**Redefining Pedagogical Supervision: From Directive Models to Collaborative Approaches**

**Abstract:** This study aimed to analyze the main challenges faced by pedagogical supervision in the current educational context, emphasizing its role at different levels and modalities of education. Pedagogical supervision constitutes a fundamental pillar in school organization, and its conception has transformed over the past decades. The concept of supervision is broader, encompassing two interconnected levels in institutional supervision, focusing on the mediation of the teacher's professional development, as well as on the organisational development of the school. Through a literature review, eight articles published between 2021 and 2024 were selected from databases such as SciELO and CAPES. The results revealed the predominance of supervisory models still characterized by oversight practices, with low formative effectiveness, especially in contexts with structural limitations. On the other hand, more recent experiences indicate a transition towards collaborative and dialogical approaches, strengthened by the use of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) and institutional policies focused on continuous professional development. It is concluded that pedagogical supervision needs to be redefined as a tool for supporting teacher development, requiring consistent public policies and investment in the qualification of supervisory professionals.
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**1. INTRODUCTION**

Pedagogical supervision can be defined as the theory and practice of teaching and learning regulation in an educational context, with pedagogy as its object, and aimed at improving educational action and the skills of the teacher in training. Supervision can then be characterised as an articulation between reflective practice and pedagogy for autonomy; reflective analysis of theories and practices in the community; planning, implementing and evaluating teaching and learning projects; creation of conditions and spaces for collaboration between peers; supervision and collaborative evaluation of the processes and results of professional development and continuous training (Kwok et al., 2025). Student engagement is central to the teaching and learning process, and the pedagogical decisions made by teachers is critical to students’ experiences of engagement (Parviainen et al., 2024; Bhuttah et al., 2024). Pedagogical supervision constitutes a fundamental pillar in school organization, and its conception has transformed over the past decades (Agricola et al., 2022; Coimbra et al., 2020; Marie, 2021). Historically, as noted by Nascimento et al. (2024), the supervisory function has evolved from a traditional, controlling model—focused on compliance with norms and regulations—to more contemporary, collaborative approaches aimed at the continuous training of educational managers. According to the authors, this shift reflects a current perspective that prioritizes teamwork, critical analysis of educational data, and evidence-based decision-making to achieve more effective student learning outcomes. Pedagogical supervision can play a strategic role in the process of constructing professional identity because it facilitates processes of communication and interaction among work group members, thereby enhancing levels of collaboration as well as individual and collective professional educational competencies, making them visible and communicable (Alam et al., 2021; Tarimo & Lekule, 2024).

However, despite this conceptual evolution, the practice of pedagogical supervision still faces challenges in specific contexts, particularly when it involves specialized modalities such as inclusive special education. As highlighted by Negreiro and Gonçalves (2023), the school supervisor plays a crucial role in monitoring teachers who work with students with special needs. Nevertheless, in many cases, this function is limited to superficial monitoring of the activities carried out by professionals in Specialized Educational Assistance (AEE), without significantly contributing to the improvement of teaching practices. The authors emphasize that “the supervisor understands the importance of their role in inclusive special education; however, they often end up merely overseeing the work of the specialized professional alongside teachers” (NEGREIRO & GONÇALVES, 2023, p. 127).

With the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic, the role of the pedagogical supervisor faced new and complex challenges. Carvalho, Carvalho, and Barbosa (2021) investigated the work of pedagogical supervisors during the implementation of hybrid education in the state of Tocantins, highlighting that supervision had to quickly adapt, assuming a crucial technical support function to ensure the continuity of emergency remote teaching. The authors stress that, in this unexpected scenario, the supervisor played a strategic role “in guiding and strengthening teachers’ work, aiming to support and motivate the team while coordinating with families to establish a new educational approach” (CARVALHO; CARVALHO; BARBOSA, 2021, p. 2). In this context, the need to reconfigure supervisory practices and strategies became evident to ensure a closer, more humanized, and dialogical approach.

This study aimed to analyze the main challenges faced by pedagogical supervision in the current educational context through a review of recent literature. It seeks to understand how supervision has been conceived and practised across different educational levels and modalities, identifying its limitations, potentialities, and pathways for its redefinition as a formative and transformative practice in the educational environment.

**2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

Pedagogical supervision in higher education faces several challenges that significantly compromise its transformative potential in educational practices. According to Greia and Uagire (2023), in the context of YX University in Mozambique, pedagogical supervisors often work without adequate material and training resources, directly affecting the effectiveness of their role. The authors point out that the selection of professionals responsible for supervision is primarily based on trust and administrative leadership positions, without proper technical or academic training. This hinders the adoption of more consistent and innovative pedagogical practices by faculty members. Furthermore, they highlight that many professors do not fully perform their basic duties, such as properly planning lessons or regularly participating in continuous training activities, which reinforces a limited perception of supervision as a mere administrative and bureaucratic function rather than a formative and reflective practice.

In a critical analysis of teachers’ perceptions of pedagogical supervision, Nicaquela and Assane (2021) highlight a challenging scenario for formative practices in the Monapo District, Mozambique. The authors found that, from teachers’ perspectives, supervision is predominantly seen as an administrative activity with a strong oversight and punitive character. Instead of perceiving it as an opportunity for continuous professional growth, teachers often regard supervisory visits to their classrooms as isolated and unproductive events, significantly limiting the potential of supervision to support effective improvements in teaching quality. These findings underline an urgent need to redefine pedagogical supervision, shifting its focus from a controlling approach to a collaborative and professional development perspective capable of fostering trust between supervisors and teachers.

Lopes and Henriques (2024), in a study conducted within the professional training of the Tax and Customs Authority in Portugal, highlight that pedagogical supervision often lacks structure and is dominated by hierarchical and directive models. Although they acknowledge the emergence of some collaborative practices, the authors emphasize that supervision is still largely perceived as an activity aimed at ensuring compliance with administrative norms, with little emphasis on reflective or dialogical processes that could drive real changes in pedagogical practices. This situation is further complicated by the lack of clarity regarding the role and methodology employed by supervisors, who often lack specific training or well-defined strategies to promote the professional development of trainees. The study suggests that a more structured and collaborative approach could significantly enhance the effectiveness of pedagogical supervision in fostering sustainable formative changes.

The experience of pedagogical supervision in the context of emergency remote teaching was also discussed by Reis, Vito, and Picelli (2021) in their analysis of supervised internships in Pedagogy programs during the pandemic. The authors emphasize that, despite the limitations imposed by social distancing, it was possible to implement effective pedagogical practices thanks to the use of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs). They highlight that pedagogical supervision played a crucial role in adapting traditional methodologies to new technologies, significantly contributing to maintaining the quality of formative experiences through the use of "cloud computing tools and collaborative virtual environments" (REIS; VITO; PICELLI, 2021, p. 2).

Alongside the adaptations required by the pandemic context, Carvalho and Oliveira (2022) critically analyzed the broader landscape of Brazilian higher education, linking it to the goals of the National Education Plan (PNE). According to the authors, the challenges faced by pedagogical supervision reflect broader structural issues related to public education policies and the country’s economic and political constraints. In this regard, they highlighted that budget restrictions and austerity policies have negatively impacted the expansion and quality of higher education, including supervision and evaluation processes. This underscores the urgent need to review policies and strategies for more effective pedagogical supervision in higher education.

It is important to emphasize that these structural challenges not only limit the role of pedagogical supervision but also reduce its capacity to effectively support continuous formative practices in institutions. Nascimento et al. (2024) add to this discussion by advocating for the importance of autonomy and responsibility in the delegated supervision process—a model in which supervisors play a more active role in the continuous training of management teams. This more autonomous supervision approach enables more integrated and effective school management, directly contributing to better educational outcomes.

The studies analyzed point to an urgent need for the reconceptualization and restructuring of pedagogical supervision, considering both the challenges posed by emerging crises and the specific demands of different educational modalities. This perspective should go beyond a merely administrative vision, assuming a formative and collaborative role that not only monitors but also transforms pedagogical practices in diverse educational contexts, ensuring quality and equity in student training.

**3. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

This study is a descriptive review conducted through a theoretical survey in the SciELO database ([http://www.scielo.org](http://www.scielo.org" \t "_new)) and the CAPES Journal Portal ([http://www.periodicos.capes.gov.br](http://www.periodicos.capes.gov.br" \t "_new)). The descriptors used were “pedagogical supervision,” “teacher training,” and “higher education,” selecting articles published between 2021 and 2024. The final sample consisted of eight articles that directly address the challenges, practices, and transformations of pedagogical supervision in different educational contexts, including basic education, higher education, professional training, and inclusive education.

**4. RESULTS**

From the analysis of the selected articles, significant aspects related to the challenges faced by pedagogical supervision in the current educational context were identified. These findings are summarized in **Table 1**, which presents a comparative synthesis of the main conclusions from the reviewed studies.

**Table 1 – Comparative synthesis of the main findings from the analyzed studies**

| **Study** | **Context** | **Main Findings Identified** | **Comparison with the Literature** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Greia e Uagire (2023) | Higher Education in Mozambique | Supervision with little structure, insufficient resources, selection based on administrative positions, and lack of continuous training. | Confirms Lopes and Henriques' (2024) view on directive models and insufficient continuous training practices. |
| Nicaquela and Assane (2021) | Basic Education in Mozambique | Supervision is perceived as an administrative and punitive practice, with little contribution to teachers' continuous training. | In line with Negreiro and Gonçalves (2023), who also highlight superficial supervision focused on oversight. |
| Lopes and Henriques (2024) | Professional Training in Portugal | Hierarchical and directive supervision, with unstructured practices and limited formative impact on pedagogical change. | Corroborates the findings of Nascimento et al. (2024), highlighting the need for collaborative practices. |
| Nascimento *et al*. (2024) | SESI-SP Network, Brazil | Evolution of supervision from an oversight model to a collaborative approach, focused on the continuous training of educational managers. | Differs from the directive models identified in Mozambique (Greia & Uagire, 2023), showing significant progress. |
| Negreiro and Gonçalves (2023) | Inclusive Special Education in Joinville-SC | Supervision limited to monitoring, without in-depth engagement in inclusive pedagogical practices. | Similar to the limited model identified by Nicaquela and Assane (2021), with little formative influence. |
| Carvalho, Carvalho and Barbosa (2021) | Hybrid Education During the Pandemic (Tocantins, Brazil) | Supervision played a strategic role in emergency adaptations, highlighting the need for technological and relational skills. | Reinforces the findings of Reis, Vito, and Picelli (2021) on the importance of digital technologies in pedagogical supervision. |
| Reis, Vito and Picelli (2021) | Estágio supervisionado remoto (Paraná, Brasil) | Adaptação bem-sucedida às tecnologias digitais para a realização do estágio supervisionado durante a pandemia. | Complements Carvalho, Carvalho, and Barbosa (2021), highlighting the positive potential of ICTs in pedagogical supervision. |
| Carvalho and Oliveira (2022) | PNE Goals (Brazil) | Structural and budgetary limitations negatively affect the effectiveness of pedagogical supervision practices in higher education. | Confirms the findings of Greia and Uagire (2023) regarding structural and economic difficulties. |

Source: Research data.

The results presented in **Table 1** highlight that, despite conceptual and methodological advances, pedagogical supervision still faces considerable practical challenges that limit its effectiveness. There is a clear predominance of directive and administrative practices in specific contexts, as identified by Greia and Uagire (2023) and Lopes and Henriques (2024), hindering an effective formative role. On the other hand, positive experiences reported by Nascimento et al. (2024) in the SESI-SP network demonstrate that it is possible to transition towards more collaborative approaches focused on continuous professional development.

Another relevant aspect is the urgent need for the integration of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs), as pointed out by Carvalho, Carvalho, and Barbosa (2021) and Reis, Vito, and Picelli (2021). The COVID-19 pandemic required an emergency adaptation of pedagogical supervisors, revealing that the proper use of digital technologies can significantly enhance the positive impact of supervision in the contemporary educational context.

Finally, the research by Carvalho and Oliveira (2022) reinforces that the challenges of pedagogical supervision cannot be isolated from public policies and the structural conditions of educational institutions. The broader scenario of economic limitations and educational policies directly influences the ability of supervision to achieve its objectives, thus requiring strategic actions and more consistent public policies to strengthen this fundamental pedagogical practice.

**5. CONCLUSION**

This literature review highlighted the various challenges faced by pedagogical supervision in the current educational context, particularly in response to demands imposed by health crises, structural limitations, and weaknesses in educational policies. The analyzed studies reveal a heterogeneous reality in which supervisory practices, in many contexts, remain anchored in directive and regulatory models with low formative effectiveness. On the other hand, successful experiences, such as those developed in the SESI-SP network and during emergency remote learning, demonstrate that collaborative approaches, combined with the strategic use of technology, have the potential to redefine the role of the pedagogical supervisor.

Pedagogical supervision must be rethought from a formative, dialogical, and integrative perspective, recognizing the teacher as a key player in the educational process and the supervisor as a partner in the collective construction of knowledge and pedagogical practice. Encouraging continuous training, investing in public policies that value education, and strengthening structural conditions in institutions are essential aspects for advancing high-quality supervision.

This research contributes to the understanding of the complexities involved in pedagogical supervision, providing a critical and up-to-date overview of its limitations and possibilities. For future investigations, it is recommended to conduct empirical studies that explore collaborative supervision strategies across different levels and teaching modalities, as well as analyze the impact of educational policies on the effective exercise of this essential function for improving the quality of education.

**Disclaimer (Artificial intelligence)**

During the preparation of this work, the author(s) used ChatGPT 3.5 to assist in the translation of the article. After using this tool/service, the author(s) reviewed and edited the content as necessary and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

**COMPETING INTERESTS DISCLAIMER:**

Authors have declared that they have no known competing financial interests OR non-financial interests OR personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

**6. REFERENCES**

CARVALHO, Edineide Paslandim Neto de; CARVALHO, Philipe Lira de; BARBOSA, Lêda Lira Costa. The relevance and scenarios of pedagogical supervision in the face of hybrid teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic in Tocantins. Research, Society and Development, v. 10, n. 12, e588101221055, 2021. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.33448/rsd-v10i12.21055>. Available at: <https://rsdjournal.org/index.php/rsd/article/view/21055>. Accessed on: March 18, 2025.

CARVALHO, Renata Ramos da Silva; OLIVEIRA, João Ferreira de. Expansion and quality of higher education: an assessment of goals 12, 13, and 14 of the National Education Plan - PNE 2014-2024. Avaliação, Campinas; Sorocaba, SP, v. 27, n. 02, p. 227-247, Jul. 2022. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1414-40772022000200002>. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/aval/a/9nWkRbmYZ9Q8LpGcXMgRPvM>. Accessed on: March 19, 2025.

GREIA, José; UAGIRE, João Flávio Amisse. The role of pedagogical supervision in the development of teachers' pedagogical practices in higher education in Mozambique: a case study at University YX in the city of Nampula. Njinga & Sepé, São Francisco do Conde (BA), v. 3, n. 1, p. 274-292, Jan./Jun. 2023. Available at: <https://revistas.unilab.edu.br/index.php/njingaesape/article/view/1136>. Accessed on: March 18, 2025.

LOPES, Fernanda; HENRIQUES, Susana. Pedagogical supervision in professional training: contributions to changing training practices. Dialogia, São Paulo, n. 48, p. 1-26, e26244, Jan./Apr. 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5585/48.2024.26244>. Available at: <https://periodicos.uninove.br/dialogia/article/view/26244>. Accessed on: March 20, 2025.

NASCIMENTO, Aline Luz do et al. Delegated supervision in the SESI-SP education network: autonomy and responsibilities in processes. Revista de Educação da Faculdade SESI-SP, São Paulo, v. 2, n. 1, p. 1-20, 2024. Available at: <https://revistacientifica.sesisp.org.br/index.php/nee_arandu/article/view/47>. Accessed on: March 20, 2025.

NICAQUELA, Wilson Profírio; ASSANE, Adelino Inácio. Pedagogical supervision and continuous training: myths and perceptions through teachers' narratives in the Monapo District. Práxis Educativa, Ponta Grossa, v. 16, e2116810, p. 1-17, 2021. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5212/PraxEduc.v.16.16810.014>. Available at: <https://www.revistas2.uepg.br/index.php/praxiseducativa/article/view/16810>. Accessed on: March 20, 2025.

NEGREIRO, Letícia Graudin de; GONÇALVES, Rosemari Conti. School supervision and its contribution to the teaching and learning process in inclusive special education. Monumenta – Revista de Estudos Interdisciplinares, Joinville, v. 4, n. 7, p. 126-152, Jan./Jun. 2023. Available at: <https://monumenta.emnuvens.com.br/monumenta/article/view/137>. Accessed on: March 20, 2025.

REIS, Elisangela Alves dos; VITO, Rosana Vasconcelos; PICELLI, Lucyelena Amaral. Higher education and remote teaching: supervised internship in Pedagogy courses during the pandemic. ReTER – Revista de Tecnologias Educacionais em Rede, Santa Maria, v. 2, n. 2, p. 1-15, 2021. Available at: <https://periodicos.ufsm.br/reter/article/view/65040>. Accessed on: March 20, 2025.

Agricola, B. T., van der Schaaf, M. F., Prins, F. J., & van Tartwijk, J. (2022). The development of research supervisors’ pedagogical content knowledge in a lesson study project. *Educational Action Research*, *30*(2), 261-280.

Coimbra, N., Pereira, A. V., Martins, A., & Batista, C. (2020). Pedagogical supervision and change: Dynamics of collaboration and teacher development. *Default journal*.

Marie, S. M. J. A. (2021). Improved pedagogical practices strengthens the performance of student teachers by a blended learning approach. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *4*(1), 100199.

Parviainen, P., Eklund, K., Koivula, M., Liinamaa, T., & Rutanen, N. (2024). Enhancing teachers’ pedagogical awareness of teaching early mathematical skills–A mixed methods study of tailored professional development program. Early Education and Development, 35(5), 1103-1125.

Bhuttah, T. M., Xusheng, Q., Abid, M. N., & Sharma, S. (2024). Enhancing student critical thinking and learning outcomes through innovative pedagogical approaches in higher education: the mediating role of inclusive leadership. *Scientific Reports*, *14*(1), 24362.

Kwok, A., De La Cruz, I., & Kwok, M. (2025). Clinical Teaching Learning Trajectory: Exploring Field Supervisor Written Feedback on Clinical Teacher Pedagogy. American Educational Research Journal, 62(1), 214-257.

Tarimo, P., & Lekule, C. (2024). Effect of instructional supervision on education quality in secondary schools in Kaham District, Tanzania. East African Journal of Education Studies, 7(1), 216-230.

Alam, Md. Jahangir, A. K. M. Mahmudul Haque, and Akter Banu. 2021. “Academic Supervision for Improving Quality Education in Primary Schools of Bangladesh: Concept, Issues and Implications”. Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies 14 (4):1-12. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2021/v14i330359.