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ABSTRACT

Pengawasan merupakan kegiatan penting yang harus dilakukan oleh setiap lembaga pendidikan untuk mewujudkan pendidikan yang berkualitas melalui pembinaan, perbaikan dan peningkatan profesionalisme guru dan staf sekolah. Pendidikan yang berkualitas ini erat kaitannya dengan upaya sekolah dalam menghasilkan sumber daya manusia yang berkualitas. Penelitian ini dilakukan dengan tujuan untuk menganalisis kinerja supervisi akademik kepala sekolah. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif. Masalah dan solusi pelaksanaan penelitian ini melibatkan 4 kepala sekolah dan 8 guru. Teknik pengumpulan data menggunakan wawancara, studi dokumen dan observasi. Validasi data menggunakan triangulasi teknis dan triangulasi sumber. Data yang terkumpul kemudian dianalisis menggunakan model Miles dan Huberman tahapan, yaitu: pengumpulan data, reduksi data, penjajakan data dan penarikan kesimpulan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa rata-rata skor kinerja kepala sekolah pada tahap perencanaan supervisi akademik adalah 25% (kategori kurang), tahap pelaksanaan supervisi akademik 46,8% (kategori kurang) dan tahap tindak lanjut supervisi akademik, adalah 30% (kategori kurang). Berbagai permasalahan juga ditemukan dalam pelaksanaan supervisi akademik sehingga model supervisi dengan pendekatan kolaboratif dapat menjadi solusi yang tepat untuk diterapkan.

1. INTRODUCTION

Supervision is an important activity that must be carried out by every educational institution to realize a quality education through coaching, repairing and increasing the professionalism of teachers and school staff. This quality education is closely related to school efforts in producing quality human resources. This research was conducted with the aims to analyses the performance of the principal’s academic supervision. This study use qualitative method. This study implementation problems and solutions with 4 principals and 8 teachers as the subject. Data collection techniques using interviews, document studies and observation. The data was validated using technical triangulation and source triangulation. The collected data is then analyzed using the Miles and Huberman model stages, were: data collection, data reduction, data display and drawing conclusions. The results showed that the average score of the principal’s performance at the planning stage of academic supervision was 25% (less category), the implementation stage of academic supervision was 46,8% (less category) and the follow-up stage of academic supervision was 30% (less category). Various problems are also found in the implementation of academic supervision so that the supervision model with a collaborative approach can be the right solution to be applied.
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This demand is a challenge that schools must face in managing the quality of education to be better and meet community expectations (Sinambela, 2017; Zahro et al., 2018). In school institutions, the principal is a key actor who is responsible for the process of managing and ensuring the quality of education (Khaleel et al., 2021; Warlizasusi, 2017). This means, principals play an important role in ensuring the quality of education through the development of school programs both administratively and learning (Constantia et al., 2021; Dadaczynski et al., 2020; Jong et al., 2020; Khaleel et al., 2021). Therefore, it can be concluded that the main role of a school principal is as the person in charge of school management whose task is to lead, direct and motivate all human resources in schools and carry out every policy from the central government to achieve quality education (Beausaert et al., 2021; Supriadi et al., 2021). In carrying out his duties, a school principal is required to have five competencies, namely: managerial competence, social competence, personality competence, entrepreneurial competence and supervisory competence (Astika et al., 2020; Setiyadi & Lukita, 2020). These competencies will be used by school principals in carrying out and managing the educational process in schools to improve the quality of learning through the development of facilities and infrastructure as well as the quality of teachers.

One of the principal competencies that are important to be implemented is supervisory competence. Supervision relates to an activity that is carried out in a planned manner to help teachers and school employees to do their job effectively (Meidiana et al., 2020; Murtiningsih et al., 2019; Renata et al., 2018). In carrying out these competencies, the principal acts as a supervisor (Muflihin, 2018; Yunus et al., 2017). There are three types of supervision, namely: managerial supervision, clinical supervision and academic supervision (Jiwa, 2019; Kompri, 2017). Academic supervision can be interpreted as an effort made by supervisors to help teachers improve academic quality on an ongoing basis through supervision and coaching activities (Istiningsih et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2021; Zulfakar et al., 2020). The academic quality in question is related to increasing teacher competence in planning, implementing, evaluating and following up on classroom learning (Isniwati et al., 2020; Slameto, 2017). Thus, the academic supervision activities carried out show the principal’s active role as a form of collaboration with teachers in improving the quality of learning (Grisom & Bartanen, 2019; Jong et al., 2020; Prastania & Sanoto, 2021).

Academic supervision is carried out in three main stages, including: (1) the planning stage related to the preparation of schedules, supervision instruments and learning equipment; (2) the observation stage related to the monitoring and assessment of learning activities carried out for teacher in the classroom; and (3) the conference stage related to evaluation activities and the formulation of follow-up supervision results (Alam et al., 2021; Nurlaili et al., 2021). As with these stages, academic supervision is an important process to do because it can directly measure the ability of teachers by making comparisons with the plans that have been set, seeing if there are deviations and correcting these deviations through improvement programs (Prasetyono et al., 2018; Sudiana, 2019).

Although academic supervision is important, in its implementation there are still many deviations and problems. Several studies reveal that the implementation of supervision in schools is still very general in nature and does not follow the actual guidelines because of the busyness and heavy workload of the principal, so it is not directed at fulfilling the aspects needed by teachers (Fahmi et al., 2019; Iskandar, 2020; Noor & Sofyaningrum, 2020). Even teachers sometimes do not understand the benefits of implementing academic supervision for themselves. In addition, school principals have not fully planned for programmed and continuous academic supervision and follow-up on supervision results is only done by making reports, but is not used as a basis for determining sustainable development programs and preparing further supervision programs (Yari Dwikurnaningsih, 2020; Masliah, 2019; Merukh & Sulasmono, 2016). The results of interviews with SMA/SMK teachers in Sorong Regency clarified the above problems by obtaining information that there were schools that had never carried out academic supervision activities, or had implemented the activities yet the perceived feedback was still unable to bring about changes to increase teacher’s competence. Teachers themselves are less involved in every stage of the supervision, so its implementation is only considered as a routine to obtain the results of the teacher performance assessment. So, it can be said that the implementation of academic supervision has not been directed and programmed properly and has not shown any effort to help teachers. Based on this background, this research was conducted to analyses performance, implementation problems, and appropriate solutions for the principal’s academic supervision at SMA/SMK in Sorong Regency. This research may be useful in providing scientific contributions and information for school principals in carrying out academic supervision ideally.

2. METHOD

This research was conducted qualitatively with the subject of 4 principals and 8 teachers from SMAN 2 Sorong Regency, SMAN 5 Sorong Regency, SMA Keguruan Sorong Regency and SMKN 1 Sorong Regency. Data collection technique uses interviews, document studies and observation. Data validation
technique uses technical triangulation and source triangulation. The data analysis technique used refers to the Miles and Huberman model which includes four stages, namely: (1) data collection; (2) data reduction; (3) data display; and (4) drawing conclusions (Salimi et al., 2021; Sugiyono, 2018). As a reference to determine the percentage of principal’s academic supervision performance, an assessment instrument was developed with reference to the Guidelines for Teacher Performance Implementation according to the Ministry of National Education, Directorate General of PMP and Kindergarten and the Guidelines for Performance Assessment of Principals/Madrasah according to the Ministry of Education and Culture, BPSDMP/K and PMPPPTK. The grid of school principals’ academic supervision performance assessment instruments is presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of Academic Supervision</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score (%)</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Planning</td>
<td>Identifying problems</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>There are activities; there are documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formulating goals</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>There are activities; there are documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compiling programs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>There are activities; there are documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing instruments</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>There are activities; there are documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of Academic Supervision</td>
<td>Supervising lesson planning</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>There are activities; there are documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of learning planning</td>
<td>Holding an initial meeting</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>There are activities; there are documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of learning implementation</td>
<td>Carry out learning observation activities</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>There are activities; there are documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of learning assessment</td>
<td>Implementing supervision of learning assessment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>There are activities; there are documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Supervision</td>
<td>Analyzing the results of learning planning supervision</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>There are activities; there are documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carrying out follow-up supervision of learning planning</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>There are activities; there are documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holding a feedback meeting after learning observations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>There are activities; there are documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducting an analysis of the teacher’s strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>There are activities; there are documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analyzing the results of the learning assessment supervision</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>There are activities; there are documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducting follow-up supervision of learning assessment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>There are activities; there are documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing reinforcement and appreciation to teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>There are activities; there are documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing opportunities for teachers to participate in continuous professional development programs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>There are activities; there are documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carrying out teacher training and development</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>There are activities; there are documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 1, each indicator on the principal’s academic supervision performance assessment instruments is said to be fulfilled if the principal carries out every academic supervision activity at each stage and is able to show complete authentic evidence with at least 70% achievement of the expected performance data. The principal’s performance value is started in the range of values 0% to 100% which is divided into five assessment categories, namely: Very Good (91%-100%), Good (76%-90%), Enough (61%-75%), Moderate (51%-60%), Less (<51%).
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3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

The results of this study are divided into three parts, namely: the performance of the academic supervision of SMA/SMK principals in Sorong Regency (planning, implementation, follow-up stages), problems and solutions.

Principal's Academic Supervision Performance

Academic Supervision Planning Stage

Based on authentic evidence from the results of interviews, observations and document studies conducted, the results of the assessment of the performance of the principal's academic supervision at the planning stage are obtained, which are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Results of Academic Supervision Performance Assessment of SMA/SMK principals at the Academic Supervision Planning Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Performance Indicator Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMAN 2 Sorong Regency</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAN 5 Sorong Regency</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA Keguruan Sorong Regency</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMKN 1 Sorong Regency</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 2, the assessment results of the performance of the principal's academic supervision at the planning stage show that the performance indicator scores of the four principals are at 0% (2 schools) and 50% (2 schools) in the less category. A score of 0% was obtained by SMA Keguruan Sorong Regency and SMKN 1 Sorong Regency because the principal does not carry out academic supervision in a programmed and planned manner. Meanwhile, a score of 50% was obtained by SMAN 2 Sorong Regency and SMAN 5 Sorong Regency because so far the principal has only carried out the planning stages of academic supervision by preparing schedule and supervision instruments without any problem identification process and goal formulation. Referring to the average score of the four principals' performance indicators, which is 25% in the less category, it can be concluded that the academic supervision performance of SMA/SMK principals in Sorong Regency at the planning stage still does not meet the expected standard.

Academic Supervision Implementation Stage

Based on authentic evidence from the results of interviews, observations and document studies conducted, the results of the assessment of the performance of the principal's academic supervision at the implementation stage are obtained, which are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Results of Academic Supervision Performance Assessment of SMA/SMK principals at the Academic Supervision Implementation Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Performance Indicator Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMAN 2 Sorong Regency</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAN 5 Sorong Regency</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA Keguruan Sorong Regency</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMKN 1 Sorong Regency</td>
<td>12,5%</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,8%</strong></td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 3, the assessment results of the performance of the principal's academic supervision at the implementation stage show that the performance indicator score of the four principals are 12,5% (1 school) in the less category, 25% (1 school) in the less category and 75% (2 schools) with enough category. A score of 12,5% was obtained by SMKN 1 Sorong Regency because it only carried out preparation of learning tools at the beginning of learning year but no notes were found related to the results of these activities, while supervision of the implementation and assessment of learning was not carried out at all. A score of 25% was obtained by SMA Keguruan Sorong Regency because they made the preparation of learning tools and the principal had a record of the results of the tools for each teacher, while supervision of the implementation and assessment of learning was not carried out at all. Then, a score of 75% was obtained by SMAN 2 Sorong Regency and SMAN 5 Sorong Regency for carrying out three of four indicators.
developed with sufficient evidence of records or documents. One indicator that was not implemented is the supervision of learning assessment. Referring to the average score of the four principals’ performance indicators, which is 46.8% in the less category, it can be concluded that the academic supervision performance of SMA/SMK principals in Sorong Regency at the implementation stage still does not meet the expected standard.

**Academic Supervision Follow-up Stage**

Based on authentic evidence from the results of interviews, observations and document studies conducted, the results of the assessment of the performance of the principal’s academic supervision at the follow-up stage are obtained, which are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4. Results of Academic Supervision Performance Assessment of SMA/SMK principals at the Academic Supervision Follow-up Stage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Performance Indicator Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMAN 2 Sorong Regency</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAN 5 Sorong Regency</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA Keguruan Sorong Regency</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMKN 1 Sorong Regency</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 4, the assessment results of the performance of the principal’s academic supervision at the follow-up stage show that the performance indicator score of the four principals are in the range of 6% to 42%. A score of 6% in the less category was obtained by SMKN 1 Sorong Regency because it only carried out one indicator, namely the principal provided the opportunity for each teacher to take part in the professional development program, but no special notes or documents were found regarding the implementation of activities. A score of 36% in the less category was obtained by SMAN 2 Sorong Regency and SMA Keguruan Sorong Regency because they carried out three indicators with evidence of complete documents or activity records. These indicators include: (1) analyzing the results of the supervision of learning planning; (2) carrying out follow-up supervision of learning planning; and (3) provide opportunities for teachers to participate in sustainable professional development programs. Also, a score of 42% in the less category too was obtained by SMAN 5 Sorong Regency because it carried out four indicators out of nine indicators developed at the follow-up stage of academic supervision. The three indicators carried out by SMAN 5 Sorong Regency are the same as SMAN 2 Sorong Regency and SMA Keguruan Sorong Regency with one additional indicator, namely providing reinforcement and appreciation to teachers, but no specific notes were found regarding these activities. Referring to the average score of the four principals’ performance indicators, which is 30% in the less category, it can be concluded that the academic supervision performance of SMA/SMK principals in Sorong Regency at the follow-up stage still does not meet the expected standard.

**Problems with the Implementation of the Principal’s Academic Supervision**

Information on problems encountered during the implementation of academic supervision was obtained from interviews with principals and teachers from the four schools. The description of these problems in each school is presented in Table 5.

**Table 5. Problems of Implementation of Academic Supervision of SMA/SMK Principals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Principal:</th>
<th>Teachers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMAN 2 Sorong Regency</td>
<td>• Time problem. The implementation of supervision often deviates from the specified schedule due to sudden activities.</td>
<td>• Feeling nervous and afraid when supervised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There are teachers who avoid being supervised</td>
<td>• Supervision is not followed up personally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supervision is only seen as an assessment activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of involvement of teachers in each stage of the implementation of supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supervision schedule still often crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SMAN 5 Sorong Regency         | **Principal:**  
|                               | • The workload is too much so that sometimes some teachers cannot be supervised  
|                               | • Technical problems, such as power failure so that the LCD cannot be used  
|                               | **Teachers:**  
|                               | • Some teachers are afraid to be supervised  
|                               | • Supervision is not based on the problems faced by the teacher (no monitoring/initial conversation)  
|                               | • Follow-up supervision is still very general  |
| SMA Keguruan Sorong Regency  | **Principal:**  
|                               | • Academic supervision is not programmed and carried out optimally because the principal workload is too much  
|                               | • Do not have a good understanding of the concept and implementation of academic supervision  
|                               | • Has not carried out special supervision yet, only coaching to teachers during meetings and examination of learning devices at the beginning of the school year  
|                               | **Teachers:**  
|                               | • Lack of understanding of the concept and importance of implementing academic supervision  |
| SMKN 1 Sorong Regency         | **Principal:**  
|                               | • Do not understand how to carry out specific academic supervision  
|                               | • Very heavy workload  
|                               | • Has not created and implemented a programmatic and planned supervision program yet  
|                               | **Teachers:**  
|                               | • Lack of understanding of the concept and importance of implementing academic supervision  |

Based on the information in Table 5, the implementation of the principal’s academic supervision at SMA/SMK in Sorong Regency consists of six main problems, namely: (1) the heavy workload and activities of the principal; (2) teachers feel nervous and afraid to be supervised; (3) supervision has not been programmed and implemented optimally; (4) lack of understanding of principals and teachers on concept and implementation of academic supervision; (5) the implementation and follow-up of supervision is still very general; and (6) the reference for the implementation of supervision is not based on the problems faced by the teacher (lack of teacher involvement).

**Solutions to the Problems of Implementation of Principal’s Academic Supervision**

Referring to the problems of implementing the principal’s academic supervision above, the solution that can be suggested as a recommendation is to carry out academic supervision with a collaborative approach. Academic supervision with a collaborative approach based on this collegiality relationship will provide space for principals and teachers to collaborate fully at each stage of supervision. Thus, teacher problems, structure and flow can be discussed in order to support the meaningfulness of the implementation of academic supervision. The flow of the implementation of academic supervision with a collaborative approach that is recommended as a solution to answer the problems of implementing academic supervision of principals at SMA/SMK in Sorong Regency is shown in Figure 1.
Discussion

There are three competencies that must be carried out by school principals as a form of performance in carrying out academic supervision for teachers in school, namely: (1) planning an academic supervision program; (2) carrying out academic supervision; and (3) following up on the result of the implementation of academic supervision (Jumadiah et al., 2016; Praditia et al., 2020). The planning stage is the first step that must be taken by a school principal in carrying out academic supervision (Leniwati & Arafat, 2017; Zulfakar et al., 2020). Ideally at this stage the principal must carry out various activities, including: (1) indentifying problems in formulating an academic supervision program; (2) formulating complete academic supervision objectives with measurable achievement targets; (3) formulating an academic supervision program, which consists of the preparation of a program plan and schedule for the implementation of academic supervision; and (4) developing academic supervision instruments, namely: supervision of learning planning, supervision of learning implementation and supervision of learning assessment (Suradi, 2018; Hasanah & Kristiawan, 2019). Gaps were found based on research results that not all schools plan academic supervision programs. Meanwhile, for schools that run, principals tend to only develop programs and instruments without identifying problems and formulating the objectives of implementing academic supervision first. In fact, academic supervision programs must be developed based on the problems faced by teachers so that their implementation in right on target and meeting the needs of teachers (Mok & Staub, 2021; Muttaqin, 2020). The results of this study are in line with the research that describes a portrait of academic supervision at SMKN 1 Jambi which found that in the supervision planning stage, the principal only focused on preparing schedules and instruments that were carried out personally without involving the teacher, thus causing teachers not knowing what goals, objectives, approaches and follow-up to be given and expected to be achieved (Muswawi et al., 2021).

After the planning stage, then the principal will carry out an academic supervision program. Regulation of the Minister of the Republic of Indonesia Number 41 of 2007 concerning Process Standards, explains that there are three activities that must be carried out by school principals at the stage of implementing academic supervision, namely: (1) supervision of learning planning; (2) supervision of learning implementation; and (3) supervision of learning assessment (Suradi, 2018; Hasanah & Kristiawan, 2019). Ideally, the implementation of academic supervision activities should begin with an initial meeting

---

**Figure 1. Flow of Recommendation for the Implementation of Academic Supervision with a Collaborative Approach.**

- **Problems**
  - The heavy workload and activities of the principal
  - Supervision has not been programmed and implemented optimally
  - Lack of understanding of principals and teachers on concept and implementation of academic supervision
  - Teachers feel nervous and afraid to be supervised
  - The implementation and follow-up of supervision is still very general
  - The reference for the implementation of supervision is not based on the problems faced by the teacher

- **Solution**
  1. Formation of School Academic Supervision Team
  2. Academic Supervision Training
  3. Academic Supervision with a Collaborative Approach
between the principal and the teacher to analyze teacher shortages and formulate, then conduct classroom observations to assess teacher performance in learning (Bertus, 2019; Khon & Rahmaniah, 2018; Kontesa et al., 2021). However, the results of the study show schools that run academic supervision programs only hold initial meeting to convey the supervision schedule without having in-depth conversation about problems and preparations that must be prepared by teachers. The preparation of the supervision schedule is also still carried out by the principal unilaterally without coordinating with the teachers, so that sometimes teachers become unprepared and unable to participate in the supervision process. This certainly causes the implementation of academic supervision at SMA/SMK in Sorong Regency has not shown maximum efforts in helping, motivating, and encouraging the development of teacher competences. Various studies have clarified the results of this study that in the implementation of academic supervision, the principal only held a brief meeting to announce the supervision schedule, the supervision schedule sometimes clashed with other schedules, and the results of the learning assessment supervision were never used as a reference for carrying out the next supervision program (Dwikurnaningsih, 2020; Nurmalina, 2018; Syafruddin, 2018).

This study also shows that there is one important indicator that is not carried out by the principals at the stage of implementing academic supervision, namely the supervision of learning assessment. Supervision of learning assessment is related to supervisory actions on the ability of teachers to understand, determine procedures, develop instruments, and analyze the results of assessment processes and learning outcomes for the purposes of evaluating the achievement of attitudes, knowledge, and skills of students (Astuti, 2016; Kasaming, 2022). Thus, this activity is very important to do in order to maintain the quality of the evaluation so that it remains in accordance with the principles of assessment, the characteristic of students, the learning environment, and the standards set (Kasaming, 2022; Sari & Setiawan, 2020). Supervision of learning assessment is not carried out in SMA/SMK in Sorong Regency due to the principal’s lack of understanding of this matter. So far, the principals have not thoroughly examined the feasibility of the items and assessment indicators developed by the teachers in the daily process test, mid-term test, and last-term test. So, sometimes there are still assessment instruments that are not suitable but still used in class. Therefore, a follow-up effort is needed that training in the preparation of process assessment instruments and student learning outcomes assessment instruments for principal and teachers.

The results of the implementation of academic supervision need to be followed up so that it can significantly improve the competence and performance of teachers in managing quality learning (Iskandar, 2020; Riyanto et al., 2021). Therefore, the follow-up stage of academic supervision must be carried out seriously and continuously through various programs developed by referring to the results of a personal analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of teachers (Iskandar, 2020; Subaidi & Sutain, 2019). The results of the study indicate that the follow-up the principal’s academic supervision has not been carried out optimally because it has not touched on the continuous guidance and development of teachers. In addition, reinforcement and appreciation for teachers based on the results of academic supervision are also not carried out by school principals. In fact, reinforcement and rewards function to provide motivation for teachers to continue to develop their competencies in managing learning (Nurtaniati, 2018). The follow-up program that has been carried out by the principals of SMA/SMK in Sorong Regency is group activities through In House Training (IHT) for the preparation of learning tools. Meanwhile, personal coaching for teachers has not been carried out optimally, so it has not been able to solve learning problems accurately. The implementation of academic supervision programs does not always run smoothly. There are still various kinds of problems causing academic supervision cannot be carried out optimally. The dense activities and workload of supervisors and the lack of follow-up on the results of academic supervision are still the main problems (Iskandar, 2020; Noor & Sofyaningrum, 2020). In addition, another problems faced is that there are still teachers who often avoid being supervised because they are nervous and afraid, lack of understanding of the academic supervision of principal and teachers, and lack of teacher involvement in each stage of supervision (Zulifikar et al., 2017; Nurmalina, 2018; Fahmi, 2019).

In order to address these problems, an effort is needed as an appropriate solution. Academic supervision with a collaborative approach can be a suitable alternative to be applied. Collaborative approach supervision prioritizes collegial relationships so as to bridge supervisor and teachers to discuss teacher issues and determine the process and criteria for supervision that will be carried out (Y. Dwikurnaningsih, 2018; Kurniady & Komariah, 2019; Machali & Hidayat, 2018). This is certainly effective in eliminating teacher fear and making the implementation of supervision more meaningful. In addition, the structure of the process which is complemented by the formation of a school academic principal team can be ease the burden on the principal and support the effectiveness of the implementation of academic supervision (Noor & Sofyaningrum, 2020; Praditia et al., 2020) as well as academic supervision training to increase understanding of academic supervision competencies (Nuridin et al., 2019). Thus, the application
of academic supervision with a collaborative approach in assisting principals and teachers in maximizing the implementation of academic supervision in SMA/SMK in Sorong Regency.

4. CONCLUSION

The academic supervision performance of SMA/SMK principals in Sorong Regency is still very far from the expected standard. This is proved by the acquisition of an average score of the principal's performance at the planning stage which was 25% (less category), the implementation stage was 46.8% (less category) and the follow-up stage was 30% (less category). When implementing the principal's academic supervision, various problems were also found that caused a gap between supervisor and teachers so that the program was not implemented optimally. Therefore, the application of academic supervision with a collaborative approach can be a recommendation for the right solution to be carried out by schools.
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