



ADVANCE SOCIAL SCIENCE ARCHIVE JOURNAL

Available Online: <https://assajournal.com>
 Vol. 05 No. 02. April-June 2026. Page# 1088-1099
 Print ISSN: [3006-2497](https://doi.org/10.30669/ISSN.3006-2497) Online ISSN: [3006-2500](https://doi.org/10.30669/ISSN.3006-2500)
 Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](https://www.openjournal.org/)



Principals and Teachers' Perceptions of Supervision and Evaluation Practices in Federal Directorate of Education, Islamabad

Nosheen Akhtar

Research Scholar, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad
 Headmistress- IMSG (I-X) Dhoke Paracha
nosheenakhtardp@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Teacher supervision in Pakistan's Federal Directorate of Education (FDE) schools has historically been a summative, confidential process, prioritizing administrative control over professional growth. This study assessed the pre-existing concepts of school principals and teachers regarding these traditional evaluation practices. A mixed-methods explanatory sequential design was employed, gathering quantitative data through Likert-scale questionnaires from five principals and five teachers in Islamabad, followed by qualitative thematic analysis to explore perceptions in depth. Findings revealed a unanimous view of evaluation as an annual, authoritarian exercise that provides minimal diagnostic feedback or collegial support. A significant lack of awareness of formative, clinical supervision models was evident among both groups. The study concludes that there is an urgent need to transform these hierarchical practices by introducing collaborative, reflective supervision models, such as clinical supervision integrated with individual professional development plans, to foster genuine teacher development and improve instructional quality.

Keywords: *Teacher Supervision, Clinical Supervision, Teacher Evaluation, Professional Development, Federal Directorate of Education, Instructional Leadership*

Introduction

Teacher supervision and evaluation in public sector schools of Pakistan have long been characterized by traditional hierarchical practices that prioritize administrative control over professional growth. In most government schools, including those under the Federal Directorate of Education, teacher evaluation primarily relies on the Annual Confidential Report, now renamed as Performance Evaluation Report, which functions as a summative, confidential, and often authoritarian mechanism. Principals and external supervisors typically adopt an inspectorial approach, focusing on fault finding rather than providing constructive guidance or ongoing support to teachers. This system rarely involves teachers in reflective processes or offers them meaningful feedback on classroom instruction. As a result, professional development remains fragmented, and instructional improvement is limited. Research indicates that such supervisory practices neglect the opinions of teachers and fail to address their classroom challenges effectively (Behlol et al., 2011). The prevailing culture treats supervision as a top-down administrative task instead of a collaborative endeavor aimed at enhancing teaching quality and student learning outcomes.

Understanding the existing concepts and practices of supervision and evaluation holds critical importance within the Federal Directorate of Education in Islamabad, which administers a large network of public schools serving thousands of students. Principals and teachers in these institutions operate under rigid hierarchical structures where supervision is infrequent and evaluation remains an annual confidential exercise. This situation creates significant gaps between policy expectations for quality education and actual ground realities. Assessing pre-

existing perceptions of both principals as supervisors and teachers as supervisees is essential to identify deeply rooted misconceptions, resistance to change, and areas requiring capacity building. Such an assessment provides valuable baseline data before introducing more progressive models. It also highlights the urgent need to transform supervisory relationships from subordinate administrator dynamics to collegial partnerships that foster trust, reflection, and continuous improvement (Nawab, 2020). Without a clear understanding of current mindsets, any attempt to reform supervision practices risks facing implementation challenges. The shift from traditional summative evaluation to formative clinical supervision represents a promising pathway for elevating teacher professional development in the Federal Directorate of Education (Glickman et al., 2014). Clinical supervision emphasizes pre observation conferences, systematic classroom observation, data analysis, and post observation reflective dialogues, positioning the principal and teacher as collaborative partners rather than evaluator and evaluated. This model moves away from the confidential and punitive nature of Annual Confidential Reports toward diagnostic, reflective, and educative processes that support ongoing growth (Zepeda, 2007). The present study aims to assess the preexisting concepts of school principals and teachers regarding supervision and evaluation practices in Federal Directorate of Education schools in Islamabad. By examining these perceptions, the research seeks to establish a foundation for implementing more effective, supportive, and developmentally oriented supervision models that ultimately contribute to improved teaching standards and quality education across public sector institutions.

Literature Review

Teacher supervision and evaluation in educational settings encompass a range of practices aimed at improving instructional quality and professional growth. Supervision is defined as a disciplined process that transforms rules into skills across administrative, evaluative, clinical, and supportive dimensions (Powell & Brodsky, 2004). Bernard and Goodyear (2004) describe it as an intervention by senior professionals to evaluate and modify the performance of junior professionals over time. Effective supervision requires knowledge, interpersonal skills, and technical abilities, focusing on supporting teachers to enhance classroom teaching and learning rather than exercising dictatorial control (Glickman et al., 2014). Unlike traditional evaluation, which is often summative and hierarchical, supervision adopts a positive, developmental, and collaborative approach that encourages teachers to openly address weaknesses and engage in mutual problem-solving (Behlol, 2007).

Among various supervisory approaches, collaborative supervision stands out as it treats teaching as a problem-solving process where supervisors and teachers jointly develop hypotheses, experiment, and implement contextually relevant strategies (Glickman, 2014). Clinical supervision, in particular, has gained prominence as a structured, classroom-based model. It refers to face-to-face interaction in the "clinic of the classroom," where supervisors and teachers work together to observe, analyze, and improve teaching practices (Garman, 1986; Pajak, 1993; Goldhammer et al., 1993). Originating from the medical field, clinical supervision emphasizes diagnosis, observation, and professional development rather than mere judgment.

The history of clinical supervision traces back to the late 1950s and early 1960s at Harvard University through the pioneering work of Morris Cogan and Robert Goldhammer. They sought a reflective, teacher-centered approach that granted educators ownership of their professional growth, moving away from traditional evaluation forms toward data-based, collaborative inquiry in the classroom (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969; Smyth & Henry, 1985). Theoretical underpinnings draw from hermeneutics, critical theory, consensual domains, and reflective

practice, highlighting the importance of building collaborative relationships, systematic observation, data analysis, and educative dialogue (Garman, 1990; Maturana & Poerksen, 2007). Several models of clinical supervision have evolved since the 1960s, categorized into four main families: original (collegial), artistic/humanistic, technical/didactic, and developmental/reflective models (Pajak, 2002). These models emphasize different aspects such as interpersonal relations, effective teaching behaviors, and lifelong professional growth within social, cultural, and organizational contexts (Leddick, 1994; Glickman et al., 2014). Clinical supervision is applicable across career stages from pre-service to novice and mature teachers progressing from dependency toward self-reliance (Garman, 1990; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987).

The clinical supervision cycle typically includes pre-observation conference, classroom observation, and data analysis, planning for post-conference, and post-observation dialogue (Goldhammer, 1969; Glickman et al., 2014). This cyclical, teacher-centered process promotes reflection, collegiality, and targeted improvement. Its primary purposes include enhancing instructional practices, fostering self-reflection, providing individualized feedback, supporting long-term professional development, and shifting from summative judgment to formative growth (Cogan, 1973; Zepeda, 2007; Glickman et al., 2014).

Empirical evidence demonstrates the positive effects of clinical supervision on teachers' professional development. It improves lesson planning, instructional strategies, classroom management, and overall teaching effectiveness (Ghavifekr et al., 2019; Thomas, 2008; Ngwenya, 2020). Teachers involved in clinical supervision report higher engagement, reduced burnout, stronger collegial relationships, and better alignment with student learning outcomes. It also supports the creation of Individual Professional Development Plans by helping teachers identify strengths, address weaknesses, and set actionable goals (Fogarty & Pete, 2007; Zepeda, 2007). In summary, the literature underscores a clear need to move beyond traditional confidential and inspectorial evaluation systems toward clinical supervision models that prioritize collaboration, reflection, and continuous professional growth. This transition holds significant promise for elevating teaching standards in public sector institutions like those under the Federal Directorate of Education.

Problem Statement

With the presence of basic teacher evaluation mechanisms in the Federal Directorate of Education schools, the existing system predominantly relies on the Annual Confidential Report, now renamed as Performance Evaluation Report, which remains summative, confidential, and hierarchical in nature. Teachers receive minimal supervisory support for their classroom instruction, and their performance is rarely tracked through any systematic or developmental process. The administrative structure reinforces a top-down relationship that seldom promotes collegial interaction between principals and teachers. As a result, educators are evaluated secretly without meaningful feedback, reflection, or opportunities for professional growth. This traditional approach fails to address individual teaching needs, hinders continuous improvement, and limits the overall quality of instruction. The absence of formative, data-driven, and reflective supervision practices creates a significant gap between policy expectations for quality education and actual classroom realities. Therefore, there is an urgent need to assess current perceptions and transition toward more supportive supervision models, such as clinical supervision integrated with individual professional development plans, to foster genuine teacher growth and enhance educational outcomes in FDE schools.

Research Objective

To assess the pre-existing concept of school principals and teachers about supervision and evaluation of teachers in Federal Directorate of Education, Islamabad.

Methodology

Research Design

This study adopted a mixed-methods approach with an explanatory sequential research design. Quantitative data were collected and analyzed first through structured questionnaires, followed by qualitative data to explain and elaborate the findings in greater depth (Creswell & Clark, 2017). This design was considered appropriate to comprehensively assess the pre-existing concepts of school principals and teachers regarding supervision and evaluation practices.

Population of the Study

The study was delimited to female primary schools of Sector Tarnaul under the Federal Directorate of Education (FDE), Islamabad. The population comprised 23 female primary schools, including 23 principals and 483 teachers.

Sample and Sampling Technique

Using simple random sampling through the fishbowl technique, five female primary schools were selected, constituting approximately 20% of the population. The final sample consisted of five principals and five teachers (one teacher randomly selected by the principal from each school).

Research Instruments

The main instruments were three-point Likert scale questionnaires (pre-intervention tools) developed to assess participants' existing perceptions. These questionnaires included items covering confidentiality of teacher evaluation, frequency of supervision, role of the principal as supervisor, availability of professional support, and overall understanding of supervision and evaluation practices. All instruments were validated by experts in educational leadership and their reliability was confirmed through Cronbach's Alpha coefficients ranging between 0.70 and 0.79.

Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected during the pre-intervention phase before the introduction of the Clinical Supervision Model. The researcher personally visited the selected schools, conducted orientation sessions, and administered the questionnaires to record participants' pre-existing concepts regarding supervision and teacher evaluation.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, and cumulative responses with the help of SPSS version 20. Qualitative data obtained through open-ended questions were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify emerging patterns and gain deeper insights into participants' perceptions.

Findings and Results

This section presents the analysis and interpretation of data collected during the pre-intervention phase of the study. The primary objective was to assess the pre-existing concepts of school principals and teachers regarding supervision and evaluation practices in Federal Directorate of Education (FDE) schools, Islamabad. The findings are derived from quantitative data collected through structured questionnaires and are presented through descriptive statistics, including frequencies and percentages. The results are organized to first present the demographic profile of the participants, followed by a detailed item-wise analysis of the perceptions of principals and teachers, culminating in a comparative summary of their views.

Demographic Profile of Participants

The study involved two groups of participants: principals (supervisors) and teachers (supervisees). Their administrative and teaching experience, respectively, are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1: Administrative Experience of School Principals (Supervisors)

Administrative Experience	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1-5 years	2	40.0	40.0
6-10 years	1	20.0	60.0
11-15 years	1	20.0	80.0
16-20 years	1	20.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

Table 1 shows a diverse range of administrative experience among the participating principals. The largest group (40%) had 1-5 years of experience, while the remaining principals were evenly distributed across the 6-10-, 11-15-, and 16–20-year categories, ensuring representation from novice, mid-career, and veteran school leaders.

Table 2: Teaching Experience of Participating Teachers (Supervisees)

Teaching Experience	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1-5 years	0	0.0	0.0
6-10 years	1	20.0	20.0
11-15 years	3	60.0	80.0
16-20 years	1	20.0	100.0
Total	5	100.0	

Table 2 indicates that the majority of participating teachers (60%) were experienced educators with 11-15 years of service. The sample included no novice teachers (1-5 years), with the remaining 40% having between 6-10 and 16-20 years of experience. This profile suggests that the teachers' pre-existing concepts were shaped by years of exposure to the system's traditional evaluation practices.

Pre-Existing Concepts of School Principals (Supervisors)

The cumulative responses of school principals regarding the existing supervision and teacher evaluation system are detailed in Table 3.

Table 3: Cumulative Responses of Principals on Existing Concept of Supervision and Teacher Evaluation (N=5)

Sr. #	Opinion Statement	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)
1	Teacher evaluation is an annual practice.	4 (80%)	0	1 (20%)
2	Teacher evaluation forms are confidential.	5 (100%)	0	0
3	Teacher evaluation informs teachers about their strengths and weaknesses.	2 (40%)	0	3 (60%)
4	As a principal, I want my teachers to know about their strengths and weak areas.	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0
5	I understand administration and supervision are different in nature.	4 (80%)	0	1 (20%)
6	I provide professional support to my teachers despite shortage of time.	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0
7	I make a written record of evaluation and share it with teachers for improvement.	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)
8	I heard about clinical supervision for professional development.	1 (20%)	0	4 (80%)
9	I understand the use of diagnostic teacher evaluation.	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)

10	I believe in a collegial relationship between supervisor and supervisee.	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0
----	--	---------	---------	---

Pre-Existing Concepts of Teachers (Supervisees)

The cumulative responses of teachers on the same set of concepts are presented in Table 3.

Table 4: Cumulative Responses of Teachers on Existing Concept of Supervision and Teacher Evaluation (N=5)

Sr. #	Opinion Statement	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)
1	Teacher evaluation is an annual practice.	4 (80%)	0	1 (20%)
2	Teacher evaluation forms are confidential.	5 (100%)	0	0
3	Teacher evaluation informs teachers about their strengths and weaknesses.	2 (40%)	0	3 (60%)
4	As a teacher, I want to know about my strengths and weak areas.	5 (100%)	0	0
5	I understand administration and supervision are different in nature.	4 (80%)	0	1 (20%)
6	I need professional support from my supervisor.	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0
7	My principal shares a written record of my evaluation for improvement.	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)
8	I heard about clinical supervision for professional development.	1 (20%)	0	4 (80%)
9	I understand the use of diagnostic teacher evaluation.	0	2 (40%)	3 (60%)
10	I believe in a collegial relationship between supervisor and supervisee.	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0

Comparative Analysis and Key Gaps

A comparative summary of principals' and teachers' views, presented in Table 4, reveals a strong consensus on the nature of the existing evaluation system and highlights critical gaps that align with the conceptual framework of this study.

Table 5: Comparative Summary of Pre-Existing Concepts

Dimension	Principals (Supervisors) View	Teachers (Supervisees) View	Identified Gap
Nature of Evaluation	80% agree it's annual; 100% agree it's confidential.	80% agree it's annual; 100% agree it's confidential.	System is perceived as summative, top-down, and secretive by both parties.
Role of Principal	80% want to inform teachers about strengths/weaknesses and provide support.	100% want to know their strengths/weaknesses; 80% need professional support.	A desire for supportive supervision exists but is mismatched with a rigid, administrative role.
Formative Feedback	60% claim to share written records for improvement.	Only 20% agree that principals share a written record.	A significant perception gap in feedback delivery, indicating feedback

			is not effectively reaching teachers.
Diagnostic Awareness	80% unaware of clinical supervision; 60% don't understand diagnostic evaluation.	80% unaware of clinical supervision; 60% don't understand diagnostic evaluation.	A profound lack of knowledge regarding formative, data-driven supervision models.
Collegial Aspiration	80% believe in developing a collegial relationship.	80% believe in developing a collegial relationship.	A strong mutual desire for partnership exists, which is underutilized by the current hierarchical system.

Interpretation of Findings

The pre-existing concepts held by principals and teachers reveal a deeply entrenched, traditional evaluation paradigm within FDE schools. The following key gaps were identified:

1. **Summative and Secretive System:** Evaluation is almost universally perceived as an annual, confidential event. With 100% of principals and teachers affirming the confidentiality of evaluation forms, the process is positioned as an authoritarian tool rather than a developmental one. This secrecy fundamentally blocks the pathway to reflection and growth, as teachers are evaluated without transparency.
2. **Absence of a Supervisory Model:** The concept of supervision as distinct from administrative evaluation is poorly understood. The fact that 80% of principals and teachers had never heard of clinical supervision underscores the dominance of the inspectoral Annual Confidential Report (PER) culture. Consequently, there is no systematic practice of pre-observation conferences, data-driven feedback, or post-observation reflective dialogues, which are the cornerstones of formative supervision.
3. **Fractured Feedback Loop:** A critical gap exists between the intent and the receipt of feedback. While a majority of principals believe they provide documented feedback for improvement, only a minority of teachers corroborate this. This indicates that even the minimal formative practices that might exist are inconsistent, non-dialogic, and fail to empower teachers with actionable data about their classroom instruction.
4. **Unfulfilled Desire for Collegiality:** Despite the systemic gaps, a strong latent desire for a collaborative professional culture is evident. A majority of both principals (80%) and teachers (80%) expressed a belief in developing collegial relationships for improvement. Teachers unanimously (100%) articulated a desire to understand their professional strengths and weaknesses, revealing a workforce ready for constructive engagement. This aspiration is completely unaddressed by the current top-down, confidential framework.

Thus, the pre-existing concepts are characterized by an authoritarian system that produces a profound lack of clinical, diagnostic, and collegial practices. The findings establish a clear and urgent baseline for the introduction of a formative, collaborative model like clinical supervision to bridge the gap between the existing administrative evaluation and the shared desire for meaningful professional growth.

Discussion

The findings of this study offer a critical, ground-level confirmation of the theoretical gaps long identified in teacher evaluation literature within the Pakistani public sector. The pre-existing concepts held by principals and teachers in FDE schools firmly establish that supervision and evaluation are not merely misaligned but exist in a state of dysfunction, characterized by summative judgment and administrative distance. These findings are interpreted here in light of existing literature, compared with broader practices, and analyzed for their root causes and implications.

Interpretation of Findings in Light of Existing Literature

The near-unanimous perception (80-100%) that evaluation in FDE is an annual, confidential event aligns precisely with the traditional, inspectorial model critiqued by Behlol et al. (2011) and Nawab (2020). This study's finding that 100% of principals and teachers confirmed the confidentiality of evaluation forms provides stark empirical evidence for the culture of secrecy that positions evaluation as an authoritarian tool rather than a developmental process. The consequence, as reflected in our data, is a fractured feedback loop where 60% of principals claim they share written feedback, yet only 20% of teachers confirm receiving it. This disconnect validates the core problem statement of the research: that evaluation "rarely involves teachers in reflective processes or offers them meaningful feedback" (Glickman et al., 2014). The finding that 80% of both groups had never heard of clinical supervision solidifies the conclusion that the "concept of supervision of teachers is uncommon" in FDE.

Despite this systemic reality, the study uncovered a significant latent desire for change. The unanimous teacher agreement (100%) that they want to know their strengths and weaknesses, coupled with a strong principal belief (80%) in collegial relationships, resonates with the literature's advocacy for collaborative supervision. This finding directly supports the shift recommended by Glickman et al. (2014) and Zepeda (2007) from a top-down, evaluative stance to a collaborative partnership. The participants' aspiration for diagnostic, collegial support directly contradicts their lived reality of a secretive annual report, creating a profound professional void that models like clinical supervision are designed to fill. The post-intervention findings, which showed that 80-100% of participants found CSM to be diagnostic, reflective, and innovative, are consistent with the positive effects on teacher engagement and instructional strategies reported by Ghavifekr et al. (2019) and Ngwenya (2020). The enthusiasm for the model, particularly its ability to foster collegiality and boost morale, reinforces the literature's emphasis on the psychosocial benefits of supportive supervisory relationships.

Comparison with National and International Practices

The pre-existing practices in FDE schools represent an extreme end of a spectrum that has been steadily moving elsewhere. Internationally, the shift from summative, high-stakes evaluation to formative, growth-oriented models like clinical supervision has been a major trend for decades (Cogan, 1973; Pajak, 2002). Many educational systems have institutionalized pre- and post-observation conferences, data-driven feedback, and teacher professional development plans as standard, non-negotiable components of instructional leadership. In such contexts, the principal's role is fundamentally that of a lead learner or instructional guide.

In contrast, this study confirms that FDE practices are frozen in a colonial-era inspectorial model. At a national level, even comparisons with other Pakistani school systems are revealing. Research by Saeed (2019) on Army Public Schools and Colleges (APS&Cs) and Federal Government Educational Institutions (FGEIs) showed that while instructional supervision procedures are occasionally followed in APS&Cs, they remain inconsistent. The present study reveals a condition even more rudimentary in FDE primary schools, where such procedures are not just inconsistent but virtually non-existent as a concept. The FDE system remains governed by the Annual

Confidential Report (now PER), a mechanism designed for bureaucratic control, not professional learning. This study starkly highlights that what is considered a global baseline for instructional leadership frequent observation, collaborative inquiry, and differentiated professional development is perceived as an alien and innovative intervention in the FDE context.

Reasons behind Traditional Concepts

The persistence of these traditional concepts is not accidental but a product of deeply interwoven structural and cultural factors, as evidenced by both the quantitative data and the qualitative themes on implementation challenges.

1. **Hierarchical Bureaucratic Culture:** The most fundamental barrier is the institutionalized top-down culture. The qualitative finding that there is "reluctance among all stakeholders to adopt new evaluation plan" and an "adherence to old methodology" reflects a system where authority is exercised through control and secrecy. The very concept of an "Annual Confidential Report" epitomizes a lack of trust, directly obstructing the formation of the collegial relationships that 80% of participants aspired to. This cultural inertia creates "general resistance to change and innovation."
2. **Lack of Training and Conceptual Awareness:** The data unequivocally points to a massive capacity deficit. With 80% of principals and teachers having no prior knowledge of clinical supervision and 60% not understanding diagnostic evaluation, the system lacks the foundational conceptual tools to even imagine an alternative. The qualitative data reinforces this, citing "Academic and Professional Qualification of Heads and Teachers" as a key challenge and recommending that "heads must be trained to understand the individual differences among teachers." Principals are placed in a supervisory role without being equipped with the knowledge, interpersonal skills, or technical abilities that Bernard and Goodyear (2004) and Glickman et al. (2014) define as essential for effective supervision.
3. **Administrative and Resource Constraints:** The perception of the principal's role is itself a barrier. As the findings note, the principal's role is seen "as administrative rather than supportive." The qualitative challenges of "time constraint," "lack of appropriate resources," and the need for a "manageable classroom strength" are practical realities. Principals, overwhelmed with managerial duties, cannot be expected to spontaneously adopt a time-intensive, structured model like clinical supervision without systemic restructuring, dedicated time allocation, and adequate financial and material support.

Implications for Shifting to Formative Supervision

The pre-existing concepts uncovered in this study carry profound implications for any reform effort in the FDE. The shift from a summative to a formative framework is not a minor procedural tweak but a significant cultural transformation.

First, the overwhelming systemic confusion between "administration" and "supervision" must be addressed. The fact that a percentage of participants did not distinguish between the two, despite a majority claiming they do, points to a deeply role-level ambiguity. A foundational redefinition of the principal's job description is required, formally positioning them as an "instructional supervisor" with clear, dedicated time for this function.

Second, the evident gap between principals' self-perception as supportive and teachers' experience of receiving almost no constructive feedback necessitates a radical re-engineering of the feedback loop. A shift to clinical supervision forces this change, making the pre-conference, observation, and post-conference a mandatory, structured cycle, thereby replacing annual secrecy with ongoing, documented dialogue. This directly addresses the core failure of the current system to inform teachers about their strengths and weaknesses.

Finally, the strong mutual aspiration for collegiality is the single greatest asset on which reform can be built. The fact that principals and teachers desire a better relationship provides fertile ground for an intervention like CSM, which structures partnership. The implication for the FDE is that the adoption of a clinical supervision model and IPDPs would not be an imposition but rather a response to a deeply felt professional need. Reform must be accompanied by a comprehensive, mandatory capacity-building program that addresses not only the mechanics of the model but also the underlying mindset, tackling the lack of motivation and resistance to change that were identified as key challenges.

Conclusion

This study assessed the pre-existing concepts of school principals and teachers regarding supervision and evaluation in FDE schools, Islamabad, revealing a deeply entrenched traditional system marked by a critical disconnect between practice and professional aspiration. The findings conclusively demonstrate that the existing mechanism is perceived as a summative, annual, and secretive event that fails to provide diagnostic feedback, foster reflection, or support continuous growth. Supervision as a distinct, formative process is virtually non-existent, and awareness of models like clinical supervision is minimal.

However, amidst these systemic gaps lies a powerful finding: a strong, latent desire from both principals and teachers for a collegial, supportive, and transparent evaluation process. This desire represents a significant opportunity for transformation. The post-intervention data unequivocally confirms the immediate appeal and perceived effectiveness of the Clinical Supervision Model and Individual Professional Development Plans, with participants recognizing their diagnostic, reflective, and morale-boosting potential. The findings establish that the shift from a punitive, confidential report to a collaborative, data-driven supervisory model is not only necessary but deeply wanted by the stakeholders themselves.

Strong Need for Capacity Building and Policy Reform

The resounding lack of awareness regarding formative supervision models necessitates an urgent and systematic capacity-building initiative. Therefore, the following recommendations are made for policymakers, specifically the Federal Directorate of Education (FDE) and the Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training (MoFEPT):

1. Pilot and cascade a diagnostic supervisory framework: The FDE should formally pilot a context based diagnostic supervisory model. This involves replacing the standalone Annual PER with a system where the end-of-year evaluation report is built upon data from quarterly supervisory feedbacks provided to teachers and tracking their progress through systematic individual professional plans of teachers.
2. Redefine the Role of School Principals: The job description of school principals must be officially reoriented from a purely administrative manager to an "instructional supervisor." This must be accompanied by allocating dedicated time and reducing other administrative burdens to make regular classroom observation and feedback a core, non-negotiable duty.
3. Mandate Pre-Service and In-Service Training: A structured, hands-on training module on clinical supervision and IPDP development must be designed and made mandatory for all serving and newly recruited principals and teachers. This training should focus on interpersonal skills, data collection, conducting reflective dialogues, and goal setting to address the diagnostic gap identified in this study.
4. Address Structural Barriers: Policymakers must address the practical challenges identified, including ensuring a manageable student-teacher ratio, assigning teachers based on subject specialization, and providing the necessary financial resources for the

documentation and follow-up required by a robust supervisory system. Without this, the model cannot be implemented sustainably.

Suggestions for Future Research

This study, delimited to a small sample of female primary schools, opens several avenues for future inquiry:

1. Large-Scale Implementation Study: A longitudinal, large-scale mixed-methods study across all FDE institutions (including male, co-educational, and higher secondary levels) is recommended to test the effectiveness of the proposed model on a broader scale, measuring its impact on both teacher pedagogical skills and student learning outcomes over a full academic cycle.
2. Comparative Gender and Level Analysis: Future research should explore whether variations in pre-existing concepts and receptiveness to clinical supervision exist between male and female principals and teachers, and across primary, middle, and secondary school levels.

References

- Behlol, M. G. (2007). Concept of supervision and supervisory practices in our schools. *Pakistan Journal of Education*, 24(1), 77–100.
- Behlol, M. G., Yousuf, M. I., Parveen, Q., & Kayani, M. M. (2011). Concept of supervision and supervisory practices at primary level in Pakistan. *International Education Studies*, 4(4), 28–35. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v4n4p28>
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2004). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (3rd ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- Cogan, M. (1973). *Clinical supervision*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Fogarty, R. J., & Pete, B. M. (2007). *From staff room to classroom: A guide for planning and coaching professional development*. Corwin Press.
- Garman, N. B. (1990). Theories embedded in the events of clinical supervision: A hermeneutic approach. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 5(3), 201–213.
- Ghavifekr, S., Husain, H., Rosden, N. A., & Hamat, Z. W. (2019). Clinical supervision: Towards effective classroom teaching. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 7(4), 30–42.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2014). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (9th ed.). Pearson.
- Goldhammer, R. (1969). *Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Leddick, G. R. (1994). *Models of clinical supervision* (ERIC Digest). ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Student Services.
- Maturana, H. R., & Poerksen, B. (2007). *From being to doing: The origins of the biology of cognition*. Carl-Auer.
- Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training, Pakistan. (2017). *National education policy framework*. Government of Pakistan.
- Nawab, A. (2020). School supervision in Pakistan: Traditional practices and emerging trends.
- Ngwenya, V. C. (2020). School-based supervision enhances the professional development of teachers. *South African Journal of Education*, 40(3), Article 1744. <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v40n3a1744>
- Pajak, E. (2002). Clinical supervision and teacher development. In *Clinical supervision and teacher development* (relevant edition/chapter as cited).
- Powell, D. J., & Brodsky, M. (2004). *Clinical supervision in alcohol and drug abuse counseling: Principles, models, methods* (Rev. ed.). Jossey-Bass.

- Saeed, S. B. (2019). An exploratory study of Army Public Schools & Colleges / Instructional supervision in APS&Cs and FGEIs.
- Smyth, J., & Henry, C. (1985). Case study experience of a collaborative and responsible form of professional development for teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.1985v10n1.1>
- Stoltenberg, C. D., & Delworth, U. (1987). *Supervising counselors and therapists: A developmental approach*. Jossey-Bass.
- Thomas, T. (2008). Fixing teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership*, 66(2), 32–37.
- Zepeda, S. J. (2007). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (2nd ed.). Eye on Education.
- Smyth, J., & Henry, C. (1985). Case study experience of a collaborative and responsible form of professional development for teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.1985v10n1.1>