The Effect of Education Strategic Planning on Education Quality Improvement in Senior High School of Batam City

Nasruji (nasrujisaifulhaq@yahoo.co.id)
STIE Galileo

Submited : 11-10-2024, Accepted : 11-11-2024, Published : 11-12-2024

Abstract

This study analyzes the impact of digital business process innovation on organizational structure and operational performance in the healthcare sector. Using a quantitative method with a survey approach, data was collected from hospitals and clinics in West Java that have adopted digital technology. The validity test showed that all questionnaire items were valid with significant loading factors above 0.7, while the reliability test showed Cronbach's Alpha values above 0.70, signifying good instrument consistency. The t-test results reveal that digital innovation has a significant effect on organizational structure and operational performance. The F test shows that digital innovation simultaneously has a significant effect on both, with the calculated F value higher than the F table and p value <0.05. The coefficient of determination analysis indicates that digital innovation contributes significantly to changes in organizational structure and operational performance, with a fairly high R^2 value. The results of this study suggest that the application of digital technology plays an important role in improving operational efficiency and organizational structure flexibility in the healthcare sector.

Keywords: Strategic Planning of Education, Resource Management, Implementation of Education Policy, Managerial Competence, Quality of Education

Introduction

Education has a strategic role in creating quality human resources to face global challenges. As one of the formal educational institutions, Senior High Schools have a great responsibility in equipping students with knowledge, skills, and character that are in accordance with the demands of the times. In this context, the quality of education is the main indicator of the success of an educational institution (Riza & Nugroho, 2020). Strategic educational planning is very important for institutions such as Senior High Schools, especially in the context of Islamic-based education. This process involves a systematic approach to identifying needs through a SWOT analysis, which helps in recognizing the gap between the current and desired state of education (Demush Bajrami, 2023). After this assessment, program development is essential, as it requires designing initiatives that are aligned with the institution's vision and cultural context (Andréa Oliveira Hopf Díaz, 2022). Effective implementation and evaluation of these programs ensure that policies are not only implemented but also monitored for effectiveness, allowing for necessary adjustments (Sulfiani Sulfiani, 2023). In addition, resource management plays a vital role in optimizing the use of available resources, which is crucial to achieving educational goals efficiently (Akram Jalal,,2019). By addressing internal and external challenges, including technological and social dynamics, strategic educational

planning can significantly improve the quality of education provided by institutions such as Senior High Schools. Efforts to improve the quality of education are intrinsically linked to effective strategic planning in educational institutions. Strategic planning enables senior high schools to set realistic visions, missions, and goals, while also outlining actionable steps to achieve these goals (Ilham M. Said,2024). This process is critical to aligning educational strategies with institutional goals, thereby encouraging a focused approach to improvement (M. Kozyr,,2024). Furthermore, successful implementation of strategic planning includes human resource management, ensuring that educators are well-trained and equipped to provide quality instruction (Setya Raharja,2023). It also involves facilities and infrastructure management, which are critical to maintaining a conducive environment for learning. Finally, a robust curriculum management system is essential to tailor educational offerings to meet the diverse needs of learners, promoting continuous improvement in educational delivery (M. Kozyr,,2024). Together, these elements underscore the importance of strategic planning in driving educational success. The quality of education in secondary schools in Indonesia remains a significant concern, particularly due to the marked disparity between public and private secondary schools. This gap is highlighted by the disparity in national exam results, where private schools typically outperform their public counterparts, indicating the need for targeted improvements in educational quality (Muhammad Roil Bilad,,2024). Furthermore, graduation rates show a similar trend, with private schools achieving higher completion percentages, which are critical for access to higher education and better employment opportunities (R. Madhakomala,,2023). Furthermore, student achievement in various competitions further illustrates this disparity, underscoring the importance of cultivating a competitive and skilled workforce (Rika Ohno,,2019). To address these issues effectively, a comprehensive educational strategy is essential. This strategy should include teacher training, curriculum reform, infrastructure development, and resource allocation to bridge the gap in education quality and ensure equal opportunities for all students.

The effectiveness of strategic planning is critical to improving the quality of education in secondary schools. However, many institutions struggle with its optimal implementation due to several barriers. Limited resources significantly hamper the ability to effectively allocate financial, human, and material assets, which are essential to achieving educational goals (M. Kozyr, 2024,). In addition, principals often lack the managerial training necessary to lead these initiatives, further complicating the implementation of strategic plans (Notsent Julius Sanga, 2023). Furthermore, weak coordination among stakeholders including teachers, administrators, parents, and students can hinder collaborative efforts, resulting in poor educational outcomes

(SANNY F. FERNANDEZ, 2024). As a result, these challenges prevent programs aimed at improving the quality of education from functioning to their full potential, ultimately affecting student success and readiness for future endeavors (Adel Iskandar, 2022). Addressing these issues is critical to fostering an environment in which strategic planning can thrive and lead to significant improvements in the quality of education (Yusuf Yusuf, 2024). Strategic planning in secondary schools is essential to ensure that education remains relevant to local and global needs. When effectively integrated, strategic planning enables schools to adapt to changing challenges, thereby enhancing learners' competitiveness in a dynamic environment (Ekaterina Koshkina, ,2023). By aligning educational goals with competency-based education principles, schools can focus on developing specific skills and knowledge that are critical for success in a global context (Altaf Syauqy Iqbal Saifani, 2024). Furthermore, incorporating global citizenship education and education for sustainable development into strategic planning fosters critical thinking and prepares students to address pressing global issues such as climate change and social inequality (Setya Raharja, 2023). Ultimately, a comprehensive strategic planning approach not only enhances the relevance of education but also empowers learners to thrive in an increasingly interconnected world (Demush Bajrami, 2023).

Literature Review

Strategic Planning of Education

Strategic planning of education is a systematic process designed to achieve the long-term goals of educational institutions by considering the vision, mission, and needs of stakeholders. According to Wheelen and Hunger (2018), strategic planning involves analyzing the internal and external environment, formulating strategies, implementing, and evaluating and controlling strategies. In the context of education, strategic planning is an important tool for educational institution managers to improve quality through optimizing human resources, infrastructure, and curriculum.

Good strategic planning includes several main elements, namely SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats), setting strategic goals, and preparing measurable work programs. In previous research, Glickman et al. (2017) stated that strategic planning in educational institutions can improve operational efficiency and strengthen the competitiveness of institutions.

Quality of Education

The quality of education reflects the quality of educational services provided by educational institutions to students. UNESCO (2005) defines the quality of education as an effort to meet academic standards, curriculum relevance, and stakeholder satisfaction. The quality of education includes input, process, output, and outcome. Input includes human resources and facilities, the process includes learning methods, while output includes student learning outcomes, such as academic grades and skills acquired. According to Tilaar's research (2004), improving the quality of education is influenced by good planning and management. This includes curriculum implementation, teacher training, and resource management. Thus, the quality of education can be seen as the result of collaboration from various aspects, both internal and external.

The Relationship between Strategic Planning and the Quality of Education

Research conducted by Eacott (2011) shows that structured strategic planning can have a positive impact on the quality of education. Strategic planning allows educational institutions to develop programs that are relevant, efficient, and based on local and global needs. In addition, strategic planning helps institutions determine development priorities that have a direct impact on improving the quality of education services.

High Schools as one of the Islamic-based educational institutions have their own challenges in implementing strategic planning. Research by Anwar (2020) revealed that High Schools that implement strategic planning based on the needs of students and the local community are able to significantly improve student achievement. This shows the importance of implementing a measurable and targeted strategy.

Factors Affecting the Success of Strategic Planning

According to Robbins and Coulter (2018), the success of strategic planning is influenced by several main factors, including:

- Visionary Leadership: Principals or leaders of educational institutions who have a clear vision are able to motivate all elements of the school to achieve common goals.
- Stakeholder Participation: The involvement of teachers, students, parents, and the community in strategic planning ensures that the programs designed are relevant and acceptable.
- Adequate Resources: Funding, facilities, and training support are important prerequisites for the success of strategic planning.

- Continuous Evaluation: A systematic evaluation and monitoring process ensures that strategic planning can run according to plan and produce the expected impact.

Methods

This study uses a quantitative approach with a survey method. This approach was chosen because it aims to measure the relationship and influence between strategic educational planning and improving the quality of education in Senior High Schools. This study uses a causal explanatory design, which is a design that aims to explain the influence of independent variables (strategic educational planning) on dependent variables (quality of education). This approach allows researchers to test hypotheses empirically. The population in this study was all Senior High Schools in a certain area (for example, one district or province). The research sample was determined using a stratified random sampling technique to ensure proportional representation based on the category of Senior High Schools (public and private). The number of samples was calculated using the Slovin formula with a 95% confidence level.

Results and Discussion

Descriptive Analysis:

Descriptive Analysis Table

	Strategic Planning of Education (X1)	***Resource Management (X2)***	***Implementation of Education Policy (X3)***	***Quality of Education (Z)***	***Principal Managerial Competence (M)***
count	100	100	100	100	100
mean	16,21	16,99	17,07	13,79	15,51
std	2,889531785	2,959303085	2,67896784	2,266555256	2,955887807
min	10	10	11	8	10
25%	14	15	15	12	13
50%	16	17	17	14	15
75%	18	19	19	15	17
max	23	22	22	19	22

The following is an interpretation of the results of the descriptive analysis for each variable:

1. Strategic Planning of Education (X1):

- Mean: 16.21 indicates that the level of strategic planning of education is in the medium to good category on the scale used.
- Standard Deviation (Std): 2.89 indicates that there is moderate variation in the assessment of strategic planning of education among respondents.
- Minimum Value (Min): 10, indicating that there are some respondents who give a low assessment of strategic planning of education.
- First Quartile (25%): 14, indicating that 25% of respondents gave a rating of 14 or lower.
- Conclusion: Strategic planning of education is quite good, but there is significant variation in its implementation among respondents.

2. Resource Management (X2):

- Mean: 16.99 indicates that resource management is in the medium to high category.
- Standard Deviation (Std): 2.96 indicates that there is quite a large variation among respondents regarding resource management.
- Minimum Value (Min): 10, indicating that there is a low assessment on this aspect.
- First Quartile (25%): 15, indicating that 25% of respondents gave a score of 15 or lower.
- Conclusion: Resource management is considered quite good in general, but some institutions show weaknesses.

3. Implementation of Education Policy (X3):

- Average (Mean): 17.07 indicates that the implementation of education policy is considered quite good.
- Standard Deviation (Std): 2.67 indicates moderate variation among respondents.
- Minimum Value (Min): 11, indicating that there are institutions that have difficulty in implementing education policy.
- First Quartile (25%): 15, indicating that most assessments are above the moderate category.
- Conclusion: In general, the implementation of education policies is going well although there is still room for improvement.

4. Quality of Education (Z):

- Mean: 13.79 indicates that the quality of education is at a medium level.
- Standard Deviation (Std): 2.27 indicates that there is quite a large variation in the assessment of the quality of education.
- Minimum Value (Min): 8, indicating that there are institutions with very low quality of education.
- First Quartile (25%): 12, indicating that 25% of institutions have low quality of education.

- Conclusion: The quality of education is generally quite good, but there are some institutions that require special attention.

5. Principal Managerial Competence (M):

- Mean: 15.51 indicates that the principal's managerial competence is in the good category.
- Standard Deviation (Std): 2.96 indicates that there is quite a large variation among respondents.
- Minimum Value (Min): 10, indicating that there are principals who are considered less competent.
- First Quartile (25%): 13, indicating that 25% of principals have poor managerial competence.
- Conclusion: Principals' managerial competence is generally considered good, although some principals still need development.

Validity and Reliability Test

Validity Test Table

Correlations		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	Keterangan
Strategic Planning of Education (X1)	0,000	Valid
Resource Management (X2)	0,000	Valid
Implementation of Education Policy(X3)	0,000	Valid
Quality of Education (Y)	0,000	Valid
Principal Managerial Competence (M)	0,000	Valid
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).		

Interpretation

All variable items in this study have a significance value of 0.000 (<0.005), thus it can be stated that the items in this study are declared valid.

Reliability table

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0,845	5

Interpretation

The items in this study have a Cronbach`s Alpha value of 0.845 (>0.700), thus it can be stated that all variable items in this study are reliable and worthy of being continued in further research.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Model 1

t-Test Table

Coefficients[a]						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2,591	1,171		2,214	0,029
	Strategic Planning of Education (X1)	0,371	0,071	0,473	5,211	0,000
	Resource Management (X2)	0,143	0,098	0,187	1,462	0,147
	Implementation of Education Policy(X3)	0,101	0,108	0,120	0,940	0,350
	Principal Managerial Competence (M)	0,066	0,059	0,086	1,117	0,267
a. Dependent Variable: Quality of Education (Y)						

The following is the interpretation of the t-test results and significance values (Sig.) for each variable in the regression analysis:

1. Constant:

• t = 2.214

• Sig. = 0.029

o Because the significance value is less than 0.05, the model constant is statistically significant. This means that even though there is no influence from the independent variables (X1, X2, X3, M), there are still other factors that influence the Quality of Education (Y) by the constant value (2.591).

2. Strategic Planning of Education (X1):

• t = 5.211

• Sig. = 0.000

o Because the significance value is less than 0.05, Strategic Planning of Education (X1) is statistically significant. This means that this variable has a real influence on the Quality of Education (Y). A high t value indicates a strong relationship.

3. Resource Management (X2):

• t = 1.462

• Sig. = 0.147

o Since the significance value is greater than 0.05, Resource Management (X2) is not statistically significant. This means that, individually, X2 does not have a strong enough influence to affect Quality of Education (Y).

4. Implementation of Education Policy(X3):

• t = 0.940

• Sig. = 0.350

o Since the significance value is greater than 0.05, Implementation of Education Policy(X3) is also not statistically significant. This means that X3 does not have a significant influence on Quality of Education (Y).

5. Principal Managerial Competence (M):

• t = 1.117

• Sig. = 0.267

o Since the significance value is greater than 0.05, Principal Managerial Competence (M) is not statistically significant. This means that, individually, M does not have a significant influence on Quality of Education (Y).

F Test Table

ANOVA[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	273,791	4	68,448	27,694	,000[b]
	Residual	234,799	95	2,472		
	Total	508,590	99			
a. Dependent Variable: Quality of Education (Y)						

b. Predictors: (Constant), Principal Managerial Competence (M), Implementation of Education Policy(X3), Strategic Planning of Education (X1), Resource Management (X2)

The following is an interpretation of the F test results and significance values (Sig.) in the ANOVA table:

1. The F value = 27.694 indicates that the overall regression model is significant. A high F value indicates that the combination of independent variables (X1, X2, X3, M) together significantly affects the dependent variable (Quality of Education, Y).
2. Significance Value (Sig. = 0.000), Because the significance value is less than 0.05, this result indicates that the regression model is statistically significant. This means that there is a real relationship between the independent variables (X1, X2, X3, M) together with the dependent variable (Quality of Education, Y)..

Table of determinant coefficients

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,734[a]	0,538	0,519	1,572
a. Predictors: (Constant), Principal Managerial Competence (M), Implementation of Education Policy(X3), Strategic Planning of Education (X1), Resource Management (X2)				

Interpretation

In model 1, before being influenced by the moderator variable, the RSquare value in this study was 0.538, thus, all variables in this study contributed an influence on the Quality of Education of 53.8%, while the remaining 46.2% was influenced by other variables outside this study.

Model 2

f Test Table

ANOVA[a]					
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.

1	Regression	282,095	7	40,299	16,369	,000[b]
	Residual	226,495	92	2,462		
	Total	508,590	99			
a. Dependent Variable: Quality of Education (Y)						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Principal Managerial Competence (M) * Implementation of Education Policy(X3, Strategic Planning of Education (X1), Resource Management (X2), Implementation of Education Policy(X3), Principal Managerial Competence (M), Managerial Competence* Strategic Planning of Education (X1) , Principal Managerial Competence (M) * Resource Management (X2)						

The following is the interpretation of the ANOVA test results after entering the moderator and interaction variables in the regression model:

1. F value (16.369):

F = 16.369 indicates that the overall regression model is significant after adding the interaction effect between Principal Managerial Competence (M) and other independent variables (X1, X2, X3). A high F value indicates that the independent variables and their interaction effects together have a significant effect on the dependent variable (Quality of Education, Y).

2. Significance Value (Sig. = 0.000):

Because the significance value is less than 0.05, this regression model is statistically significant. This means that the combination of independent variables, moderator variables (Principal Managerial Competence), and their interactions significantly affect Quality of Education (Y).

T-Test Table

Coefficients[a]						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	9,003	6,548		1,375	0,173
	Strategic Planning of Education (X1)	-0,095	0,339	-0,121	-0,280	0,780
	Resource Management (X2)	-0,368	0,546	-0,481	-0,674	0,502
	Implementation of Education Policy(X3)	0,707	0,617	0,835	1,145	0,255

	Principal Managerial Competence (M)	-0,381	0,445	-0,497	-0,857	0,393
	Managerial Competence* Strategic Planning of Education (X1)	0,032	0,022	1,117	1,447	0,151
	Principal Managerial Competence (M) * Resource Management (X2)	0,033	0,035	1,207	0,953	0,343
	Principal Managerial Competence (M) * Implementation of Education Policy(X3	-0,040	0,040	-1,364	-0,992	0,324
a. Dependent Variable: Quality of Education (Y)						

The following is the interpretation of the t-test results and significance values (Sig.) for the second regression model, after being influenced by the moderator and interaction variables:

Independent Variables:

a. Strategic Planning of Education (X1):

t = -0.280, Sig. = 0.780, Because the significance value is greater than 0.05, X1 is not statistically significant in this model. This means that individually, X1 does not have a significant effect on Quality of Education (Y) after considering the moderator variables.

b. Resource Management (X2):

t = -0.674, Sig. = 0.502, Because the significance value is greater than 0.05, X2 is also not statistically significant. This means that X2 does not have a significant effect on Quality of Education (Y).

c. Implementation of Education Policy (X3):

t = 1.145, Sig. = 0.255, Because the significance value is greater than 0.05, X3 is not statistically significant. Thus, X3 does not have a strong enough influence on Quality of Education (Y).

d. Principal Managerial Competence (M): t = -0.857, Sig. = 0.393, Because the significance value is greater than 0.05, M is also not statistically significant. This means that the moderator variables individually do not have a direct influence on Quality of Education (Y).

Variable Interaction (Moderator):

a. Managerial Competence * Strategic Planning of Education (X1):
t = 1.447, Sig. = 0.151, Because the significance value is greater than 0.05, the interaction between M and X1 is not statistically significant. This means that the moderating effect of M on the relationship between X1 and Quality of Education is not strong enough.

b. Managerial Competence * Resource Management (X2):
t = 0.953, Sig. = 0.343, Because the significance value is greater than 0.05, the interaction between M and X2 is also not statistically significant. This means that the moderating effect of M on the relationship between X2 and Quality of Education is not significant enough.

c. Managerial Competence * Implementation of Education Policy (X3):
t = -0.992, Sig. = 0.324, Because the significance value is greater than 0.05, the interaction between M and X3 is not statistically significant. Thus, the moderating effect of M on the relationship between X3 and Quality of Education does not provide a significant influence.

Tabel Coefficien Determinan

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,745[a]	0,555	0,521	1,569
a. Predictors: (Constant), Principal Managerial Competence (M) * Implementation of Education Policy(X3, Strategic Planning of Education (X1), Resource Management (X2), Implementation of Education Policy(X3), Principal Managerial Competence (M), Managerial Competence* Strategic Planning of Education (X1) , Principal Managerial Competence (M) * Resource Management (X2)				

Here is the interpretation of the R Square results in the Summary Model:
R Square value (0.555): R Square = 0.555 means that this model is able to explain 55.5% of the variability in the dependent variable (Quality of Education, Y) through a combination of independent variables (X1, X2, X3) and moderators and their interaction effects (M). The

remaining 44.5% of the variability in Quality of Education (Y) is explained by other factors not included in the variables of this study.

Conclusion

This study aims to analyze the influence of strategic planning of education, resource management, and Implementation of Education Policy on the quality of education, with Principal Managerial Competence as a moderator variable. Based on the results of the analysis, the overall regression model shows a significant relationship, with an R Square value of 0.555. This means that 55.5% of the variability of Quality of Education can be explained by a combination of independent and moderator variables, while the rest is influenced by other factors outside the model. However, the t-test shows that individually, the independent variables and the moderation effect do not have a significant effect on the quality of education.

Strategic planning of education, resource management, and Implementation of Education Policy have a positive relationship with the quality of education, but are not strong enough to be statistically significant. Likewise, the principal's managerial competence, both individually and in its interaction with the independent variables, does not show a significant effect as a moderator. However, this model is able to show that collectively, the combination of these variables makes a significant contribution to the quality of education.

Based on these findings, it is recommended that further research consider other factors that may contribute significantly to educational quality, such as community support, school culture, or more focused policy implementation. In addition, the role of the principal as an educational leader remains important to be further evaluated, especially in improving the coordination and implementation of strategic programs in schools. Overall, this study provides initial insights into the importance of strategic planning, resource management, and implementation of educational policies, as well as the role of the principal in supporting the improvement of educational quality. However, the development of a more complex model with additional variables is needed to obtain a more comprehensive picture.

References

Adel, Iskandar., Ibnu, Rusydi., Husna, Amin., Muhammad, Nur, Hakim., Habyb, Amirul, Haqq. (2022). 5. Strategic Management in Improving the Quality of Education in Boarding School. Al-Ishlah, doi: 10.35445/alishlah.v14i4.2075

Akram, Jalal., Alan, Murray. (2019). 5. Strategic planning for higher education: a novel model for a strategic planning process for higher education.

Altaf, Syauqy, Iqbal, Saifani., Andriyani, Andriyani., Nurmalia, Lusida. (2024). 2. Strategic management in improving education quality. Deleted Journal, doi: 10.37567/jie.v10i1.3253

Andréa, Oliveira, Hopf, Díaz., Daize, Giovanella., Irani, Rocha, de, Souza. (2022). 3. Management in education by applying strategic planning. E-tech, doi: 10.18624/etech.v15i4.1228

Demush, Bajrami. (2023). The Role of Strategic Planning in Ensuring the Success of Education. SEEU Review, doi: 10.2478/seeur-2023-0050

Ekaterina, Koshkina., I., E., Bocharova., E., R., Orlova., S., A., Bannikov. (2023). 1. Strategic planning in the sphere of education in regions. Вестник университета, doi: 10.26425/1816-4277-2023-7-109-120

Hesti, Kusumaningrum., Ahmad, Muzakki, Hakim., Ahmad, Rizky, Nur, Rajab., Rayyana, Fithras, Kiram. (2024). 2. Implementasi Model Manajemen Strategik Sumber Daya Manusia Dalam Peningkatan Kualitas Pendidikan. Gemilang, doi: 10.56910/gemilang.v4i3.1577

Ilham, M., Said., Muarif, Al, Farizi, Rambe., Heri, Setiawan. (2024). 1. Strategies to improve the quality of education. Indonesian Vocational Research Journal, doi: 10.30587/ivrj.v3i2.8404

Marilou, Delfin, Junsay. (2023). 1. Strategic Planning in Education: A Systematic Review. Asian journal of education and social studies, doi: 10.9734/ajess/2023/v45i1976

Muhammad, Roil, Bilad., Siti, Zubaidah., Saiful, Prayogi. (2024). 2. Addressing the PISA 2022 Results: A Call for Reinvigorating Indonesia's Education System. International Journal of Essential Competencies In Education, doi: 10.36312/ijece.v3i1.1935

Notsent, Julius, Sanga., Egidio, Chaula., Salvatory, Flavian, Mhando. (2023). 3. Challenges of Implementing Educational Strategic Plans on Students Academic Performance in Public Secondary Schools in Njombe Town Council, Tanzania. Asian journal of education and social studies, doi: 10.9734/ajess/2023/v49i21128

R., Madhakomala., Matteen, Hakim., Nabillah, Syifauzzuhrah. (2022). 3. Problems of education in indonesia and alternative solutions. International Journal of Business, Law, and Education, doi: 10.56442/ijble.v3i3.64

Rika, Ohno. (2019). 4. Study on Regional Disparity of Academic Achievement in Indonesia. doi: 10.2991/ICREAM-18.2019.43

Riza, H., & Nugroho, A. S. (Eds.). (2020). Kaji Terap Kecerdasan Buatan di Badan Pengkajian dan Penerapan Teknologi. Jurnal SItem Cerdas, 3(1), 1–24. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.37396/jsc.v3i1.60

Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2018). Management. 14th Edition. Pearson Education.

SANNY, F., FERNANDEZ. (2024). 4. Educational management and supervision. doi: 10.55083/isbn.978-93-94435-73-5.ccedtb092469

Setya, Raharja. (2023). 4. The Importance of Strategic Planning With Modern Trends in Education. Al-Ishlah, doi: 10.35445/alishlah.v15i2.2527

Sulfiani, Sulfiani., Nora, Saiva, Jannana., Sedya, Sentosa. (2023). 4. Enhancing Islamic Educational Quality through Output-Based Quality Assurance: A Literature Review Perspective. doi: 10.14421/hjie.2023.32-02

Tilaar, H. A. R. (2004). Manajemen Pendidikan Nasional: Kebijakan dan Implementasi. Jakarta: PT Gramedia.

UNESCO. (2005). EFA Global Monitoring Report: Education for All – The Quality Imperative. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

Wheelen, T. L., & Hunger, J. D. (2018). Strategic Management and Business Policy: Globalization, Innovation, and Sustainability. Pearson Education.

Yusuf, Yusuf., Muhammad, Zuhri, Ismail., Afandi, Afandi. (2024). 1. Implementation of strategic management in improving the quality of education at maktuba al-majidiyah islamic boarding school. Molang, doi: 10.32806/ynaeq523

M., Kozyr., O., Kosachevych., O., B., Терещенко. (2024). 2. Development strategy of a general secondary education institution as a guarantee of a quality educational environment. Pedagogìčna osvìta: teorìâ ì praktika, doi: 10.28925/2311-2409.2024.417

M., Kozyr., O., Kosachevych., O., B., Терещенко. (2024). 3. Development strategy of a general secondary education institution as a guarantee of a quality educational environment. Pedagogìčna osvìta: teorìâ ì praktika, doi: 10.28925/2311-2409.2024.417.

.