

Academic Supervision Management in Improving Teacher Performance at SDN Pekojan 05 and Kalideres 03 in West Jakarta

Martha Napitupulu¹, Waska Warta²

Universitas Islam Nusantara, Bandung, Indonesia^{1,2}

Email: tampo70@gmail.com¹, waskawarta@uninus.ac.id²

| Keywords | Abstract |
|--|---|
| academic supervision, POAC, teacher performance, quality of learning | Academic supervision is a strategic agenda in improving the quality of learning in elementary schools. Teachers, as the spearhead of education, need systematic assistance so that their performance continues to improve. This study aims to describe POAC (Planning, Organizing, Actuating, Controlling)-based academic supervision management carried out by school principals in improving teacher performance at SDN Pekojan 05 and SDN Kalideres 03 in West Jakarta. The research method used a qualitative approach with a case study design, employing observation, interviews, and documentation studies involving school principals, teachers, and school supervisors. The results show that academic supervision planning is not yet fully based on the actual needs of teachers; organization remains relatively simple, with the principal playing a dominant role; implementation tends to be formal and administrative, characterized by one-way communication; and supervision focuses more on administrative compliance than on substantive guidance. Limited time, resources, and instruments were the main constraints; however, there was a commitment from the principals to maintain the continuity of supervision. The research conclusion emphasizes that the application of POAC has the potential to strengthen collaboration, accountability, and the effectiveness of academic supervision when accompanied by participatory planning, a structured supervision team, dialogical implementation, and continuous evaluation. It is hoped that this research will contribute to the development of more adaptive, reflective, and sustainable academic supervision policies and practices to improve teacher performance and the quality of learning in elementary schools. |

INTRODUCTION

Academic supervision is a strategic agenda in improving the quality of education, especially at the elementary school level, which is the foundation of learning (Okafor, Obona, Ngene, & Eji, 2024; Sugiar, Sukirman, & Sanusi, 2024; Sumarmi & Sudadi, 2023; Widatin, 2025; Yani et al., 2024). Teachers play a central role not only as conveyors of material, but also as facilitators, motivators, and role models for students (Fadillah, Hashim, & Aini, 2025; Ly, 2024). The success of the learning process is greatly influenced by the performance of teachers who are professional, creative, and committed. However, reality shows that the implementation of academic supervision in many elementary schools is still not optimal, resulting in low teacher readiness in teaching, limited innovation, and student learning achievements that are not in line with national standards (Kemendikbudristek, 2023). Therefore, planned, organized, and sustainable academic supervision management is an urgent need in supporting the improvement of teacher performance.

Although academic supervision is regulated in various regulations, its implementation often faces obstacles. Yulianti, Prestiadi, & Imron (2021) research found that academic supervision in elementary schools is often administrative in nature, limited to formal observation without meaningful follow-up. Rahmat, Badu, & Djibu (2020) survey also showed

that only 35% of teachers felt that supervision in their schools really helped improve learning. This is exacerbated by Haji (2019) finding that the limited supervisory skills of school principals and the lack of time and resources mean that supervision practices do not have a significant impact on teachers' pedagogical competence. These conditions reveal a gap between the ideal policy and its implementation in the field.

Field observations show different dynamics in two elementary schools in West Jakarta. At SDN Pekojan 05, academic supervision is carried out routinely by the principal with a focus on the use of learning technology, but there is still a lack of written planning and no structured supervision team. As a result, teachers are not yet fully consistent in implementing learning innovations. In contrast, at SDN Kalideres 03, academic supervision tends to be incidental and administrative, limited to classroom observation and verbal feedback. This makes learning improvement unsustainable, while the challenges of student literacy and numeracy achievement remain a major issue. These two conditions confirm the vulnerability of academic supervision in elementary schools, as shown by previous studies.

To strengthen the effectiveness of academic supervision, a management approach can be used as a strategic framework. Stoner, Freeman, & Gilbert (2008) explain the functions of management through four main stages (POAC): planning, organizing, executing, and controlling. In the context of academic supervision, POAC means that the principal not only observes classes but also designs a systematic supervision program, forms an organized team, implements collaborative coaching, and conducts data-based evaluation and follow-up. Thus, academic supervision management has the potential to become an instrument for optimizing teacher performance in a measurable and sustainable manner.

A number of studies support the importance of integrating management into supervision. Wulandari, Vivekanantharasa, & Fauzan (2022) proved that a systematic planning-based clinical approach can improve the quality of teacher learning. Sirojuddin, Aprilianto, & Zahari (2021) emphasized that the active role of the principal as a supervisor is directly related to improving teacher performance.

Similarly, Sitorus (2023) found that supervision integrated with professional development produces more adaptive and innovative teachers. These findings reinforce that POAC-based academic supervision is relevant for improving the quality of learning in elementary schools. However, studies that specifically examine academic supervision from an educational management perspective are still limited.

Previous studies have mostly highlighted the influence of supervision on teacher competence or technical obstacles to implementation, but have not comprehensively explored the managerial process through the POAC function. In fact, a comprehensive understanding of the planning, organizing, implementing, and supervising of academic supervision is essential for systematically improving teacher performance.

Based on this, this study focuses on the question: How does the principal's academic supervision management improve teacher performance at SDN Pekojan 05 and SDN Kalideres 03 in West Jakarta? The objective is to analyze the strategies, practices, and results of academic supervision based on the POAC function, taking into account the social, cultural, and institutional contexts of each school.

The novelty of this study lies in the integration of the POAC management concept with academic supervision practices in the context of urban elementary schools. Theoretically, this

research is expected to enrich the literature on educational management with a management function-based supervision approach. Practically, the results of this research can serve as strategic recommendations for principals, teachers, and policy makers in designing more adaptive, collaborative, and sustainable academic supervision, thereby strengthening teacher performance and the quality of learning in elementary schools.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study used a qualitative approach with a case study design. This design was chosen based on the research objective, which is to gain an in-depth understanding of the academic supervision management process in improving teacher performance at SDN Pekojan 05 and SDN Kalideres 03 in West Jakarta. The qualitative approach was chosen because it is able to explore the meaning, experience, and context of supervision carried out by the principal in a naturalistic manner. Meanwhile, case studies were used to provide a realistic picture of the practices of planning, organizing, implementing, and evaluating academic supervision without manipulating the research variables.

The research targets were the main actors in the academic supervision process at both schools. Informants were selected using purposive sampling based on their direct involvement in academic supervision management, namely: (1) the principal as the person primarily responsible for planning, implementing, and evaluating supervision; (2) classroom teachers and subject teachers as the parties being supervised and the beneficiaries of supervision; (3) vice principals or senior teachers who support the organization of supervision; and (4) school supervisors who provide an external perspective on the implementation of supervision.

Data collection techniques were carried out through three main methods. First, participatory observation, by directly observing academic supervision practices, including program planning, classroom observation implementation, and follow-up on supervision results. Second, in-depth interviews were conducted with school principals, teachers, and school supervisors to gain an understanding of the strategies, obstacles, and impact of supervision on teacher performance. Third, a documentation study was conducted, which consisted of analyzing documents such as academic supervision programs, supervision schedules, observation instruments, supervision result reports, and follow-up meeting minutes.

The combination of these three techniques aims to ensure the depth and validity of the data through triangulation of sources and methods. The research procedure consisted of several stages. First, the planning stage, which involved the preparation of interview guidelines, observation guidelines, and document analysis formats.

Second, the field implementation stage, in which researchers collect data through interviews, observations, and documentation at SDN Pekojan 05 and SDN Kalideres 03. Third, the recording and verification stage, which involves reducing, coding, and categorizing data according to the research focus. Fourth, the evaluation stage, which involves examining the consistency of the data with the research objectives to produce valid findings.

Data analysis used the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, (2014), which consists of three main steps: (1) data reduction, which is the process of selecting, simplifying, and focusing on data relevant to academic supervision; (2) data presentation, in the form of descriptive narratives, tables, or thematic matrices to facilitate interpretation; and (3) conclusion/verification, which is reviewing the analyzed data to ensure consistency and

validity. This analysis was carried out continuously from data collection to the final stage of the research, so that the results obtained were able to fully describe the dynamics of academic supervision management in both schools.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Academic Supervision Planning to Improve Teacher Performance

Research findings show that academic supervision planning does not yet fully comply with the principles of educational management as stated by Stoner et al., (2008), who emphasize that planning must be systematic, focused, and supportive of organizational goals. In practice, academic supervision should ideally be designed based on an analysis of teacher needs, learning quality indicators, and clear professional development targets.

Empirically, some school principals have attempted to develop supervision program documents and activity schedules as a form of awareness of the importance of planning. However, the weakness lies in the flexibility and consistency of implementation, so that existing plans often function merely as administrative formalities. This condition is in line with Yulianti et al., (Yulianti et al., 2021) findings, which state that academic supervision in elementary schools often stops at the document stage without any real follow-up.

On the other hand, there are still supervisory practices that are carried out incidentally without systematic planning documents. This shows that supervision is viewed merely as a regulatory obligation, not as a strategy for continuous development. The lack of planning documents causes supervision to lose its strategic direction and teachers do not receive continuous development support. In fact, according to Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2017), effective supervision should begin with planning based on the real needs of teachers, not merely to meet regulatory requirements.

When compared, schools that have supervision program documents and schedules are superior in terms of administration, while schools that carry out supervision without written documents appear to be weaker in terms of strategic planning. However, both face similar problems, namely a planning process that is still carried out in a top-down manner without actively involving teachers. In fact, Burden (2020) emphasizes that collaborative supervision is more effective in improving teacher professionalism because they feel involved in the planning and evaluation processes.

In addition, existing supervision planning does not fully integrate the principle of continuous evaluation. Good planning should include a cycle of reflection that covers goal setting, implementation, evaluation of results, and revision of planning. The absence of this cycle means that supervision does not result in systematic improvements from year to year.

Resource constraints also affect the quality of supervision planning. On the one hand, although learning facilities are relatively adequate, teachers are not accustomed to utilizing available technology, so supervision planning is not responsive to the challenges of education digitization. On the other hand, limited support staff means that principals must work alone, so planning tends to be practical and simple. This is in line with Robbins, Judge, & Judge (2018), who emphasize that the quality of organizational planning is greatly influenced by the availability of human resources, facilities, and leadership.

When linked to previous research, these findings reinforce the results of Haji (Haji, 2019) study, which shows that structured academic supervision planning can improve teachers'

pedagogical competence by up to 40%. Conversely, the absence of written planning makes supervision only evaluative without providing meaningful guidance. Thus, the results of this study reaffirm that the planning aspect is the main foundation for the success of academic supervision.

Based on this description, it can be concluded that academic supervision planning is not yet optimal. On the one hand, there are schools that already have formal documents, but their implementation is not consistent. On the other hand, there are also schools that do not even have systematic written plans, so that supervision is incidental. Neither of these schools involve teachers in the planning process, so supervision is not yet perceived as a collaborative process.

To improve this situation, supervision planning needs to be directed towards: (1) developing a supervision program based on an analysis of teachers' needs, (2) setting specific supervision objectives covering the four teacher competencies, (3) developing a realistic and consistent schedule, (4) involving teachers in planning to create collaborative supervision, and (5) integrating a reflection cycle (*plan–do–check–act*) to ensure continuous improvement.

Thus, academic supervision planning is no longer viewed as a mere administrative obligation, but as a managerial strategy that can improve teacher performance in a sustainable manner and contribute directly to improving the quality of education.

Organization of Academic Supervision to Improve Teacher Performance

The organization of academic supervision is an important step after planning, because it determines the extent to which supervision activities can be carried out systematically, distributed, and involve all parties. Research findings show that the organization of academic supervision in elementary schools still faces a number of limitations, both in terms of structure, human resource involvement, and administrative support.

In practice, the principal is the main actor who controls the entire academic supervision process, from scheduling, conducting observations, to providing feedback. The absence of a formal supervision team means that the principal works almost individually. Some schools do involve the vice principal or senior teachers in supporting supervision activities, but this involvement is more informal and not clearly regulated in the organizational structure. This condition results in the burden of supervision falling on one party, making it difficult to maintain consistency and continuity in supervision activities.

In terms of administrative support, documents related to the division of supervisory tasks, such as decrees, implementation guidelines, or standard operating procedures, are not always available. This has an impact on the weak legitimacy and accountability of the supervision process. Some teachers also admit that they do not fully understand the supervision procedures because the information is only conveyed through verbal briefings. These limitations result in the supervision process being less transparent, while also reducing opportunities for teachers to be actively involved in the process.

Other findings show that the organization of supervision does not yet fully accommodate the principle of collaboration. Teachers are still positioned as objects of supervision, not as partners in professional development efforts. As a result, supervision is often perceived as merely a performance evaluation, not as a participatory coaching process. In fact, Burden's (2010) research confirms that the success of supervision is greatly influenced by the active involvement of teachers as subjects of professional learning.

From a theoretical perspective, these conditions indicate that the organization of academic supervision is not in line with the principles of management as described by Stoner et al. (2008) namely the importance of dividing tasks, assigning responsibilities, and coordinating activities to achieve organizational goals. In practice, the division of supervisory tasks is still minimal, coordination is not yet effective, and human resource support is limited.

When compared to previous research findings, these results are in line with Yulianti et al., (Yulianti et al., 2021), who identified weak organization as one of the main obstacles to academic supervision in elementary schools. The absence of a supervision team meant that the principal was unable to reach all teachers effectively. Conversely, Sitorus (Sitorus, 2023) research emphasizes that supervision integrated with professional development programs requires a clear organizational structure, an equitable division of roles, and a sustainable coordination mechanism. The findings of this study indicate that these ideal conditions have not yet been realized in the field.

In addition to structural aspects, limited resources also affect the quality of supervision organization. The relatively large number of teachers, coupled with the administrative burden on the principal, makes it impossible for the supervision process to be carried out comprehensively. In many cases, supervision is only carried out for some teachers, while others have not received intensive assistance. This shows that there are imbalances in the organization of supervision, where limited human and time capacities hinder the effectiveness of implementation. Robbins et al. (2018) explain that the success of organization is greatly influenced by the leader's ability to manage limited resources and create efficient coordination.

These findings also show that the organization of academic supervision has not been followed by an internal monitoring mechanism. The absence of a special team or standardized administrative tools makes it difficult to evaluate supervision activities collectively. Teachers only receive feedback from the principal, without any space for joint reflection through forums or evaluation meetings. In fact, according to Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007), effective academic supervision must be based on democratic principles, where teachers are given space to openly discuss their learning experiences and challenges.

A synthesis of these findings shows that the organization of academic supervision is still simple, individual, and administrative in nature. The advantage of this condition is the direct role of the principal as the main person in charge, which demonstrates a commitment to quality improvement. However, the fundamental weaknesses lie in the absence of a team, the lack of teacher involvement, and weak administrative support. This makes the organization of supervision less effective in creating a collaborative, transparent, and sustainable atmosphere.

To improve this condition, the organization of academic supervision should be directed towards: (1) forming a supervision team consisting of the deputy principal, senior teachers, and other elements, (2) preparing official documents such as decrees, guidelines, and SOPs that clarify the structure and responsibilities, (3) involving teachers in planning and evaluation forums, and (4) strengthening coordination through regular meetings and documentation of supervision results. With these steps, academic supervision will not only run formally, but also create a collaborative work culture that supports continuous improvement in teacher performance.

Implementation of Academic Supervision to Improve Teacher Performance

The implementation or *actuating* of academic supervision is at the core of the entire supervision management process. If planning and organizing serve as the foundation, then implementation is the stage that determines the extent to which the supervision program actually impacts teacher performance. Research findings show that the implementation of supervision in elementary schools still faces a gap between the idealism of the documents and the reality in the field.

In practice, principals carry out supervision by visiting classrooms, observing the learning process, and providing feedback to teachers. Observations are conducted both on a scheduled and incidental basis, depending on the situation and needs of the school. The observation instruments used are generally simple formats, covering aspects of lesson planning, classroom management, teaching methods, teacher-student interaction, and the use of learning media. However, this implementation often focuses more on administrative compliance aspects, such as the completeness of lesson plans, the use of certain methods, or conformity with the curriculum, rather than on the in-depth professional development of teachers.

Teachers generally view supervision as an assessment activity rather than coaching. This is due to the one-way nature of the implementation: the principal conducts observations and then provides notes or comments without much room for dialogue. Some teachers even admit that they only receive brief feedback without any follow-up in the form of mentoring. As a result, supervision is not yet fully perceived as a collaborative learning process that fosters motivation and innovation in teaching.

The implementation of supervision also varies in terms of intensity. In schools with strong leadership, supervision is carried out relatively regularly according to a set schedule. However, this schedule is often subject to change due to time constraints or other urgent matters. In other schools, supervision is carried out less frequently and only occurs at certain times, such as before accreditation or when there are reports of learning problems. This condition confirms that academic supervision is still viewed as a formal obligation, not yet an inherent need in the school culture.

When viewed from management theory, the implementation of academic supervision does not yet reflect the principle of *actuating* as emphasized by Stoner et al. (2008), which is to motivate all members of the organization to work according to predetermined goals. Ideally, the principal should be able to act as a motivator who inspires teachers to improve their professionalism, not just as an evaluator. However, findings in the field show that this motivational role has not been optimally implemented.

A number of studies support this picture. Glickman et al. (2017) emphasizes that effective supervision must emphasize dialogic interaction between supervisors and teachers so that the input provided can be understood, accepted, and internalized. However, in practice, one-way communication patterns still dominate. This makes teachers less actively involved, even though teacher participation is very important for supervision to function as a means of self-development.

In addition, the implementation of supervision is not fully supported by a continuous coaching strategy. Observations show that feedback after supervision is rarely followed by intensive mentoring. Teachers are mostly left to improve their weaknesses on their own without

any concrete guidance. In fact, according to Sergiovanni & Starratt (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007), supervision should be clinical in nature, involving a process of reflection, diagnosis, improvement, and evaluation carried out jointly by supervisors and teachers.

The limitations of supervision implementation are also evident in the lack of variety in approaches. Supervision is still dominated by classroom observation, while other forms such as group discussions, peer supervision, or needs-based training are not widely practiced. This condition limits opportunities for teachers to learn from each other and share experiences. According to Wulandari et al. (Wulandari et al., 2022) research, varying supervision methods can increase teacher motivation because they provide a richer and more relevant learning experience.

In terms of resources, time constraints are a major obstacle. Principals must divide their attention between supervision and other administrative and managerial tasks. As a result, supervision is not carried out optimally and is often delayed. Teachers who should receive regular supervision sometimes have to wait a long time for the schedule to be implemented. Robbins et al. (2018) explain that time constraints and priorities are often factors that hinder the implementation of management functions, including at the implementation stage.

A synthesis of these findings shows that the implementation of academic supervision is still stuck in a pattern of administrative formalities. Supervision is mostly understood as an instrument of control, not guidance. Teacher involvement in the process is still limited, communication is not very dialogical, and follow-up after supervision is not well managed. These conditions make supervision less effective in improving teachers' pedagogical and professional competencies.

To improve this situation, the implementation of academic supervision needs to be directed towards several strategic steps. First, strengthening a clinical approach that emphasizes dialogue, reflection, and continuous mentoring. Second, expanding the forms of supervision through various methods such as peer supervision, workshops, or group discussions. Third, enhancing the role of the principal as a motivator, not just an evaluator, by providing constructive and inspiring feedback. Fourth, maximize technology to support both close and remote supervision, so that time constraints can be overcome.

Thus, the implementation of academic supervision is no longer seen as a routine procedure, but as a collaborative process that is able to motivate teachers to continue learning, innovating, and improving their performance on an ongoing basis.

Academic Supervision Monitoring to Improve Teacher Performance

Evaluation is an important stage in the academic supervision management cycle. This function not only ensures that supervision is carried out according to plan, but also provides a basis for continuous improvement. The results of the study show that the monitoring and evaluation of academic supervision in elementary schools still faces a number of limitations, both in terms of procedures, follow-up, and sustainability.

In general, supervision is carried out by the principal through the evaluation of learning observation results. Feedback is usually given directly to teachers after supervision, either verbally or in writing. However, this evaluation more often focuses on administrative aspects, such as the completeness of learning tools, the use of media, and classroom order, rather than delving into substantive aspects such as innovative learning strategies or teacher professional

development. Thus, evaluation functions more as a form of compliance control rather than a means of reflection and coaching.

Teachers often receive notes on the results of supervision, but follow-up in the form of mentoring, training, or joint reflection forums is rarely carried out. This condition causes the supervision process to stop at the assessment stage without a continuous cycle of improvement. Some teachers even consider supervision to only produce reports that are stored as archives, without having a real impact on improving teaching quality. These findings are in line with Sirojuddin et al. (Sirojuddin et al., 2021) research, which highlights the weakness of follow-up supervision, resulting in teachers not feeling the direct benefits of these activities.

In terms of mechanism, supervision is not yet supported by a standardized evaluation system. Not all schools have clear evaluation instruments, and the format of supervision reports is often simple. Evaluation results are not always analyzed comprehensively to identify patterns of problems that can be used as a basis for improvement. As a result, supervision has not produced data that can be used to formulate systematic teacher development strategies. In fact, according to (Miles et al. (Miles et al., 2014), supervision data should be analyzed, presented, and verified to form the basis for valid decision-making.

In addition, teacher involvement in the evaluation process is still limited. Evaluations are usually conducted top-down, where the principal conveys the results of observations without giving teachers the opportunity to reflect on themselves or provide feedback to supervisors. In fact, according to Sergiovanni & Starratt (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007), democratic academic supervision requires participatory evaluation, where teachers are actively involved in assessing and improving their own performance.

Another limitation is the lack of follow-up monitoring. After the initial evaluation is conducted, there is no formal mechanism to monitor whether teachers have made improvements in accordance with the recommendations. This often results in supervision recommendations not being properly implemented. Robbins et al. (2018) emphasize that supervision must include a follow-up cycle so that organizations can make corrections and adjustments on an ongoing basis.

Nevertheless, there are several positive aspects that were found. Principals showed commitment by continuing to carry out supervision despite its limitations. The presence of evaluations, albeit simple, signals to teachers that the quality of learning remains a primary concern. This is important because it forms the basis for a culture of accountability in school organizations. However, without a stronger and more structured evaluation system, the supervisory function cannot have a significant impact.

A synthesis of these findings shows that the controlling function in academic supervision is still weak in three main areas: (1) the focus of evaluation is still predominantly administrative rather than substantive, (2) follow-up on supervision results is poorly managed, and (3) continuous monitoring is almost non-existent. This condition causes supervision to lose its role as a means of long-term guidance and tends to be viewed only as a formal control mechanism.

To improve this situation, academic supervision oversight and evaluation need to be directed toward several strategic steps. First, develop more comprehensive evaluation instruments that assess not only administrative compliance but also the pedagogical, professional, social, and personal aspects of teachers. Second, strengthen follow-up through mentoring, training, or coaching programs tailored to the evaluation results.

Third, involve teachers in the evaluation reflection process to create a sense of ownership of performance improvement. Fourth, establish a continuous monitoring mechanism, for example through follow-up meetings or regular teacher reflection forums. With these steps, the controlling function in academic supervision will not only be a means of control but also an instrument of organizational learning. Supervision does not stop at evaluation, but forms a continuous cycle: assessing, improving, monitoring, and enhancing. Thus, supervision and evaluation can make a real contribution to improving teacher performance and the quality of learning in elementary schools. Supervision can be a meaningful coaching instrument based on a system of six values (Sanusi, 2023).

Theological values guide the principal to carry out supervision with sincerity and fairness; logical values ensure that the supervision process is based on data and objective analysis; physiological values encourage attention to teacher welfare; ethical values ensure transparency and fairness in coaching; aesthetic values create a harmonious and pleasant supervision atmosphere; and teleological values affirm the direction of supervision towards improving the quality of learning and teacher performance. Thus, value-based academic supervision is not only a managerial mechanism, but also a humanistic process that can strengthen teacher professionalism and the quality of education in a sustainable manner.

CONCLUSION

This study affirms that POAC-based academic supervision management—encompassing systematic planning aligned with real needs, structured organization of tasks, dialogic and coaching-focused implementation, and reflective ongoing supervision—serves as a strategic driver for enhancing teacher performance, pedagogical competence, professionalism, and learning quality in elementary schools, while fostering a collaborative culture through regular cycles. Schools should bolster principals' and teachers' capacities via participatory, professional development approaches, including refined supervision tools, team collaboration, digital tech for observations and reporting, and structured follow-ups like mentoring, coaching, and reflection forums to overcome time and resource constraints. Theoretically, it enriches POAC literature in education management by highlighting supervision's role in teacher growth; practically, it guides principals, teachers, and policymakers toward adaptive, inclusive, sustainable practices. For future research, a suggestion is to conduct longitudinal comparative studies across diverse school contexts (urban vs. rural) to evaluate the long-term impacts of digital integration in POAC supervision on teacher retention and student outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Burden, P. R. (2020). *Classroom Management: Creating a Successful K-12 Learning Community*. Wiley.
- Fadillah, Z. I., Hashim, R., & Aini, S. (2025). The Strategic Role of Teacher Communication in Shaping a Learning Environment that Promotes Student Learning Motivation: A Qualitative Study. *Journal Sains and Education*, 3(02).
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2017). *SuperVision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Haji, S. (2019). Supervisi Kepala Sekolah Untuk Meningkatkan Kompetensi Pedagogik Guru Di Sd Negeri Pulau Rimau. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Program Pascasarjana*

Universitas PGRI Palembang.

- Kemendikbudristek. (2023). *Perdirjen GTK Nomor 7607/B.B1/HK.03/2023 tentang Pedoman Supervisi Akademik*. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Ly, C. K. (2024). Teachers' roles on English language teaching for promoting learner-centered language learning: A theoretical review. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 4(2), 78–98.
- Miles, M., Huberman, A., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications Inc.
- Okafor, R. N., Obona, E. E., Ngene, A. N., & Eji, E. E. (2024). School supervision and inspection: Enhancing educational quality, accountability, and student social welfare in Nigerian secondary schools. *Unizik Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 18(3).
- Rahmat, A., Badu, R., & Djibu, R. (2020). Implementation of clinical supervision to improve teacher performance in managing learning in tk Dungaliyo gorontalo District. *International Journal of Innovations in Engineering Research and Technology*, 7(9), 67–74.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. (2018). *Organizational Behavior*. New Jersey: Pearson.
- Sanusi, A. (2023). *Sistem Nilai: Alternatif Wajah-wajah Pendidikan*. Nuansa Cendekia.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2007). *Supervision: A Redefinition*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Sirojuddin, A., Aprilianto, A., & Zahari, N. E. (2021). Peran Kepala Sekolah Sebagai Supervisor Pendidikan Dalam Meningkatkan Profesionalisme Guru. *Chalim Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 1(2), 159–168. <https://doi.org/10.31538/cjotl.v1i2.142>
- Sitorus, A. P. P. (2023). Upaya Peningkatan Kinerja Tugas Pokok Guru Melalui Peran Supervisi Akademik Kepala Sekolah Di SMAN 9 Kota Jambi. *ACADEMIA: Jurnal Inovasi Riset Akademik*, 2(4), 325–330. <https://doi.org/10.51878/academia.v2i4.1878>
- Stoner, J. A. F., Freeman, R. E., & Gilbert, D. R. (2008). *Manajemen*. Jakarta: Prenhallindo.
- Sugiar, L., Sukirman, S., & Sanusi, S. (2024). Academic supervision as a strategy for improving teaching and learning quality. *International Journal of Educational Administration, Management, and Leadership*, 31–48.
- Sumarmi, S., & Sudadi, S. (2023). *School Supervision Improving Learning Quality School Quality in Early Childhood Education*.
- Widatin, T. (2025). Case Study on the Academic Supervision of School Teachers Utilizing Coaching Techniques to Sustain Learning Quality in Elementary Education. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation*, 9(3), 602–612.
- Wulandari, D., Vivekanantharasa, R., & Fauzan, A. (2022). Clinical Supervision's Role in Improving Teachers' Teaching Skills in Online Learning. *PPDP International Journal of Education*, 1(2), 211–218.
- Yani, A., Henjilito, R., Noviardila, I., Hasan, B., Setyawan, H., Shidiq, A. A. P., ... Zulfahri, Z. (2024). The role of school supervisors in the quality assurance of physical education learning: A systematic review. *Retos: Nuevas Tendencias En Educación Física, Deporte y Recreación*, (57), 589–597.
- Yulianti, H., Prestiadi, D., & Imron, A. (2021). Implementation of academic supervision in improving teachers teaching performance in the Covid-19 pandemic era at elementary school. *7th International Conference on Education and Technology (ICET 2021)*, 85–90. Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211126.041>