E-ISSN: 3163-3153

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION POLICY PRAXIS

Volume 1, Issue 2, 2026

Academic Supervision Through the TIRTA Coaching Model: A Case Study of Driving School in Sinjai Regency

Muallim[1]*, Andi Rizka Ekaputri[2], Muh. Riswan[3]

[1,2] Universitas Negeri Makassar

[3]Universitas Cenderawasih

Corresponding author's email: muallim@unm.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study examines how the TIRTA coaching model was enacted in academic supervision, how teachers experienced the process, and which conditions supported or constrained implementation in junior high schools participating in Indonesia's Sekolah Penggerak program. A qualitative case-study approach was used across three public schools in Sinjai Regency: SMP Negeri 1 Sinjai, SMP Negeri 35 Sinjai, and SMP Negeri 11 Sinjai. The study drew on semi-structured interviews, observation, and documentation involving 12 informants: three principals, six teachers involved in Learning Committee Training, and three school supervisors. Data were interpreted through collection, condensation, display, and conclusion verification, supported by source triangulation. The findings indicate that principals organized coaching around goal clarification, identification of instructional challenges, action planning, and accountability, linking these elements to pre-observation, classroom observation, and post-observation dialogue. Participants reported more open principal–teacher communication, opportunities for reflective problem identification, and greater participation in developing instructional follow-up plans. Implementation was facilitated by principals' questioning and listening skills, teacher commitment, and collaborative school norms. Constraints included limited time, teaching workloads, uneven understanding of coaching, and lingering discomfort with conventional supervisory hierarchies. The study contributes a contextual account of how a structured coaching conversation can connect supervisory routines with teachers' professional agency in resource-constrained school settings. However, reported changes should not be interpreted as causal evidence of improvements in student achievement.

Keywords: academic supervision, TIRTA coaching model, instructional leadership, teacher reflection, Sekolah Penggerak, professional collaboration

INTRODUCTION

Academic supervision is a central responsibility of school principals because instructional improvement requires more than administrative monitoring. Effective supervision entails identifying teachers' instructional needs, examining evidence from classroom activities, and sustaining professional conversations about improvement. From a leadership-for-learning perspective, the contribution of principals depends on

Volume 1, Issue 2, 2026, pp: 119-130
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70188/1nqkqb14

whether leadership practices direct attention to teaching and create conditions for professional learning rather than merely ensuring formal compliance(Hallinger, 2011). Research on instructional leadership in Indonesia connects principals' practices with teacher performance (Muallim & Abdi, 2025). Recent Indonesian studies likewise describe academic supervision as a potential mechanism for supporting teachers' instructional and pedagogical development when observation is followed by feedback and assistance (Soro et al., 2024; Yulidar et al., 2025).

Nevertheless, supervision may become counterproductive when teachers experience it primarily as a one-way judgement. A supervisory encounter dominated by identifying deficiencies offers limited opportunity for teachers to explain instructional decisions, examine contextual constraints, or formulate workable changes. Coaching offers a different interactional logic: the principal listens, asks open questions, facilitates self-assessment, and helps teachers establish ownership of the next steps. Research on feedback emphasizes that the value of feedback depends on its clarity and ability to orient learners toward their next actions (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). A systematic review of leadership coaching also shows that effective coaching must be understood within the wider relationships and organizational conditions surrounding school leaders (Collins et al., 2025).

Within the Indonesian driving school initiative, a commonly adopted conversation framework is TIRTA, derived from Objective, Identification, Action Plan, and Responsibilities (accountability). The framework is intended to help principals and teachers negotiate supervision objectives, identify instructional concerns, generate viable responses, and commit to follow-up. (Ningsih, 2023) examined the TIRTA approach in developing principals' supervision competencies. Studies of its use have described reflective conversations and more participatory instructional support (Setianingsih & Hanif, 2024; Tanggulungan & Sihotang, 2023) . Reviews of TIRTA-based supervision have also highlighted the significance of conceptual understanding and well-designed instruments, rather than treating a questioning sequence alone as sufficient for improving classroom practice (Atikah, 2024; Nofitri & Hadiyanto, 2023).

An expanding body of recent empirical literature has examined coaching in Indonesian schools. (Hanik et al., 2024) reported that teachers experienced greater opportunities for reflection and collaborative working relationships in elementary-school supervision. (Darmawan et al., 2025) documented principals' implementation of TIRTA coaching skills, wherea. (Juhadira et al., 2024) described the importance of two-way communication for motivation and teacher confidence. The studies of (Yusnidar et al., 2024) and (Yulidar et al., 2025) also addressed planning, implementation, and follow-up within coaching-oriented academic supervision. More recently, (Arfin et al., 2026) discussed perceived improvements in teacher performance alongside implementation constraints. Although these studies provide useful evidence, the connection between the stages of TIRTA, experienced changes in professional relationships, and the conditions required for implementation remains important to examine across settings.

Sinjai Regency provides a useful case for such an investigation. The three junior high schools studied are situated in distinct local environments, including agricultural communities and locations where access or school resources present practical

considerations. In preliminary interviews reported in the original thesis, some principals and teachers were still adapting to coaching and remained accustomed to conventional supervision. The gap addressed here is therefore not whether the TIRTA model exists or whether coaching is universally effective, but how its conversational stages were translated into actual supervision routines, how principals and teachers interpreted their experiences, and which personal and institutional constraints shaped follow-up. This connected, three-dimensional explanation is relatively underdeveloped in the studies cited above, especially for junior high schools implementing driving school outside major urban centers.

Accordingly, this study aims to (1) describe how principals implemented the TIRTA coaching model during academic supervision; (2) examine reported changes in teachers' reflection, instructional planning, and professional communication; and (3) identify facilitating and inhibiting conditions across the three schools. The analytical contribution lies in linking the TIRTA conversation sequence to the full supervision cycle and to the interpersonal and organizational conditions that give the model practical meaning. The study is interpretive, not experimental; consequently, it does not test a statistical hypothesis about the causal effect of coaching on teacher or student outcomes.

METHODS

Research Design and Setting

A qualitative case-study design was employed to examine coaching-based academic supervision in the natural setting of three driving school public junior high schools in Sinjai Regency, West Sulawesi, Indonesia: UPTD SMP Negeri 1 Sinjai, UPTD SMP Negeri 35 Sinjai, and UPTD SMP Negeri 11 Sinjai. The three cases were selected because each school was implementing the program and its principal reported using coaching in academic supervision. The field evidence documented in the thesis dates from 2024; the dated principal and teacher interviews reproduced in the results were undertaken between June and August of that year. The precise closing date of data collection should be confirmed from the original field records before submission

Participants and Data Sources

The study involved 12 informants from the three schools and their supervisory system: three principals, six teachers who had participated in Learning Committee Training (Learning Committee Training, hereafter PKP), and three assigned school supervisors. Principals and PKP teachers constituted key informants on coaching practice, while school supervisors provided complementary perspectives. Their roles and distribution are summarized in Table 1. The selection reflected direct knowledge of academic supervision in the respective settings; the sample was not intended to represent all schools or teachers in the regency.

Volume 1, Issue 2, 2026, pp: 119-130
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70188/1nqkqb14

Table 1: Distribution of Research Informants

Study site	Principal	PKP Teacher	School supervisor
SMP Negeri 1 Sinjai	1	2	1
SMP Negeri 35 Sinjai	1	2	1
SMP Negeri 11 Sinjai	1	2	1
Total	3	6	3

Source: Study informant register reported in the original 2025 thesis (fieldwork, 2024)

Data Collection and Analysis

The principal investigator served as the primary research instrument, supported by a semi-structured interview guide, an observation sheet, and recorded field conversations. Interviews elicited principals' coaching strategies, teachers' experiences during supervision, and perceived enablers and barriers. Participatory observation focused on academic supervision activities, and documentary materials provided contextual information on the schools and supervision arrangements. The analysis followed an interactive qualitative process: data collection, data condensation, presentation of evidence in narrative form, and conclusion drawing with verification. The material was synthesized into three overarching themes consistent with the research questions: implementation strategies, experienced changes, and contextual conditions.

Credibility was addressed in the original study through source triangulation: principal, teacher, and supervisor accounts were compared, alongside relevant observations. The present article reconstructs and analytically elaborates the already reported evidence; it does not introduce new informants, newly collected measurements, or additional statistical analyses. Interview extracts presented below have been translated from Indonesian into English for journal presentation and are assigned role-based codes to avoid unnecessary identification of individual participants. The thesis includes research-permission documentation, but it does not provide sufficiently detailed information to assert institutional ethics approval or specific written-consent procedures; these matters require author verification prior to submission.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Implementation of TIRTA Across the Academic Supervision Cycle

All three principals stated that they used coaching-oriented academic supervision after their schools joined driving school. Across the cases, practices were grouped into pre-observation, classroom observation, and post-observation stages. During pre-observation, principals approached teachers personally and clarified the purpose and focus of supervision. Observation supplied concrete accounts of classroom practices, while subsequent dialogue encouraged teachers to identify difficulties, consider alternative responses, and assume responsibility for follow-up. The central pattern was

a conversational cycle rather than a rigid sequence of identical procedures implemented by each school.

> *"The strategy I have used in coaching-based supervision is to approach the teachers, usually beginning by discussing the purpose of the supervision before direct classroom observation."*
> —Principal, SMP Negeri 1 Sinjai; interview, 28 June 2024

The Balangnipa account illustrates how agreement on a purpose is used to reduce uncertainty before classroom observation. At Lita, a PKP teacher described the questioning practices that helped make the supervision conversation more exploratory:

> *"My principal has applied a range of strategies and techniques in coaching: open-ended questions, feedback, reflection, mapping strengths, mapping challenges, and communicating follow-up efforts."*
> — PKP teacher, SMP Negeri 35 Sinjai; interview, 6 August 2024

At White Sand, the principal emphasized creating a comfortable atmosphere before asking teachers to discuss goals, problems, possible solutions, and their readiness to take action. These similarities indicate shared TIRTA principles, while local descriptions such as direct approach, individual assistance, and personal communication suggest variation in how the principles were operationalized. The analysis therefore identifies the model's main features but does not claim that all four elements were documented in every supervision encounter or for every teacher.

Table 2: Analytical Mapping of TIRTA to Supervision Activities

TIRTA componen	Principal	PKP Teacher
Goal (Tujuan)	Joint clarification of supervision objectives and instructional focus	Pre-observation
Identification (Identifikasi)	Classroom observation; open questions to surface strengths and challenges	Observation and reflective dialogue
Action plan (Rencana Aksi)	Discussion of alternatives and specific instructional improvement steps	Post-observation
Accountability (Tanggung Jawab)	Teacher commitment, planned follow-up, and review of progress	Post-observation and follow-up

Source: Authors' thematic synthesis of interviews and case descriptions

This pattern accords with (Darmawan et al., 2025) , who found that TIRTA coaching skills helped structure principals' supervisory conversations, and with (Setianingsih & Hanif, 2024), who associated coaching with more reflective instructional support. (Aswad & Badrun, 2025) similarly described goal agreement, reflection, action plans, and sustained monitoring within the Independent Curriculum context. However, the Sinjai cases add an explanatory emphasis on how the same framework was locally expressed across three junior high schools rather than on the creation of a new coaching model. The observations support an interpretation of TIRTA as a practical

mechanism for organizing professional dialogue, contingent on the principal's ability to listen and on the teacher's opportunities to participate.

In the wider literature, the effectiveness of a supervisory approach is not guaranteed by the presence of procedural stages alone. A distinct coaching-based supervision design, MOTIRTAR, was examined by Wahyudi et al. (Wahyudi et al., 2022); its outcomes cannot be treated as direct evidence for TIRTA in this study. (Mabruroh & Atikah, 2024) emphasized the relationship among supervision principles, models, instruments, and procedures; (Nofitri & Hadiyanto, 2023) reviewed the application of TIRTA to principal-led supervision. Read alongside the current cases, these studies suggest that the sequence is useful insofar as the evidence observed in class is transformed into teacher-generated reflection and a practical commitment. An unattended action plan, even if properly written, would not constitute substantive coaching.

Teachers' Reflection, Classroom Practice, and Professional Relationships

Three interconnected areas of experienced change emerged. First, teachers reported becoming more willing to recognize teaching difficulties and examine their practice. Second, they perceived that coaching helped them plan instructional improvements, including classroom management and teaching approaches. Third, principals and teachers described their professional conversations as more open and less dominated by one-way instruction. The following teacher account links problem identification to subsequent planning:

> *"I felt helped because I could identify the problems I had encountered in teaching. Those problems were reflected upon and evaluated to find solutions for improving the next learning process."*
> — PKP teacher, SMP Negeri 35 Sinjai; interview, 6 August 2024

The reported ability to identify one's own instructional problems indicates a possible shift in teacher agency: teachers were not restricted to receiving external judgments but were encouraged to formulate interpretations and solutions. A principal in Balangnipa similarly described changes in communication:

> *"Teachers are more open in communicating their difficulties, so discussions between me as principal and the teachers I supervise are more relaxed, and we can look for solutions together."*
> — Principal, SMP Negeri 1 Sinjai; interview, 28 June 2024

These accounts do not establish that an equivalent shift occurred across the entire teaching staff. They nevertheless make the interpersonal mechanism visible: teachers' willingness to disclose difficulties creates more precise problems for discussion, and a non-punitive response makes follow-up planning easier. Mardini (Mardini, 2023) also described face-to-face coaching as a means of supporting teachers' implementation of project-based learning, although in a different design and setting. Findings by (Juhadira et al., 2024) also associated coaching supervision with reciprocal communication and teacher motivation. Hanik et al. (Hanik et al., 2024) reported reflective development and improved collaborative relationships in an elementary-school context. Comparison

with these studies suggests that professional trust and dialogue are not incidental benefits; they are conditions through which a coaching conversation can produce meaningful instructional reflection.

Table 3: Reported Changes and Evidentiary Boundaries

Domain	Indications in the case-study data	Interpretive boundary
Teachers	Self-reflection, identification of problems, motivation, confidence	Based on informants' reported experiences
Instructional practice	Planning of follow-up actions, classroom management, consideration of teaching strategies	No experimental or causal assessment of classroom outcomes
Professional relationships	More open dialogue, shared problem-solving, principal–teacher collaboration	Applies to the cases and informants studied

Source: Authors' synthesis of interview findings and the original study conclusion

From an instructional leadership perspective, the findings suggest a reorientation in the principal's immediate supervisory role from sole evaluator toward facilitator of professional reasoning. (Hallinger, 2011) situated leadership for learning within context-sensitive practices rather than purely administrative control. A more recent systematic review by (Collins et al., 2025) similarly argued that coaching for school leaders depends on relationships and the ecological setting in which leadership is enacted. Sinjai provides a small-scale illustration of these arguments: principals used their formal authority to open a conversational space in which teachers could explore instructional decisions. The expression "shift toward collaborative supervision" should nonetheless be treated as an interpretation of the interviews rather than a measured before-and-after transformation.

Importantly, reported improvements in teaching quality must be distinguished from objectively established changes in student learning. (Arfin et al., 2026) found perceived benefits of coaching for planning, teaching methods, classroom management, and professional cooperation, while (Visscher et al., 2025), in a meta-analysis of professional development interventions, showed that student learning effects vary markedly across programs. (Kraft et al., 2018) likewise demonstrated promise for teacher coaching but cautioned that results depend on how programs are designed and delivered. In the present study, the primary evidence supports changes in teachers' reported reflection and instructional intentions; it is insufficient to quantify teacher performance improvements or attribute any observed student achievement change causally to the coaching intervention.

Facilitating Factors and Barriers to Sustainable Coaching

The data revealed two broad sets of influences. Facilitating conditions included principals' readiness and coaching skills, especially listening and questioning; teachers' commitment to reflection; interpersonal trust; and collaborative school cultures. Barriers were reported at three interconnected levels: individual factors such as limited coaching understanding, low confidence, and reluctance to change; operational factors such as workload, limited time, and competing priorities; and socio-cultural factors,

particularly discomfort resulting from earlier, more hierarchical supervisory routines. (Fatmawati & Hariyadi, 2024) similarly situated coaching within teacher performance support, reinforcing the need to address conditions surrounding the conversation. The principal at Lita described the latter problem directly:

> *"Sometimes I see that some teachers still feel awkward about coaching because they are still accustomed to conventional supervision."*
> — Principal, SMP Negeri 35 Sinjai; interview, 6 August 2024

Time constraints were also highlighted by the same principal, who explained the need to prioritize activities when supervision schedules were limited. (Arfin et al., 2026) likewise identified scheduling constraints as a practical challenge to sustaining coaching. This alignment suggests that quality depends not only on coaching competence at the level of an individual principal but also on school-level provisions for protected time and follow-up.

The social environment further shapes whether questions can elicit honest reflection. A teacher who anticipates sanctions from supervision may offer socially acceptable answers rather than discuss actual difficulties. This interpretation resonates with (Yusnidar et al., 2024), who examined the stages of TIRTA supervision and the importance of evaluation and follow-up, and with (Mabruroh & Atikah, 2024), who stressed coherence among supervision approaches and implementation procedures. In practical terms, principals must communicate the developmental intention of coaching clearly, particularly to teachers who have not participated in specialized training and may still associate supervision with administrative appraisal.

Although the three schools differ in their geography and available resources, the study does not establish that geographical distance itself caused weaker coaching practices. Such contextual information should be treated as a condition that may influence implementation logistics rather than as a measured predictor. The interview evidence points more directly to scheduling, trust, readiness, and skill as issues that principals and teachers had to negotiate. An adaptive approach therefore ought to retain TIRTA's essential aims while allowing the timing and conversational arrangements to fit the realities of each school.

Scholarly Contribution, Practice Implications, and Study Limitations

The study's main contribution is an integrated, context-sensitive explanation of TIRTA implementation: (a) goals, identification, action plans, and accountability were situated within pre-observation, observation, and post-observation activities; (b) teachers described reflective opportunities and more collaborative professional conversations; and (c) the sustainability of these practices depended on leadership skill, teacher participation, available time, and the inherited culture of supervision. This is not a newly invented coaching model, nor a demonstration of statistically measured effectiveness. Rather, it clarifies the relational and organizational mechanisms through which an established framework was interpreted and used in three junior high school cases.

The findings have practical implications for school principals and educational supervisors. An implementable cycle would begin by identifying one specific instructional focus jointly with a teacher, documenting relevant classroom evidence, conducting a post-observation conversation based on open questions, and recording a realistic action plan with the support and review date needed. Principals should also explain the purpose of coaching to teachers outside the PKP group and provide predictable time for follow-up discussions. This recommendation follows from the reported obstacles and is consistent with the emphasis on a sustained, socially situated coaching process in (Collins et al., 2025) and on coherent professional learning practices (Sims et al., 2025). It has not, however, been separately trial led or evaluated in the present cases.

Several limitations constrain the interpretation. First, the cases comprise three schools and 12 informants, with the direct teacher accounts largely derived from PKP participants rather than the whole teaching staff. Second, findings rely heavily on qualitative accounts, supported by observation and documentation but without an explicitly reported longitudinal audit of each teacher's action plan. Third, the material does not provide baseline and follow-up measurements of classroom quality or student achievement. Finally, the exact date on which all data collection concluded and the procedures used to obtain individual consent require author verification against field records. Future mixed-method or longitudinal studies could follow several supervision cycles, include non-PKP teachers, examine coaching records and observed classroom practices, and test whether reflective changes persist and are associated with student learning.

CONCLUSION

The TIRTA coaching model was implemented in three Sekolah Penggerak junior high schools in Sinjai Regency through goal clarification, identification of instructional needs, action planning, and teacher accountability linked to pre-observation, classroom observation, and post-observation supervision. Interviewed principals and teachers described more open professional dialogue and greater opportunities for teacher-led reflection and instructional follow-up. The coherence of the process depended on principals' coaching skills, teacher participation, supportive school cultures, and sufficient time, while established hierarchical expectations and uneven understanding of coaching constrained implementation. The study contributes an empirical account of how a structured coaching framework connects supervision routines with professional relationships in three contextually distinct schools. Given its qualitative design, these findings should not be taken as proof of causal gains in teacher performance or student achievement. Schools adopting the approach should prioritize clear developmental purposes, consistent scheduling, and documented follow-up, while further research should trace changes across repeated coaching cycles using additional classroom evidence.

REFERENCES

Arfin, M., Munirah, & Nurlina. (2026). Implementation of the coaching model in academic supervision to improve teacher performance: The perspective of principals and teachers. *International Journal on Studies in Education*, *8*(2), 320–337. https://doi.org/10.46328/ijonse.7024

Aswad, F. H., & Badrun, M. (2025). Implementasi supervisi akademik berbasis coaching dalam meningkatkan kualitas pembelajaran pada Kurikulum Merdeka. *Manajemen Pendidikan*, 187–196.

Atikah, C. (2024). Penerapan coaching dalam supervisi akademik. *Pendas: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, *9*(4), 917–928.

Collins, C., Murphy, R., & Brown, M. (2025). The power of coaching in the professional learning and development of school leaders: An ecological framework and critical insights from a systematic review. *Frontiers in Education*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1601455

Darmawan, R. A. E. A., Hariyati, N., & Khamidi, A. (2025). Penerapan Keterampilan Coaching Alur TIRTA Kepala Sekolah dalam Supervisi Akademik. *JIIP-Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, *8*(2), 2202–2208.

Fatmawati, N., & Hariyadi, A. (2024). Teknik coaching dalam supervisi akademik untuk peningkatan kinerja guru. *Scientia: Social Sciences & Humanities*, *3*(2), 224–228. https://doi.org/10.51773/sssh.v3i2.308

Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *49*(2), 125–142. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699

Hanik, S. U., Hilmi, M. I., Rindriani, D., Meiyasinta, F., Arifin, M. R., & Antari, S. N. (2024). Peningkatan kualitas guru melalui supervisi akademik dengan tehnik coaching di sekokah dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, *8*(5), 3799–3805. https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v8i5.8088

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

Juhadira, Hasniati, Ririk, Lilianti, & Nasir. (2024). Implementasi metode coaching dalam supervisi akademik. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen Sosial Humaniora*, *6*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.51454/jimsh.v6i1.404

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

Mabruroh, & Atikah, C. (2024). Penerapan coaching dalam supervisi akademik. *Pendas: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, *9*(4). https://doi.org/10.23969/jp.v9i4.19113

Mardini, S. (2023). Peningkatan kemampuan mengajar guru dalam penerapan project based learning melalui coaching tatap muka. *Ideguru: Jurnal Karya Ilmiah Guru*, *8*(2), 199–207. https://doi.org/10.51169/ideguru.v8i2.467

Muallim, M., & Abdi, F. S. (2025). Madrasah Principal's Managerial Innovations to Enhance Learning Quality at MIS Miftahul Hasanah Muhammadiyah Songing, Sinjai Regency. *Paidagogia: Jurnal Pengajaran Dan Pendidikan*, *2*(1), 13–28.

Nofitri, F., & Hadiyanto, R. (2023). Penerapan coaching model alur Tirta oleh kepala sekolah dalam mensupervisi guru di sekolah. *Pendas: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, *8*(1), 1209–1221.

Setianingsih, E., & Hanif, M. (2024). Supervisi akademik dengan coaching model TIRTA untuk meningkatkan kualitas pembelajaran di sekolah. *EDUCATIONAL: Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan & Pengajaran*, *4*(2), 60–70.

Sims, S., Fletcher-Wood, H., O'Mara-Eves, A., Cottingham, S., Stansfield, C., Goodrich, J., & Anders, J. (2025). Effective teacher professional development: New theory and a meta-analytic test. *Review of Educational Research*, *95*(2), 213–254. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543231217480

Soro, S. H., Hakim, A. R., Rahayu, S., & Pangestuti, W. R. (2024). Implementasi supervisi akademik berbasis coaching oleh kepala sekolah dalam meningkatkan kompetensi pedagogik guru sekolah dasar negeri Cicalengka 06 Kabupaten Bandung. *Edukasia: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran*, *5*(1), 2235–2242. https://doi.org/10.62775/edukasia.v5i1.1241

Tanggulungan, L., & Sihotang, H. (2023). Coaching Model Tirta dalam Supervisi Akademik: Strategi Inovatif untuk Meningkatkan Kualitas Pembelajaran di Sekolah. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, *7*(3), 31399–31407.

Visscher, A. J., Dmoshinskaia, N., Pellegrini, M., & Rey-Naizaque, A. (2025). (When) do teacher professional development interventions improve student achievement? A meta-analysis of 128 high-quality studies. *Educational Research Review*, *49*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2025.100742

Wahyudi, E., Utaminingsih, S., & Ismaya, E. A. (2022). Efektivitas model supervisi akademik berbasis coaching MOTIRTAR. *Primary: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar*, *11*(5), 1396–1406. https://doi.org/10.33578/jpfkip.v11i5.9189

Yulidar, Aswad, F. H., & Badrun, M. (2025). Implementasi supervisi akademik berbasis coaching dalam meningkatkan kualitas pembelajaran pada Kurikulum Merdeka. *Manajemen Pendidikan*, *20*(1), 187–196. https://doi.org/10.23917/jmp.v20i1.11296

Yusnidar, Rasyid, S., & Marisa, R. (2024). Supervisi kepala sekolah berbasis coaching TIRTA dalam meningkatkan profesionalisme kompetensi guru SD negeri. *Hijri*, *13*(2), 239–253. https://doi.org/10.30821/hijri.v13i2.21438