Int. j. adv. multidisc. res. stud. 2026; 6(6):925-933

Received: 01-10-2026
Accepted: 11-11-2026

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Beyond Curriculum Compliance: Instructional Supervision and Values-Based Quality Assurance in an Indonesian Islamic Secondary School

[1] Warman, [2] Lorensius, [3] Dydik Kurniawan, [4] Teguh Arie Sandy
[1, 3] Universitas Mulawarman, Samarinda, Indonesia
[2] STKPK Bina Insan, Samarinda, Indonesia
[4] Ahli Media Consultant, Malang, Indonesia

DOI: https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049X.2026.6.6.7202
Corresponding Author: **Warman**

Abstract
School leaders in faith-based education must coordinate national curriculum expectations with institutional commitments to religious and moral formation. Yet relatively little empirical attention has been given to the everyday supervisory practices through which these commitments become observable teaching standards. This qualitative single-case study examines instructional supervision at SMA IT Daarul Hikmah Bontang, an Indonesian Islamic secondary school implementing the Integrated Islamic School Network (JSIT) curriculum alongside the national curriculum. The source study draws on interviews with the principal, vice-principal for curriculum, and two physics teachers, together with lesson-related observations and school documents collected during the second semester of 2020/2021. A qualitative, evidence-linked analysis traces three interconnected processes: supervision planning, implementation, and evaluation. Planning translated the seven-stage TERPADU instructional approach into schedules, lesson-plan expectations, and observation indicators. Implementation combined directive guidance, pre-observation consultation, nonintrusive online lesson observation, and post-observation feedback during pandemic-related remote teaching. Evaluation consolidated supervision records and identified peer modelling and internal teacher working-group discussions as routes for professional learning. The findings suggest that values-based quality assurance depends not only on monitoring curriculum conformity but also on providing practical support for teachers' pedagogical decisions. Because the evidence comes from one historical case without outcome measures or follow-up observations, the study demonstrates an organizational process rather than causal improvements in teaching or student learning.

Keywords: Instructional Supervision, Islamic Secondary Schools, JSIT Curriculum, TERPADU, Instructional Leadership, Quality Assurance, Teacher Professional Learning

Introduction

The supervision of teaching is a practical meeting point between a school's formal commitments and what students encounter during lessons. School authorities establish curricula, issue teaching standards, and expect teachers to enact shared educational priorities. Classroom work, however, remains contingent on teacher judgment, subject matter, student participation, time, and available resources. A curriculum may therefore appear coherent in policy documents while producing uneven opportunities to learn in practice. Instructional leadership matters because principals and their colleagues can connect institutional purposes with the planning, observation, feedback, and collective learning that influence teaching. Recent evidence associates instructional leadership with teacher professional development, instructional practices, and trust, although these associations do not establish a universal causal mechanism (Dorukbasi & Cansoy, 2024; Hallinger, Liu, & Chen, 2025; He *et al*., 2024) [11, 15, 16]. The central question is not whether supervision exists in the timetable, but whether its information is used to interpret and improve instruction.

This question is particularly important in Indonesian integrated Islamic schools. The Jaringan Sekolah Islam Terpadu (JSIT), or Integrated Islamic School Network, promotes an educational orientation that combines general academic learning with Islamic values and practices. Teachers must therefore address subject-specific competencies and a characteristic approach to values integration. The TERPADU sequence named in the case documents comprises Telaah (review and reflection),

Eksplorasi (exploration), Rumuskan (formulation), Presentasikan (presentation), Aplikasikan (application), Duniawi (connections with worldly life), and Ukhrowi (orientation toward life hereafter). These are not seven separate subjects. They are instructional prompts intended to connect knowledge acquisition, expression, application, and moral reflection. Studies of TERPADU implementation describe the challenge of sustaining this integrative logic during pandemic-era teaching and underscore the importance of interpreting curriculum goals in classroom activity rather than reducing integration to additional content (Sa'idah *et al*., 2022; Sholehah *et al*., 2025) [28, 30].

Religious education adds a conceptual issue to conventional discussions of curriculum fidelity. Fidelity might be interpreted narrowly as the presence of prescribed stages on a lesson plan. But a teacher may mention a spiritual value without helping students understand its relationship to the scientific topic being studied. Conversely, students may develop rich conceptual understanding in a lesson that does not visibly display every label in a mandated sequence. An informative supervisory process needs to ask both whether valued elements are present and whether their pedagogical use is appropriate. This distinction matters when formal evaluation carries consequences for teachers' professional confidence. Research on teacher feedback, collegial supervision, and professional learning communities emphasizes the quality of evidence, dialogue, and reciprocal trust rather than the mere frequency of checks (Grimm, 2024; Lavigne *et al*., 2023; Musah *et al*., 2026; Nguyen *et al*., 2024) [13, 18, 21, 22].

The school context also shapes the style of supervision. At some institutions, a principal directs lesson design and insists on standard procedures; at others, teachers have more room to negotiate criteria and test alternatives. Direction and professional agency need not be mutually exclusive, but they can conflict when the criteria themselves are treated as unquestionable. Research on distributed and instructional leadership suggests that school leadership operates through different channels, including trust, collaboration, collective efficacy, and teacher-led learning (Karakose *et al*., 2024; Talebizadeh *et al*., 2021; Thien *et al*., 2023; Zheng *et al*., 2023) [17, 32, 33, 36]. Such work provides a useful comparative perspective, while the meaning of accountability in a school with an explicit religious identity requires closer contextual analysis.

The COVID-19 period exposed another layer of complexity. When instruction shifted to online platforms, familiar forms of classroom observation became difficult, and school leaders had to assess instruction while preserving relationships under considerable uncertainty. Studies from several systems show that principals adapted their leadership priorities, organized digital communication, and reconsidered how to support teachers in emergency remote education (Berkovich & Hassan, 2022; Brock *et al*., 2021; Brown *et al*., 2023; Shaked, 2022) [4, 7, 8, 29]. Indonesian evidence likewise documents uneven connectivity, limited opportunities for interaction, and demands on teachers to improvise online practices (Azhari & Fajri, 2022; Cahyadi *et al*., 2022; Rahayu *et al*., 2022) [2, 9, 25]. These contextual studies help interpret the source case without attributing to it circumstances that the original material does not document.

Although interest in principal instructional leadership has expanded across Asia, broad reviews cannot fully explain how a school translates its own identity-defining curriculum into a supervisory instrument and subsequent professional-learning activities (Hallinger, Liu, & Aung, 2025; Lipscombe *et al*., 2025) [14, 19]. Studies focused on JSIT describe curriculum integration, but the relationship among instructional criteria, classroom observation, and teacher support merits closer examination. A qualitative case can illuminate the sequence of decisions, the documents used, the roles participants occupy, and the points at which quality assurance becomes either developmental or merely procedural. It should not, however, be confused with evidence of program effectiveness unless observations before and after an intervention or comparable outcome measures exist.

A further distinction is needed between supervision as monitoring, supervision as instructional support, and supervision as quality assurance. Monitoring generates descriptive evidence about whether expected practice occurred. Instructional support helps a teacher decide what to do differently. Quality assurance connects those decisions to institutional standards, allocates responsibility for improvement, and checks the evidence again. These functions can overlap, but they should not be treated as synonyms. Research on feedback interventions and teacher-learning mechanisms suggests that information is useful when accompanied by opportunities to interpret and act on it (Cansoy *et al*., 2025; Song *et al*., 2021) [10, 31]. In a faith-based institution, a supervision system can claim to safeguard values while providing little evidence about how students actually engage with them. A stronger analysis therefore considers what each supervisory phase permits the school to know and what remains outside its field of view.

The present article re-examines a documented case of instructional supervision at SMA IT Daarul Hikmah Bontang, East Kalimantan. Its contribution is an analytical account of how instructional supervision operated as an internal quality-assurance practice while the school combined the 2013 national curriculum with JSIT requirements during the second semester of the 2020/2021 academic year. The inquiry addresses three questions. How were curriculum expectations incorporated into supervision planning and instruments? How did supervision operate during remote instruction, including the use of directive guidance and feedback? And how were findings documented and proposed for use in teacher professional learning? This focus keeps the argument closely tied to the available data while identifying design principles and tensions that may inform subsequent comparative research.

Method

This study uses a qualitative single-case design to examine an institutionally situated process rather than to estimate relationships among variables. The bounded case is the school-level instructional supervision cycle at SMA IT Daarul Hikmah Bontang, an Islamic senior secondary school in East Kalimantan. The empirical period is the second semester of the 2020/2021 academic year. This historical timing is essential: the analysis concerns supervision undertaken during emergency remote teaching, not a contemporaneous assessment of the school's curriculum or current policy. A single-case approach is appropriate when the object of inquiry is the interaction between organizational routines, actors, records, and classroom practices. It permits close attention to sequence and meaning but limits claims about other institutions and periods.

The case material identifies four purposively selected key informants who were directly involved in curriculum implementation or supervision. The principal, identified in the original records as S., had served for approximately 18 months. The vice-principal for curriculum, L., had worked at the school for about six years. Two physics teachers, M.B. and A.W.W., had approximately three years and 18 months of experience, respectively. Their roles provided perspectives from school leadership, curriculum coordination, and classroom practice. These four informants are not the same as the five science and mathematics teachers named on the supervision schedule. The schedule is a program record, not a verified roster of all interviewed or observed teachers. Consequently, this study does not present the five scheduled teachers as five research respondents.

The source manuscript reports three forms of material: semi-structured interviews, observations of instructional and supervisory activity, and school documents. Interview topics concerned preparation for supervision, observation procedures, teacher experiences, feedback, and subsequent support. The documentary material included school work programs, teaching plans (Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran, RPP), observation forms, schedules, and supervision reports. During remote instruction, the relevant school supervision process involved online class observation through Zoom. The original account distinguishes a supervisor joining as a relatively passive observer from the more directive conversations before and after observation. This article maintains that distinction rather than inferring that the supervisor had no effect on lesson behavior.

The source supplies evidence identifiers for a number of statements. These include principal interview notes dated 16 April 2021 (L3/KS/16-04-2021), curriculum vice-principal notes dated 26 February 2021 (L4/WKS/26-02-2021), and teacher-related notes associated with February and April 2021 (L5 and L6). Those identifiers are treated as documentary traces that help locate claims in the original case record, not as verbatim transcripts. The uploaded manuscript does not supply full interview transcripts, video files, scored observation sheets, or systematic pre- and post-supervision performance data. Accordingly, no direct quotations or numerical effectiveness estimates have been reconstructed.

The analytic strategy follows the organizing logic described in the original manuscript: data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing with verification. For the present revision, claims were organized into an evidence matrix connecting program planning, enactment, feedback, reporting, and subsequent professional-learning proposals to the source interviews and documents. This is an interpretive re-analysis of a supplied case account, not a newly conducted round of data collection. The discussion distinguishes directly reported practices from analytical interpretations and possible implications. This distinction is consistent with methodological cautions about imposing theoretical categories without sufficient empirical evidence and about conflating description with explanation (Braun & Clarke, 2021) [6].

The original study describes source triangulation across the principal, vice-principal, and teachers, and method triangulation between interviews, observed activities, and documents. In this revision, triangulation is understood as an attempt to compare different kinds of material, not proof that every assertion was independently confirmed. For example, the existence of a dated supervision schedule supports an assertion about planned oversight. It does not establish that every scheduled observation was completed, that all teachers adopted feedback, or that students achieved better results. Similar caution applies to claims about the success of the JSIT curriculum. The analysis discusses observable mechanisms and implementation challenges, while withholding causal conclusions that the material cannot support.

The evidence matrix also helps prevent the premature merging of different claims into a single conclusion. A scheduled observation, a supervisor's statement of intent, a teacher's experience of feedback, and a written development plan are distinct evidentiary objects. Each can support a different kind of inference. A schedule is useful for reconstructing administrative coordination, but not lesson quality. A teacher's statement can illuminate perceived support, but not verify a change in practice. A reported plan for KKG meetings indicates an institutional response, but does not document how frequently peers met or what they learned. By preserving these boundaries, the analysis makes the historical case more transparent even when access to the original field corpus is incomplete. This procedure complements the original source's use of source and method triangulation rather than replacing it with a retrospective claim of new validation.

Research ethics require particular care in retrospective cases. The source gives masked participant initials and a named school, but it does not state an institutional ethics approval number, the precise consent process, or how interview and video records were retained. The revised article therefore does not fabricate ethical approval, explicit consent, or data-sharing permission. Those items require author verification before submission. Names appearing in the source are retained only where already supplied as part of the scholarly authorship or institutional case description. Reporting follows the principle that the boundaries of the available evidence should be visible to readers.

The analytical framework links three phases of supervision to three distinct quality-assurance functions. Planning concerns standard-setting: defining expectations, scheduling observations, and specifying evidence. Implementation concerns monitoring and professional dialogue: observing instructional activity and interpreting strengths and constraints. Evaluation concerns organizational learning: assembling reports, identifying development needs, and deciding whether evidence should inform peer support. This framework is an analytical representation of the reported sequence, not a tested structural model. It enables examination of how each phase may contribute to a more coherent assurance cycle and where the process could stop at compliance.

Table 1: Participants and scope of case evidence

Role	Record identifier	Reported experience / scope
Principal	S. / L3	Approximately 1 year 6 months in post
Vice-principal for curriculum	L. / L4	Approximately 6 years at the school
Physics teacher	M.B. / L5 or L6	Approximately 3 years
Physics teacher	A.W.W. / L5 or L6	Approximately 1 year 6 months

Results

The results are organized around the documented sequence of planning, implementation, and evaluation, followed by an integrated assessment of what the sequence reveals about institutional quality assurance. Three cross-cutting features recur in the source: the deliberate alignment of instruments with the seven TERPADU stages, adaptation of lesson observation to online teaching, and an effort to move findings into teacher-to-teacher support. The available record establishes how those features were described and planned; it does not permit quantification of their effects on instruction or learning.

Instructional supervision was planned as a coordinated school program rather than as isolated visits to teachers. The principal worked with the curriculum vice-principal and senior or core teachers to clarify program expectations, dates, and instruments. The planning process addressed an institutional issue: teachers were expected to implement both the national 2013 curriculum and JSIT-specific provisions. The principal's account (L3/KS/16-04-2021) indicates that a major purpose was to check whether TERPADU could be identified both in lesson preparation and in teaching activities. The vice-principal's account (L4/WKS/26-02-2021) portrays curriculum coordination as a continuing operational responsibility, rather than a one-time administrative approval.

The supervisory program thus included a curricular translation process. Abstract institutional language became practical questions about teaching. Could the teacher open a scientific topic through review and reflection? Did learners have opportunities to explore information, formulate an understanding, present ideas, and apply knowledge? Were connections made to everyday life and an Islamic moral or spiritual frame? The sequence made it possible to observe more than the existence of an RPP. It also revealed a methodological tension: an instrument that counts stages can register compliance, whereas assessing the intellectual quality of the transitions between stages requires professional judgment. The source clearly supports the first purpose and suggests, but does not fully document, the depth of the second.

The original schedule for the first supervision phase in the second semester of 2020/2021 names five teachers in physics, chemistry, mathematics, and biology. It records a physics lesson in Grade XI science on 12 February 2021, another physics lesson in Grade X science on 26 February, a chemistry lesson in Grade X science on 2 April, a mathematics lesson in Grade XI science on 4 April, and a biology lesson in Grade X science on 7 April. The dates and distribution show a planned sequence spanning several subjects and two grade levels. The source states that information was shared in teachers' WhatsApp groups, displayed in the staff room, and discussed in coordination meetings. Such communication makes expectations visible before observation, although it is not itself evidence that supervision was delivered in each scheduled lesson.

Planning also produced a specialized observation instrument. Its notable feature was the incorporation of the JSIT pedagogical sequence alongside ordinary administrative checks. For instance, a reviewer would not examine the opening of the lesson solely for attendance or delivery of objectives, but also for Telaah, which the school's framework associated with careful examination and reflection. During Eksplorasi, attention shifted to how students encountered evidence or learning materials; Rumuskan and Presentasikan made students' sense-making and expression relevant; Aplikasikan addressed transfer or practical use. Duniawi and Ukhrowi invited connections between classroom knowledge, everyday life, and faith-oriented reflection. These categories are analytically meaningful because they give curricular distinctiveness an observable role in supervision. They also raise the question of how strongly each stage can be judged in a lesson with limited online interaction.

The second major result concerns the way the school enacted supervision during pandemic-related remote teaching. The manuscript describes a systematic or 'scientific' supervision model: procedures were scheduled, information was gathered with specified forms, and evaluators were expected to use observable evidence. It simultaneously identifies a directive orientation in which supervisors clarified correct or expected practice and proposed improvements. These terms describe the school's approach; they should not be interpreted as evidence of an experimentally validated supervision intervention. The account further states that supervisory personnel had participated in JSIT-oriented training, indicating an attempt to align evaluators' understanding of the distinctive curriculum.

Supervision was organized around a pre-observation meeting, lesson observation, and post-observation conversation. During pre-observation, the school checked RPP documentation and related materials such as syllabi, annual and semester programs, attendance records, journals, assessments, and teaching resources. This discussion also offered a way to communicate the criteria for judging the lesson before the teacher taught. The principal and vice-principal reportedly tried to create a less intimidating atmosphere; such an intention is important, but the available record contains no standardized measure of teacher anxiety. The reported design should therefore be described as supportive in intention rather than proven to reduce stress.

During the observation stage, the supervisor joined online learning through a video-conferencing platform without taking over the lesson. This operational adjustment was important. Online classrooms restrict many familiar visual cues: individual students may keep cameras off, household conditions may affect participation, and connectivity can interrupt exchanges. The supervisor could monitor the visible interaction and lesson sequence, but not every private learning activity. The source presents nonintrusive attendance as a way of minimizing disruption. The evidence does not establish complete neutrality of observation or equal observation quality across classes. It does show that institutional monitoring continued when face-to-face supervision was difficult.

The post-observation meeting was described as an individual exchange of findings and recommendations. A teacher interview note (L6/GF2/26-02-2021) indicates that feedback helped identify stages of TERPADU needing further attention. Rather than treating this account as an outcome measure, it is more accurate to read it as participant-reported usefulness. The supervisor's role involved discussing strengths and weaknesses observed through the instrument. An educationally consequential feedback conversation would ideally specify the instructional decision at issue, describe what happened in the observed lesson, and suggest a manageable alternative.

The source confirms the presence of feedback and its relation to the instrument, but does not reproduce the feedback protocols or subsequent lesson revisions.

A concrete pedagogical problem emerged from the original report. During remote learning, some teachers struggled to vary activities associated with Telaah and Eksplorasi; instructional routines could become repetitive and insufficiently creative (L3/KS/16-04-2021; L5/GF1/22-04-2021). This finding is narrower than a general claim of low teaching quality. It relates specifically to the design of early learning activities and the constraints of online delivery. It is also informative because it identifies a point at which the rubric's distinctive categories exposed a need for support. A teacher might correctly include a reflection or exploration stage in a lesson plan while relying on an unchanging classroom routine. In such circumstances, supervision reveals a gap between planned stages and the diversity of learning experiences.

The school's response included two forms of proposed or reported follow-up. First, teachers with stronger command of the TERPADU approach were identified as possible models for colleagues. Second, the school intended to use supervisory findings as discussion material in internal teacher working groups, referred to in the manuscript as Kelompok Kerja Guru (KKG). These mechanisms mark a movement from individualized evaluation toward collective learning. Their importance lies in the possibility of sharing practical lesson examples, discussing what counts as meaningful integration, and reducing dependence on the principal as the sole source of expertise. Nevertheless, the manuscript does not provide attendance logs, frequencies of meetings, peer-coaching observations, or subsequent gains. The evidence therefore supports a follow-up strategy rather than verified long-term implementation or effectiveness.

The relationship between the TERPADU stages and the subject matter also warrants attention. In physics, the early phases may involve predicting a phenomenon, examining an illustration, or comparing evidence; in biology, exploration might involve observing processes or interpreting living-system representations. The source identifies difficulties with variation in initial activities but does not provide lesson scripts detailed enough to compare disciplinary enactments. It would therefore be misleading to claim that the same strategy was adequate across subjects. Instead, the finding suggests that a common curriculum framework needs subject-sensitive examples and supervisory dialogue. Supervisors can use standardized indicators to ask whether a stage has pedagogical substance, yet teachers need a repertoire of legitimate ways to realize each stage. This observation links the school-level standard to the practical complexity of implementing an integrated curriculum under constrained teaching conditions.

The final supervisory phase was documentary and managerial. The principal reportedly compiled records of the first round of supervision, including plans, findings, conversations, and recommendations, into a formal report. Within the school, the report was described as an accountability record for relevant stakeholders and as a reference for teacher development. The principal also reported separately summarizing indicators specific to JSIT so that professional support could respond to challenges in the institution's distinctive curriculum. This is a potentially important organizational arrangement because it retains evidence that could otherwise remain in individual supervisors' notes.

A quality-assurance cycle becomes substantive only when the report informs subsequent decisions. The record identifies an intention to distinguish teachers needing reinforcement from those ready for further development and to connect such judgments with modelling and KKG discussion. Yet it does not specify decision thresholds, the reliability of rubric scoring, or a subsequent observation of revised instruction. The case thus illustrates the architecture of evidence-informed follow-up, not the completion of an empirically evaluated improvement cycle. Such separation between a documented mechanism and a demonstrated outcome is necessary for an accurate interpretation of qualitative findings.

Across the three phases, a coherent institutional pattern is visible. Supervision began with standards linked to the school's identity, used prepared instruments to observe lessons, and produced feedback and reporting procedures intended to inform further professional learning. The school did not simply impose an external standard; it made distinctive curricular commitments visible in its own supervisory routines. At the same time, the process depended on the judgment of school leaders, the practical feasibility of online observation, and teachers' ability to turn stage labels into meaningful learning activities. Those dependencies define both the contribution and the limits of the case.

Table 2: Documented first-phase supervision schedule, semester 2, 2020/2021

Teacher code	Subject	Class	Scheduled date
AW	Physics	XI Science	12 February 2021
MB	Physics	X Science	26 February 2021
BE	Chemistry	X Science	2 April 2021
Z	Mathematics	XI Science	4 April 2021
LA	Biology	X Science	7 April 2021

Table 3: Evidence-bounded interpretation of the supervision cycle

Phase	Directly reported practice	Inference / unresolved question
Planning	Program coordination, published schedule, TERPADU-based instruments	Stage alignment is visible; quality of rubric application is not scored
Implementation	Pre-observation document review, Zoom class observation, directive guidance, feedback	Online monitoring continued; teacher learning and effects remain unmeasured
Evaluation	Formal supervision report, potential peer models and internal KKG discussion	Follow-up mechanism identified; later implementation or effects not verified

Discussion

The case suggests that values-based quality assurance is better understood as an interaction among curricular interpretation, supervisory evidence, and professional support than as an administrative checklist. Institutionalization occurs when a school's values are translated into repeatable decisions and routines, but repeated routines are not automatically educationally productive. The distinction is central to the present study. SMA IT Daarul Hikmah's practice moved beyond a generic instruction-observation schedule by embedding JSIT's TERPADU stages in supervisory planning. Whether this

produced better learning cannot be established, yet the design illuminates the organizational mechanism through which a values-based curriculum became a shared point of reference.

The first implication concerns the relationship between fidelity and instructional quality. Curriculum fidelity has value when teachers understand the agreed learning intentions and schools can identify meaningful divergence from them. However, fidelity cannot be inferred from the presence of labels alone. A science lesson can formally include Telaah, Eksplorasi, and Ukhrowi while providing little time for scientific explanation or reasoned moral reflection. Conversely, a carefully structured exploration may legitimately cross several stages. The school's approach made seven expectations visible; the next developmental challenge would be to articulate performance descriptors for the quality of student engagement, conceptual accuracy, and the coherence of values integration. Contemporary JSIT-focused studies similarly emphasize alignment between curriculum frameworks and concrete practice, while not eliminating the need for local pedagogical interpretation (Purba & Mahariah, 2026; Sa'idah *et al*., 2022; Sholehah *et al*., 2025; Yustiana *et al*., 2025) [24, 28, 30, 35].

Values integration can be evaluated with more intellectual precision than asking whether an Islamic phrase occurred during class. A supervisor observing a physics lesson might consider whether the teacher helped learners distinguish scientific explanation from religious reflection, whether the moral connection was appropriate to the topic, and whether students had an opportunity to articulate their own understanding. These questions are proposed analytical extensions, not observations documented in the source material. They illustrate why curriculum-specific rubrics require room for disciplinary expertise. For religiously affiliated schools, a highly standardized instrument may protect institutional identity but also risk superficial performances of values if teachers understand that only visible compliance will be rewarded.

The second implication concerns the coexistence of directive supervision and professional autonomy. A directive stance can be useful when a school introduces an unfamiliar framework, a teacher is unsure about the expected sequence, or emergency conditions demand rapid coordination. In the source case, it enabled supervisors to clarify what a JSIT lesson was expected to include. Yet sustained improvement also requires teachers to explain why they made particular instructional choices, question unsuitable routines, and adapt lessons for different learners. Research on instructional leadership and post-observation feedback indicates that leadership is most informative when professional learning mediates or accompanies formal guidance (Cansoy *et al*., 2025; Dorukbasi & Cansoy, 2024; Lavigne *et al*., 2023) [10, 11, 18]. A rubric should therefore structure dialogue without substituting for teacher reasoning.

A useful way to interpret the supervisory meeting is to distinguish three kinds of statement. A descriptive statement identifies what was observed: for example, students were invited to formulate an answer but only one student responded. An interpretive statement examines the possible instructional significance of that event. An action statement proposes an adjustment, such as using short written responses before group discussion. The source document confirms that strengths and weaknesses were communicated, but it does not reveal how consistently conversations moved through these three types of statement. That gap identifies an appropriate objective for subsequent observation of actual feedback conferences. The value of feedback depends not merely on its existence but also on specificity, feasibility, and opportunities for teachers to revisit the same practice (Balcı & Özkan, 2023; Grimm, 2024; Song *et al*., 2021) [3, 13, 31].

The third implication concerns collective capacity. Peer modelling and internal KKG discussion may reduce the limitations of principal-centered evaluation. Teachers often share concrete examples, students' reactions, and subject-specific constraints more readily with colleagues who teach in comparable circumstances. Work on professional learning communities suggests that productive collaboration needs reflective dialogue, shared responsibility, distributed leadership, and time to test ideas, rather than meetings whose only purpose is reporting compliance (Borg & Finne, 2024; Grimm, 2024; Nguyen *et al*., 2024; Olmo-Extremera *et al*., 2024; Zheng *et al*., 2023) [5, 13, 22, 23, 36]. In the present case, the proposal to recognize stronger TERPADU practitioners as peer models is significant precisely because it may connect a centrally defined curriculum to locally generated pedagogical examples.

Peer modelling also contains risks. A nominated model teacher could become the embodiment of a preferred script rather than a contributor to reflective professional learning. Observers might imitate surface features without understanding the reasoning behind them. To mitigate this risk, follow-up sessions would need to compare more than one successful teaching strategy, invite teachers to explain contextual modifications, and collect evidence of student understanding. None of these procedures is documented as completed in the historical case. They are recommendations derived from the analysis and supported by recent work on collaborative supervision, principal development, and school middle leadership (Lipscombe *et al*., 2025; Meyer & Richter, 2025; Musah *et al*., 2026) [19, 20, 21].

The fourth implication concerns supervision under crisis conditions. The use of Zoom in this case should be interpreted as an adaptation to the restrictions of 2020/2021 rather than as proof that remote observation is superior to in-person visits. Pandemic studies document a broad range of responses, including the reprioritization of school relationships, new communication channels, and digitally mediated instructional leadership (Andriani *et al*., 2022; Berkovich & Hassan, 2022; Brock *et al*., 2021; Brown *et al*., 2023; Reyes-Guerra *et al*., 2021; Shaked, 2022) [1, 4, 7, 8, 27, 29]. When an observer is limited to what a meeting platform shows, conclusions about students' participation should be correspondingly cautious. Supervisors need to ask what was not visible, whether technical conditions affected interaction, and how teachers adapted tasks to available resources.

This matters because online teaching constraints may be mistaken for teacher deficiencies. Indonesian research describes connectivity limitations, uneven technology access, challenges in assessment, and difficulty observing students' understanding during emergency remote teaching (Azhari & Fajri, 2022; Cahyadi *et al*., 2022; Rahayu *et al*., 2022) [2, 9, 25]. In the focal case, difficulty diversifying Telaah and Eksplorasi may reflect instructional design issues, platform constraints, or both. The available data do not disentangle these mechanisms. A fair supervision system

should distinguish aspects under teachers' control from institutional barriers, then use the distinction to allocate instructional coaching or resources. Crisis leadership scholarship similarly suggests that responsive leadership requires attention to organizational conditions, not only to individual performance (Ramos-Pla *et al*., 2021; Reyes-Guerra *et al*., 2021) [26, 27].

A useful future quality-assurance instrument would make its standards more transparent by separating observable classroom events from interpretive judgments. For example, it could record the stated purpose of an activity, the learning action students were asked to perform, the kind of response they produced, and the evidence used by the teacher to assess understanding. It could then record the supervisor's appraisal of how the event represented the TERPADU framework and the national learning objective. This design would provide a more informative basis for discussion than a binary completed/not-completed box. It would also permit two supervisors to explain why they reached different judgments. The source case does not report inter-rater reliability or common scoring calibration, so the feasibility of this extension remains to be tested. Even so, the proposal follows from the observed reliance on curriculum-specific forms and from research stressing feedback quality and the organizational conditions for reflective teacher learning (Lavigne *et al*., 2023; Musah *et al*., 2026) [18, 21].

The fifth implication concerns evidence use. The original school program treated reports as accountability documents and as a possible record of professional growth. This dual function can be constructive, but it creates a tension: documentation designed for external assurance may discourage honest discussion of weaknesses if teachers believe it will primarily be used for judgment. Recent studies link instructional leadership to trust and efficacy, although the direction and size of observed relationships depend on design and context (Hallinger, Liu, & Chen, 2025; Karakose *et al*., 2024; Talebizadeh *et al*., 2021; Thien *et al*., 2023) [15, 17, 32, 33]. This literature supports a practical distinction between recording evidence for decisions and using evidence to punish deviation. In a developmental approach, reports should identify instructional needs, agreed actions, and responsibilities for support, while avoiding unsupported claims that a teacher or school has improved.

At the system level, the case also adds nuance to accounts of leadership in religious or values-oriented schooling. Much of the general instructional leadership literature is developed across public schools or large cross-sectional samples. Its concepts remain useful, but the criteria for successful teaching are not identical in every institution. The meaning of quality assurance in a JSIT school includes alignment with a locally mandated approach to Islamic values alongside national academic expectations. The present study does not argue that one model should be exported unchanged. Rather, it shows the importance of specifying what counts as curricular quality before principals judge teaching, and of keeping those criteria open to pedagogical analysis. Reviews of Asian instructional leadership show why contextual variation and the interpretation of leadership practices matter (Hallinger, Liu, & Aung, 2025) [14].

This interpretation has several practical consequences. A school implementing a distinctive curriculum should first identify which curricular elements are genuinely observable during a lesson and which require a review of planning or student work. It should then distinguish compliance indicators from quality indicators. During feedback, supervisors can present evidence linked to a specific lesson event and invite teachers to propose a plausible modification. A follow-up meeting can examine implementation constraints and identify peer expertise. Finally, subsequent observation or student-work review should test whether the proposed change occurred. These are sequential recommendations, not a claim that the focal school completed all of them. They move the supervision model toward a testable process of instructional improvement.

Another concern is the place of student voice in quality assurance. The documented cycle was largely organized around adults' reports and supervision instruments. That design can identify teacher planning and instructional behavior, but it does not reveal how learners interpret the curriculum or which activities they find most helpful. For a curriculum intended to connect academic learning with personal and spiritual development, evidence of students' understanding is particularly relevant. Short written explanations, selected student work, or interviews about a specific lesson could indicate whether students understood a scientific concept and whether they could explain the intended moral connection without merely repeating the teacher's language. These possibilities are not part of the reported dataset. They identify a constructive boundary of the current method and suggest an avenue for future inquiry that would make claims about educational quality more closely connected to the learner experience.

The case's strongest contribution is therefore explanatory rather than evaluative. It illustrates how an identity-defining curriculum can be operationalized within normal school management through planning documents, dedicated instruments, observational routines, and professional-learning proposals. It also exposes three unresolved tensions: prescribed sequence versus disciplinary responsiveness, directive accountability versus teacher agency, and documented follow-up versus demonstrated learning. These tensions are likely to be relevant beyond the focal institution, but their prevalence cannot be inferred from one case. Cross-school studies could compare how JSIT institutions adapt the same standards and whether differences in the quality of feedback, peer learning, and rubric design correspond to observable instructional change.

Several limitations constrain the argument. First, the research covers a single school and four key informants, who may have had shared interests in presenting supervision positively. Second, the work took place during pandemic-related remote instruction and therefore reflects unusual organizational conditions. Third, the source material includes summarized interviews and supervision documents rather than a full open corpus of transcripts, observation records, or student work. Fourth, the analysis lacks quantitative performance indicators, student outcomes, independent rubric scoring, or repeat observations that could establish change. Fifth, the ethics and consent documentation is not included in the supplied manuscript. These limitations should remain explicit when presenting the article to a journal; they protect the distinction between what was reported, what can be inferred, and what requires further study.

A future multi-site design could select schools with different levels of experience implementing JSIT and compare supervision planning, observation, teacher feedback, and

peer-learning practices over an academic year. A process study could collect recordings of supervisory conferences, anonymized student work, successive teaching plans, and repeated observations of the same teachers. It could also include teacher and student perspectives that are not represented in the present case. Such work would permit researchers to test whether supervision fosters deeper enactment of TERPADU beyond formal compliance, and whether teachers' confidence and classroom practices change over time. Contemporary research on school leadership, principal development, and lesson-study practices offers several possible design models (Borg & Finne, 2024; He *et al*., 2024; Meyer & Richter, 2025; Widiyan & Takayoshi, 2024) [5, 16, 20, 34].

Conclusion

This qualitative case study examined how a faith-based secondary school in Indonesia used instructional supervision to translate a distinctive curriculum into school-level quality-assurance practices. The source record identifies three linked phases. Planning specified supervision goals, scheduled observations, and linked instruments to the seven-stage TERPADU approach. Implementation combined a directive orientation, lesson-related document checks, online observation during the COVID-19 period, and feedback discussions. Evaluation assembled findings and linked identified needs to proposed peer modelling and internal teacher working-group discussions. Together, these phases show how curriculum expectations can be made visible within ordinary school routines.

The study does not demonstrate that supervision caused improvements in teaching effectiveness or student achievement. It documents the logic and reported activities of one historical supervision program. The central implication is that institutionalized supervision should examine both whether a required curriculum is represented in teaching and whether that representation supports intellectually meaningful learning. Structured instruments can clarify expectations, but their developmental value depends on evidence-based dialogue, feasible instructional support, and follow-up that is actually documented and reviewed. For values-based schools, these conditions offer a more defensible interpretation of quality assurance than treating procedural compliance as educational quality.

Further research should test the transferability of these observations across Indonesian Islamic secondary schools, compare directive and collaborative supervisory practices, and follow teachers' instructional choices over successive cycles. More complete documentation of consent, observation evidence, and teacher responses would strengthen the evidentiary basis. The present contribution is a carefully bounded explanation of a school process and a set of empirically motivated questions for the next stage of investigation.

References

1. Andriani DE, Annisa R, Rahmat B, Isbianti P, Dewantoro D, Lestari S, *et al*. Principal leadership practices in the early stages of Covid-19 pandemic crisis. Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan. 2022; 3(2):115-130. Doi: https://doi.org/10.21831/jump.v3i2.48430
2. Azhari B, Fajri I. Distance learning during the COVID-19 pandemic: School closure in Indonesia. International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology. 2022; 53(7):1934-1954. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/0020739X.2021.1875072
3. Balcı S, Özkan H. Development, implementation, and evaluation of an effective feedback program for school principals to improve in-class teaching. Shanlax International Journal of Education. 2023; 11(S1):242-258. Doi: https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v11iS1-July.6283
4. Berkovich I, Hassan T. Principals' digital instructional leadership during the pandemic: Impact on teachers' intrinsic motivation and students' learning. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 2022. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432221113411
5. Borg E, Finne J. A scoping review of school leadership practices in lesson study. Cogent Education. 2024; 11(1), Article 2353470. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2353470
6. Braun V, Clarke V. Can I use TA? Should I use TA? Should I not use TA? Comparing reflexive thematic analysis and other pattern-based qualitative analytic approaches. Counselling and Psychotherapy Research. 2021; 21(1):37-47. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12360
7. Brock JD, Beach DM, Musselwhite M, Holder I. Instructional supervision and the COVID-19 pandemic: Perspectives from principals. Journal of Educational Research and Practice. 2021; 11(1):168-180. Doi: https://doi.org/10.5590/JERAP.2021.11.1.12
8. Brown B, Wang T, Lee M, Childs A. Surviving, navigating and innovating through a pandemic: A review of research on school leadership during COVID-19, 2020-2021. International Journal of Educational Development. 2023; 100, Article 102804. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102804
9. Cahyadi A, Hendryadi Widyastuti S, Suryani. COVID-19, emergency remote teaching evaluation: The case of Indonesia. Education and Information Technologies. 2022; 27:2165-2179. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10680-3
10. Cansoy R, Türkoğlu ME, Polatcan M. Boosting classroom practices through principal feedback: The mediating roles of teacher professional learning and teacher self-efficacy. European Journal of Education. 2025; 60(4), Article e70265. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70265
11. Dorukbasi E, Cansoy R. Examining the mediating role of teacher professional learning between perceived instructional leadership and teacher instructional practices. European Journal of Education. 2024; 59(3), Article e12672. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12672
12. Eckert J, Morgan G, Daughtrey A. Collective school leadership and collective teacher efficacy through turbulence. Leadership and Policy in Schools. 2024; 23(4):773-791. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2023.2239894
13. Grimm F. Teacher leadership for teaching improvement in professional learning communities. Professional Development in Education. 2024; 50(6):1135-1147. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2023.2264286
14. Hallinger P, Liu S, Aung PN. A systematic state-of-the-art review of Asian research on principal instructional leadership, 1987-2024. Education Sciences. 2025; 15(7), Article 817. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15070817

15. Hallinger P, Liu S, Chen L. Principal instructional leadership and teacher attitudes: A meta-analytic review, 1989-2024. European Journal of Education. 2025; 60(4), Article e70199. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70199
16. He P, Guo F, Abazie GA. School principals' instructional leadership as a predictor of teacher's professional development. Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education. 2024; 9, Article 63. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00290-0
17. Karakose T, Kardas A, Kanadlı S, Tülübaş T, Yildirim B. How collective efficacy mediates the association between principal instructional leadership and teacher self-efficacy: Findings from a meta-analytic structural equation modeling (MASEM) study. Behavioral Sciences. 2024; 14(2), Article 85. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14020085
18. Lavigne AL, Allen S, Shao S, Acosta Feliz JA. Learning from post-observation conferences: Emerging measures of and mechanisms to improve principals' feedback to teachers. Journal of Educational Supervision. 2023; 6(3):25-46. Doi: https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.6.3.2
19. Lipscombe K, Harris J, Tindall-Ford S, Groth S. School middle leadership: A systematic review revisited 2020-2024. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 2025. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432251362970
20. Meyer A, Richter D. Longitudinal effects of a professional development program on principals' leadership practices: Results of a baseline latent change score model. Professional Development in Education. 2025; 51(7):1278-1295. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2024.2413119
21. Musah MB, Hussien AM, Elkaleh ES, Al Hakmani R, Yigit-Gencten V, Tameem S, *et al*. Reconceptualising collegial supervision as a mechanism for teacher professional learning: A systematic review. Education Sciences. 2026; 16(11), Article 1882. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci16111882
22. Nguyen D, Boeren E, Maitra S, Cabus S. A review of the empirical research literature on PLCs for teachers in the Global South: Evidence, implications, and directions. Professional Development in Education. 2024; 50(1):91-107. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2023.2238728
23. Olmo-Extremera M, Fernández-Terol L, Domingo-Segovia J. Leading a professional learning community in elementary education: A systematic review of the literature. Journal of Research on Leadership Education. 2024; 19(1):53-76. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/19427751221145207
24. Purba FA, Mahariah. Pelaksanaan kurikulum JSIT dalam Kurikulum Merdeka untuk meningkatkan kualitas pendidikan di SMA Swasta Islam Terpadu Al Izzah. Pendas: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar, 2026. Doi: https://doi.org/10.23969/jp.v11i01.42025
25. Rahayu S, Rahmadani E, Syafitri E, Prasetyoningsih LSA, Ubaidillah MF, Tavakoli M. Teaching with technology during COVID-19 pandemic: An interview study with teachers in Indonesia. Education Research International, 2022, Article 7853310. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/7853310
26. Ramos-Pla A, Tintoré M, Del Arco I. Leadership in times of crisis: School principals facing COVID-19. Heliyon. 2021; 7(11), Article e08443. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08443
27. Reyes-Guerra D, Maslin-Ostrowski P, Barakat MY, Stefanovic MA. Confronting a compound crisis: The school principal's role during initial phase of the COVID-19 pandemic. Frontiers in Education. 2021; 6, Article 617875. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.617875
28. Sa'idah EM, Hitami M, Anwar A. Implementation of the TERPADU learning concept during the Covid-19 pandemic at integrated Islamic junior high school. Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan. 2022; 14(2):1711-1720. Doi: https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v14i2.768
29. Shaked H. Instructional leadership during the COVID-19 pandemic: The case of Israel. Educational Management Administration & Leadership. 2022; 52(3). Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432221102521
30. Sholehah AF, Khoerunnisa AS, Nursobah A, Erihadiana M. Telaah kurikulum TERPADU khas JSIT: Perumusan dan aplikasinya dalam pendidikan Islam. Intelektualita. 2025; 14(1). Doi: https://doi.org/10.19109/intelektualita.v14i1.26655
31. Song M, Wayne AJ, Garet MS, Brown S, Rickles J. Impact of providing teachers and principals with performance feedback on their practice and student achievement: Evidence from a large-scale randomized experiment. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness. 2021; 14(2):353-378. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2020.1868030
32. Talebizadeh SM, Hosseingholizadeh R, Bellibaş MŞ. Analyzing the relationship between principals' learning-centered leadership and teacher professional learning: The mediation role of trust and knowledge sharing behavior. Studies in Educational Evaluation. 2021; 68, Article 100970. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100970
33. Thien LM, Darmawan IN, Adams D. (Re)investigating the pathways between instructional leadership, collective teacher efficacy, and teacher commitment: A multilevel analysis. International Journal of Educational Management. 2023; 37(4):830-845. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-12-2022-0516
34. Widiyan AP, Takayoshi M. School principals' support for teachers' professional development in Indonesia and Japan. Jurnal Akuntabilitas Manajemen Pendidikan. 2024; 12(2):108-117. Doi: https://doi.org/10.21831/jamp.v12i2.78882
35. Yustiana D, Vitasari D, Anjelina N, Andrian F, Adiwijaya SN. Integrasi jaringan sekolah Islam terpadu (JSIT) dan Kurikulum Merdeka di sekolah dasar. Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar, 2025. Doi: https://doi.org/10.37081/jipdas.v5i1.2567
36. Zheng X, Jiang C, Liu C. Uncovering the complex relationships among distributed leadership, departmental teacher leadership, and professional learning community in Chinese schools. Future in Educational Research. 2023; 1(2):182-197. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/fer3.15