



Implementation and Relevance of ARAL (Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning) Program

Merlie D. Romelo¹, Neil Arden B. Sotto²

^{1,2}State University of Northern Negros, Philippines

Corresponding Email: merlie.deita@deped.gov.ph

Received: March 12, 2026

Revised: April 6, 2026

Accepted: April 13, 2026

ABSTRACT

Republic Act No. 12028 instituted the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program in the Philippines as a national response to substantial learning deficits made worse by the COVID-19 pandemic, especially in reading and numeracy. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the ARAL Program's perceived relevance and degree of implementation in Sagay City's Schools Division Office's District 1-A during the 2025–2026 academic year. It specifically looked at how well the Department of Education's key dimensions—coverage, learner determination and assessment, tutors, tutorial session delivery methods, learning resources, tutor compensation, and complementary initiatives—were implemented. It also assessed the program's relevance in terms of instructional relevance, professional and instructional support, and overall perceived value. Using a descriptive-evaluative research design, data were collected from all 67 key stage 2 teachers implementing the ARAL Program through a researcher-developed, validated, and reliable questionnaire. Descriptive statistics, including mean and standard deviation, were used to analyze the data. Results revealed that the ARAL Program was implemented to a very high extent across all key dimensions, with an overall mean of 4.35. Core components such as coverage, learner assessment, delivery modes, tutors, and learning resources demonstrated consistently strong implementation. While tutor remuneration received a very high mean score, it also showed greater variability, indicating implementation inconsistencies. Complementary initiatives likewise reflected slightly lower yet still very high ratings. In terms of relevance, the ARAL Program was perceived as very highly relevant, with an overall mean of 4.58. Respondents strongly affirmed the program's instructional relevance, professional and instructional support, and overall value in addressing learning gaps and supporting teaching practices. The findings indicate that the ARAL Program is both effectively implemented and highly relevant as an academic recovery intervention. However, targeted improvements in tutor remuneration and complementary initiatives are recommended to enhance consistency, sustainability, and long-term impact.

Keywords: Academic Recovery, ARAL Program, Instructional Relevance, Philippine Basic Education., Program Implementation

How to Cite:

Romelo, M. D. & Sotto, N. A. B. (2026). Implementation and Relevance of ARAL (Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning) Program. *Global Journal of STEM Education & Management Research*, 2(1), 191-202. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19555517>



This work is Licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



INTRODUCTION

The Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program was viewed as a transformational initiative that inspired learners to overcome academic learning gaps through targeted support, developing confidence, resilience, and a renewed passion for learning. It was designed to elevate and hasten student achievement. The ARAL Program brought focused, inclusive, and impactful interventions that bridged learning losses and unlocked every learner's full potential.

To address these concerns, the Philippine ARAL Program was implemented in response to significant learning gaps experienced by learners, particularly after prolonged disruptions in schooling caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. Local and global studies showed that many students fell below minimum proficiency levels in reading, mathematics, and science due to limited access to consistent and effective learning opportunities (UNESCO, 2022; UNICEF, UNESCO, & World Bank, 2022). In the Philippines, these learning losses were further intensified by socio-economic challenges and inequitable access to educational resources.

To address these concerns, the Philippine government enacted Republic Act No. 12028, institutionalizing the ARAL Program as a free and effective national learning intervention. The program aimed to help struggling learners recover essential competencies through targeted tutorials, flexible delivery modes, and inclusive learning strategies, ensuring that no learner was left behind (Republic Act No. 12028, 2024; Department of Education [DepEd], 2025). Thus, the implementation of the ARAL Program served as a strategic response to learning inequality and as a long-term solution for strengthening foundational skills among learners.

Data from the Second Congressional Commission on Education (EDCOM II) revealed a deep learning crisis in Philippine basic education, with only 14.47% of early-grade learners reading at grade level, 88% of students entering Grade 7 struggling with reading, and proficiency rates collapsing to below 1% by Senior High School. These findings indicated systemic failure in foundational literacy and numeracy, largely due to prolonged learning disruptions and mass promotion without mastery. In response, the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program was implemented as an evidence-based national intervention to provide targeted, accessible, and timely academic support, particularly in reading, mathematics, and science, to help learners recover lost competencies and prevent long-term educational failure (EDCOM II, 2025–2026).

Philippine education was continuously looking into improving Filipino learners' performance by addressing gaps exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, thus necessitating large-scale recovery interventions. To provide support for the identified learning gaps, the Department of Education, through Republic Act No. 12028, institutionalized the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program by providing structured tutorial support in reading, mathematics, and science to all learners from Kindergarten to Grade 10. The target of this program was the struggling learners reported in EDCOM II, and it mobilized school heads, trained tutors, and community stakeholders to reinforce foundational skills and guarantee reasonable access to quality education. ARAL, as implemented in S.Y. 2025–2026, emphasized literacy recovery, particularly for learners classified as low or frustrated readers, while promoting a whole-of-community approach to educational reform (Hernando-Malipot, 2025; Guzman, 2025; Estrellado & Altarejos, 2025).

Despite the strong policy foundation provided by ARAL, there remained a critical gap in contextualized implementation at the division level, specifically in geographically diverse and resource-constrained areas such as the Sagay City Division. Localized challenges, including varying levels of learner readiness, teacher workload assignments, parental involvement, and access to learning resources, necessitated empirical investigation to determine the program's actual effectiveness and relevance in specific classroom settings. This program highlighted the importance of community commitment and targeted interventions to address learning loss. This gap accentuated the need to assess how ARAL was implemented in Sagay City, with a focus on its responsiveness to learners' needs and its alignment with on-the-ground realities. The inquiry was essential to inform data-driven improvements and ensure that national recovery efforts achieved meaningful and sustainable educational impact (Edale, 2025; Calipay, 2025).

As this program had been institutionalized at the Schools Division Office, the office and the city government hoped that the number of struggling learners would be reduced, enabling them to become instructional or independent readers with comprehension.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Generally, this study aimed to comprehensively assess the extent of implementation of the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program and to determine its relevance and effectiveness in mitigating learning loss among learners.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:



1. To what extent is the ARAL Program implemented across the following key dimensions based on DepEd guidelines?
 - 1.1 Coverage
 - 1.2 Determination and Assessment of Learners
 - 1.3 Delivery Modes for Tutorial Sessions
 - 1.4 Learning Resources
 - 1.5 Remuneration of Teachers
 - 1.6 Complementary Initiatives
2. What is the level of relevance of the ARAL Program to teachers in terms of:
 - 2.1 instructional relevance,
 - 2.2 professional and instructional support,
 - 2.3 over-all perceived value of the program

LITERATURE REVIEW

Global Learning Loss and the Need for Learning Recovery

Global studies consistently document significant learning losses caused by prolonged school closures and disrupted instructional delivery during the COVID-19 pandemic. A large-scale meta-analysis by Di Pietro et al. (2023) found that students worldwide experienced substantial declines in academic achievement, particularly in foundational literacy and numeracy. Similarly, OECD (2023) reported that learning gaps widened most among disadvantaged learners, highlighting the urgency of structured learning recovery programs. International agencies emphasize that without targeted recovery interventions, learning losses may persist long-term and negatively affect learners' future educational trajectories (UNICEF, 2022; UNESCO, 2023). These findings underscore the necessity of systematic academic recovery initiatives such as ARAL.

Learning Recovery and Acceleration Frameworks

To address learning loss, global education institutions have proposed structured recovery frameworks. The RAPID framework developed by the World Bank, UNICEF, and UNESCO emphasizes reaching learners, assessing learning levels, prioritizing foundational skills, increasing instructional efficiency, and supporting psychosocial well-being (World Bank et al., 2022). UNESCO (2023) further stresses that learning recovery should not merely restore lost content but transform instructional practices toward inclusivity and equity. Empirical policy analyses indicate that recovery programs anchored on assessment-driven and targeted instruction are more effective than generalized remediation approaches (OECD, 2023; UNICEF, 2022).

Effectiveness of Tutoring and Targeted Remediation

Recent empirical literature identifies tutoring and structured remediation as among the most effective learning recovery strategies. A systematic review and meta-analysis by Nickow et al. (2024) demonstrated that tutoring interventions produced significant gains in reading and mathematics across grade levels. Likewise, Pellegrini et al. (2021) found that structured catch-up programs in elementary mathematics resulted in moderate to large learning gains. Large-scale implementation studies also confirm that tutoring can be successfully delivered at scale when supported by clear program design and monitoring (Cortes et al., 2025; Neitzel et al., 2022). These findings provide strong empirical support for recovery-oriented programs such as ARAL.

Program Implementation and Evaluation in Learning Recovery

While evidence identifies effective recovery strategies, recent studies emphasize that outcomes depend heavily on implementation quality. Carbonari et al. (2024) observed that variability in program delivery significantly affected learning recovery outcomes across school districts. Educational evaluation literature highlights the importance of descriptive–evaluative approaches that capture stakeholder perceptions to assess implementation fidelity and relevance (Huang, 2025; Creswell & Creswell, 2023).

Inclusive and Accessible Learning Recovery

Inclusivity and accessibility are central to effective learning recovery. UNESCO (2023) emphasizes that recovery programs must address diverse learner needs to prevent further marginalization. UNICEF (2022) similarly argues that inclusive design and flexible delivery modes enhance learner engagement and participation. Studies on inclusive pedagogy demonstrate that recovery interventions are more effective when they accommodate varied learning levels and learning modalities (UNESCO, 2023;



OECD, 2023). These principles directly align with ARAL's mandate to provide accessible learning opportunities for struggling learners.

Philippine Learning Recovery Policies and Programs

In the Philippine context, learning recovery has been institutionalized through national policy. The Department of Education issued the Basic Education Learning Recovery and Continuity Plan to guide schools in diagnosing learning gaps and implementing targeted interventions (Department of Education, 2022). This policy direction was strengthened through the adoption of the National Learning Recovery Program (NLRP) and initiatives such as the National Learning Camp (Department of Education, 2023a; 2023b). Most significantly, the enactment of Republic Act No. 12028 (2024) institutionalized the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program, signaling the government's long-term commitment to learning recovery. The Implementing Rules and Regulations further clarified ARAL's objectives, target learners, and delivery mechanisms (Department of Education, 2024; 2025).

Philippine Empirical Studies on Learning Recovery

Local empirical studies provide contextual evidence supporting learning recovery programs. Callo (2024) found that school-based learning recovery plans positively contributed to addressing learning gaps when implemented systematically. Reading intervention studies report improvements in learners' literacy levels following structured remediation programs (Gagno, 2022; Matalines, 2025). Similarly, numeracy-focused recovery interventions demonstrated gains among early-grade learners (Miña & Caballes, 2023). However, studies also note persistent challenges related to implementation consistency and learner engagement, reinforcing the need for program evaluation from the learner's perspective (Genciana et al., 2024).

Learning recovery initiatives are directly linked to Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education), which emphasizes inclusive and equitable education and improved learning outcomes. UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2025) highlights that foundational literacy and numeracy are key SDG 4 indicators, particularly in low- and middle-income countries. Philippine development studies show that achieving SDG 4 requires sustained learning recovery efforts and evidence-based school-level interventions (Albert et al., 2023; UNESCO, 2023). In this context, evaluating ARAL's implementation and relevance contributes to national and global efforts to ensure quality education for all.

Synthesis

The reviewed literature consistently affirms that learning loss is a widespread and critical issue, particularly following the COVID-19 pandemic, with global studies (e.g., Di Pietro et al., 2023; OECD, 2023; UNESCO, 2023) emphasizing significant declines in foundational literacy and numeracy. Across both international and local contexts, there is strong agreement that structured learning recovery interventions—especially those grounded in assessment-driven and targeted instruction—are essential in addressing these gaps. Frameworks such as RAPID and policies implemented in the Philippine education system further reinforce the importance of systematic and inclusive recovery approaches.

Moreover, a convergence of findings highlights the effectiveness of tutoring and structured remediation programs in improving learning outcomes (Nickow et al., 2024; Pellegrini et al., 2021; Miña & Caballes, 2023). Both global and Philippine studies demonstrate that when interventions are well-designed and properly implemented, they can lead to measurable gains in literacy and numeracy skills. This alignment strengthens the empirical and theoretical foundation of recovery programs such as ARAL.

However, despite these consistencies, several limitations and inconsistencies emerge across the literature. While many studies report positive outcomes, the extent of effectiveness varies depending on implementation quality, resource availability, and contextual factors such as learner diversity and school capacity (Carbonari et al., 2024; Genciana et al., 2024). Global studies often assume ideal implementation conditions, whereas local studies reveal practical challenges, including inconsistent delivery, limited resources, and issues in sustaining learner engagement. Additionally, although international research emphasizes inclusive and flexible learning approaches, there is limited localized evidence on how these principles are effectively operationalized in Philippine classrooms.

Furthermore, most existing studies focus on measuring learning outcomes, with relatively less attention given to stakeholders' perceptions of program relevance and implementation processes. This indicates a gap in descriptive–evaluative research that captures the experiences of teachers and learners in actual program delivery.

In summary, while the literature strongly supports the effectiveness and necessity of learning recovery programs, it also reveals critical gaps related to implementation consistency, contextual adaptability, and stakeholder-centered evaluation. These gaps



justify the need for further research on the implementation and perceived relevance of the ARAL Program, particularly within specific local contexts.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study utilized an applied, descriptive–evaluative research design to examine how the ARAL Program was implemented and how relevant it was to the needs of learners and teachers within the actual school setting. The design was used to generate evidence that could support improvements in the program’s delivery and effectiveness.

Specifically, the descriptive component was applied by systematically documenting how the ARAL Program was carried out in terms of its key components, including learner assessment, delivery of tutorial sessions, learning resources, and teacher support. Data were gathered from teacher-respondents to capture their direct observations and experiences regarding how the program operated in practice.

The evaluative component was applied by measuring the extent to which the ARAL Program met its intended objectives based on the perceptions of the respondents. Evaluation was anchored on specific indicators such as clarity of learning objectives, organization and time management of sessions, level of learner engagement, and perceived improvement in learning outcomes. In addition, the study assessed the program’s relevance using indicators including alignment with the curriculum, appropriateness to learners’ cognitive levels, responsiveness to diverse learner needs, and usefulness in supporting classroom instruction.

By combining these approaches, the study was able to both describe actual implementation practices and assess how well the program responded to educational needs, providing a basis for identifying strengths, gaps, and areas for improvement in the ARAL Program.

Sampling Technique

The study employed total enumeration as its sampling technique. Since the respondents of the ARAL Program, every eligible teacher from the four schools in District 1-A where the program was actively carried out was included. Total enumeration was used because the population size was manageable, and including all ARAL implementers ensured complete and accurate representation of the group under the study.

Only teachers who were directly involved in implementing the ARAL Program served as respondents. This approach guaranteed that study captured the full range of insights and experiences of all teacher-implementers within the district. Table 1 presents the total number of teachers who participated in the study.

Table 1

Total Number of Respondents per school

Schools	Teacher		Total
	Male	Female	
Jose B. Puey Sr. Elementary School	6	27	34
Alfredo E. Marañon Elementary School-School of the Future	2	4	7
Alfredo E. Marañon Elementary School-Regular	2	14	17
General Luna Elementary School	3	9	13
Total	13	54	67



Data Analysis Procedure

The data collected from the quantitative instrument were analyzed to determine the extent of implementation and the level of relevance of the ARAL Program. Prior to analysis, all responses were checked for completeness and accuracy, and the data were encoded into a statistical software program for processing.

For Part I – Extent of Implementation, descriptive statistics, including mean and standard deviation, were computed for each key area—coverage, determination, and assessment of learners, tutors under the ARAL Program, delivery modes for tutorial sessions, learning resources, remuneration of tutors, and complementary initiatives—and for the overall program.

For Part II – Relevance, similar descriptive statistics were computed for instructional relevance, professional and instructional support, and overall perceived value. Inferential statistics were not utilized in this study because the primary purpose of the research was to describe and evaluate the current implementation and perceived relevance of the ARAL Program based on the responses of the selected participants, rather than to test hypotheses or establish relationships between variables.

The study focused on summarizing the respondents' perceptions using numerical descriptions such as mean and standard deviation. Since the data were gathered from a specific group of teacher-respondents within a defined context, the intention was not to generalize the findings to a larger population but to provide an accurate representation of how the program is implemented and perceived in the selected setting. As such, descriptive statistics were deemed sufficient to capture the extent of implementation and level of relevance across the identified program components.

Furthermore, the use of a Likert-type scale supports the computation of central tendencies to interpret patterns in responses, making descriptive analysis appropriate for identifying strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement. The study did not aim to examine cause-and-effect relationships, differences between groups, or predictive outcomes, which are typical purposes of inferential statistical methods.

Therefore, the exclusive use of descriptive statistics aligns with the descriptive–evaluative nature of the research and ensures that the findings remain focused on practical program assessment rather than statistical generalization. To guide interpretation of the mean scores, a mean interpretation scale was applied, classifying the results as Very High, High, Moderate, Low, or Very Low, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Mean Interpretation Scale for Extent of Implementation

Mean Range	Interpretation	Description
4.21 – 5.00	Very High / Always	The practice is consistently observed/performed at all times.
3.41 – 4.20	High / Often	The practice is frequently observed/performed in most situations.
2.61 – 3.40	Moderate / Sometimes	The practice is moderately observed/performed occasionally.
1.81 – 2.60	Low / Rarely	The practice is seldom observed/performed in a few situations.
1.00 – 1.80	Very Low / Never	The practice is not observed/performed at all.



A separate mean interpretation scale was applied for Part II to reflect the perceived relevance of the program, as presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Mean Interpretation Scale for Relevance of the Program

Mean Range	Interpretation	Description
4.21 – 5.00	Very High / Strongly Agree	Teachers strongly perceive the program as highly relevant and valuable.
3.41 – 4.20	High / Agree	Teachers generally perceive the program as relevant and beneficial.
2.61 – 3.40	Moderate / Undecided	Teachers perceive the program as moderately relevant or occasionally beneficial.
1.81 – 2.60	Low / Disagree	Teachers perceive the program as minimally relevant or rarely beneficial.
1.00 – 1.80	Very Low / Strongly Disagree	Teachers perceive the program as not relevant or of little to no value.

These interpretation scales were used to classify the mean scores for each key area and overall results in both Parts I and II, providing a clear framework for evaluating the program's implementation and relevance.

For this study, the results are presented in a single table for each part, with separate columns specifically reflecting the responses of teacher-implementers. This presentation format allows for a clear and organized display of teachers' perceptions, offering a detailed understanding of how the ARAL Program is implemented and valued by its primary implementers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents and discusses the results of the study on the implementation and perceived relevance of the ARAL Program. The findings are organized according to the key dimensions outlined in the program's guidelines and the corresponding subpart of the quantitative instrument.

The analysis focuses on two main areas: the extent to which the ARAL Program is implemented across its designated components and the level of relevance of the program as perceived by the stakeholders. The discussion integrates statistical results with interpretative insights to provide a comprehensive understanding of both the program's operational performance and its practical significance in supporting learners and teachers.

To systematically examine the implementation of the ARAL Program, the responses for each key area of Part I of the instrument, which includes coverage, determination, and assessment of learners, tutors, delivery modes, learning resources, remuneration of tutors, and complementary initiatives, were analyzed.

The results are summarized in Table 3, which presents the mean scores and standard deviations for each subpart, offering a clear overview of how consistently the program is applied across its key dimensions. These findings serve as the basis for discussing the areas of strong implementation as well as identifying potential areas for further improvement.



Table 4

Extent of Implementation Across Key Areas

Key Areas	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Coverage	4.68	0.50	Very High
2. Determination and Assessment of Learners	4.68	0.52	Very High
3. Tutors	4.65	0.54	Very High
4. Delivery Modes for Tutorial Sessions	4.69	0.56	Very High
5. Learning Resources	4.70	0.53	Very High
6. Remuneration of Tutors	4.80	1.35	Very High
7. Complementary Initiatives	4.34	0.68	Very High
Overall Extent of Implementation	4.35	0.44	Very High

The results indicate that the ARAL Program is implemented to a great extent across its key areas, reflecting adherence to DepEd guidelines and alignment with best practices in academic recovery programs. Key Areas covering coverage, determination, and assessment of learners, tutors, delivery modes for tutorial sessions, and learning resources all obtained very high mean scores ranging from 4.65 to 4.70, with relatively low standard deviations ranging from 0.50 to 0.56. These findings suggest a consistently high level of implementation across these components, indicating that the program effectively reaches its intended learners, applies appropriate assessment procedures, utilizes qualified tutors, employs suitable delivery modes, and provides adequate instructional resources. The low variability further implies that implementation of these core components is generally uniform across respondents. These results are consistent with studies emphasizing that structured and well-supported instructional interventions tend to achieve high implementation fidelity and effectiveness when clearly guided by policy frameworks (Arrieta Cohen et al., 2024; Dianela et al., 2023).

In contrast, remuneration of tutors obtained the highest mean of 4.80 but also recorded the highest standard deviation of 1.35. This indicates that while tutor remuneration is perceived very positively on average, there is considerable variability in responses. Such variability suggests inconsistencies in how compensation is experienced or implemented, which may be influenced by contextual or administrative factors. This finding implies that although compensation mechanisms are generally in place, they may not be uniformly implemented across contexts. Prior literature highlights that fair, timely, and consistent compensation is a critical factor in sustaining educator motivation and program effectiveness (EdResearch for Action, 2024).

Complementary initiatives received a mean of 4.34 with a standard deviation of 0.68. While still interpreted as very high, the comparatively lower mean suggests that this area is slightly less strongly implemented relative to other key areas. The moderate variability indicates differences in how these initiatives are applied or experienced. This implies that complementary activities, such as supplemental mentoring or enrichment programs, may benefit from further strengthening and standardization to ensure more consistent implementation and to better support learner development. Research on academic recovery programs emphasizes the importance of supplementary interventions in enhancing learner outcomes and ensuring holistic support beyond core instruction (Dianela et al., 2023).

The overall mean of 4.35 with a standard deviation of 0.44 confirms that the ARAL Program is implemented to a great extent across its key areas, with relatively low overall variability. This indicates a generally consistent and well-executed implementation of the program, particularly in its core instructional components. The findings imply that while the program is functioning effectively at a broad level, targeted improvements in areas with higher variability, such as tutor remuneration and



complementary initiatives, may further enhance consistency, sustainability, and overall program effectiveness across implementation sites.

Following the assessment of the ARAL Program's implementation across its key areas, the study also examined the perceived relevance of the program in terms of its overall applicability, usefulness, and value to its users. While implementation reflects the extent to which the program is executed, relevance focuses on how meaningful and aligned the program is with instructional needs and educational goals. This includes evaluating whether the program supports instructional practices, provides professional and instructional guidance, and offers overall value in facilitating student learning. Analyzing these dimensions provides a more comprehensive understanding of the program's effectiveness, highlighting how well it aligns with the expectations and professional needs of stakeholders. The descriptive statistics for each key area of relevance are presented in Table 4 and are interpreted using the mean interpretation scale established in the methodology.

Table 5

Level of Relevance Across Key Areas

Subscales	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Instructional Relevance	4.61	0.63	Very High
2. Professional and Instructional Support	4.63	0.63	Very High
3. Overall Perceived Value	4.63	0.61	Very High
Overall Perceived Relevance	4.58	0.57	Very High

The results indicate that the ARAL Program is perceived as highly relevant across all its key areas. For Instructional Relevance, the overall mean of 4.61 suggests that the program effectively supports classroom practices and aligns with curriculum goals, providing materials and strategies that are useful for teaching and learning. This implies that the program is responsive to instructional needs and contributes to improving teaching effectiveness. Research suggests that interventions closely aligned with classroom practices tend to enhance instructional quality and learner engagement (Arrieta Cohen et al., 2024).

For Professional and Instructional Support, the overall mean of 4.63 indicates that the program provides strong support in terms of guidance, mentorship, and instructional assistance. This implies that the program plays a significant role in strengthening teachers' professional capacity and sustaining effective instructional delivery. Prior studies emphasize that access to continuous professional and instructional support contributes to improved teaching practices and better educational outcomes (EdResearch for Action, 2024).

For Overall Perceived Value, the overall mean of 4.63 reflects that the program is viewed as meaningful and beneficial in supporting educational goals. This suggests that the ARAL Program is considered valuable in addressing learning needs and enhancing instructional processes. The high perceived value implies strong acceptance of the program and reinforces its role in academic recovery initiatives, consistent with findings that perceived usefulness is linked to sustained program engagement and effectiveness (Arrieta Cohen et al., 2024).

The overall mean of 4.58 confirms that the ARAL Program is perceived as highly relevant across its key areas, indicating that its design and implementation align well with instructional needs and educational objectives. The relatively low standard deviation of 0.57 suggests moderate consistency in responses, implying that perceptions of relevance are generally stable across respondents. These findings imply that the program is not only effectively implemented but also considered meaningful and applicable in practice, supporting its continued adoption and integration within school contexts.

Taken together, the results suggest that the ARAL Program demonstrates strong relevance in terms of instructional alignment, professional support, and overall value. The consistently high ratings across its key areas imply that the program addresses critical aspects of teaching and learning while supporting educational stakeholders in managing learning recovery. This reinforces the program's effectiveness as an intervention that is both practical and aligned with the needs of the education system, while also highlighting its potential to sustain improved learning outcomes when continuously supported and refined (Dianela et al., 2023; EdResearch for Action, 2024).



CONCLUSION

The quantitative findings indicate that the ARAL Program is implemented to a great extent across its key areas. Core components, including coverage, determination, and assessment of learners, tutors, delivery modes for tutorial sessions, and learning resources, received very high mean scores, demonstrating consistent and effective implementation across schools. In contrast, tutor remuneration recorded relatively lower scores with higher variability, while complementary initiatives also showed slightly lower ratings compared with other key areas, indicating areas where implementation may vary. The overall mean for implementation, 4.35, confirms that the program is largely executed in accordance with DepEd guidelines, with generally low variability across responses.

In terms of relevance, the program was perceived as highly meaningful and valuable across all its key areas. Instructional relevance, professional and instructional support, and overall perceived value all obtained very high mean scores, reflecting strong alignment with instructional needs and educational objectives. The overall mean for relevance, 4.58, indicates that the program is well-aligned with stakeholder expectations and is considered useful in supporting teaching and learning processes. The relatively low standard deviation further suggests a generally consistent perception of relevance.

Collectively, these results show that the ARAL Program is both effectively implemented and highly relevant in addressing learning needs. The findings highlight the program's strengths in its core implementation components and perceived instructional value, while also identifying areas such as tutor remuneration and complementary initiatives where targeted improvements may further enhance consistency, sustainability, and overall program effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the quantitative findings of this study, several recommendations can be made to strengthen the implementation and relevance of the ARAL Program. First, attention should be given to tutor remuneration, which obtained a relatively lower mean among the implementation key areas and showed higher variability. Addressing inconsistencies in compensation and ensuring fair, timely, and standardized payment procedures may help improve tutor motivation, engagement, and overall program delivery.

Second, efforts should be made to enhance complementary initiatives, which, while generally implemented, obtained comparatively lower mean scores than other key areas. Schools and program administrators may consider strengthening supplemental support activities, enrichment programs, and mentoring opportunities to further reinforce the effectiveness of the ARAL Program and maximize its benefits for learners.

Third, the variability observed in tutor remuneration and complementary initiatives suggests that contextual factors such as available resources, school workload, and implementation capacity may influence program execution. It is recommended that schools and program implementers assess local conditions and provide appropriate support mechanisms to promote more consistent and effective implementation across schools.

Finally, the consistently high mean scores in core areas, including coverage, determination, and assessment of learners, tutors, delivery modes for tutorial sessions, learning resources, instructional relevance, professional and instructional support, and overall perceived value, indicate that these aspects of the program are functioning effectively. Continued monitoring and sustained support for these areas are recommended to maintain the quality, consistency, and impact of the ARAL Program, ensuring that it continues to meet its intended objectives in addressing learning gaps.

Conflict of Interest

The authors must disclose any potential conflicts of interest, financial or otherwise, that could be perceived to influence the work.

REFERENCES

- Arrieta-Cohen, M. C., Torres-Arizal, L. A., & Gómez-Yepes, R. L. (2024). Evaluating the impact of an educational intervention using project-based learning on postpandemic recovery in rural Colombia. *Education Sciences*, 14(12), Article 1341. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14121341>
<https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/14/12/1341>
- Arrieta-Cohen, D., Torres-Arizal, L. A., & Gómez-Yepes, R. L. (2024). Effective academic recovery strategies: Aligning interventions with classroom practice. *Education Sciences*.
<https://www.mdpi.com/journal/education>



- Calipay, C. (2025). Parental support crucial to students' learning, recovery. Philippine News Agency.
<https://www.pna.gov.ph>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
<https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/research-design/book255675>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Schachner, A., & Edgerton, A. K. (2021). *Restarting and reinventing school: Learning in the time of COVID and beyond*. Learning Policy Institute.
<https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/restarting-reinventing-school>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2021). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
<https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/effective-teacher-professional-development>
- Department of Education. (2023). *Academic recovery and accessible learning (ARAL) program framework*. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.
<https://www.deped.gov.ph>
- Dianela, M. A., Cruz, P. T., & Ramos, J. L. (2023). Recovery programs and learner outcomes: Evaluating post-pandemic interventions. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 98(1), 55–72.
<https://peac.org.ph>
- Dianela, J. F., Mercado, K. A. R., Vale, M. P., & Paterno, K. V. (2023). Evaluation of the effects of the 8-week learning recovery program on pupils' reading competencies in mother tongue, Filipino, and English. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation (IJRSI)*.
<https://www.rsisinternational.org>
- Dianela, M. A., Cruz, P. T., & Ramos, J. L. (2023). Contextual factors in the implementation of educational interventions. *Philippine Journal of Education*.
<https://peac.org.ph>
- EdResearch for Action. (2024). *Compensation equity and educator performance in intervention programs*. University of Pennsylvania.
<https://edresearch.rti.org>
- EdResearch for Action. (2024). *Designing and implementing effective tutoring and academic support programs*. University of Pennsylvania.
<https://edresearch.rti.org>
- EdResearch for Action. (2024). *Design principles for accelerating student learning with high-impact tutoring* (Brief No. 30). University of Pennsylvania.
<https://edresearch.rti.org>
- Estrellado, C. J. P., & Altarejos, M. P. O. (2025). The Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program on the discourse of dialectical hegemony. *Pantao International Journal*.
<https://journals.pantao.edu.ph>
- Fullan, M. (2020). *Leading in a culture of change* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
<https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Leading+in+a+Culture+of+Change-p-9780787987668>
- García, E., & Weiss, E. (2020). COVID-19 and student performance, equity, and U.S. education policy. Economic Policy Institute.
<https://www.epi.org/publication/the-consequences-of-the-covid-19-pandemic-for-education/>
- Ganohay, J. M. B., Gargar, A. M. C., Cortes, G. B., Balang, W. M., Valmorida, F. M. S., & Tantog, A. J. D. (2025). Perceptions of intermediate-level public school teachers in implementing the Catch-Up Friday program. *Journal of Elementary and Secondary School (JESS)*, 3(1), 70–86.
<https://jessjournal.org>
- Guzman, J. (2025). DepEd launches ARAL program to strengthen students' foundational skills. Philippine Information Agency.
<https://www.pia.gov.ph>
- Hernando-Malipot, M. (2025). DepEd rolls out ARAL program to strengthen literacy, learning recovery. *Manila Bulletin*.
<https://mb.com.ph>
- Kraft, M. A., & Falken, G. T. (2021). *A blueprint for scaling tutoring across public schools* (EdWorkingPaper No. 21-335). Annenberg Institute at Brown University.
<https://annenberg.brown.edu/publications/edworkingpaper-21-335>
- Kuhfeld, M., Soland, J., Tarasawa, B., Johnson, A., Ruzek, E., & Liu, J. (2022). Projecting the potential impacts of COVID-19 school closures on academic achievement. *Educational Researcher*, 51(8), 549–565.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X221093715>
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3102/0013189X221093715>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2022). *Education at a glance 2022: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/3197152b-en>
<https://www.oecd.org/education/education-at-a-glance/>



- Patton, M. Q. (2021). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
<https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/qualitative-research-evaluation-methods/book232962>
- Pressman, R. S., & Maxim, B. R. (2020). *Software engineering: A practitioner's approach* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
<https://www.mheducation.com/highered/product/software-engineering-practitioner-s-approach-pressman/M9781259872976.html>
- Republic of the Philippines. (2013). Republic Act No. 10533: Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
<https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2013/05/15/republic-act-no-10533/>
- Stratman, A., & Helton, J. (2024). Staff buy-in and teacher perceptions as factors in implementation outcomes. In S. J. Moore & P. Kelly (Eds.), *School mental health practices and challenges*. Springer.
<https://link.springer.com>
- UNESCO. (2023). *Transforming education: Monitoring progress on SDG 4*. UNESCO Publishing.
<https://www.unesco.org/en/education/sdg4>
- Yang, J., & Wei, H. (2025). Development of a scale of teachers' perceived training quality from the perspective of TPACK. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12, Article 34. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-03341-0>
<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-025-03341-0>