher capacity development in curriculum and student affairs separately. Cross-unit analysis was then used to identify similarities, differences, complementarities, and integrative patterns between the two units.

Trustworthiness was maintained through source triangulation, technique triangulation, member checking, prolonged engagement, and audit trail. These procedures follow qualitative trustworthiness criteria that emphasize credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The use of multiple informants, observations, and documents ensured that the model was grounded in empirical patterns rather than researcher assumptions.

Results

The results are organized into four interrelated findings: planning, implementation, model construction, and model proposition. The findings show that teacher capacity development at SDI Al-Ma'arif 02 Singosari was not a single training activity but an organizational system that linked teacher learning, curriculum management, student development, and school performance.

Planning of Teacher Capacity Buildings

Teacher capacity development began with identifying real needs in teaching and student guidance. Needs were obtained from supervision, incidental observation, peer assessment, teacher reflection, discussion forums, and evaluation of school programs. In the curriculum unit, planning emphasized lesson design, teaching modules, classroom management, technology use, active learning, assessment, and learning reflection. In the student affairs unit, planning emphasized character education, discipline, student mentoring, extracurricular management, interest and talent development, and academic or non-academic achievement.

Planning was supported by policy direction, organizational structure, and program design. The school aligned teacher development with its vision, curriculum policy, student development agenda, and institutional priorities. Routine and incidental programs were arranged to ensure both continuity and flexibility. This pattern shows that curriculum and student affairs did not operate as separated administrative fields. They complemented each other in shaping teacher capacity for instructional improvement and holistic student development.

Implementation of Teacher Capacity Building

Implementation was carried out through a combination of internal and external activities. Internal mechanisms included professional learning communities, teacher working groups, school-based workshops, academic supervision, mentoring, reflective discussion, and coordination meetings. External mechanisms involved programs from the foundation, government offices, professional communities, universities, and other educational networks. This combination allowed teachers to learn from daily practice and broader professional resources.

The curriculum unit focused on pedagogical and professional capacities: designing learning, managing classrooms, using technology, assessing learning, and improving instructional quality. The student affairs unit strengthened teachers' capacity to mentor students, manage extracurricular activities, build discipline, cultivate character, and support student achievement. Evaluation, reflection, and follow-up became essential mechanisms to ensure that development programs continued into improvement actions.

The implementation produced impacts at three levels. At the teacher level, it strengthened pedagogical, professional, social, and personal competence. At the student level, it supported learning quality, character development, discipline, participation, and achievement. At the organizational level, it contributed to structured programs, stronger collaboration, improved educational services, school achievements, and public trust.

Table 1 Cross-unit pattern of teacher capacity building

Analytical focus	Curriculum unit	Student affairs unit	Cross-unit meaning
Planning orientation	Learning quality, lesson design, modules, assessment, technology use	Character education, discipline, mentoring, extracurricular programs, student achievement	Planning connected instructional improvement with holistic student development
Implementation form	KomBel, KKG, supervision, workshops, reflective discussion, teaching practice improvement	Student guidance, extracurricular coaching, coordination meetings, discipline and character programs	Routine-incidental and internal-external activities created a shared learning system
Main outcome	Pedagogical and professional competence; better classroom processes	Mentoring capacity; stronger student character, participation, and non-academic achievement	Individual teacher competence began to function as collective organizational capacity
Organizational effect	Improved learning management and instructional quality	More structured student programs and stronger public trust	Teacher capacity development supported educational service quality and school performance

Cross-unit Synthesis and Model Construction

Cross-unit synthesis resulted in five components of the model. The model foundation connects school vision, quality needs, educational change, and curriculum-student affairs integration. The model process consists of needs identification, planning, implementation, evaluation, reflection, and follow-up. The implementation strategy is contextual, collaborative, reflective, applicable, and sustainable. Contextual factors include internal and external support as well as obstacles such as varying motivation, individual readiness, limited time, and resistance to innovation. Model outcomes refer to the transformation from individual teacher capacity to collective organizational capacity, educational service quality, and school performance.

The synthesis also produced three characteristics. First, curriculum and student affairs function as complementary domains. Curriculum strengthens teachers in academic and instructional matters, while student affairs extends teacher capacity in character education, discipline, mentoring, and student development. Second, teacher roles expand from instructional actors to organizational actors. Third, individual capacity is transformed into collective organizational capacity through collaboration, shared reflection, supervision, mentoring, and practice sharing.

IKRKT Dimensions and Propositions

The IKRKT Model was formulated from the components and characteristics above. Integrative means that teacher development is built on the integration of organizational functions, especially curriculum and student affairs. Collaborative means that capacity grows through professional interaction, shared work, mentoring, and networks. Reflective means that the school learns from experience through evaluation, reflection, analysis, and follow-up. Continuous means that development occurs through a recurring cycle rather than one-time training. Transformative means that teacher capacity moves from personal competence to collective organizational strength.

The major proposition states that teacher capacity development based on Integrative, Collaborative, Reflective, Continuous, and Transformative dimensions can transform individual teacher capacity into collective organizational capacity through curriculum-student affairs integration, professional collaboration, reflective organizational learning, and sustainable improvement cycles, thereby strengthening educational service quality and school organizational performance.

Table 2 Dimensions and propositions of the IKRKT Model

Dimension	Role in the model	Minor proposition
Integrative	Foundation for connecting curriculum and student affairs as complementary organizational functions	Integration of curriculum and student affairs strengthens alignment between teacher competence, student academic-character development, and organizational goals.
Collaborative	Strategy for expanding professional learning through shared work and professional networks	Collaboration among educational actors expands teacher learning spaces and strengthens collective organizational capacity.
Reflective	Mechanism for turning experience, evaluation, and feedback into organizational learning	Reflective practice through evaluation, shared reflection, experience analysis, and follow-up improves teacher capacity development.
Continuous	Cycle of recurring improvement rather than one-time training	Needs identification, planning, implementation, evaluation, reflection, and follow-up create continuous improvement in the school.
Transformative	Orientation of change from individual competence to organizational capacity	Transformation of individual teacher capacity into collective organizational capacity strengthens educational service quality and school performance.

Table 3 Conceptual flow of the IKRKT Model

Individual teacher capacity → Collective organizational capacity → Educational service quality → School organizational performance

Discussion

The findings refine human capital theory in school management. Becker (1964) explains education and training as investments in productivity. This study confirms that teacher competence is an important investment, yet it also shows that personal competence becomes meaningful when embedded in a school system that supports collective learning. Recent research on teacher professional development similarly shows that program quality, active learning, coherence, and sustained participation are critical for meaningful improvement (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone, 2009; Sims & Fletcher-Wood, 2021).

The findings also support HRD and Strategic HRD perspectives. Swanson and Holton (2009) underline the connection between individual development and organizational performance, while Garavan (1991) emphasizes the alignment of HRD with organizational strategy. Armstrong and Taylor (2023), Dessler (2020), and Noe (2023) also stress that training and development must be linked with organizational needs, not only individual skill acquisition. In this study, alignment appears in the integration of teacher development with school vision, curriculum policy, student affairs programs, and organizational goals.

The integrative dimension is consistent with capacity-building theory, which views capacity not only as individual ability but also as organizational and systemic capability (Grindle, 1997). In the researched school, curriculum and student affairs became two complementary domains that connected instructional improvement with character building, extracurricular coaching, and student achievement. This integration is relevant to studies showing that school improvement depends on leadership, teacher competence, school culture, and coordinated internal processes (Aimang et al., 2024; Leithwood et al., 2020).

The collaborative dimension is consistent with communities of practice and professional learning community literature. Teacher learning occurred through KomBel, KKG, supervision, mentoring, and shared practice. These forums created spaces where teachers exchanged experiences, solved problems, and built collective knowledge. Collaboration in this sense is not limited to coordination; it is an active process of working, learning, and improving together (Admiraal et al., 2021; DuFour & Eaker, 2008; Grimm, 2024; Nguyen, 2023; Wenger, 1998). This finding also resonates with Indonesian Islamic school studies emphasizing professional community, supervision, and human resource development as mechanisms for teacher improvement (Hosna et al., 2025; Mardia et al., 2025; Trihapsari et al., 2021).

The reflective dimension resonates with reflective practice, learning organization theory, and organizational knowledge creation. Reflection appeared through evaluation forums, supervision feedback, analysis of constraints, and follow-up planning. These practices turned individual experience into organizational learning (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Schön, 1983; Senge, 2006). When reflection becomes routine, the school gains the capacity to adjust programs, improve internal processes, and respond to educational change. Recent work on professional learning also stresses that reflective dialogue and structured teacher collaboration are central to sustainable development (Dille & Røkenes, 2021; Wang, 2025).

The continuous dimension strengthens the logic of continuous improvement. The cycle of needs identification, planning, implementation, evaluation, reflection, and follow-up made teacher

development a recurring organizational process. This pattern is aligned with Deming's (2008) improvement cycle and with studies on sustained professional learning that emphasize duration, coherence, and follow-up rather than one-time training (Day, 1999; Prediger et al., 2022; Prediger & Selter, 2024).

The transformative dimension is the core contribution of this study. Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) argue that teacher quality depends on human, social, and decisional capital, while Hargreaves and O'Connor (2018) show that collaborative professionalism turns teacher expertise into shared capacity. This study shows how individual competence develops through training and practice, social capital grows through collaboration, and decisional capital develops through reflection and professional judgment. The result is collective organizational capacity that supports educational service quality and school performance.

The study also strengthens the relevance of the Balanced Scorecard perspective in education. Kaplan and Norton (2006) view organizational performance through learning and growth, internal processes, and stakeholder satisfaction. At SDI Al-Ma'arif 02 Singosari, teacher capacity development contributed to improved learning practices, better-managed student programs, collaborative culture, school achievements, and public trust. Recent studies similarly show that school culture, transformational leadership, teacher commitment, and professional development influence teacher performance and organizational outcomes (Alzoraiki et al., 2023; Alzoraiki et al., 2024; Amtu et al., 2020; Bakker et al., 2023; Firmansyah et al., 2022; Ibrahim et al., 2023; Mansor et al., 2021; Nurrizayani et al., 2024; Park et al., 2021; Siri et al., 2020).

Practically, the model implies that Islamic school leaders need to design teacher development as an integrated system. Curriculum and student affairs should be connected in planning, implementation, evaluation, and follow-up. Professional learning communities must be strengthened as spaces for collaboration and reflection. Foundations, government agencies, universities, and professional networks can support schools by providing resources, expertise, and opportunities for teacher learning. The limitation of this study is its single-case design; therefore, further studies may test the IKRKT Model in multiple schools, compare different institutional contexts, or develop quantitative instruments for measuring its dimensions.

Conclusion

Teacher capacity development at SDI Al-Ma'arif 02 Singosari was organized as a strategic organizational process. Planning was based on teacher needs, school policy, governance structure, curriculum-student affairs integration, program design, and professional learning communities. Implementation was conducted through routine and incidental programs, supervision, mentoring, professional learning communities, teacher working groups, workshops, external networks, evaluation, reflection, and follow-up. These processes strengthened teacher competence, student development, educational service quality, and school organizational performance.

The study produced the IKRKT Model, which consists of Integrative, Collaborative, Reflective, Continuous, and Transformative dimensions. The model contributes to Islamic education management by explaining how teacher capacity development can move from individual competence to collective organizational capacity. Its practical implication is that schools should integrate teacher development with organizational strategy, connect curriculum and student affairs, and institutionalize collaborative-reflective learning as a sustainable mechanism for improving school performance. Future studies are encouraged to examine the model in different educational settings and to develop instruments for testing its conceptual dimensions.

Acknowledgements

The authors express their appreciation to SDI Al-Ma'arif 02 Singosari for facilitating access to the research context and to Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang for academic support during the study.

References

- Admiraal, W., Schenke, W., De Jong, L., Emmelot, Y., & Sligte, H. (2021). Schools as professional learning communities: What can schools do to support professional development of their teachers? *Professional Development in Education*, 47(4), 684–698. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2019.1665573>
- Aimang, H. A., Indriani, R., & Amaliah, N. (2024). The role of principal in enhancing learning quality and teacher performance in schools. *Al-Tanzim: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*. <https://ejournal.unuja.ac.id/index.php/al-tanzim/article/view/8354>
- Alzoraiki, M., Ahmad, A. R., Ateeq, A. A., Naji, G. M. A., Almaamari, Q., & Beshr, B. A. H. (2023). Impact of teachers' commitment to the relationship between transformational leadership and sustainable teaching performance. *Sustainability*, 15(5), 4620. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15054620>
- Alzoraiki, M., Ahmad, A. R., Ateeq, A. A., & Milhem, M. M. (2024). The role of transformational leadership in enhancing school culture and teaching performance in Yemeni public schools. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1413607. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1413607>
- Amtu, O., Makulua, K., Matital, J., & Pattiruhu, C. M. (2020). Improving student learning outcomes through school culture, work motivation and teacher performance. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(4), 885–902. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13454a>
- Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2023). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice* (16th ed.). Kogan Page.
- Bakker, A. B., Hetland, J., Kjellefold Olsen, O., & Espevik, R. (2023). Daily transformational leadership: A source of inspiration for follower performance? *European Management Journal*, 41(5), 700–708. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2022.04.004>
- Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education*. University of Chicago Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/effective-teacher-professional-development-report>
- Day, C. (1999). *Developing teachers: The challenges of lifelong learning*. Falmer Press.
- Deming, W. E. (2008). *Out of the crisis*. MIT Press.
- Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181–199. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08331140>
- Dessler, G. (2020). *Human resource management* (16th ed.). Pearson.
- Dille, K. B., & Røkenes, F. M. (2021). Teachers' professional development in formal online communities: A scoping review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 105, 103431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103431>
- DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (2008). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement*. Solution Tree Press.
- Firmansyah, F., Prasojo, L. D., Jaedun, A., & Retnawati, H. (2022). Transformational leadership effect on teacher performance in Asia: A meta-analysis. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 17(6), 2127–2146. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v17i6.7552>
- Fullan, M. (2020). *Leading in a culture of change* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Garavan, T. N. (1991). Strategic human resource development. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 15(1), 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM00000000000219>

- Grimm, F. (2024). Teacher leadership for teaching improvement in professional learning communities. *Professional Development in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2023.2264286>
- Grindle, M. S. (1997). *Getting good government: Capacity building in the public sectors of developing countries*. Harvard Institute for International Development.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school*. Teachers College Press.
- Hargreaves, A., & O'Connor, M. T. (2018). *Collaborative professionalism: When teaching together means learning for all*. Corwin.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2020). COVID 19—school leadership in disruptive times. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(4), 243–247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2020.1811479>
- Hosna, R., Supriyanto, A., & Mubarak, R. (2025). How principal supervision shapes professional teachers through collaborative leadership. *Al-Tanzim: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*. <https://ejournal.unuja.ac.id/index.php/al-tanzim/article/view/10340>
- Ibrahim, R. Z. A. R., Zalam, W. Z. M., Foster, B., Afrizal, T., Johansyah, M. D., Saputra, J., & Sari, D. P. (2023). The role of teacher professional development in enhancing teacher performance: A systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 37(3), 456–472. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-09-2021-0345>
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2006). *The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.
- Mansor, A. N., Abdullah, R., & Jamaludin, K. A. (2021). The influence of transformational leadership and teachers' trust in principals on teachers' working commitment. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 8, 302. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-021-00985-6>
- Mardia, M., Hambali, M., & Halim, A. (2025). Managing sustainable professional development for madrasah teachers in Islamic boarding schools. *Al-Tanzim: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*. <https://ejournal.unuja.ac.id/index.php/al-tanzim/article/view/12143>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2020). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Nguyen, Q. A. T. (2023). Professional learning communities in Vietnamese primary schools in the educational reform context: Forms and challenges. *European Journal of Educational Research*. <https://www.eu-jer.com/professional-learning-communities-in-vietnamese-primary-schools-in-the-educational-reform-context-forms-and-challenges>
- Noe, R. A. (2023). *Employee training and development* (9th ed.). McGraw Hill.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press.
- Nurrisayani, N., Niswanto, N., & Usman, N. (2024). Empowering education: Transformational leadership creates inspiring work climates to boost teacher performance. *Al-Tanzim: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 8(4), 1302–1312. <https://doi.org/10.33650/al-tanzim.v8i4.9646>
- OECD. (2020). *TALIS 2018 results (Volume II): Teachers and school leaders as valued professionals*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/19cf08df-en>
- Park, J., Han, S. J., Kim, J., & Kim, W. (2021). Structural relationships among transformational leadership, affective organizational commitment, and job performance: The mediating role of employee engagement. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 46(9), 920–936. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-10-2020-0149>
- Prediger, S., Götze, D., Holzäpfel, L., Rösken-Winter, B., & Selter, C. (2022). Five principles for high-quality mathematics teaching: Combining normative, epistemological, empirical, and pragmatic perspectives for specifying the content of professional development. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, 969212. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.969212>
- Prediger, S., & Selter, C. (2024). Establish shared visions and support productive adaptations on all

- levels: Aims, strategies, and architecture of a nationwide implementation program. *Implementation and Replication Studies in Mathematics Education*, 4(1), 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1163/26670127-bja10020>
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.
- Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Doubleday.
- Sims, S., & Fletcher-Wood, H. (2021). Identifying the characteristics of effective teacher professional development: A critical review. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 32(1), 47–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2020.1772841>
- Siri, A., Supartha, I. W. G., Sukaatmadja, I. P. G., & Rahyuda, A. G. (2020). Does teacher competence and commitment improve teacher's professionalism? *Cogent Business & Management*, 7(1), 1781993. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1781993>
- Swanson, R. A., & Holton, E. F. (2009). *Foundations of human resource development* (2nd ed.). Berrett-Koehler.
- Trihapsari, C., Mujahidah, F., & Humairoh, N. (2021). Enhancement of the quality of human resources through training and development programs in schools. *Al-Tanzim: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 5(2), 145–153. <https://doi.org/10.33650/al-tanzim.v5i2.2325>
- UNESCO. (2024). *Global education monitoring report 2024/5: Leadership in education*. UNESCO. <https://www.unesco.org/gem-report/en/leadership>
- Wang, Y. (2025). Teacher development in an evolving online professional learning community. *Teachers and Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2023.2282485>
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage.