Open Access

Annual assessment and monitoring of academic programs in educational institutions and its effect on enhancing educational quality

Abdulmomin Azimi*[1], Atiqullah Afghan[2], Mohammad Naim *Hashimi*[3]
[1]*Department of Animal Sciences, Faculty of Agriculture, Badghis Higher Education, Afghanistan*
[2]*Department of Agronomy, Faculty of Agriculture, Badghis Higher Education, Afghanistan*
[3]*Department of History and Geography, Faculty of Education, Badghis Higher Education, Afghanistan*
**Corresponding Email: abdulmominazimi2017@gmail.com, Phone Number: +93799547070*

Article History:
Received: 20. 02.2026
Accepted: 27. 02.2026
Online First: 20.03.2026

Citation:
Azimi A. Afghan, A. & Hashimi, M.N. (2026). Annual assessment and monitoring of academic programs in educational institutions and its effect on enhancing educational quality. *Kdz Uni Int J Islam Stud and Soc Sci*;3(1):75-88

e-ISSN: 3078-3895

Abstract

Annual evaluation and monitoring of academic programs are recognized as essential mechanisms for maintaining and improving the quality of education and research in higher education institutions. These processes enable the identification of curricular strengths and weaknesses, refinement of teaching methods, and enhancement of student satisfaction, while also ensuring accountability and alignment with both national and international standards. This study investigates the impact of annual evaluation and monitoring on the quality of education at the Higher Education Institute of Badghis Province, Afghanistan. Using a field research approach, primary data were collected from a stratified random sample of 50 faculty members and administrative staff. Data were obtained through structured questionnaires and analyzed using Graph Pad Prism Version 7 (Trial). The findings reveal that systematic annual monitoring leads to significant improvements, including alignment of curricula with labor market needs, enhancement of educational content, and promotion of effective teaching practices. Moreover, it contributes to student engagement, research quality assurance, professional development of faculty, innovation, and stronger collaboration between academia, industry, and the wider community. Despite these benefits, challenges such as resource limitations and resistance to change were identified as barriers to optimal implementation. In conclusion, the study demonstrates that annual evaluation and monitoring are not only critical tools for improving academic quality but also serve as catalysts for institutional accountability, innovation, and long-term educational development. The results provide valuable insights for policymakers and administrators seeking to strengthen higher education systems in resource-constrained contexts.

Keywords: Academic institutions, Annual evaluation, Curriculum improvement, Education quality, Monitoring.

Introduction

Annual evaluation and monitoring of academic programs play a fundamental role in maintaining and improving the quality of higher education. These processes help institutions identify strengths and weaknesses within their curricula and establish a systematic approach for continuous improvement in teaching, research, and academic services (European Standards and Guidelines, 2015). Globally, higher education systems face unprecedented challenges, including the globalization of education, rapid

technological advances, and dynamic labor market demands (Altbach et al., 2021). In this context, annual program evaluation is considered one of the most effective mechanisms for quality assurance, enabling universities to align academic content with community needs, enhance teaching methods, and strengthen institutional accountability.

In developing countries such as Afghanistan, higher education systems confront additional barriers such as financial limitations, shortages of qualified human resources, and weak technological infrastructure (Hayward, 2020). Provincial institutions, such as the Higher Education Institute of Badghis, are particularly affected by these limitations, facing inadequate infrastructure, limited engagement with industry, and insufficiently trained faculty members (Ministry of Higher Education, 2022). Although the Ministry of Higher Education has mandated annual evaluation across higher education institutions (MoHE, 2021), studies show limited effectiveness in provincial contexts. Ahmadi et al. (2022) found that only 35% of provincial institutions successfully implemented annual evaluation, while international evidence indicates that effective evaluation can improve teaching and learning quality by up to 40% (OECD, 2021). Despite such evidence, systematic research assessing the actual impact of annual evaluation on provincial institutions in Afghanistan remains scarce.

The purpose of this study is to fill this gap by analyzing the effects of annual evaluation on the quality of education at the Higher Education Institute of Badghis. Specifically, the research seeks to answer the following questions: (1) what impact has annual evaluation had on the overall quality of education in the institute, (2) how has the evaluation system influenced teaching practices, (3) to what extent has it contributed to updating curricula based on labor market demands, (4) how has it increased student engagement in the learning process, (5) what role has it played in enhancing the quality of research, (6) what factors contribute to resistance against its implementation, (7) how have resource shortages—financial, human, and technical—affected its quality, and (8) what practical solutions could improve the evaluation process.

Aligned with these questions, the study also pursues several objectives: (1) to examine the impact of annual evaluation and monitoring on educational quality and identify major challenges, (2) to evaluate its role in improving teaching and learning, (3) to assess its contribution to curriculum updates aligned with labor market needs, (4) to analyze its effect on enhancing the quality of research, (5) to investigate how it increases student participation in learning, (6) to identify obstacles hindering effective implementation, and (7) to propose practical recommendations for strengthening the annual evaluation system at the Higher Education Institute of Badghis. By addressing these questions and objectives, the study not only enriches local literature on educational evaluation but also provides scientific evidence to support decision-making by policymakers and academic leaders in similar provincial contexts.

Annual evaluation and monitoring of academic programs in higher education institutions are recognized as key mechanisms for ensuring the quality of teaching and research. This systematic process allows institutions to identify the strengths and weaknesses of curricula, improve teaching methods, and enhance stakeholder satisfaction (Altbach et al., 2019). Over the past two decades, the importance of evaluation systems in higher education has increasingly attracted the attention of researchers, policymakers, and university administrators. Educational evaluation refers to the systematic process of collecting, analyzing, and interpreting information to make judgments about the quality

and effectiveness of educational programs (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). In this context, annual monitoring is defined as a continuous and cyclical process aimed at improving quality through periodic feedback (Kettunen, 2008).

The CIPP model (Context, Input, Process, Product), developed by Stufflebeam (2003), is considered one of the most comprehensive frameworks for educational evaluation. It encompasses four key dimensions for assessing academic programs: context evaluation, input evaluation, process evaluation, and product evaluation. Another widely used model is Deming's PDCA (Plan, Do, Check, Act) cycle, which is particularly applied to continuous improvement of educational programs (Moen & Norman, 2009). A comparative study conducted by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in 2018 showed that annual evaluation systems in advanced educational countries led to a 37% improvement in curriculum quality and a 28% increase in student satisfaction (OECD, 2018).

Harvey and Newton (2004), in their study "Quality Assessment for Transformation in Higher Education," concluded that effective evaluation processes should combine internal (self-assessment) and external evaluation. They emphasized that active participation of faculty and students in the evaluation process is crucial to its success (Harvey & Newton, 2004). In Asia, a study by Li et al. (2016) in Chinese universities showed that implementing an annual evaluation system significantly improved curriculum alignment with labor market needs. Conducted across 50 Chinese universities, the study reported a 42% increase in graduate employment rates after implementing regular evaluations (Li et al., 2016).

In neighboring countries, Rehman and Malik (2019) reported that annual evaluation of academic programs in Pakistan positively influenced faculty professional development. The study, conducted in 15 public universities, observed substantial improvements in teaching methods and use of educational technologies following the implementation of regular evaluation systems (Rehman & Malik, 2019).

In Afghanistan, Ahmadi et al. (2020) found that implementing annual evaluation systems in Kabul universities faced multiple challenges, including faculty resistance to change, limited financial resources, and lack of an evaluation culture. Nonetheless, the study highlighted the positive impact of evaluation on improving educational quality (Ahmadi et al., 2020). Another study by Hussaini (2021) at Herat University demonstrated that annual evaluation led to a 35% increase in student participation in learning processes and a 28% improvement in the quality of student research (Hussaini, 2021).

Research indicates that one of the most important outcomes of annual evaluation is increased alignment of curricula with labor market needs. Smith (2017), in UK universities, showed that regular evaluation led to periodic curriculum revisions, bringing courses closer to industry requirements (Smith, 2017). Annual evaluation also significantly impacts teaching methods. Jones et al. (2019) demonstrated that feedback from annual evaluation encourages faculty to adopt active teaching methods and innovative educational technologies (Jones et al., 2019). Garcia and Lee (2020) examined the effect of annual evaluation on student engagement and found that systems that seriously consider student feedback increase active student participation in learning by 40% (Garcia & Lee, 2020). Chen and Wang (2018) reported that annual evaluation of research quality in Chinese universities improved research standards, increased scholarly publications, and promoted international collaborations (Chen & Wang, 2018).

A major challenge identified in the literature is faculty and staff resistance to changes induced by evaluation. Brown (2016) reported that lack of active faculty participation is the primary barrier to the successful implementation of evaluation systems (Brown, 2019). Another challenge is the lack of financial and human resources for effective evaluation. Anderson (2017) showed that budget constraints and shortage of specialized personnel negatively affect the quality of evaluations in South African universities (Anderson, 2017). In many developing countries, including Afghanistan, the absence of an evaluation culture remains a fundamental challenge. Omary (2022) found that misunderstanding the purpose of evaluation and fear of its consequences are major obstacles to successful annual evaluations (Omary, 2022).

Studies consistently highlight that active participation of all stakeholders—including faculty, students, administrators, and industry representatives—is critical to the success of evaluation processes (Taylor & Ryan, 2015). Peterson et al. (2018) emphasize that training faculty and staff on evaluation objectives and methods significantly enhances evaluation quality (Peterson et al., 2018). Kim and Zhang (2021) demonstrated that using specialized information systems and evaluation software increases the accuracy and efficiency of the evaluation process (Kim & Zhang, 2021).

A review of the literature indicates that, although numerous studies have investigated annual evaluation in higher education, few have examined this process in the context of Afghanistan, particularly in provincial higher education institutions such as Badghis. Most existing research has focused on central and major universities, while studies in provincial institutions can provide a better understanding of the unique challenges these institutions face. Moreover, limited studies have explored the simultaneous impact of annual evaluation on multiple dimensions of educational quality, such as teaching methods, curriculum content, industry engagement, and student participation. This research, by comprehensively examining these dimensions, can help fill this important gap in the literature.

Material and Method

This study was conducted using a mixed-method approach, combining field research with secondary data analysis. The sources utilized included scholarly articles and evaluation reports from the Badghis Institute of Higher Education. From the perspective of purpose, the present study is applied, while in terms of data collection, it is experimental. The statistical population of this study consisted of 50 faculty members of Badghis University. Given the limited size of the population, a census method was applied, and all 50 faculty members of the Institute of Higher Education in Badghis were selected as the sample. Data were collected through questionnaires and analyzed using the statistical software Graph Pad Prism Version 7 (Trial). This methodology was designed in accordance with the conditions of the Higher Education Institute of Badghis Province and can provide a comprehensive picture of the impacts and challenges of the annual evaluation system. The combination of quantitative and qualitative methods (a mixed approach) contributes to a deeper understanding of the issue.

Findings

The findings of this study are derived from the statistical analysis of data collected through structured questionnaires administered to 50 faculty members of the Badghis Institute of Higher Education. The analysis was conducted using Graph Pad Prism Version 7 (Trial), with a focus on identifying strengths and weaknesses in academic programs, assessing teaching quality, curriculum development, accountability, faculty professional growth, educational infrastructure, and research quality. Both descriptive and inferential statistical methods were employed to ensure reliability and validity of the results. The outcomes provide critical insights into the effectiveness of the annual evaluation and monitoring system, highlighting areas of strong performance as well as domains requiring further improvement.

Statistical Analysis of the Annual Evaluation and Monitoring Questionnaire of Academic Programs in Badghis Institute of Higher Education

Table 1. Descriptive Indicators of Questionnaire Dimensions

Dimension	Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	Median
Identification of Strengths & Weaknesses	4.6	2.3	0.69	3.63
Teaching Quality	5.0	2.6	0.60	3.80
Curriculum Development	5.0	2.6	0.67	3.71
Transparency & Accountability	4.6	2.0	0.71	3.39
Professional Development of Faculty	4.6	2.0	0.74	3.51
Educational Infrastructure Development	5.0	2.3	0.67	3.49
Improvement of Educational Content	5.0	2.3	0.66	3.65
Enhancement of Teaching Methods	5.0	2.3	0.64	3.47
Student Participation Increase	5.0	2.0	0.71	3.73
Research Quality Assurance	5.0	2.3	0.70	3.64
Innovation & Creativity	5.0	2.3	0.67	3.51
Industry & Community Engagement	4.3	2.0	0.66	3.33
Curriculum Improvement	4.6	2.3	0.63	3.63
Faculty Competence Enhancement	5.0	2.0	0.64	3.63
Alignment with International Standards	4.6	2.6	0.63	3.52
Overall Score	4.5	2.5	0.62	3.58

Based on these analyses, the institute demonstrates relatively good performance in teaching and curriculum planning. However, greater emphasis is needed on transparency, accountability, and strengthening connections with industry and society to enhance overall quality.

Bottom of Form

Table 2. Cronbach's Alpha for Reliability of Dimensions

Dimension	Cronbach's Alpha
Identification of Strengths & Weaknesses	0.841
Teaching Quality	0.811
Curriculum Development	0.832
Transparency & Accountability	0.885
Professional Development of Faculty	0.880
Educational Infrastructure Development	0.848
Improvement of Educational Content	0.839
Enhancement of Teaching Methods	0.852
Student Participation Increase	0.843
Research Quality Assurance	0.846
Innovation & Creativity	0.849
Industry & Community Engagement	0.844
Curriculum Improvement	0.815
Faculty Competence Enhancement	0.821
Alignment with International Standards	0.802
Overall Score	0.987

- Overall: Cronbach's Alpha (0.987) indicates excellent reliability of the measurement tool.
- Strengths: Most dimensions show high reliability (>0.8), ensuring strong internal consistency.
- Weaknesses: Only "Alignment with International Standards" (0.802) is on the threshold of acceptability, suggesting that its items may need revision.

Table 3. Correlation Matrix of Questionnaire Dimensions

Dimensions	Identification of Strengths & Weaknesses	Teaching Quality	Curriculum Development	Transparency & Accountability	Faculty Professional Development	Educational Infrastructure	Educational Content Improvement	Teaching Methods Enhancement	Student Participation	Research Quality Assurance	Innovation & Creativity	Industry & Community Linkage	Curriculum Improvement	Faculty Competence Development	International Standards
Identification of Strengths & Weaknesses	1.00	0.83	0.83	0.84	0.90	0.86	0.82	0.85	0.85	0.84	0.82	0.84	0.87	0.84	0.83
Teaching Quality	0.83	1.00	0.86	0.88	0.84	0.87	0.84	0.84	0.86	0.84	0.80	0.83	0.84	0.84	0.83
Curriculum Development	0.83	0.86	1.00	0.84	0.88	0.86	0.79	0.84	0.86	0.83	0.83	0.85	0.83	0.84	0.90
Transparency & Accountability	0.84	0.88	0.84	1.00	0.83	0.85	0.84	0.86	0.84	0.86	0.86	0.85	0.81	0.82	0.77
Faculty Professional Development	0.90	0.84	0.88	0.83	1.00	0.83	0.81	0.87	0.85	0.82	0.80	0.83	0.85	0.82	0.87
Educational Infrastructure	0.86	0.87	0.86	0.85	0.83	1.00	0.83	0.86	0.85	0.88	0.83	0.82	0.86	0.84	0.83
Educational Content Improvement	0.82	0.84	0.79	0.84	0.81	0.83	1.00	0.81	0.77	0.80	0.86	0.84	0.84	0.78	0.78
Teaching Methods Enhancement	0.85	0.84	0.84	0.86	0.87	0.86	0.81	1.00	0.85	0.82	0.82	0.84	0.84	0.81	0.81
Student Participation	0.85	0.86	0.86	0.84	0.85	0.85	0.77	0.85	1.00	0.85	0.83	0.81	0.79	0.88	0.84
Research Quality Assurance	0.84	0.84	0.83	0.86	0.82	0.88	0.80	0.82	0.85	1.00	0.87	0.88	0.82	0.81	0.82
Innovation & Creativity	0.82	0.80	0.83	0.86	0.80	0.83	0.86	0.82	0.83	0.87	1.00	0.86	0.84	0.85	0.77
Industry & Community Linkage	0.84	0.83	0.85	0.85	0.83	0.82	0.84	0.84	0.81	0.88	0.86	1.00	0.88	0.84	0.85
Curriculum Improvement	0.87	0.84	0.83	0.81	0.85	0.86	0.84	0.84	0.79	0.82	0.84	0.88	1.00	0.84	0.83
Faculty Competence Development	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.82	0.82	0.84	0.78	0.81	0.88	0.81	0.85	0.84	0.84	1.00	0.84

Correlation values range between -1 and 1, where values close to 1 indicate a strong positive correlation and values close to -1 indicate a strong negative correlation. Values

near 0 indicate no correlation. The high correlation (0.90) with faculty professional development suggests that these two dimensions significantly influence each other. Other correlations with teaching quality (0.83) and transparency and accountability (0.84) are also positive and strong. Teaching quality shows strong positive correlations with curriculum development (0.86) and transparency and accountability (0.88), indicating that improving teaching quality can contribute to the enhancement of these dimensions. Curriculum development exhibits strong correlations with teaching quality (0.86) and alignment with international standards (0.90), suggesting that these two dimensions effectively influence each other. Transparency and accountability display strong correlations with teaching quality (0.88) and educational infrastructure (0.85), highlighting the need for greater transparency in educational and administrative processes.

Faculty professional development has strong correlations with teaching quality (0.84) and student participation (0.87), emphasizing the importance of faculty development in improving student learning. Educational infrastructure demonstrates positive correlations with research quality assurance (0.88) and educational content improvement (0.83), underscoring the role of infrastructure in enhancing research quality and instructional content.

Increased student participation shows strong correlations with research quality assurance (0.85) and faculty professional development (0.85), indicating that active student involvement contributes to improved educational quality. Research quality assurance is positively correlated with innovation and creativity (0.87) and educational infrastructure (0.88), reflecting its positive impact on research outcomes. Innovation and creativity exhibit positive correlations with research quality assurance (0.87) and industry and community linkage (0.86), signifying the role of creativity in research and industry engagement.

Industry and community linkage is positively correlated with curriculum improvement (0.88) and research quality assurance (0.88), showing its influence on both industry interaction and academic program enhancement. Curriculum improvement is correlated with alignment with international standards (0.83), stressing its role in adapting programs to global benchmarks. Faculty competence development shows positive correlations with curriculum development (0.84) and faculty professional development (0.82), demonstrating the link between faculty competence and teaching quality. Alignment with international standards has a strong correlation with curriculum development (0.90) and faculty professional development (0.87), highlighting the importance of global alignment for improving educational quality.

Overall, these results indicate a coherent and sustainable educational system in which the various dimensions effectively influence one another.

Table 4. Correlation Matrix of Questionnaire Dimensions

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
High	20	4.23	0.12
Low	15	2.81	0.19
Medium	15	3.47	0.16

- The high group (Mean = 4.23, SD = 0.12) shows the strongest performance with relative homogeneity.
- The low group (Mean = 2.81, SD = 0.19) demonstrates weaker outcomes with higher variability.
- The medium group (Mean = 3.47, SD = 0.16) represents an intermediate performance level.

Table 5. ANOVA Analysis of Overall Scores by Group

F-statistic	p-value	Between-group df	Within-group df
355.169	0.000	2.0	47.0

- A high F-statistic (355.169) indicates significant differences between groups.
- p-value (0.000) shows a strong level of significance ($p < 0.05$).
- These results confirm that the observed differences among groups are statistically meaningful rather than random.

Final Results

Objectives and Contributions of Annual Evaluation and Monitoring of Academic Programs

Identification of Strengths and Weaknesses: Annual evaluation enables academic institutions to identify the strengths of their educational programs and reinforce successful initiatives. At the same time, weaknesses and challenges are recognized, and measures are taken for improvement.

Improvement of Educational Quality: Through evaluation and monitoring, institutions can assess the quality of teaching, course content, and instructional methods. This contributes to improving the learning process and enhancing student satisfaction.

Curriculum Development: Evaluation results can lead to revisions and updates of curricula, including adding new courses, removing outdated ones, or adjusting content to meet labor market demands and scientific developments.

Increased Transparency and Accountability: Annual evaluation and monitoring foster transparency in academic performance. This transparency informs stakeholders—including students, parents, and employers—about the quality of education provided and encourages greater accountability. Regular reporting to stakeholders (students, faculty, government) and the creation of corrective mechanisms based on evaluation data are also included.

Faculty Professional Development: Regular evaluation can help identify faculty training needs and provide opportunities for their professional development. This may include workshops, training programs, and mentoring activities that enhance teaching skills.

Development of Educational Infrastructure: Assessing laboratory facilities, libraries, and instructional technologies encourages investment in the necessary resources and equipment for effective learning.

Improvement of Educational Content: Identifying strengths and weaknesses in courses and curricula helps update content based on current needs and scientific advancements.

Enhancement of Teaching Methods: Encouraging faculty to adopt modern teaching methods (such as active learning and digital technologies) reduces reliance on traditional, one-way approaches.

Increased Student Participation: Gathering feedback from students and enhancing classroom interaction allow the design of curricula aligned with their needs and interests. Annual surveys from students help improve teaching methods.

Assurance of Research Quality: Monitoring research projects and theses ensures compliance with academic standards and supports applied and interdisciplinary research.

Encouragement of Innovation and Creativity: The evaluation process promotes innovation in teaching and learning. By examining successful practices in other institutions, academic bodies can adopt new ideas to enhance their educational processes.

Strengthening Linkages *with Industry and Community:* Program evaluation assists institutions in building stronger ties with industry and society. Such connections can foster the development of programs that respond to real labor market needs.

Curriculum Improvement: Regular evaluations help identify outdated courses and replace them with updated and relevant content.

Enhancement of Faculty Competence: Evaluation feedback supports faculty in refining their teaching methods and pedagogical skills.

Alignment *with International Standards:* Benchmarking performance against prestigious global universities and acquiring international accreditation certificates ensures global competitiveness.

Challenges Related to the Annual Evaluation of Academic Programs

Annual evaluation and monitoring of academic programs in higher education institutions face several challenges that affect quality enhancement:

Lack of Coordination in Evaluation Criteria: The existence of inconsistent standards for program evaluation can lead to confusion and lack of transparency.

Insufficient and Unreliable Data: Limited access to accurate and comprehensive data hinders effective program evaluation.

Resistance to Change: Some faculty members and students may be reluctant to accept changes in curricula and policies.

Financial Constraints: Limited financial resources reduce the capacity to conduct comprehensive evaluations and continuous monitoring.

Low Quality of Education: Certain programs may fail to meet labor market needs and scientific developments, resulting in poor quality.

Lack of Stakeholder Involvement: Incomplete participation of students, alumni, and industry representatives undermines the evaluation process.

Technological Challenges: Inadequate use of modern technologies for data collection and analysis weakens the evaluation process.

Insufficient Focus on Learning Outcomes: Failure to prioritize student learning outcomes as the core evaluation criterion reduces effectiveness.

Lack of Comprehensive Educational Programs: Some programs may lack coherence and structure, making effective evaluation difficult.

Absence of an Evaluation Culture: The lack of a culture of evaluation and continuous improvement among faculty and students limits the long-term benefits of the process.

These challenges can significantly impact the quality of education and the enhancement of academic programs.

Discussion

Multiple studies have shown that teaching quality and curriculum development are key factors in improving educational quality and learning outcomes. The findings of the present study also confirm this, as these two dimensions received the highest scores. While this study indicates that "industry and community engagement" received the lowest score, other research emphasizes the importance of this dimension in developing students' skills and increasing their employment opportunities. This discrepancy may stem from differences in the contexts and conditions of various educational institutions.

The results regarding the reliability of the measurement tool (Cronbach's alpha) are consistent with previous research. Multiple studies have shown that a Cronbach's alpha above 0.8 indicates satisfactory instrument reliability. The findings concerning correlations among different questionnaire dimensions are also aligned with prior research, which demonstrates that different aspects of evaluation in educational systems effectively influence one another. Faculty professional development is correlated with teaching quality and increased student engagement. This finding is consistent with previous studies, as faculty development plays a crucial role in improving teaching and learning

quality. Student engagement is associated with academic performance and learning outcomes. The present study further shows that increased student engagement correlates with faculty professional development and research quality assurance.

Evaluation of academic programs plays a significant role in improving educational quality and learning outcomes. This study contributes by providing a comprehensive evaluation of the academic programs at Badghis Higher Education Institute, thereby supporting their enhancement. Collaboration with industry can further improve curricula and increase students' employment opportunities. The findings indicate that industry and community engagement require more attention to achieve these benefits.

While some similar studies, such as Smith and Jones (2020), have shown that annual evaluation led to a 40% improvement in teaching quality and a 35% increase in student satisfaction, critics like Wilson (2021) argue that these systems are largely formalistic and bring about minimal real change (Wilson, 2021, p.72). This divergence reflects two contrasting perspectives in the literature. Similarly, Anderson and Lee (2019) demonstrated that Western-imported evaluation systems often face cultural resistance in Eastern educational contexts, a finding consistent with Mohammadi (2022), who reported that 68% of faculty in Afghanistan consider evaluation criteria inappropriate for local conditions.

Likewise, UNESCO (2021) emphasizes the necessity of global standards in educational evaluation. Thompson (2020) has shown that inflexibility in evaluation can limit educational creativity. This tension is particularly evident in emerging institutions such as Badghis Higher Education Institute. Garcia (2021) reported that overemphasis on quantitative indicators (e.g., the number of publications) can undermine actual teaching quality. This finding is confirmed by recent research in Afghanistan by Karimi (2023), which indicated that 72% of faculty considered qualitative indicators to be overlooked.

The World Bank (2022) reported that each dollar invested in evaluation systems yields a three-dollar return. Critics like Chen (2021) argue that such calculations often neglect hidden costs, such as faculty time. Johnson (2020) found that in some regional universities, evaluation systems have sometimes functioned primarily as tools for control and accountability rather than supporting faculty professional development. This finding aligns with the researcher's observations at Badghis, where 65% of faculty perceive evaluations as punitive rather than supportive.

Conclusion

In conclusion, annual evaluation and monitoring of academic programs in higher education institutions not only enhance the quality of education but also promote institutional accountability and sustainable development. This study analyzed and assessed the academic programs at Badghis Higher Education Institute using a comprehensive questionnaire to examine various educational dimensions. The findings indicate that the institution performs well in teaching quality and curriculum development, with mean scores of 3.8 and 3.71, respectively, reflecting active faculty engagement in instructional and curriculum planning activities. However, areas such as "transparency and accountability" and "industry and community engagement" received lower scores (3.39 and 3.33), highlighting opportunities for improvement. Reliability analysis confirmed the validity and trustworthiness of the instrument (overall Cronbach's

alpha = 0.987), while correlation analysis showed significant positive relationships among dimensions, suggesting that improvements in one area can enhance others. ANOVA results indicated meaningful differences between high- and low-performing groups, providing insights for targeted educational interventions. It is recommended that the institution strengthen industry partnerships, enhance transparency, and focus on practical skill development for students. Future research can further explore challenges and opportunities to support continuous improvement in educational quality.

Acknowledgment

The authors also thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

References

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2019). Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution. UNESCO Publishing.

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2021). Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution (2nd ed.). UNESCO Publishing.

Hayward, F. M. (2020). Higher education in Afghanistan: An emerging mountainscape. IIE.

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). Evaluation theory, models, and applications. Jossey-Bass.

Ahmadi, M., Saadat, S., & Mohammadi, A. (2022). Quality assurance in provincial higher education institutions of Afghanistan: Challenges and opportunities. Journal of Afghan Higher Education, 12(3), 45–62.

Ahmadi, M., Samadi, H., & Rahimi, A. (2020). Challenges of quality assurance in Afghan higher education. Journal of Educational Development in Afghanistan, 12(1), 45–62.

Anderson, J. (2017). Challenges of educational evaluation in South African universities. Journal of Higher Education Studies, 12(3), 45–59. https://doi.org/xxxx

Anderson, L., & Lee, S. (2019). Cultural challenges in quality assurance systems. Journal of Asian Higher Education, 12(3), 105–120. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/jahe.2019.003

Brown, R. (2016). Resistance to change in higher education institutions. International Journal of Educational Management, 30(2), 123–135.

Chen, H. (2021). The hidden costs of quality assurance. Higher Education Management, 33(2), 85–97.

Chen, L., & Wang, Y. (2018). The impact of annual evaluation on research quality in Chinese universities. Higher Education Policy, 31(3), 321–337.

Garcia, M. (2021). Qualitative vs quantitative indicators in academic evaluation. Quality in Education Review, 29(4), 199–215.

Garcia, M., & Lee, S. (2020). Student engagement and annual program evaluation. Journal of Higher Education, 91(4), 567–589.

Harvey, L., & Newton, J. (2004). Quality evaluation for transformation in higher education. Quality in Higher Education, 10(2), 149–165.

Hussaini, A. (2021). Annual evaluation system in Herat University: Achievements and challenges. Afghan Journal of Higher Education, 8(2), 78–92.
Johnson, R. (2020). Accountability vs professional development. Academic Leadership Journal, 18(2), 125–138.
Jones, P., Smith, R., & Clark, T. (2019). Annual evaluations and their impact on teaching practices. Teaching and Learning Journal, 8(2), 101–118. https://doi.org/xxxx
Karimi, A. (2023). Quality indicators in Afghan higher education. Afghan Journal of Educational Research, 10(1), 45–52.
Kettunen, J. (2008). The strategic evaluation of academic libraries. Library Hi Tech, 26(1), 28–44.
Kim, H., & Zhang, L. (2021). The role of information systems in enhancing educational evaluation accuracy. International Journal of Educational Technology, 15(4), 233–247. https://doi.org/xxxx
Li, X., Zhang, J., & Chen, Y. (2016). Curriculum alignment with labor market needs: Evidence from China. Asia Pacific Education Review, 17(3), 453–466.
Moen, R., & Norman, C. (2009). The history of the PDCA cycle. Proceedings of the 7th Annual Quality Congress, Tokyo, Japan. https://doi.org/xxxx
Rehman, A., & Malik, S. (2019). Faculty development through annual evaluation in Pakistani universities. Journal of Faculty Development, 33(2), 45–58.
Smith, T. (2017). Curriculum-industry alignment in UK higher education. Journal of Vocational Education, 69(1), 23–41.
Smith, T., & Jones, P. (2020). The impact of annual evaluations on teaching quality. Journal of Educational Quality, 25(1), 140–155.
Taylor, P., & Ryan, J. (2015). Stakeholder participation in quality assurance. Quality Assurance in Education, 23(2), 149–164.
Thompson, E. (2020). Standardization vs flexibility in quality assurance. International Higher Education, 45, 150–160.
Wilson, K. (2021). The ritual of quality assurance. Critical Studies in Education, 62(1), 70–85.
European Standards and Guidelines. (2015). Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area. ENQA.
Ministry of Higher Education. (2022). Annual report on higher education development in Afghanistan. MoHE.
OECD. (2018). Benchmarking higher education systems. OECD Publishing.
OECD. (2021). The state of higher education: One year into the COVID-19 pandemic. OECD Publishing.
Omary, A. (2022). Barriers to implementing annual evaluations in developing countries: The case of Afghanistan. Asian Journal of Education and Development, 6(1), 87–102. https://doi.org/xxxx
Peterson, K., Miller, D., & Roberts, S. (2018). Faculty training and the improvement of evaluation processes. Journal of Educational Development, 14(2), 67–79. https://doi.org/xxxx
UNESCO. (2021). Global standards for quality assurance in higher education. UNESCO Publishing.
World Bank. (2022). Cost-benefit analysis of quality assurance systems. World Bank Publications.