Coaching-Based Academic Supervision for Junior High School Teachers: From Planning to Evaluation and performance Improvement

Markas Ismi Afaidi, Bahrun, Suparta Rasyid, And Cut Lismeni
Universitas Syiah Kuala, Banda Aceh, Indonesia
Corresponding author: supartarasyid@usk.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines the planning, implementation, and evaluation of coaching-based academic supervision as an effort to improve teacher performance at the junior high school level. Employing a descriptive qualitative design, the study involved 12 participants consisting of school principals, teachers, and school supervisors. Data were collected over a three-month period through observation, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis using purposive sampling. Data analysis followed an interactive model comprising data reduction, data display, and verification, supported by restatement, analytical description, and interpretation to capture patterns, relationships, and meanings within the supervision process. The findings reveal that (1) supervision planning is systematically conducted at the beginning of the academic year through deliberation, needs analysis, goal formulation, instrument preparation, and scheduling; (2) the implementation of coaching-based academic supervision follows three stages—pre-observation, classroom observation, and post-observation—emphasizing reflective dialogue and collaborative interaction; and (3) evaluation results are utilized to refine supervision programs, address teachers' instructional challenges, and adjust coaching strategies to support continuous professional development. Overall, the study concludes that coaching-based academic supervision contributes to improved teacher performance through participatory planning, structured and supportive implementation, and reflective evaluation that fosters professional growth and sustainable instructional improvement.

Keywords: academic supervision, coaching, teacher performance, implementation, evaluation

Introduction

The quality of education in Indonesia continues to face serious challenges, particularly at the junior high school (SMP) level, which represents a critical transition from basic learning to more complex academic demands. Various reports suggest that the quality of learning in many SMPs remains closely associated with teacher performance, especially in lesson planning, the use of innovative instructional strategies, technology integration, and comprehensive assessment practices. When these areas are weak, classroom learning tends to become monotonous, feedback is limited, and improvement in student learning outcomes becomes difficult to achieve.

In this context, academic supervision is widely viewed as a strategic instrument for improving teaching practices through systematic professional guidance (Suhardan, 2014). Supervision, in educational administration, is not merely an evaluative procedure but a professional service intended to strengthen teachers' pedagogical competence, enhance self-confidence, and support job satisfaction (Suhardan, 2014; Sutisna, 1989). However, in many school settings, academic supervision is still carried out within a traditional framework that emphasizes administrative monitoring and performance appraisal rather than collaborative professional

growth. As a result, supervision may be experienced as compliance-oriented and less effective in promoting reflective practice and instructional innovation.

Recent developments in educational leadership and supervision highlight a growing shift from supervision as "control" toward supervision as teacher capacity development. International evidence indicates that consistent coaching can significantly improve teaching quality, reinforcing the relevance of coaching as an alternative supervision paradigm (Kraft et al., 2018). In line with this shift, studies also emphasize the importance of principals and school supervisors in conducting planned, continuous, and development-oriented supervision (Hoque et al., 2020; Shobariyah & Dwikurnaningsih, 2025). Nevertheless, there remains a conceptual and empirical gap regarding how coaching-based academic supervision is designed and enacted in schools, particularly at the junior high school level, where teacher demands increase alongside curriculum complexity and expectations for technology integration (Rasyid et al., 2022).

Coaching-based academic supervision is therefore increasingly recognized as a relevant strategy for addressing the demands of 21st-century education. This approach emphasizes partnership, reflective dialogue, and ongoing mentoring—features that distinguish it from conventional supervision models (Lofthouse, 2018; Zepeda, 2017). In junior high schools, where teachers must respond to adolescent developmental needs, curriculum requirements, and evolving learning technologies, coaching can function as a transformative mechanism that supports professional adaptation and sustainable instructional improvement (Chen, 2018; Tekir, 2022). Through collaborative relationships between principals, supervisors, and teachers, coaching-based supervision encourages reflective teaching, experimentation with instructional strategies, and continuous professional learning.

Building on these issues, this study offers novelty by providing a comprehensive analysis of how coaching-based academic supervision is planned, implemented, and evaluated in junior high school settings. Unlike studies that focus primarily on conventional supervision procedures, this study positions coaching as a core approach for strengthening teacher capacity and improving performance. Specifically, the contribution of this study lies in mapping the supervision process from planning to evaluation and explaining how institutional structures, leadership practices, and school resources shape the effectiveness of coaching-based supervision in the junior high school context.

Literature Review

Academic supervision

Academic supervision is widely conceptualized as a form of professional service aimed at improving the quality of teaching and learning through systematic guidance, reflection, and professional support (Suhardan, 2014; Sutisna, 1989). In contemporary educational discourse, supervision is no longer viewed merely as administrative oversight but as an educative, dialogic, and collaborative process that supports teachers' continuous professional development (Imamah & Churrahman, 2022; Zepeda, 2017). This perspective emphasizes supervision as a developmental practice that encourages reflection, instructional improvement, and shared responsibility for learning quality.

Scholars have highlighted that effective academic supervision contributes to the creation of a positive school climate and improved teacher performance. Blase and Blasé (2000) argue that supervision becomes effective when it provides constructive feedback and sustained instructional support, rather than one-time evaluation. Similarly, Glickman (2021) emphasizes that the essence of supervision lies in empowering teachers through reflection, collaboration, and mentoring, rather

than controlling their performance. Empirical studies further support this view, demonstrating that supervision positively influences teacher professionalism and student learning outcomes when implemented as a continuous and supportive process (Amtu et al., 2020; Erwiati et al., 2022).

In the Indonesian educational context, academic supervision continues to evolve in response to the demands of 21st-century learning. The effectiveness of supervision is strongly influenced by principals' leadership capacity, supervisors' professional competence, and teachers' openness to professional guidance (Hamka, 2023). Recent studies suggest that supervision models emphasizing reflective practice and collaborative interaction are more effective in fostering innovation, pedagogical improvement, and technology integration in classrooms (Hidayati et al., 2025; Toh et al., 2022). These findings indicate that academic supervision plays a strategic role in transforming teaching practices and strengthening a culture of professional learning in schools.

Coaching

Coaching is commonly defined as a structured mentoring process oriented toward developing individual potential through reflective dialogue, meaningful questioning, and constructive feedback (Grant, 2013; Whitmore, 1992). In educational settings, coaching is understood as a collaborative approach that enables teachers to identify solutions to instructional challenges through self-awareness and reflection, rather than receiving directive instructions (Alindawati et al., 2024). This approach positions teachers as active learners and partners in professional growth.

Lofthouse (2018) emphasizes that coaching fosters teachers' reflective capacity and supports lifelong professional learning. Similarly, coaching has been shown to strengthen teachers' autonomy, creativity, and intrinsic motivation to improve instructional quality (Glickman, 2021; Hidayati et al., 2025). Empirical evidence indicates that trust-based coaching relationships accelerate teacher professional development and encourage instructional innovation (Chen, 2018). When coaching is integrated into academic supervision, it shifts the supervision paradigm from evaluation toward sustained professional learning and developmental support (Zepeda, 2017).

Within the supervision context, coaching functions as a key mechanism that facilitates reflective dialogue, collaborative problem-solving, and instructional experimentation. Through equal partnerships between supervisors and teachers, coaching-based supervision supports teachers in exploring new strategies, refining classroom practices, and developing professional confidence (Hamka, 2023). Consequently, coaching is increasingly recognized as a strategic approach for improving teacher performance and fostering collaborative learning cultures in schools.

Teacher performance

Teacher performance refers to teachers' professional ability to plan, implement, and evaluate learning effectively in order to achieve educational goals (Rukajat et al., 2022). This performance encompasses not only technical teaching skills but also pedagogical, professional, social, and personal competencies, as stipulated in national teacher competency standards (Tekir, 2022). Saihu (2020) describes teacher performance as an indicator of the effectiveness of teachers' roles in facilitating meaningful learning experiences.

Previous studies consistently demonstrate that teacher performance is positively associated with academic supervision, instructional leadership, and institutional support (Amtu et al., 2020). Coaching-based supervision, in particular, contributes to improved teacher performance by enhancing reflective practice, creativity, and intrinsic motivation (Blase & Blasé, 2000; Lofthouse,

2018). Hidayati et al. (2025) further argue that teacher performance improvement is more sustainable when supervision is conducted collaboratively and oriented toward continuous competency development.

Both internal and external factors influence teacher performance. Internal factors include motivation, commitment, and reflective attitudes, while external factors encompass organizational climate, supervisory support, and the availability of learning resources (Imamah & Churrahman, 2022; Zepeda, 2017). Taken together, these studies suggest that teacher performance serves as a key indicator of instructional quality and the effectiveness of coaching-based academic supervision.

Implementation and evaluation framework for academic supervision

Understanding the implementation and evaluation framework is essential for examining how coaching-based academic supervision operates systematically and how its effectiveness is assessed. Educational management literature commonly describes supervision as a cyclical process consisting of planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation (Zepeda, 2017). During the planning stage, supervisors formulate objectives, prepare instruments, design coaching strategies, and establish indicators of success.

The implementation stage involves classroom observation, reflective dialogue, feedback, and ongoing professional mentoring. Monitoring ensures that supervision activities align with planned objectives and allows supervisors to assess the quality of coaching interactions and teacher engagement. Evaluation, in turn, focuses on identifying changes in teaching behavior, improvements in pedagogical competence, and the broader impact on learning quality (Glickman, 2021).

Both formative and summative evaluation approaches are necessary to ensure that supervision is effective not only in process but also in outcome. Through systematic implementation and evaluation, coaching-based academic supervision becomes a structured and evidence-informed mechanism for improving teacher performance and sustaining professional development. This framework provides a strong analytical foundation for examining the design, implementation, and evaluation of coaching-based supervision in junior high school settings.

Methodology

Research design and approach of the study

This study employed a descriptive qualitative research design to examine how coaching-based academic supervision is planned, implemented, and evaluated in junior high schools. A qualitative approach was considered appropriate because the study aimed to capture in-depth insights into supervision practices, coaching interactions, and their contribution to teacher performance within a natural school setting. Qualitative inquiry allows researchers to explore meanings, experiences, and social processes that cannot be adequately represented through quantitative measures (Sugiyono, 2023).

To support this aim, the study utilized passive participant observation, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis. These methods enabled a comprehensive understanding of the supervision process and facilitated the exploration of perspectives from different stakeholders involved in academic supervision.

Research site and participants

The research was conducted at three public junior high schools: SMP Negeri 1 Salang, SMP Negeri 3 Salang, and SMP Negeri 4 Salang, located in Simeulue Regency, Aceh, Indonesia. These schools were selected because they actively implement academic supervision practices that incorporate coaching elements and involve collaboration between principals, teachers, and school supervisors.

A total of 12 participants were involved in the study, consisting of three principals, six teachers, and three school supervisors. Participants were selected using purposive sampling to ensure the inclusion of informants who possessed direct experience and in-depth knowledge of the design, implementation, and evaluation of academic supervision. The criteria for participant selection included: (1) active involvement in academic supervision activities, (2) professional experience relevant to supervision or teaching practice, and (3) willingness to participate in the study. Data collection was conducted over a three-month period to allow sufficient time for observing supervision cycles and follow-up activities.

In addition to human participants, documents such as supervision plans, observation instruments, lesson plans, follow-up notes, and supervision schedules were included as units of analysis. These documents provided contextual and corroborative evidence regarding supervision practices and outcomes.

Data collection

Data were collected using three complementary techniques: observation, semi-structured interviews, and documentation. The use of multiple techniques was intended to strengthen data credibility through triangulation (Patton, 2002).

Observation was conducted using a passive participant approach, whereby the researcher observed supervision activities without direct involvement. Observations focused on the three stages of academic supervision: pre-observation, classroom observation, and post-observation. Field notes and, where appropriate, audio-visual records were used to document interactions, coaching dialogues, and supervision dynamics (Creswell & Poth, 2016).

Semi-structured interviews were carried out with principals, teachers, and school supervisors to explore their experiences, perceptions, and interpretations of coaching-based supervision. An interview guide was developed to ensure consistency across participants while allowing flexibility to probe emerging issues (Kvale, 2009). Interviews focused on supervision planning, coaching interactions, evaluation processes, and perceived impacts on teacher performance.

Document analysis involved reviewing supervision programs, assessment instruments, observation sheets, and evaluation reports. These documents were analyzed to verify the consistency between planned supervision activities and their actual implementation.

Data analysis

Data analysis followed the interactive model proposed by Miles and Huberman (2007), which consists of three interconnected stages: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. During data reduction, interview transcripts, observation notes, and documents were coded and organized into thematic categories related to supervision planning, implementation, and evaluation (Miles et al., 2014).

Data display was conducted through thematic narratives, tables, and matrices to facilitate the identification of patterns, relationships, and trends across data sources (Creswell & Poth, 2016). In the verification stage, emerging interpretations were continually compared with the data through member checking, document review, and triangulation to ensure analytical rigor.

In addition, the analysis incorporated three complementary procedures: (1) restatement of data to reformulate key findings, (2) analytical description to identify patterns and relationships, and (3) interpretation to reveal the underlying meanings and theoretical as well as practical implications of the findings. This iterative process enhanced the trustworthiness and depth of the analysis.

Trustworthiness

To ensure the trustworthiness of the findings, this study applied criteria of credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Credibility was strengthened through source triangulation, technique triangulation, and member checking, whereby participants were invited to verify preliminary interpretations. Dependability was supported by maintaining detailed documentation of research procedures and analytical decisions. Confirmability was ensured by grounding interpretations in empirical evidence and minimizing researcher bias through reflective field notes. Transferability was addressed by providing rich descriptions of the research context, participants, and supervision processes.

Findings

To explore how coaching-based academic supervision is planned, implemented, and evaluated in junior high schools, qualitative data obtained from observations, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis were analyzed using an interactive analysis model (Miles et al., 2014). The analysis involved data reduction, data display, and verification, enabling the identification of recurring patterns, relationships, and dynamics within the supervision process.

From this analysis, three major themes emerged:
1) academic supervision planning,
2) implementation of coaching-based academic supervision, and
3) evaluation and follow-up for improving teacher performance. These themes reflect the sequential and cyclical nature of supervision practices in the studied schools.

Table 1 summarizes the main themes, descriptions, and representative quotations derived from the analysis of supervision practices.

Table 1. *Analysis of the academic supervision process in improving teacher performance*

Themes	Descriptions	Representative quotes
Academic Supervision Planning	Supervision planning is carried out systematically through analyzing teacher needs, developing schedules, determining instruments, and formulating development objectives. The planning process involves the principal and teachers to ensure that supervision is relevant and contextual.	*"Our supervision plan is developed based on teacher needs at the beginning of each year." (K1)* *"The supervision schedule is mutually agreed upon to avoid disrupting the learning process." (K3)* *"Observation instruments are prepared to ensure a more focused supervision process." (K4)*

Implementation of Academic Supervision: Supporting Factors	Effective supervision implementation is supported by a clear institutional structure, collaborative leadership, the availability of competent human resources, and measurable supervision objectives. These factors strengthen the coaching process and increase teacher engagement.	*"The principal provides clear direction regarding the supervision process." (G4)* *"The supervisory team structure helps ensure a more organized division of tasks." (P1)* *"Teachers feel supported because they receive direct guidance." (G3)* *"Supervision targets are tailored to each teacher's abilities." (P3)*
Academic Supervision Evaluation: Results of Supervision Implementation	Evaluation is conducted through reflection, feedback, and follow-up on supervision results. This process contributes to improving pedagogical competence, learning quality, and teacher professionalism. Evaluation ensures tangible changes in teacher performance.	*"After receiving feedback, I feel more confident in teaching." (G2)* *"The results of the supervision show improvements in the teacher's classroom management." (K1)* *"Follow-up supervision helps teachers improve their teaching methods." (P1)* *"Supervision makes my performance more focused and measurable." (G1)*

Theme 1: Academic supervision planning

The findings indicate that academic supervision planning has shifted toward a more systematic and needs-based approach. Principals, in collaboration with senior teachers and curriculum teams, formulate supervision objectives that emphasize teacher professional development rather than procedural compliance. Planning activities include needs analysis, scheduling, preparation of observation instruments, and identification of instructional issues requiring follow-up.

As reflected in Table 1, planning is carried out through deliberative processes that involve teachers, ensuring that supervision is perceived as relevant and contextual. One principal stated, *"Our supervision plan is developed based on teacher needs at the beginning of each year"* (K1). This collaborative planning process fosters shared understanding between supervisors and teachers, thereby increasing readiness for implementation.

Furthermore, open and dialogic communication plays a crucial role in effective planning. Principals act as facilitators who clarify supervision goals and emphasize professional growth. Participants reported that this approach reduced anxiety and encouraged teachers to view supervision as supportive rather than evaluative. However, despite these strengths, technical challenges such as scheduling inconsistencies were noted, indicating the need for stronger coordination to ensure sustainability

Theme 2: Implementation of academic supervision: supporting factors

The implementation of academic supervision is characterized by structured stages—pre-observation, classroom observation, and post-observation—supported by institutional structures, collaborative leadership, and competent human resources. As shown in Table 1, these supporting factors strengthen the coaching process and enhance teacher engagement.

Participants emphasized the importance of teamwork and leadership clarity in ensuring effective implementation. One teacher noted, *"The supervisory team structure helps the division of tasks more orderly"* (K1). The principal's role was particularly significant in creating a non-judgmental coaching atmosphere, enabling teachers to openly discuss instructional challenges.

In addition, senior teachers and school supervisors contributed technical input related to classroom management, instructional media, and learning strategies. This collaborative coaching

approach enriched the supervision process and increased the relevance of feedback provided to teachers. A participant highlighted, *"The principal gave clear direction, but still made us feel valued"* (G4).

Nevertheless, the findings also reveal limitations in the depth of post-observation reflection and the consistency of follow-up activities. These challenges suggest the need for strengthening implementation management to maximize the impact of coaching-based supervision on instructional practices.

Theme 3: Academic supervision evaluation: results of supervision implementation

Evaluation emerges as a reflective and developmental component of coaching-based academic supervision. The evaluation process involves feedback sessions, joint reflection, and follow-up actions aimed at improving teacher performance. As illustrated in Table 1, evaluation is not limited to documenting results but functions as a mechanism for professional learning.

Teachers reported increased confidence and instructional focus following evaluation sessions. One teacher stated, *"After receiving feedback, I feel more confident in teaching"* (G2). Evaluation outcomes were used to identify specific instructional challenges and to design follow-up actions such as mentoring, targeted training, and peer support.

Although some participants expressed the need for more consistent follow-up, overall evaluation practices were perceived as beneficial in improving classroom management, instructional strategies, and professional awareness. These findings indicate that evaluation, when conducted collaboratively and reflectively, contributes to sustained improvements in teacher performance and professionalism.

Overall, the findings reveal that coaching-based academic supervision in the studied schools operates as a structured and reflective cycle encompassing planning, implementation, and evaluation. Planning is conducted collaboratively and grounded in teacher needs, implementation emphasizes supportive coaching interactions, and evaluation functions as a tool for continuous professional development. Together, these processes contribute to improved teacher performance, increased instructional confidence, and the development of a more collaborative and reflective school culture.

Discussion

The findings of this study indicate a clear shift in academic supervision practices from traditional, control-oriented models toward a coaching-based and collaborative approach. Across the stages of planning, implementation, and evaluation, academic supervision is no longer positioned merely as an administrative requirement but as a structured professional learning process that supports teacher development. This shift reflects broader changes in educational supervision theory, which emphasize reflection, partnership, and continuous improvement rather than inspection and compliance (Zepeda, 2017; Lofthouse, 2018).

Coaching-based supervision as a transformative leadership practice

The planning phase of supervision demonstrates how coaching-based supervision is grounded in teachers' actual needs and professional contexts. Involving teachers in needs analysis, scheduling, and instrument preparation creates a sense of shared ownership and reduces resistance to supervision. This finding aligns with instructional leadership theory, which emphasizes that effective school leaders facilitate professional growth by aligning supervision goals with teachers' instructional realities (Hallinger, 2011; Cansoy & Parlar, 2018). By shifting the focus from

procedural compliance to professional development, principals position supervision as a supportive rather than evaluative process, thereby strengthening teachers' readiness to engage in reflective practice.

Furthermore, this needs-based planning approach confirms previous findings that supervision becomes more effective when teachers are treated as professional partners rather than passive recipients of evaluation (Hoque et al., 2020; Nurhadi et al., 2023). In the context of junior high schools, where instructional demands are increasingly complex, such collaborative planning serves as a critical foundation for sustainable coaching-based supervision.

Implementation through reflective and collaborative coaching

The implementation findings highlight that coaching-based supervision operates through structured stages—pre-observation, observation, and post-observation—while emphasizing reflective dialogue and mutual trust. This approach supports the argument that coaching is most effective when it is embedded in ongoing instructional interactions rather than isolated evaluative events (Zepeda, 2017). The presence of principals, senior teachers, and supervisors as part of a collaborative supervision team further reinforces the multidimensional nature of coaching, combining pedagogical, managerial, and emotional support.

These findings are consistent with Chen (2018) and Solms et al. (2025), who emphasize that trust-based coaching relationships accelerate professional learning and encourage teachers to experiment with instructional strategies. When principals adopt a non-judgmental and facilitative stance, supervision becomes a space for inquiry and problem-solving rather than performance appraisal. This supports Kraft et al.'s (2018) meta-analysis, which demonstrated that coaching-focused supervision has a stronger impact on teaching quality than conventional observation-based models.

Nevertheless, the findings also reveal limitations related to the depth of post-observation reflection and the consistency of follow-up activities. This suggests that while coaching-based supervision has been adopted in principle, its effectiveness depends on sustained leadership commitment and time management. Similar challenges have been reported in studies of collaborative supervision, which note that reflective dialogue requires sufficient time and institutional support to produce meaningful change (Wiyono et al., 2021).

Evaluation as a mechanism for continuous professional learning

Evaluation in coaching-based academic supervision emerges not as a terminal activity but as a cyclical mechanism for continuous professional learning. The use of feedback, joint reflection, and follow-up mentoring aligns with formative evaluation principles, which emphasize improvement rather than judgment (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Teachers' reported increases in confidence and instructional focus indicate that evaluation functions as a catalyst for professional growth when conducted collaboratively.

This finding supports Glickman's (2021) assertion that effective supervision prioritizes teacher empowerment through reflective feedback and mentoring. Moreover, the use of evaluation results to design follow-up actions—such as mentoring and targeted training—demonstrates that supervision operates as an integrated system rather than a one-time intervention. Such practices resonate with organizational learning theory, which views professional development as a collective and ongoing process embedded within school culture (Sergiovanni, 1987).

Implications for teacher performance and school culture

Taken together, the findings suggest that coaching-based academic supervision contributes to improved teacher performance by strengthening pedagogical competence, professional confidence, and reflective awareness. Unlike traditional supervision models that emphasize compliance, coaching-based supervision fosters intrinsic motivation and professional responsibility, key factors associated with sustainable instructional improvement (Lofthouse, 2018; Tekir, 2022).

At the organizational level, the implementation of coaching-based supervision supports the development of a collaborative and reflective school culture. Principals act not only as supervisors but also as instructional leaders and professional partners who facilitate learning communities within schools. This aligns with prior research indicating that leadership practices grounded in trust, reflection, and collaboration are more effective in promoting long-term school improvement, particularly in resource-constrained contexts (Bahrun et al., 2020; Imamah & Churrahman, 2022).

Despite its contributions, this study has limitations. The number of participants was limited to selected principals, teachers, and supervisors within a specific regional context, which may limit the transferability of findings. Future research could expand the scope by involving a wider range of schools and educational levels to explore variations in coaching-based supervision practices. Longitudinal studies are also recommended to examine the long-term impact of coaching-based supervision on instructional change and student learning outcomes.

Conclusion and Recommendations/Implications

This study concludes that coaching-based academic supervision serves as a strategic and transformative approach to improving teacher performance at the junior high school level. When supervision is designed through participatory and needs-based planning, implemented through reflective and collaborative coaching interactions, and evaluated as a continuous professional learning cycle, it moves beyond administrative compliance toward meaningful instructional improvement. Teachers experience supervision not as control, but as professional support that enhances pedagogical competence, instructional confidence, and reflective awareness.

The findings confirm that effective supervision planning strengthens teacher readiness and engagement, while structured implementation through pre-observation, observation, and post-observation stages fosters trust and professional dialogue. Evaluation practices that emphasize feedback, joint reflection, and follow-up mentoring further reinforce continuous professional development. Collectively, these processes contribute to the development of a collaborative and reflective school culture in which supervision becomes an integral part of instructional improvement rather than a procedural obligation.

From a theoretical perspective, this study reinforces instructional leadership and coaching theories that conceptualize academic supervision as a collaborative, cyclical, and developmental process. The integration of planning, implementation, and evaluation within a coaching framework provides empirical support for the shift from traditional evaluative supervision toward professional learning–oriented supervision models.

Practically, the findings imply that school principals and supervisors should adopt coaching principles—such as partnership, reflective dialogue, and non-judgmental feedback—as the foundation of academic supervision. Schools are encouraged to institutionalize structured supervision cycles with adequate time allocation for reflection and follow-up mentoring.

Strengthening internal supervision teams and promoting shared professional responsibility among teachers are also essential to sustaining the effectiveness of coaching-based supervision.

At the policy level, education authorities are advised to support coaching-based academic supervision through targeted professional development for principals and supervisors. Supervision guidelines should emphasize formative feedback, reflective practice, and teacher development rather than purely administrative accountability. Embedding coaching-oriented supervision within school quality assurance systems may enhance the sustainability of teacher professional learning initiatives.

Based on these conclusions and implications, several recommendations are proposed. Principals are encouraged to consistently apply coaching-based supervision practices by involving teachers in planning, prioritizing reflective post-observation dialogue, and ensuring systematic follow-up based on evaluation results. Supervisors and senior teachers should act as professional partners who facilitate instructional reflection and collaborative problem-solving. Future research is recommended to expand the scope of investigation across diverse school contexts and educational levels, as well as to employ longitudinal or mixed-method designs to examine the long-term impact of coaching-based academic supervision on instructional change and student learning outcomes.

Disclosure statement

(No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors).

Acknowledgments

References

Alindawati, F., Dike, D., & Yani, A. (2024). Implementation of Academic Supervision with Coaching Method to Improve Teacher Performance in Learning at SD Negeri 21 Skp.G Sp.2 Emparu Sintang. Vox Edukasi: *Scientific Journal of Educational Sciences*, *15*(2), 444–458. https://doi.org/10.31932/ve.v15i2.4094

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

Bahrun, Kautsar, M., & Yusrizal. (2020). *Principal Leadership Strategy in Improving Teacher Discipline at MAN 1 North Aceh Regency. 11*(2), 364–376. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.46244/visipena.v11i2.1216

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *38*(2), 130–141. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230010320082

Cansoy, R., & Parlar, H. (2018). Examining the relationship between school principals' instructional leadership behaviors, teacher self-efficacy, and collective teacher efficacy. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *32*(4), 550–567. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-04-2017-0089

Chen, C. C. (2018). *Facilitation of Teachers' Professional Development through Principals' Instructional*

Supervision and Teachers' Knowledge- Management Behaviors (Y. Weinberger & Z. Libman (eds.)). Intech Open. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.77978

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage publications.

Erwiati, Hajani, Padang, S., Aceh, S., & Yuniar. (2022). The Role of School Supervisors in Improving the Quality of Education. *Journal of Research, Education and Teaching: JPPP*, *3*(3), 185–195. https://doi.org/10.30596/jppp.v3i3.12660

Glickman, C. (2021). Developing a Super-Vision of Education: Oh, No. I've Said Too Much, But Maybe I Haven't Said Enough. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, *4*(3). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.4.3.6

Glover, T. A., Reddy, L. A., & Crouse, K. (2023). Instructional coaching actions that predict teacher classroom practices and student achievement. *Journal of School Psychology*, *96*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JSP.2022.10.006

Grant, A. M. (2013). Autonomy support, relationship satisfaction and goal focus in the coach–coachee relationship: which best predicts coaching success? *Taylor & Francis*, *7*(1), 18–38. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17521882.2013.850106

Hamka, H. (2023). The Role of Principals on Teacher Performance Improvement in a Suburban School. *Qalamuna: Journal of Education, Social, and Religion*, *15*(1), 371–380. https://doi.org/10.37680/qalamuna.v15i1.2409

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hidayati, W., Raharjo, T. ., Sutarto, J., & Widiyanto. (2025). Effectiveness of Academic Supervision Models in Improving Teacher Performance in Kindergarten Schools. *Perspectives of Science and Education*, *73*(1), 718–731. https://doi.org/10.32744/pse.2025.1.46

Hoque, K. E., Bt Kenayathulla, H. B., D/O Subramaniam, M. V., & Islam, R. (2020). Relationships Between Supervision and Teachers' Performance and Attitude in Secondary Schools in Malaysia. *Sage Open*, *10*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020925501

Imamah, N., & Churrahman, T. (2022). Academic Supervision by School Principals for Improving Teacher Performance. *KnE Social Sciences*, *2022*, 60–69. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v7i10.11209

Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The Effect of Teacher Coaching on Instruction and Achievement: A Meta-Analysis of the Causal Evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, *88*(4), 547–588. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318759268

Kvale, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Sage.

Lofthouse, R. (2018). Coaching in education: a professional development process in formation. *Taylor & Francis*, *Volume 45*, (1), 33–45. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19415257.2018.1529611

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (2007). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. UI Press.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: a methods sourcebook* (Third edit). SAGE Publications.

Nurhadi, T., Imron, A., & Triwiyanto, T. (2023). Enhancing Teacher Professionalism through Academic Supervision: An Investigation in Remote and Peripheral Regions. *Tarbawi: Jurnal Keilmuan Manajemen Pendidikan*, *9*(02), 305–316. https://doi.org/10.32678/tarbawi.v9i02.9437

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods by Michael Quinn Patton*. Sage Publications Limited.

Rasyid, S., Nurdin, D., Suryana, A., Samsudin, A., & Aminudin, A. H. (2022). Can the tahfidzul-qur'an education system (T-QES) create leadership with integrity? NVivo 12 analysis. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, *17*(6), 1925–1942. https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v17i6.7485

Rukajat, A., Gusniar, N. I., & Abas, T. T. (2022). *Teacher Performance Improvement (First).* Deepublish, CV Budi Utama.

Saihu, S. (2020). the Urgency of Total Quality Management in Academic Supervision To Improve the Competency of Teachers. *Islamic Education: Journal of Islamic Education*, *9*(02), 297. https://doi.org/10.30868/ei.v9i02.905

Shobariyah, E., & Dwikurnanings, Y. (2025). Journal of Education: Education, *11*(1), 124–135. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v11i1.13869

Solms, L., van Vianen, A. E. M., Nevicka, B., Koen, J., de Hoog, M., & de Pagter, A. P. J. (2025). It's a match! The role of coach–coachee fit for working alliance and effectiveness of coaching. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *98*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12523

Sugiyono. (2023). *Qualitative Research Methods* (S. Y. Suryandari (ed.); Ketiga). Alfabeta, CV.

Suhardan, D. (2014). *Professional Supervision: Services in Improving the Quality of Learning in the Era of Regional Autonomy (Riduwan (ed.); Fifth).* Alfabeta.

Sutisna, O. (1989). *Educational Administration: Theoretical Basis for Professional Practice (Fifth).* Angkasa.

Tekir, S. (2022). Coaching for Better Teaching: A Study on Student-Centered Instructional Coaching. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*, *22*(31), 159–182. https://doi.org/10.14689/enad.31.1607

Toh, R. Q. E., Koh, K. K., Lua, J. K., Wong, R. S. M., Quah, E. L. Y., Panda, A., Ho, C. Y., Lim, N. A., Ong, Y. T., Chua, K. Z. Y., Ng, V. W. W., Wong, S. L. C. H., Yeo, L. Y. X., See, S. Y., Teo, J. J. Y., Renganathan, Y., Chin, A. M. C., & Krishna, L. K. R. (2022). The role of mentoring, supervision, coaching, teaching and instruction on professional identity formation: a systematic scoping review. *BMC Medical Education*, *22*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-022-03589-z

Whitmore, J. (1992). Coaching for Performance: A Practical Guide to Growing Your Own Skills. *Https://Books.Google.Com.Pa/Books/about/Coaching_for_Performance.Html?Id=B9thPwAACAAJ&redir_esc=yCoaching_for_Performance.Html?Id=B9thPwAACAAJ&redir_esc=y.*

Wiyono, B. B., Rasyad, A., & Maisyaroh. (2021). The Effect of Collaborative Supervision Approaches and Collegial Supervision Techniques on Teacher Intensity Using Performance-Based Learning. *Sage Open*, *11*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211013779

Yuli, T., Endang, A., Rosalina, W., & Ginting, R. B. R. (2025). *Academic Supervision Based on Coaching in Improving the Quality of Learning at State Junior High School 4 Geyer , Grobogan Regency. 8*(1), 351–357.

Zepeda, S. J. (2017). *Instructional Supervision: Applying Tools and Concepts* (Fourth Edi). Eye On Education.