RESEARCH ARTICLE

JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research
Volume 2, Issue 8, Page 57-63 | Article No. 10
DOI: 10.4898/jener.v2i8.a10
ISSN: 7895-9216
Journal homepage: https://jenerjournal.com
Journal email: editor@jenerjournal.com

The School Heads' Readiness in the Implementation of Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program in the Public Elementatry Schools in Tagkawayan Districts I And II, Division of Quezon

Rey A. Delos Santos[1] & Jay Ar Recto, Ph.D[2]

[1]University of Northeastern Philippines, School of Graduate Studies
[2]Southern Luzon State University; University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:
Published: August 2026

Keywords:
Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning
Learning Recovery
School-Head Readiness
Educational Leadership
Tagkawayan

ABSTRACT

This study assessed school heads' readiness to implement the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program in public elementary schools in Tagkawayan Districts I and II, Division of Quezon, during School Year 2025–2026. A descriptive-evaluative-inferential design employed total enumeration of 38 public elementary school heads. Two researcher-made questionnaire parts measured readiness across curriculum and instruction, resource management, community engagement, school improvement, and monitoring and evaluation, together with implementation challenges and proposed solutions. Percentage, rank, weighted mean, and Wilcoxon–Mann–Whitney procedures were used at α=.05. All readiness domains were Much Evident: resource management ranked highest (M=4.05), followed by monitoring and evaluation mechanisms (M=4.00), school improvement (M=3.95), community engagement (M=3.92), and curriculum and instruction (M=3.88). No readiness-domain rank order differed significantly between districts (z=.15–.42, reported p=.3372–.4404). Challenges were also Much Evident overall (arithmetic domain mean=3.92), led by teachers' workload (M=3.98) and limited financial resources (M=3.96); none differed significantly by district (z=.07–1.29, reported p=.0985–.4721). Proposed solutions were Much Evident (M=3.94), with no significant district difference (z=.57, reported p=.2843). The findings indicate a shared readiness baseline alongside material implementation pressures. Sustainable ARAL delivery requires protected instructional capacity, reliable financing and resources, role clarity, stakeholder mobilization, learner-level monitoring, and evidence-linked improvement cycles. Because the results are perception-based and cross-sectional, they should guide implementation support rather than be interpreted as proof of program effectiveness.

1. Introduction

Learning recovery has become a central concern for education systems confronting persistent gaps in foundational literacy, numeracy, and science. When learners do not attain prerequisite competencies, the effects accumulate across grade levels: access to increasingly complex content narrows, classroom differentiation becomes more difficult, and the risk of disengagement grows. The Philippines' learning-poverty profile has underscored the urgency of structured, timely, and sustained intervention rather than reliance on ordinary classroom progression alone (World Bank & UNESCO, 2022).

Republic Act No. 12028 institutionalized the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning Program as a free national intervention for learners who require support in meeting grade-level competencies. The statute covers identified learners from Kindergarten to Grade 10 and emphasizes systematic tutorials, appropriate learning resources, careful learner assessment, trained tutors, accessible delivery modes, and attention to learners' holistic well-being (Republic Act No. 12028, 2024). The implementing rules were subsequently disseminated through Department of Education Memorandum No. 58, s. 2025 (Department of Education, 2025).

A national policy, however, acquires educational value only through school-level implementation. School heads must translate statutory and departmental requirements into learner identification, scheduling, tutor deployment, instructional coordination, resource provision, stakeholder communication, safeguarding, monitoring, and corrective action. The Governance of Basic Education Act locates school leaders within a decentralized management structure in which they are responsible for creating conditions that support teaching and learning while remaining accountable to system standards and community needs (Republic Act No. 9155, 2001).

Readiness is therefore multidimensional. Curriculum and instructional readiness concerns the alignment of diagnostic evidence, intervention content, tutoring, and classroom instruction. Resource-management readiness addresses the availability and responsible use of funds, learning materials, spaces, technology, and personnel. Community engagement concerns communication, family participation, volunteer mobilization, and inter-organizational support. School improvement connects ARAL activities with institutional priorities, while monitoring and evaluation convert implementation and learner evidence into decisions.

Implementation research consistently distinguishes adoption from effective delivery. Policies may be formally accepted while staffing, time, materials, coaching, data routines, or local ownership remain insufficient. Core implementation components—selection, training, coaching, performance assessment, administrative support, and systems intervention—must operate together if a program is to be delivered with quality and sustained over time (Fixsen et al., 2005). Likewise, durable reform requires depth, ownership, spread, and continuity rather than temporary compliance (Coburn, 2003).

The demands of ARAL make this distinction particularly important. Tutorial support adds coordination and instructional tasks to existing school routines. School heads must protect teachers and tutors from unmanageable workload, secure resources without displacing essential services, maintain accurate learner records, build family trust, and ensure that assessment information leads to appropriate intervention. A high readiness rating may signal confidence and established routines, but it does not eliminate operational constraints or verify implementation fidelity.

Tagkawayan Districts I and II operate within the same national and divisional policy environment, yet their schools may differ in geography, staffing, enrolment, material resources, community networks, and local administrative capacity. Comparing domain rank orders can reveal whether the districts prioritize readiness indicators or challenges differently. A non-significant result should be read cautiously: it indicates that the reported analysis did not establish a difference, not that schools or districts are identical.

The present study provides an early implementation baseline from the perspective of all 38 identified public elementary school heads in the two districts. Its contribution lies in bringing together readiness, challenges, solution priorities, and policy implications at the point where a national learning-recovery mandate becomes a local management responsibility. The findings are interpreted as perception-based evidence and are not extended to causal claims about learner achievement or program effectiveness.

1.1 Research Purpose and Analytical Focus

The study determined the extent of school heads' readiness for ARAL implementation across curriculum and instruction, resource management, community engagement, school improvement, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. It also examined whether the districts differed significantly in the rank ordering of these readiness domains.

A second analytical focus concerned implementation challenges: limited financial resources, teachers' workload, administrative and stakeholder support, learning delivery, monitoring and evaluation, and data-driven intervention. The study assessed proposed solutions, tested district differences in the rank orders of challenges and solutions, and developed policy recommendations from the resulting evidence.

For this journal analysis, readiness denotes the reported extent to which enabling practices and conditions were evident. It is not treated as a validated measure of actual implementation fidelity, tutor performance, learner participation, or academic recovery. This boundary preserves the practical value of the findings while avoiding claims that the design did not test.

1.2 Conceptual and Empirical Synthesis

The analytical framework integrates systems thinking, implementation science, and continuous improvement. ARAL delivery is treated as a connected system in which learner diagnosis informs instructional design; instructional design shapes staffing, scheduling, and resource requirements; implementation produces monitoring evidence; and evidence supports adaptation. A failure at one point—such as delayed materials, insufficient tutor time, unclear learner data, or weak family communication—can reduce the effectiveness of the entire intervention chain.

Readiness domains function as enabling capacities. Curriculum leadership establishes instructional coherence; resource management makes delivery feasible; community engagement builds legitimacy and support; school-improvement integration embeds the program within institutional priorities; and monitoring and evaluation sustain learning from implementation. The domains are analytically distinct but operationally interdependent.

Challenges represent implementation pressures rather than simple opposites of readiness. A school head may demonstrate strong planning and monitoring while still facing constrained funds or excessive workload. High ratings for both readiness and challenges are therefore not contradictory. They suggest that leaders perceive substantial capacity while also recognizing the intensity of the conditions under which that capacity must be exercised.

Continuous-improvement theory adds a disciplined response: schools identify a specific problem, examine local evidence, test a manageable change, study results, and refine practice (Bryk et al., 2015). For ARAL, this requires short feedback cycles linking attendance, dosage, learner progress, tutor support, resource use, and implementation barriers. Readiness becomes meaningful when it generates reliable routines and measurable improvement.

2. Methodology

The study used a descriptive-evaluative-inferential survey design. The descriptive component summarized the extent of readiness, challenges, and proposed solutions; the evaluative component interpreted the reported ratings; and the inferential component compared rank orders between Tagkawayan Districts I and II.

Total enumeration was employed for the identified population of 38 public elementary school heads from the two districts. Including the complete identified group strengthens the direct relevance of the profile to these schools, although it does not remove non-sampling error or support generalization beyond the study setting without additional evidence.

Data were gathered through a two-part researcher-made questionnaire. The readiness component covered curriculum and instruction, resource management, community engagement, school improvement, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. The implementation component covered six challenge domains and solutions offered to address them. The summarized study information did not report item counts, scale reliability, validation coefficients, or missing-response procedures; no unverified values are supplied in this article.

Percentage, rank, and weighted mean were used for descriptive analysis. Wilcoxon–Mann–Whitney procedures compared district rank orders at α=.05. The reported z and probability values guided statistical decisions. Because the available statistics concern rank-

order comparisons, they do not quantify the magnitude of school-level implementation differences or the association between readiness and learner outcomes.

Table 1. Research Design, Participants, Measures, and Analysis

Component	Specification
Design	Descriptive-evaluative-inferential, cross-sectional survey
Participants	38 public elementary school heads
Setting	Tagkawayan Districts I and II, Division of Quezon
Sampling	Total enumeration of the identified school-head population
Readiness domains	Curriculum; resources; community; improvement; monitoring/evaluation
Challenge domains	Finance; workload; support; delivery; M&E; data use
Analysis	Percentage, rank, weighted mean, Wilcoxon–Mann–Whitney; α=.05

2.1 Analytical Rigor and Boundaries

Total enumeration provides complete coverage of the identified school-head group and prevents the exclusion of smaller or less accessible schools from the intended population. Nevertheless, the 38 respondents represent one administrative setting and should not be treated as a probability sample of school heads elsewhere in Quezon or the Philippines.

Weighted means summarize the reported extent of each domain, while rank comparisons evaluate whether the ordering of indicators differed between districts. These forms of evidence answer different questions. Similar rank orders do not demonstrate equal means, equivalent implementation quality, or comparable learner outcomes.

The reported probability values were retained as presented. Future statistical reporting should specify whether probabilities were one- or two-tailed, provide U statistics and rank sums, report exact district counts and valid cases, and include an effect-size measure. These additions would make practical differences easier to judge even when $p>.05$.

The survey involved adult education professionals, but an institutional ethics approval identifier, consent procedure, and confidentiality protocol were not stated in the summarized study information. These details should be verified and inserted before submission to a journal that requires a formal ethics statement; none is inferred here.

Measurement credibility would be strengthened by reporting expert-review procedures, pilot testing, internal-consistency estimates, and evidence that the readiness and challenge domains are empirically distinguishable. Triangulation with schedules, learner profiles, tutor assignments, resource inventories, attendance records, monitoring reports, and assessment gains would further reduce common-method dependence.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Readiness for ARAL Implementation

All five readiness domains were interpreted as Much Evident.

Table 2. School Heads' Readiness for ARAL Implementation

Readiness Domain	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Resource management	4.05	Much Evident	1
Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms	4.00	Much Evident	2
School improvement	3.95	Much Evident	3
Community engagement	3.92	Much Evident	4
Curriculum and instruction	3.88	Much Evident	5
Arithmetic domain mean	3.96	Much Evident	—

Resource management ranked first, suggesting that respondents most strongly recognized the organizational provision and coordination of inputs required for implementation. Monitoring and evaluation followed, indicating a favorable perception of mechanisms for tracking progress and implementation conditions.

Curriculum and instruction ranked last. Its mean remained within the same favorable interpretation, and the .17 range between the highest and lowest domains is modest. The result nevertheless matters because ARAL is fundamentally an instructional intervention. Resource availability and administrative readiness create opportunity, but learner recovery depends on accurate diagnosis, appropriately sequenced content, sufficient tutorial dosage, responsive pedagogy, and alignment with regular classroom instruction.

The unweighted arithmetic average of the five reported domain means is 3.96. This synthesis describes a broadly favorable readiness baseline. It should not be interpreted as an implementation-fidelity score because the study did not report direct observations, administrative indicators, or learner outcomes.

3.2 District Differences in Readiness

No readiness domain showed a statistically significant difference in reported rank order between the two districts.

Table 3. Wilcoxon–Mann–Whitney Results for Readiness Domains

Readiness Domain	z	Reported p	Decision
Curriculum and instruction	.42	.3372	Not significant
Resource management	.30	.3321	Not significant
Community engagement	.15	.4404	Not significant
School improvement	.34	.3669	Not significant
Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms	.23	.4090	Not significant

All reported probability values exceeded .05. The analysis therefore did not establish a district difference in how the readiness indicators were ranked. This common pattern supports shared minimum standards, coordinated professional development, and common implementation tools across Tagkawayan.

Non-significance is not evidence of equivalence. The abstracted results did not include district means, rank sums, confidence intervals, or effect sizes. Schools may still differ in staffing, learner need, resources, or the quality with which routines are enacted. District-wide standards should therefore be combined with school-specific readiness audits and targeted technical assistance.

The shared ordering also creates an opportunity for joint improvement. Cross-district learning sessions can focus on curriculum leadership, learner grouping, tutor support, and evidence use while allowing schools to adapt schedules and resource strategies to local conditions.

3.3 Challenges Encountered in ARAL Implementation

Each implementation challenge was assessed as Much Evident.

Table 4. Challenges Encountered by School Heads

Challenge Domain	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Teachers' workload	3.98	Much Evident	1
Limited financial resources	3.96	Much Evident	2
Learning delivery	3.94	Much Evident	3
Monitoring and evaluation	3.93	Much Evident	4
Administrative and stakeholder support	3.85	Much Evident	5
Data-driven intervention	3.83	Much Evident	6
Arithmetic domain mean	3.92	Much Evident	—

Teachers' workload emerged as the most evident challenge. ARAL requires assessment, grouping, tutorial preparation, delivery, progress monitoring, coordination, and reporting in addition to regular responsibilities. If these tasks are layered onto existing work without protected time, differentiated roles, or adequate personnel, implementation quality and staff well-being may be compromised.

Limited financial resources ranked second and are closely connected to learning delivery. Tutorial materials, reproduction, connectivity, suitable learning spaces, monitoring systems, and personnel support all carry direct or opportunity costs. Resource planning should therefore identify recurrent requirements, not merely start-up needs, and should specify which costs can be absorbed, mobilized through legitimate partnerships, or elevated for district and division support.

Data-driven intervention received the lowest mean but remained Much Evident as a challenge. This result deserves attention because learner diagnosis and progress evidence are central to targeting. Schools need manageable data routines that answer instructional questions—who requires support, in which competency, at what intensity, with what response—rather than reporting systems that add workload without improving decisions.

3.4 District Differences in Implementation Challenges

No challenge domain differed significantly in reported rank order between Tagkawayan Districts I and II.

Table 5. Wilcoxon–Mann–Whitney Results for Challenge Domains

Challenge Domain	z	Reported p	Decision
Limited financial resources	.45	.3264	Not significant
Teachers' workload	.15	.4404	Not significant

Challenge Domain	z	Reported p	Decision
Administrative and stakeholder support	.08	.4681	Not significant
Learning delivery	.49	.3121	Not significant
Monitoring and evaluation	.07	.4721	Not significant
Data-driven intervention	1.29	.0985	Not significant

All reported probability values exceeded .05. The evidence did not establish different rank patterns between districts, which suggests that workload, financing, delivery, support, monitoring, and data use are shared implementation concerns rather than isolated local problems. Data-driven intervention produced the largest reported z value and smallest probability, but p=.0985 remains above the prespecified .05 threshold. It should not be labeled statistically significant. It may, however, warrant descriptive follow-up because the result could reflect meaningful variation that the available rank-based analysis was not sufficiently sensitive to detect.

A common challenge profile supports division-level action on staffing, scheduling, financing, reporting simplification, and technical assistance. Local implementation plans should still be informed by each school's learner volume, tutor availability, transport and connectivity conditions, resource inventory, and existing intervention load.

3.5 Solutions Offered to Address Implementation Challenges

The proposed solutions were assessed as Much Evident, and their rank order did not differ significantly between districts.

Table 6. Overall Assessment and District Comparison of Proposed Solutions

Measure	Mean	z	Reported p	Decision
Solutions offered for ARAL challenges	3.94	.57	.2843	Not significant

The overall mean indicates broad endorsement of the proposed response strategies. The non-significant district comparison suggests that a common policy package is feasible across both districts, provided that implementation intensity and resource allocation remain responsive to school context.

Endorsement is not equivalent to feasibility or impact. Each solution should identify a responsible office or person, required resources, timeline, process indicator, intended outcome, and review schedule. Without these elements, recommendations may remain aspirational and contribute additional reporting rather than practical support.

Priority should be given to solutions that address several constraints simultaneously. Protected tutorial schedules, for example, can reduce workload conflict, improve learning delivery, and produce more reliable monitoring data. A standardized learner-progress dashboard can support instructional decisions while reducing duplicative reports. Coordinated partnerships can mobilize materials and volunteers while clarifying accountability and safeguarding responsibilities.

3.6 Evidence-to-Action Synthesis

The combined findings identify five implementation priorities that connect readiness strengths with the most evident pressures.

Table 7. Evidence-to-Action Synthesis for ARAL Implementation

Evidence Pattern	Interpretive Risk	Immediate Management Response
Resource management ranked first	Inputs may be available but not instructionally aligned	Link every resource request and allocation to diagnosed learner needs
Curriculum/instruction ranked fifth	Administrative readiness may outpace instructional coherence	Use common diagnostic, grouping, lesson, and progress-review protocols
Teacher workload ranked first challenge	Added tasks may reduce quality and staff well-being	Protect time, distribute roles, simplify reports, and monitor workload
Financial limits ranked second challenge	Delivery may depend on unstable or one-time support	Cost the full intervention cycle and establish accountable resource plans
All district tests were non-significant	Common patterns may conceal school-level variation	Apply shared standards with school-specific readiness and risk reviews

The readiness profile and challenge profile should be read together. School heads reported substantial enabling capacity, yet they also encountered substantial workload, financial, delivery, monitoring, and data constraints. This combination is consistent with an implementation system that is mobilized but under pressure.

Resource management is valuable only when resources are converted into sufficient, responsive instructional support. The relative position of curriculum and instruction indicates that the next stage of implementation should emphasize intervention quality: accurate learner placement, explicit competency targets, appropriately trained tutors, coherent materials, formative assessment, and adjustment based on learner response.

The policy objective is not to add another layer of compliance. It is to make delivery easier and evidence more useful. Shared templates, clear decision rights, protected schedules, responsive technical assistance, and concise dashboards can reduce coordination costs while improving accountability.

3.7 Integrated Interpretation of the Findings

The central finding is a favorable but demanding implementation context. School heads reported that readiness was Much Evident across all five domains, with particular strength in resource management and monitoring structures. At the same time, all six challenge domains were Much Evident, led by workload and limited financial resources. Readiness should therefore be understood as active capacity under constraint rather than as the absence of barriers.

The non-significant district comparisons indicate a shared pattern across Tagkawayan Districts I and II. This supports division-wide standards for learner identification, instructional planning, tutor support, resource accountability, stakeholder engagement, and monitoring. It does not justify identical resource allocations, because school-level need and delivery conditions may vary substantially.

The most consequential developmental priority is instructional coherence. ARAL succeeds when diagnostic evidence leads to the right learner receiving the right intervention at sufficient intensity and when progress information results in timely adaptation. Leadership routines, resources, partnerships, and reports should be evaluated by how well they support that instructional chain.

Workload and data use require joint redesign. Excessive documentation can weaken both delivery and data quality. Schools and district offices should identify the minimum evidence needed for learner placement, attendance, dosage, progress, tutor support, resource use, and safeguarding; remove duplicative requirements; and ensure that each data element has a clear decision purpose.

Finally, the study establishes perception-based readiness and challenge baselines, not program impact. The next evidence phase should connect implementation conditions with verified learner participation, progress, equity, and outcomes. Such triangulation would allow policymakers to distinguish visible activity from effective academic recovery.

4. Conclusions and Implications

4.1 Conclusions

School heads' readiness for ARAL implementation was Much Evident across curriculum and instruction, resource management, community engagement, school improvement, and monitoring and evaluation. Resource management was the strongest reported domain, while curriculum and instruction was the principal relative development priority.

The reported rank orders of readiness did not differ significantly between Tagkawayan Districts I and II. The two districts therefore share a broadly comparable readiness pattern, although equivalence of implementation quality was not established.

Implementation challenges were Much Evident across all six domains. Teachers' workload and limited financial resources were the most pronounced, followed by learning delivery and monitoring and evaluation. These pressures may limit the conversion of favorable readiness into sustained instructional quality.

Proposed solutions were Much Evident and showed no significant district difference. A common implementation framework is therefore warranted, but it should include responsible actors, resources, timelines, evidence, and differentiated school-level support.

The study does not demonstrate that ARAL improved learner performance. Its findings provide a management baseline that should be paired with documentary implementation evidence and learner-level progress measures before claims of effectiveness are made.

4.2 Study Limitations

The cross-sectional design captures school heads' perceptions at one point in time. It cannot establish whether readiness preceded implementation quality or whether the ARAL Program improved learner outcomes.

The measures were based on structured self-report. Favorable self-presentation, recall error, differences in interpretation, and common-method variance may have influenced the ratings. Documentary evidence, observation, tutor and teacher perspectives, and learner-assessment records were not incorporated into the reported estimates.

The Wilcoxon–Mann–Whitney results were reported as z and probability values for domain rank orders. Rank sums, U statistics, exact district sample sizes, effect sizes, confidence intervals, and the rationale for directional testing were not available in the summarized report and should be included in a full statistical appendix.

The study involved only the school-head perspective. Teachers, tutors, learners, parents, district supervisors, and community partners may assess readiness and implementation barriers differently.

Item-level responses, district-specific means, reliability coefficients, implementation-fidelity indicators, tutorial dosage, learner attendance, and pre–post achievement evidence were not reported. The analysis therefore remains at the level of summarized domain perceptions.

4.3 Implications for Practice and Policy

District and division offices should provide a standardized ARAL implementation package that defines decision rights, essential records, learner-identification rules, tutor-support routines, progress-review intervals, safeguarding expectations, and escalation pathways. Standardization should reduce ambiguity and duplication while preserving school-level adaptation.

Workload protection should be treated as an implementation requirement. School leaders should map ARAL tasks, distribute coordination responsibilities, establish realistic tutorial schedules, integrate rather than duplicate monitoring records, and periodically review teacher and tutor workload with staff.

Resource plans should cover the entire intervention lifecycle: diagnostic assessment, learning materials, tutorial delivery, training and coaching, monitoring, maintenance, replacement, and evaluation. Legitimate partnerships with local government, civil society, families, and private organizations should be governed by transparent roles and accountability arrangements.

Instructional support should concentrate on learner grouping, explicit teaching of priority competencies, responsive pacing, formative assessment, and transition between ARAL sessions and regular classroom instruction. Coaching and collaborative review

should use actual learner evidence rather than generic compliance indicators.

Monitoring should connect implementation and outcomes. A concise dashboard should show eligible and participating learners, attendance and dosage, competencies addressed, progress status, tutor support, resource issues, and actions taken. Aggregated reporting should preserve confidentiality and equity while supporting district decisions.

5. Policy and Implementation Priorities

Table 8. ARAL Readiness and Implementation Policy Matrix

Priority Area	Recommended Direction	Expected Evidence
Instructional coherence	Standardize diagnosis, learner grouping, competency targets, lesson support, and progress review.	Learner profiles; intervention plans; progress records
Workload protection	Protect tutorial time, distribute roles, simplify reports, and review staff workload regularly.	Workload map; schedule; role matrix; review minutes
Sustainable resources	Cost the full delivery cycle and align funding, materials, spaces, technology, and personnel with need.	Costed plan; inventory; utilization and gap report
Stakeholder compact	Define family, volunteer, LGU, and partner roles, communication, safeguarding, and accountability.	Partnership plan; orientations; commitment and feedback records
Data-to-action cycle	Use a minimum learner dashboard and scheduled improvement reviews to trigger support and adaptation.	Dashboard; review log; documented corrective actions
Evidence and assurance	Triangulate self-ratings with observations, records, implementation fidelity, and learner progress.	Audit file; observation summary; outcome evaluation

6. Directions for Future Research

Future research should validate a multidimensional ARAL readiness instrument and report content-validity evidence, reliability, factor structure, and measurement comparability across school contexts.

Longitudinal studies should examine whether initial readiness predicts implementation fidelity, tutorial dosage, learner attendance, competency gains, and sustained recovery after controlling for school context and baseline performance.

Mixed-methods research should investigate how school heads, tutors, teachers, learners, parents, and partners experience workload, resource constraints, data systems, and instructional coordination.

Implementation studies should test whether protected scheduling, simplified reporting, coaching, resource packages, or progress dashboards produce measurable improvements in delivery quality and learner outcomes.

Comparative studies across rural, geographically isolated, urban, and resource-diverse settings should identify which elements require common national standards and which should be adapted locally.

References

[1] Bryk, A. S., Gomez, L. M., Grunow, A., & LeMahieu, P. G. (2015). Learning to improve: How America's schools can get better at getting better. Harvard Education Press.
[2] Coburn, C. E. (2003). Rethinking scale: Moving beyond numbers to deep and lasting change. Educational Researcher, 32(6), 3–12.
[3] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE.
[4] Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute.
[5] Department of Education. (2022). Basic Education Development Plan 2030. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.
[6] Department of Education. (2025). DepEd Memorandum No. 58, s. 2025: Dissemination of implementing rules and regulations of Republic Act No. 12028, otherwise known as the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program Act. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.
[7] Durlak, J. A., & DuPre, E. P. (2008). Implementation matters: A review of research on the influence of implementation on program outcomes and the factors affecting implementation. American Journal of Community Psychology, 41, 327–350. Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature. University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute.
[8] Fullan, M. (2007). The new meaning of educational change (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.
[9] Republic Act No. 9155. (2001). Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
[10] Republic Act No. 12028. (2024). Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program Act. Supreme Court E-Library. https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/2/97912
[11] Siegel, S., & Castellan, N. J., Jr. (1988). Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
[12] UNESCO. (2021). Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education. UNESCO.
[13] World Bank & UNESCO. (2022). Philippines learning poverty brief. World Bank. https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/099000207152223103