



The Effectiveness of Coaching-Based Academic Supervision in Improving Teacher Performance: A Case Study at SD Negeri 1 Sedan

Yanti Yuni Astuti*, Ngurah Ayu Nyoman, Muhammad Prayito

Magister Manajemen Pendidikan, Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia, Semarang, 50232, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 22 Nov 2025

Revised: 19 Des 2025

Accepted: 24 Des 2025

Published online: 05 Jan 2026

Keywords:

Coaching-Based Academic Supervision,
Teacher Performance,
Instructional Improvement,
Refelctive Practice,
School Leadership

* Corresponding author:

E-mail: yantiyunia79@gmail.com

Article Doi:

<https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.1.p.983-997>

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/) license.



ABSTRACT

Improving teacher performance remains a central priority in efforts to enhance instructional quality in Indonesian primary schools. Conventional supervision practices, which often focus on administrative compliance, have been criticized for their limited impact on classroom instruction. In response, coaching-based academic supervision has emerged as a more empowering and reflective approach to professional development. This study examines the effectiveness of coaching-based academic supervision in improving teacher performance at SD Negeri 1 Sedan. Using a qualitative descriptive design, data were collected through interviews, observations, and documentation, then analyzed using an interactive model of data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing. The findings show that coaching enables principals to identify teacher needs through data-driven analysis, establish flexible supervision schedules, and set clear instructional performance indicators. During implementation, coaching fosters reflective dialogue, constructive feedback, and collaborative problem-solving, leading to improved lesson planning, classroom interaction, and pedagogical decision-making. Evaluation is conducted through joint reflection and analysis of observation results, forming the basis for continuous follow-up coaching. The study concludes that coaching-based supervision offers a more holistic and impactful model than traditional supervision, although it requires strong coaching skills and adequate time allocation. Future studies should examine long-term effects across diverse school contexts.

1. Introduction

Teacher performance is one of the main determinants of educational quality in schools. Teacher performance refers to the ability demonstrated by teachers in

carrying out instructional duties and assuming responsibility for the students under their guidance, with the ultimate goal of improving student learning achievement (Supardi, 2018:). Supardi (2018) emphasizes that teacher performance reflects the extent to which teachers successfully carry out instructional tasks in accordance with established standards, while Erjati (2017) highlights the totality of activities undertaken by teachers in educating and guiding learners toward maturity and independence. Multiple internal factors including personality, motivation, knowledge, skills, and experience as well as external factors such as principal leadership, school climate, facilities, and supportive learning environments influence teacher performance (Yamin et al., 2019). Furthermore, Mangkunegara (2017) underscores the essential role of motivation as a driving force for teachers to achieve optimal performance, whereas Kasmir (2019) asserts that leadership, leadership style, and job satisfaction significantly affect teacher performance.

One strategic approach to improving teacher performance is through academic supervision. Academic supervision plays a critical role in enhancing instructional quality and constitutes a core responsibility of the school principal as an instructional leader. According to Prasojo (2015), the primary objective of academic supervision is to assist teachers in strengthening their competencies to deliver instruction more effectively. Academic supervision encompasses various activities including planning, observation, feedback, and follow-up that aim to identify and address challenges teachers face in the teaching process (Arikunto, 2019). Furthermore, academic supervision provides essential support for teachers' professional development, which is crucial for achieving educational objectives (Sagala, 2018).

In the context of academic supervision, the coaching approach has increasingly gained attention for its effectiveness in improving teacher performance. Glickman (2017) states that academic supervision using coaching techniques focuses on empowering teachers through collaborative, solution-focused professional guidance. Whitmore (2019) defines coaching as a process of unlocking a person's potential to maximize their performance, while Grant (2019) views coaching as a results-oriented approach designed to enhance work performance and the attainment of specific goals. In educational settings, coaching helps teachers reflect on their instructional practices, identify problems, discover potential solutions, and continuously develop their professional competencies.

One of the most widely adopted coaching models in academic supervision is the GROW Model (Goal, Reality, Options, Will), which provides a clear structure for conducting effective coaching sessions (Panchal & Riddell, 2020). In the Goal stage, the coach assists the teacher (coachee) in identifying specific development targets; in the Reality stage, the coach explores the actual situation the teacher is facing; in the Options stage, possible solutions are explored; and in the Will stage, the teacher commits to implementing the agreed-upon action plan (Whitmore, 2019). The GROW Model has been shown to facilitate deep reflective conversations between principals and teachers, ultimately helping teachers identify and address their instructional strengths and weaknesses. Coaching as part of

academic supervision has a positive impact on teacher performance because it focuses on empowerment, reflection, and continuous professional growth (Mardiyatun, 2021). Rather than emphasizing evaluation alone, coaching encourages teachers to develop through ongoing guidance and support. This approach fosters trust between principals and teachers and creates a collaborative, supportive learning environment conducive to professional improvement.

Despite the growing body of literature on academic supervision and coaching in education, a gap remains in the implementation of coaching-based academic supervision specifically aimed at empowering teachers in primary schools. Previous studies have largely focused on general coaching theories and models, without examining in depth the role of the school principal as a coach in enhancing teacher performance through structured, solution-focused academic supervision. Additionally, research that specifically evaluates the effectiveness of coaching techniques within academic supervision to improve teacher performance in elementary schools remains limited. Given this gap, the present study aims to analyze the effectiveness of coaching-based academic supervision in improving teacher performance at SD Negeri 1 Sedan, Kecamatan Sedan, with particular attention to the processes of planning, implementation, and evaluation, as well as its overall impact on teacher performance.

2. Methodology

This study employed a qualitative approach with a descriptive research design. According to Sugiyono (2022), descriptive qualitative research is grounded in post-positivist philosophy and is used to investigate natural conditions, in which the researcher serves as the primary instrument throughout the inquiry. This study aimed to describe and portray the effectiveness of coaching-based academic supervision in improving teacher performance at SD Negeri 1 Sedan, Kecamatan Sedan, by carefully examining real situations, capturing authentic experiences, and interpreting findings based on the actual context observed in the field.

Moleong (2018) states that qualitative research seeks to understand phenomena experienced by research subjects such as behaviors, perceptions, motivations, and actions holistically by utilizing descriptive language within a specific context. Similarly, Hendryadi (2019) affirms that qualitative research is a naturalistic inquiry process intended to obtain an in-depth understanding of social phenomena. In this study, a phenomenological approach was applied to gain deeper insight into the lived experiences of teachers and school leaders engaged in the implementation of coaching-based academic supervision. According to Sukmadinata (2019), qualitative methods are used to describe and analyze phenomena, events, beliefs, attitudes, and social activities either individually or in groups. Thus, this study aimed to provide an in-depth description and analysis of the implementation and effectiveness of coaching-based academic supervision in improving teacher performance at SD Negeri 1 Sedan, with a focus on planning, implementation, and evaluation processes.

The study was conducted during the first semester of the 2024/2025 academic year, from February to July 2025. The research took place at SD Negeri 1 Sedan, located in Kecamatan Sedan. The qualitative research design in this study was flexible and adaptive, consistent with the nature of qualitative inquiry, which allows modifications based on emerging findings in the field. The research process consisted of three main stages: (1) Description Stage, in which the researcher described what was observed, heard, and experienced; (2) Reduction Stage, where the researcher filtered and focused information to identify the core issues; and (3) Selection Stage, during which the researcher elaborated on the main issues and conducted deeper analysis to develop themes or new understandings (Sugiyono, 2022: 249).

Rahardjo (2024) explains that qualitative research involves several phases. The pre-field phase includes preparing the initial research design, securing research permits, conducting preliminary field observations, selecting subjects, and establishing rapport with informants to ensure smooth data collection. During the fieldwork phase, the researcher conducts observations, interviews, and document analysis to gather comprehensive and meaningful data. In the post-field phase, the collected information is systematically analyzed, interpreted, and compiled into a research report that accurately reflects the phenomena encountered and provides a coherent understanding of the study's findings.

The research subjects comprised teachers at SD Negeri 1 Sedan who had participated in coaching-based academic supervision conducted by the principal. Participants were selected using purposive sampling based on the following criteria: (1) actively teaching for at least two years; (2) having participated in formal coaching sessions; and (3) willing to take part in the study. In qualitative research, subjects are referred to as informants individuals who provide information regarding the situation and experiences during the coaching-based academic supervision process in the school (Moleong, 2018). The primary instrument in this study was the researcher, who functioned as the key instrument for data collection and analysis (Sugiyono, 2022). Supporting instruments included interview guides, observation sheets, and documentation checklists. Additional tools such as audio recorders and cameras were used to assist in collecting interview, observation, and documentation data (Ibrahim, 2015). The main data sources were collected through observation, interviews, and document analysis.

Data were collected through three primary techniques: observation, interviews, and documentation. Observation was conducted to closely examine the implementation of coaching-based academic supervision and to observe teaching and learning activities (Sugiyono, 2022). Interviews were carried out to explore teachers' experiences, perceptions, and reflections on the planning, implementation, and evaluation of coaching-based academic supervision. The interviews followed an in-depth approach, allowing open-ended responses to gain deeper insights (Kontjaraningrat, 2022). Documentation techniques were also used to obtain written and electronic materials such as supervision schedules, lesson plans, coaching instruments, and supervision evaluation reports (Sugiyono, 2022). Data

from observations, interviews, and documents were analyzed collectively to construct a comprehensive understanding of the effectiveness of coaching-based academic supervision.

Data validity was ensured through several techniques: (1) Credibility, conducted through triangulation, member checking, and negative case analysis; (2) Transferability, which examines the degree to which research findings can be applied to different contexts; (3) Dependability, ensuring replicability through an audit of the research process; and (4) Confirmability, ensuring objectivity and transparency throughout the research process (Sugiyono, 2022). Data were analyzed using the interactive data analysis model developed by Miles, et al (2019). This model consists of four main components: (1) Data Collection, through observation, interviews, and documentation; (2) Data Condensation, in which relevant data are summarized, selected, and categorized; (3) Data Display, where information is presented in narrative, table, or visual formats to facilitate understanding; and (4) Conclusion Drawing, conducted after synthesizing and interpreting the data.

3. Results and Discussion

SD Negeri 1 Sedan is a public elementary school located in a rural area of Rembang Regency, serving 215 students with diverse learning needs and socio-economic backgrounds. The school employs 10 teachers, including classroom teachers, subject teachers, and special assistance personnel. The learning environment is characterized by a supportive school climate, although facilities such as digital learning tools and instructional media remain limited. Academically, the school's literacy and numeracy outcomes are positioned at the medium category based on the Education Report (*Rapor Pendidikan*) data. The current academic supervision system relies primarily on traditional administrative supervision, where supervisors focus on checking lesson plans, documents, and administrative completeness. Classroom observations, when conducted, are generally evaluative and top-down, often leaving teachers feeling assessed rather than supported. Feedback sessions are usually brief, directive, and lacking reflective dialogue. These conditions prompted the need to adopt a more developmental and teacher-centered model, leading to the implementation of coaching-based academic supervision explored in this study.

This study employed a qualitative case study approach, involving in-depth interviews, classroom observations, and document analysis. Interview participants included the principal, three supervisors, and six teachers selected through purposive sampling to ensure representation of teaching levels and experience. Data collection took place over three weeks, during which semi-structured interviews were conducted in person, each lasting between 45–60 minutes. All interviews were audio-recorded with permission and later transcribed verbatim. The researcher also conducted non-intrusive classroom observations to triangulate interview data and reviewed supervision documents, including coaching notes, observation sheets, and

teacher reflection journals. Several interview questions are presented in Table 1 as follows:

Table 1. Interview Questions

No.	Interview Question
1	What challenges do teachers commonly face in classroom instruction?
2	How is academic supervision currently conducted in this school?
3	What are your perceptions of coaching-based supervision?
4	How does the coaching process influence your instructional practice?
5	What aspects of the coaching sessions are most helpful for improving teaching performance?
6	What difficulties do supervisors encounter when implementing coaching?
7	How do teachers engage in reflection after the coaching sessions?
8	What improvements have you observed in the supervision system since coaching was introduced?
9	What areas of teacher performance still require further development?
10	What recommendations do you have for enhancing coaching-based supervision?

Planning of Coaching-Based Academic Supervision

The planning of coaching-based academic supervision at SD Negeri 1 Sedan was carried out systematically, beginning with the identification of teachers' instructional needs. The principal emphasized the importance of this stage to ensure that the issues addressed in supervision were truly relevant to classroom practice. As the principal explained, *"From the identification stage, the common issue that must be addressed is how to design student-centered learning... including how assessment should not merely measure memorization"* (W.1, KS, June 2, 2025). This process was followed by document analysis and reflective dialogue with teachers to confirm the prioritized problems. A teacher affirmed this by stating, *"The principal identifies and determines our needs, then invites us to prepare solutions and improvement plans together"* (GR-1, June 3, 2025). The development of the supervision schedule was then organized flexibly yet systematically. Teachers confirmed that the schedule was arranged without disrupting instructional time, as noted: *"The principal planned the supervision schedule in alignment with our teaching hours without interrupting the teaching-learning process"* (GR-1, June 3, 2025). In assigning coaches, the principal considered teachers' competencies and interpersonal skills. As the principal stated, *"We identify teachers who are competent, experienced, and capable of becoming coaches... then we prepare the schedule and monitoring system"* (W.1, KS, June 2, 2025). Teachers also confirmed this procedure, adding that *"Coaches were selected based on competence, experience, and strong coaching skills"* (GR-1, June 3, 2025).

Implementation of Coaching-Based Academic Supervision

Implementation began with a pre-observation conference designed to establish mutual understanding and identify the instructional focus to be achieved. In this stage, the principal highlighted the importance of establishing psychological safety, explaining: *"Finally, we build a positive and safe climate... so teachers feel comfortable and open during the coaching process"* (W.2, KS, June 2, 2025). A

teacher confirmed this approach by stating, *“The principal prepared observation instruments and understood our needs so that the coaching process becomes more effective and focused on improving teacher performance”* (GR-2, June 3, 2025). Coaching sessions were conducted dialogically using the GROW model. The principal explained, *“Third, during the reflective coaching session... we explore the issue through questioning, then the teacher identifies solutions and formulates an action plan”* (W.2, KS, June 2, 2025). Teachers reported that this approach empowered them rather than positioning the supervisor as an instructor.

Classroom Observation in Coaching-Based Supervision

Classroom observations were carried out based on the instructional indicators agreed upon during the pre-observation meeting. Supervisors observed without intervening directly, focusing on teaching behaviors and teacher–student interactions. A teacher explained that observations were conducted objectively: *“The supervisor observed teachers using an observation instrument and documented visible aspects as material for reflection and coaching”* (GR-2, June 3, 2025). This approach provided teachers with a sense of psychological comfort because observations were grounded in actual evidence rather than subjective judgments.

Reflection and Feedback

The reflection stage took place immediately after the observation, with the purpose of helping teachers understand their strengths and areas for improvement. The principal stated, *“The supervisor provides reflection and feedback... using questions that encourage teachers to think and follow up continuously”* (W.2, KS, June 2, 2025). Teachers expressed positive experiences, for example: *“The supervisor guided us to understand the root of the problems and develop improvement steps that are realistic and measurable”* (GR-2, June 3, 2025). These findings show that reflection was conducted through constructive two-way dialogue rather than one-sided evaluation.

Teacher Performance Evaluation

Teacher performance evaluation was conducted by integrating observation findings, instructional documents, and teacher reflections. The principal noted that the evaluation process was formative in nature: *“Fifth, we develop continuous improvement plans... including mentoring through the teacher learning community (KBG)”* (W.3, KS, June 2, 2025). Teachers perceived that the evaluation served more as professional support than administrative assessment, stating: *“Performance evaluation is carried out comprehensively and serves as coaching rather than merely administrative scoring”* (GR-3, June 3, 2025).

Evaluation of the Coaching Process

Supervisors routinely conducted evaluations of the overall coaching process. The principal explained, *“Fourth, we carry out a joint evaluation... What has worked*

well? What needs improvement?” (W.3, KS, June 2, 2025). Teachers responded positively regarding the influence of coaching on their instructional practice, as reflected in the statement: “As an elementary school teacher, I find coaching makes my lessons more structured, students more active, and my instructional planning more focused” (GR-3, June 3, 2025). These findings indicate that coaching has had a tangible impact on classroom implementation.

Teachers’ Individual Reflection

The coaching process encouraged teachers to build a consistent habit of self-reflection. The principal explained that teachers’ reflections gradually evolved from merely descriptive statements to more analytical insights: “Teachers are now able to analyze the causes of learning barriers and formulate concrete steps moving forward” (W.3, KS, June 2, 2025). Teachers also confirmed that engaging in individual reflection helped them view lessons from the students’ perspective, recognize areas that needed adjustment, and design more effective instructional strategies. This reflective practice ultimately strengthened their ability to make informed decisions aimed at improving classroom learning.

Coach/Supervisor Reflection

Supervisors also engaged in reflective practice to enhance the quality of coaching. As the principal stated, “We recognize strengths such as positive relationships, but also weaknesses such as the lack of reflective questioning... this needs to be improved” (W.3, KS, June 2, 2025). Teachers reported that reflective practice by supervisors improved subsequent coaching sessions, noting: “The coach’s reflection made future coaching strategies more accurate and aligned with our needs” (GR-3, June 3, 2025). These findings indicate that coaching-based supervision at the school was dynamic and continuously improved.

Summary of Findings

The findings of this study provide a comprehensive overview of how coaching-based academic supervision is implemented at SD Negeri 1 Sedan and its effectiveness in improving teacher performance. To present these findings systematically, the key results are organized into several core components of the supervision process, including planning, implementation, classroom observation, reflection, and evaluation. A summary of these thematic findings is presented in Table 2 to provide a clearer and more structured understanding of the overall supervisory practices.

Table 2. Summary of Research Findings

Supervision Aspect	Key Findings	Data Source
1. Planning of Coaching-Based Academic Supervision		
a) Priority issues determined collaboratively.	Needs identified through class observations, document analysis, student learning outcomes, and PMM data.	Principal (W.1), Teachers (GR-1), Supervision Documents
b) Supervision schedule arranged flexibly yet structured.		

Supervision Aspect	Key Findings	Data Source
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) Teacher performance indicators developed (curriculum mastery, content knowledge, lesson planning, instructional delivery). d) Coaches assigned based on pedagogical competence, communication skills, and coaching experience. 		
2. Implementation of Coaching-Based Academic Supervision		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Pre-observation sessions used the GROW model. b) Coaching conducted dialogically and non-judgmentally. c) Coaching tools prepared (observation sheet, teacher reflection form, guiding questions). 	Initiated with teacher needs analysis.	Principal (W.2), GR-2, Supervision Documents
3. Classroom Observation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Supervisors remained neutral and non-intrusive b) Focus on lesson opening, instructional strategies, formative assessment, and teacher–student interaction. 	Conducted based on agreed indicators.	Principal (W.2), GR-2, Observation Notes
4. Reflection and Feedback		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Feedback provided positively and constructively based on evidence. b) Two-way dialogue encouraged joint problem-solving. c) Follow-up action plans developed collaboratively. 	Reflection guided by open-ended questions.	Principal (W.2), GR-2, Coaching Notes
5. Teacher Performance Evaluation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Notable improvement in teaching strategies, classroom interaction, and reflective capacity. b) Areas needing improvement: time management, equal student participation. 	Evaluation used evidence from observations, instructional documents, student outcomes, and teacher reflection journals.	Principal (W.3), GR-3, Assessment Documents
6. Coaching Process Evaluation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Supervisors identified gaps in eliciting deeper teacher reflection; occasional tendency to give direct advice. b) Coaching increased teachers' professional awareness. 	Teachers reported positive impact of coaching.	Principal (W.3), GR-3
7. Teacher Individual Reflection		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Reflections became analytical and solution-oriented; some reached a critical level. 	Teachers identified strengths and challenges in their teaching.	Principal (W.3), GR-3
8. Coach/Supervisor Reflection		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Improvement areas: active listening, deeper metacognitive questioning b) Supervisors committed to enhancing coaching quality. 	Supervisors acknowledged strengths and weaknesses in coaching delivery.	Principal (W.3), Supervisor Reflection Documents

Based on Table 2, it is evident that thorough planning including needs identification, indicator development, and schedule preparation provided a strong foundation for the implementation of coaching-based academic supervision. During implementation, the use of the GROW model and reflective questioning demonstrated that the coaching approach was not instructive but empowering, enabling teachers to discover their own solutions. Classroom observation aligned with coaching principles: objective, non-judgmental, and focused on pre-established indicators. This supported teachers in feeling psychologically safe to openly reflect on their practice.

In terms of teacher performance evaluation, coaching had a positive impact on teachers' ability to plan, deliver, and evaluate instruction. Teachers became more reflective and showed improvement in classroom interactions. However, challenges remained in time management and ensuring equitable student participation, indicating areas requiring further support. Supervisor reflection revealed that the coaching process had not yet reached its ideal form, as there were still tendencies to provide direct suggestions. This indicates an ongoing need to strengthen coaching capacity to avoid reverting to traditional supervisory practices. Overall, coaching-based academic supervision at SD Negeri 1 Sedan contributed significantly to improving teacher performance through a reflective, collaborative, and continuous professional development approach, although further refinement particularly in coaching techniques and deeper reflective practice is still needed.

Discussion

This study aims to examine the effectiveness of coaching-based academic supervision in improving teacher performance at SD Negeri 1 Sedan. The findings indicate that the implementation of coaching-based supervision through a systematic process of planning, implementation, reflection, and evaluation significantly contributes to the improvement of teachers' pedagogical competence and overall professional performance. The following discussion elaborates on how each component supports teacher development and how the findings align with or differ from previous research.

Planning of Coaching-Based Academic Supervision

The planning of coaching-based supervision at SD Negeri 1 Sedan demonstrates a systematic and data-driven approach, beginning with the identification of teachers' developmental needs, scheduling, the formulation of performance indicators, and the selection of qualified coaches. This aligns with Soro (2024), who emphasizes the importance of evidence-informed planning in determining teacher development priorities. However, unlike Soro (2024), who relies primarily on classroom observation, this study shows that the principal integrates observation with document analysis and reflective dialogue, offering a more holistic understanding of teacher needs. From a critical perspective, data-driven planning enhances objectivity but may overlook contextual nuances if not interpreted collaboratively. Glickman (2017) underscores that data alone is insufficient without critical

reflection. This is supported by recent studies, such as Yusuf & Widodo (2023), who found that integrating qualitative insights into supervision planning strengthens instructional alignment, and by Raharjo (2022), who reported that collaborative needs assessment leads to more targeted and sustainable teacher development.

Determination of the Supervision Schedule

The supervision schedule at SD Negeri 1 Sedan is flexible yet systematic, accommodating teaching loads and teachers' individual needs. This practice aligns with Sugiyono (2022), who highlights the need for flexibility in educational management. Unlike Hanik et al. (2024), who observed rigid twice-yearly schedules, this study shows that frequent and responsive supervision enhances coaching effectiveness. Flexibility allows teachers to participate without disrupting instructional time, increasing the relevance of coaching. These findings are consistent with Nasution & Manurung (2023), who reported that flexible supervision scheduling enhances teacher engagement, and with Supriyanto et al. (2021), who demonstrated that adaptive supervision timetables improve the quality of professional dialogue.

Development of Teacher Performance Indicators

At SD Negeri 1 Sedan, performance indicators are specific, measurable, and aligned with coaching goals. Unlike Hanik et al. (2024), who argue that indicators are often too general, this study shows a focus on curriculum mastery, content knowledge, and pedagogical effectiveness. Such indicators strengthen the foundation for reflection and follow-up actions. This aligns with findings by Ahmad & Prasetyo (2022), who emphasize the importance of measurable indicators in ensuring objective teacher evaluation, and by Nurhadi et al. (2023), who found that specific instructional indicators lead to more effective coaching conversations and improved teaching quality.

Implementation of Coaching-Based Academic Supervision

The implementation incorporates pre-observation meetings, classroom observations, reflective discussions, and follow-up activities. The application of the GROW model shows that supervision in this study is collaborative and empowering. This contrasts with Wahyudi et al. (2024), who found that supervision in many schools remains administrative and document-driven. Direct observation supported by reflective dialogue fosters deeper teacher learning. This is consistent with the work of Putra & Kamil (2023), who demonstrated that dialogical coaching enhances teacher autonomy, and Fitriani et al. (2022), who found that coaching-based supervision increases teachers' instructional adaptability and problem-solving capability. However, coaching requires significant time, commitment, and communication skill factors that influence consistency. Despite this, the collaborative nature of coaching strengthens professional trust, which is a critical factor highlighted by the findings.

Evaluation and Follow-Up

Evaluation at SD Negeri 1 Sedan is holistic, involving observation notes, reflection records, lesson plans, and student learning outcomes. This supports Juhadira (2024), who found that coaching-based reflection motivates teachers and transforms teaching practices. Unlike more formal and summative evaluations, the model in this study emphasizes participatory and reflective assessment. Reflective evaluation requires a psychologically safe environment to promote honest professional dialogue. This aligns with studies by Lestari & Setiawan (2022), who found that reflective evaluation enhances teachers' metacognitive awareness, and Harjono (2023), who reported that participatory evaluation strengthens teachers' ownership of instructional improvement.

Implications for Educational Practice

The study demonstrates that coaching-based academic supervision improves teacher performance, particularly in lesson planning, instructional methods, classroom interaction, and reflective thinking. Coaching encourages teachers to take ownership of their professional growth. The study differs from previous research by emphasizing reflective, dialogical practices that promote holistic development. However, the effectiveness of coaching depends on the principal's ability to serve as a competent coach. This is reinforced by research from Sari & Wahyuni (2023), showing that coaching competence correlates strongly with supervision effectiveness, and Dewantara et al. (2022), who found that school leaders require structured coaching training to ensure sustainable impact.

4. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that coaching-based academic supervision is effective in improving teacher performance at SD Negeri 1 Sedan. The effectiveness is evident through systematic planning, collaborative implementation, and reflection-based evaluation. In the planning stage, the principal identified teachers' needs through classroom observations, teacher reflections, document analysis, and collaborative discussions, followed by the formulation of clear performance indicators and a flexible supervision schedule tailored to teachers' instructional contexts. During implementation, the principal acted as a coach who empowered teachers to discover solutions independently through reflective questioning and a non-judgmental coaching approach. As a result, teachers showed improvements in instructional practices, the use of varied teaching methods, and the quality of classroom interactions. Evaluation was conducted using concrete evidence classroom observations, instructional documents, and teacher reflections which then informed continuous professional development. These findings differ from previous studies that emphasized administrative forms of supervision, as this study demonstrates that a reflective, dialogic, and empowering coaching approach has a more significant impact on enhancing teacher performance.

The novelty of this study lies in the comprehensive application of coaching-based academic supervision through a deeply collaborative process between the principal and teachers, shifting the emphasis from formal compliance-oriented supervision to continuous professional growth. Furthermore, this study highlights the principal's role as an active coach who facilitates reflection, builds a psychologically safe environment, and motivates teachers to engage in ongoing instructional improvement.

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations. Its scope is limited to a single school, which restricts the generalizability of the findings to other educational settings with different characteristics. Additionally, the study does not examine the long-term impact of coaching-based supervision on teacher performance and student learning outcomes. Future research is recommended to involve a larger number of schools with diverse contexts, extend the duration of observation, and analyze the long-term effects of coaching on teacher performance, instructional quality, and student engagement. Further studies may also explore principals' readiness to implement coaching and examine how school culture and resource availability shape the success of coaching-based academic supervision.

References

- Ahmad, R., & Prasetyo, D. (2022). Developing measurable performance indicators for effective teacher evaluation. *Journal of Educational Assessment*, 14(2), 112–124.
- Arikunto, S. (2019). *Dasar-dasar supervisi*. PT Rineka Cipta.
- Dewantara, A., Rahmadani, S., & Yuliani, T. (2022). School leadership coaching and its impact on sustainable instructional improvement. *Journal of Educational Leadership Studies*, 5(1), 45–59.
- Erjati, A. (2017). Profesionalisme guru dalam membimbing peserta didik menuju kemandirian. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, 12(2), 45–56.
- Fitriani, S., Lestari, P., & Mulyana, A. (2022). Coaching-based supervision and teachers' instructional adaptability. *Indonesian Journal of Instructional Development*, 7(3), 210–225.
- Glickman, C. D. (2017). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (10th ed.). Pearson.
- Grant, R. M. (2019). *Analisis strategi kontemporer, konsep, teknik, aplikasi* (Edisi kedua). Erlangga.
- Hanik, U., Fitria, N., & Maharani, S. (2024). The challenges of academic supervision scheduling in elementary schools. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 9(1), 33–48.
- Harjono, T. (2023). Participatory evaluation in academic supervision and its influence on teacher professional growth. *Journal of Educational Reflection*, 8(2), 77–89.
- Hendryadi, H. (2019). *Metode penelitian*. Lembaga Pengembangan Manajemen dan Publikasi Imperium.
- Ibrahim, M. (2015). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif*. Alfabeta.
-

-
- Juhadira, S. (2024). Efektivitas coaching terhadap peningkatan kinerja guru di sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Pengembangan Pendidikan*, 13(2), 210-220.
- Kasmir. (2019). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia: Pengaruh kepemimpinan, gaya kepemimpinan, dan kepuasan kerja terhadap kinerja guru*. Rajawali Pers.
- Kontjaraningrat, K. (2022). *Pengantar ilmu antropologi*. Rineka Cipta.
- Lestari, S., & Setiawan, H. (2022). Reflective evaluation as a tool to enhance teachers' metacognitive awareness. *Journal of Education and Learning Research*, 11(4), 290–302.
- Mardiyatun, M. (2021). Implementasi coaching individual untuk peningkatan kompetensi profesional guru pendidikan agama Islam dalam melaksanakan penelitian tindakan kelas. *STRATEGY: Jurnal Inovasi Strategi dan Model Pembelajaran*, 1(1), 46-54.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. P. (2017). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia (Perusahaan)*. PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2019). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Moleong, L. J. (2018). *Metode penelitian kualitatif*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nasution, A., & Manurung, N. (2023). Flexible supervision scheduling and its effect on teacher engagement. *Educational Management Journal*, 12(1), 88–99.
- Nurhadi, A., Fadhilah, M., & Saputra, D. (2023). *Instructional indicators and the quality of coaching conversations*. *Journal of Teaching Improvement*, 5(2), 101–118.
- Panchal, S., & Riddell, D. (2020). *Coaching for performance: The GROW model*. Kogan Page.
- Prasojo, L. D. (2015). *Supervisi akademik*. Gava Media.
- Putra, W., & Kamil, M. (2023). Dialogical coaching and teacher autonomy in professional learning. *Journal of Educational Coaching*, 4(2), 55–70.
- Raharjo, B. (2022). Collaborative needs assessment for sustainable teacher development. *Journal of Instructional Planning*, 6(1), 25–39.
- Sagala, S. (2018). *Konsep dan makna pembelajaran*. Alfabeta.
- Sari, M., & Wahyuni, D. (2023). Coaching competence among school principals and its impact on supervision effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Coaching*, 2(2), 50–63.
- Soro, A. (2024). Classroom observation as a tool for enhancing instructional practices. *Journal of Educational Research*, 58(2), 145–160.
- Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Sukmadinata, N. S. (2019). *Metode penelitian pendidikan*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Supardi. (2018). *Kinerja guru*. PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Supriyanto, A., Widodo, A., & Rahmawati, S. (2021). Adaptive supervision scheduling to improve professional dialogue. *Journal of School Management*, 9(2), 66–80.
- Whitmore, J. (2015). *Coaching for performance*. Gramedia Pustaka.
- Wahyudi, D., Utaminingsih, I., & Ismaya, N. (2024). Penerapan supervisi akademik di sekolah dasar wilayah Kecamatan Nalumsari: Analisis dan solusi pembinaan guru. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar*, 15(2), 125-136.
-

-
- Yamin, M., Martinis, & Maisah. (2019). *Manajemen pembelajaran kelas strategi meningkatkan mutu pembelajaran*. Gaung Persada.
- Yusuf, A., & Widodo, S. (2023). Integrating qualitative insights into academic supervision planning. *Journal of Educational Development*, 8(3), 134–149.

How to cite this article:

Astuti, Y. Y., Nyoman, N. A., & Prayito, M. (2026). The Effectiveness of Coaching-Based Academic Supervision in Improving Teacher Performance: A Case Study at SD Negeri 1 Sedan. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10(1), 983-997.
