

ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)



ISRG PUBLISHERS

Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci

ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)

Journal homepage: <https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss>

Volume – IV Issue - III (May-June) 2026

Frequency: Bimonthly



Teacher Profile, Readiness, and Instructional Competence of ARAL Tutors in the Implementation of the DepEd ARAL Program

LARRY T. FERNANDO, JR

Cagayan State University- Aparri Campus. Aparri, Cagayan

| **Received:** 22.04.2026 | **Accepted:** 26.03.2026 | **Published:** 04.05.2026

*Corresponding author: LARRY T. FERNANDO, JR

Abstract

This study examined the profile, readiness, and instructional competence of ARAL Tutors in the Camalaniugan District's Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program. It focused on describing the respondents' personal and professional characteristics and determining their level of readiness and instructional competence in implementing ARAL interventions. The study employed a descriptive research design, utilizing a validated survey questionnaire administered to 45 ARAL Tutors. Data were analyzed using appropriate descriptive statistical tools.

Findings revealed that the ARAL Tutors generally demonstrated a "Ready" level of readiness and a "Competent" level of instructional competence, indicating adequate preparation and teaching capability in delivering ARAL interventions. Strengths were evident in resource preparation, familiarity with ARAL guidelines, classroom management, assessment and feedback practices, and learner engagement. However, training and professional development emerged as a relatively weaker area of readiness.

Overall, the results highlight the importance of strengthening continuous professional development to further enhance teacher readiness and instructional competence. The findings provide essential baseline data that may serve as input in designing targeted capacitation programs to improve the implementation of the ARAL Program.

Keywords: ARAL Program; Teacher Readiness; Instructional Competence; Teacher Profile; Professional Development

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic severely disrupted education systems, resulting in significant learning losses and widening inequalities among students, particularly in reading, mathematics, and science. In the Philippines, this challenge prompted the implementation of the Republic Act No. 12028, also known as the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program, which aims

to provide targeted interventions such as diagnostic assessments, tutorials, and flexible learning modalities for learners from Kindergarten to Grade 10. Guided by policies of the Department of Education, including DepEd Order No. 018, s. 2025, ARAL seeks to address learning gaps while promoting equitable and inclusive education.

This study is anchored on the assumption that teacher readiness and instructional competence are central to the effective implementation of the ARAL Program. Teacher readiness includes instructional planning, resource preparation, professional development, and familiarity with ARAL guidelines, while instructional competence covers pedagogical skills, classroom management, assessment practices, and learner engagement. These are influenced by teachers' professional characteristics such as educational attainment, teaching position, and length of service. However, implementation is often challenged by factors such as limited resources, time constraints, and large class sizes. To cope, teachers employ strategies such as problem-focused and emotion-focused coping, adaptive instructional adjustments, and support-seeking behaviors.

Consequently, this study is supported by the Theory of Planned Behavior, which explains how attitudes, social expectations, and perceived control influence teachers' actions, and the Concerns-Based Adoption Model, which highlights the importance of addressing teachers' concerns in adopting innovations. The interaction of teacher profile, readiness, and competence, provides the basis for a capacitation plan aimed at strengthening ARAL implementation and improving learner outcomes.

Statement of the Problem

This study assessed the level of teacher readiness, instructional competence and coping strategies of Elementary and Secondary ARAL TUTORS of Camalaniugan District on the implementation of ARAL Program of the Department of Education. Specifically, it sought answers to the following queries.

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of the following variables?
 - a. Personal Profile
 - i. Sex
 - ii. Age
 - iii. Civil Status
 - iv. Economic Status
 - b. Professional Profile
 - i. Educational Attainment
 - ii. Teaching Position
 - iii. Length of Service
 - iv. Grade Level taught
 - v. Seminars and Training attended relevant to ARAL Program
2. What is the level of readiness of the ARAL Tutors in the implementation of ARAL Program in terms of;
 - a. Instructional Planning
 - b. Resource Preparation
 - c. Training and Professional Development
 - d. Familiarizing with ARAL guidelines/procedures
3. What is the level of teacher instructional competence in implementing the ARAL Program in terms of;
 - a. Pedagogical Skills
 - b. Classroom Management
 - c. Assessment and feedback practices
 - d. Learner Engagement Strategies

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study used a descriptive and correlational research design to examine the levels of readiness, instructional competence, challenges, and coping strategies of Elementary and Secondary

ARAL Tutors in Camalaniugan District as they implemented the Department of Education's ARAL Program. The descriptive part of the design helped identify and describe the tutors' personal and professional backgrounds and assess their readiness, instructional competence, challenges, and coping strategies. The correlational part examined how these factors were related and tested for significant differences across tutors' profiles. This design fit the study because it focused on analyzing current conditions and relationships among variables without changing them. The results were then used to develop a capacitation plan to address challenges in readiness and instructional competence in the ARAL Program.

Locale of the Study

This study was conducted in all public elementary and secondary schools in the Camalaniugan District, Division of Cagayan, where the ARAL Program is in place. These schools were selected because they offer a range of educational settings, with differences in resources, teacher training, and student populations. By studying the

whole district, the research gives a clear view of how the ARAL Program is used in different schools. This approach helped reveal patterns and differences in teacher readiness, instructional skills, challenges, and coping methods. Including schools with varied conditions also makes sure the results reflect real classroom situations and show where more support or resources might be needed to help all students recover their learning.

Respondents and Sampling Techniques

This study was conducted in all public elementary and secondary schools in the Camalaniugan District, Division of Cagayan, where the ARAL Program is in place.

These schools were selected because they offer a range of educational settings, with differences in resources, teacher training, and student populations. By studying the entire district, the research provides a clear view of how the ARAL Program is used across different schools. This approach helped reveal patterns and differences in teacher readiness, instructional skills, challenges, and coping methods. Including schools with varied conditions also ensures the results reflect real classroom situations and show where additional support or resources might be needed to help all students recover their learning.

Research Instruments

The main tool for this study was a questionnaire created by the researcher, based on the Statement of the Problem and related literature. The questionnaire has four sections. The first section collects information about the teachers' personal and professional backgrounds. The second section examines teachers' readiness to implement ARAL, including their planning, resource preparation, training, professional development, and knowledge of ARAL programs and guidelines. The third section examines teachers' instructional skills, such as teaching methods, classroom management, assessment and feedback, and ways to engage students. The fourth section explores the challenges teachers face and the strategies they use to cope, such as problem-focused and emotion-focused coping, adapting their teaching, and seeking support. Experts reviewed the questionnaire to ensure it was clear and relevant, and it was pilot-tested to assess its reliability. Some questions were adapted from existing validated tools and adjusted for the ARAL Program, making the questionnaire a reliable and suitable instrument for this study.

Data Gathering Procedures

The data gathering process began with the finalization of the research questionnaire aligned with the study objectives. The researcher secured ethics clearance from the institutional review board to ensure compliance with ethical standards in research involving human participants. A pilot test was then conducted to assess the clarity, reliability, and relevance of the instrument, with necessary revisions made based on feedback. Consent forms were distributed to respondents to ensure voluntary participation and understanding of the study's purpose and confidentiality. Permissions were also obtained from the School Division Superintendent and school heads before data collection. All gathered data were encoded in Excel for cleaning and analysis, while relevant literature was reviewed and properly cited to support the study. Finally, the data were analyzed, interpreted, and used as the basis for completing the research manuscript.

Data Analysis

This study utilized descriptive statistical tools such as frequencies, percentages, ranks, means, and standard deviations to describe the personal and professional profile of the teacher-respondents. A five-point Likert scale was employed to measure levels of readiness, instructional competence, challenges, and coping strategies in the implementation of the ARAL Program, with weighted means used for interpretation. Responses were categorized based on predefined scale ranges, where higher scores indicate greater readiness and competence, more serious challenges, or more frequent use of coping strategies, while lower scores reflect the opposite. Additionally, open-ended questions were included to gather supplementary qualitative insights.

Ethical Considerations

This study followed strict ethical standards to protect the rights, privacy, and safety of all participants. Before collecting data, written permission is obtained from the Schools Division Superintendent of the Schools Division Office of Cagayan to ensure full cooperation from schools and respondents. Participants were informed about the purpose of the study, the procedures involved, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Informed consent is secured, and participants are assured their responses will remain confidential and used only for academic purposes. Participation was voluntary, and no identifying information will appear in the report.

To maintain privacy, all data, including survey responses and focus group discussions, are stored securely and anonymized during analysis. The researcher personally administered and collected the surveys to ensure data integrity. Ethical clearance is obtained before the study begins, and all steps follow institutional and national guidelines.

Academic integrity is observed through proper citation of all sources. Tallied data will be retained for two years after the dissertation is finalized, then disposed of responsibly. These measures will ensure that the study is conducted with respect for participants and in compliance with ethical research standards.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Presented below are the tables of results and analysis providing discussions of the findings.

Table 1 Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 illustrates the profile variables of the ARAL Tutors.

Personal Profile

Table 1.1 ARAL Tutors' Personal Profile

Personal Profile	Frequency (n=45)	Percentage
A. SEX		
Male	7	16
Female	38	84
B. AGE		
55-61	4	9
48-54	11	24
41-47	5	11
34-40	9	20
27-33	16	36
Mean: 40.93 SD: 9.58		
C. CIVIL STATUS		
Single	12	27
Married	31	69
Widowed	1	2
Separated	1	2
D. ECONOMIC STATUS		
Middle Income	29	64
Low Middle Income	13	29
Poor/Low Income	3	7

Table 1.1 presents the personal profile of the 45 ARAL Tutors by sex, age, civil status, and economic status. The majority are female (84%), showing that ARAL tutoring in the district is mainly managed by women, while only 16% are male. Most respondents are aged 27–33 (36%), followed by those 48–54 (24%), with an average age of 40.93 years and a standard deviation of 9.58. This suggests most tutors are in their mid-career stage, bringing experience and productivity to the program.

Most respondents are married (69%), 27% are single, and a few are widowed or separated. Economically, most belong to the middle-income group (64%), followed by low middle-income (29%), and a small percentage in the low-income group (7%). Overall, these findings show that ARAL Tutors in the Camalaniugan District are mostly female, middle-aged, married, and financially stable, providing important context for understanding their readiness, instructional competence, and coping strategies.

Teachers' Professional Profile

Table 1.2 ARAL Tutors' Professional Profile

Professional Profile	Frequency (n=45)	Percentage
E. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT		
College	4	9
with MA	14	31

MA Graduate	24	53
with PhD	1	2
PhD	2	5
F. TEACHING POSITION		
Teacher 1	6	13
Teacher 2	7	16
Teacher 3	24	53
Master Teacher 1	4	9
Master Teacher 2	4	9
G. LENGTH OF SERVICE		
1-5	10	22
6-10	12	27
11-15	10	22
16-21	3	7
21-25	3	7
26-30	4	9
31 and above	3	7
H. GRADE LEVEL TAUGHT		
K-3	22	49
G4-G6	14	31
G7-G10	9	20
I. LENGTH OF TIME TO RELEVANT TRAININGS ATTENDED		
33-40	5	11
25-32	2	4
17-24	19	42
9-16	18	40
1-8	1	2

Mean : 21.55 SD: 6.61

The professional profile of the ARAL Tutors shows most are academically qualified and professionally experienced. A large majority have completed or are pursuing master's degrees, indicating strong commitment to professional growth. Most tutors hold the rank of Teacher III, with some promoted to Master Teacher positions. Many have taught for 6 to 15 years, suggesting they are mid-career and have adequate classroom exposure to support effective program implementation.

Nearly half of the ARAL Tutors handle Kindergarten to Grade 3, while others teach at the elementary and junior high levels, showing wide involvement across essential grade levels. Most tutors have attended a moderate number of ARAL-related trainings, averaging 21.55 training hours, though participation varies. Overall, the table indicates the ARAL Tutors are well-trained, experienced, and professionally prepared, which may

positively influence their readiness, instructional competence, and ability to handle challenges in implementing the ARAL Program

Table 2 Teacher Readiness

Table 2 illustrates the Readiness of ARAL Tutors in the implementation of ARAL Program in terms of Instructional Planning, Resource Preparation, Training and Professional Development, Familiarity with ARAL Guidelines and Programs

Instructional Planning

Table 2.1 Level of Readiness of the ARAL Tutors in the implementation of ARAL Program along Instructional Planning

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. I set specific, measurable learning targets aligned to ARAL objectives.	3.91	Ready
2. I diagnose learners' baseline skills to inform ARAL grouping.	4.02	Ready
3. I sequence ARAL activities based on learners' progression needs.	3.98	Ready
4. I allot realistic time-on-task for interventions within the schedule.	4.09	Ready
5. I prepare contingency plans for absences/interruptions.	3.89	Ready
Category Mean	3.98	Ready
Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. I have ready access to ARAL-aligned materials (worksheets, modules, scripts).	4.24	Very Ready
2. I adapt or create differentiated materials for diverse learner needs.	4.02	Ready
3. I can secure/prepare basic logistics (space, devices, printing).	4.11	Ready
4. I curate formative assessment tools suited to ARAL sessions.	4.04	Ready
5. I maintain an organized repository of ARAL resources for quick use.	4.11	Ready
Category Mean	4.11	Ready

The table shows that ARAL Tutors generally demonstrate a high level of readiness in resource preparation. Most indicators had weighted means above 4.00, falling under the descriptive values "Ready" and "Very Ready." The highest-rated item is having access to ARAL-aligned materials such as worksheets, modules, and scripts, with a weighted mean of 4.24, interpreted as Very Ready. This shows tutors are well-equipped with the instructional materials needed for ARAL implementation. Other indicators, such as securing basic logistics, maintaining an organized resource repository, and curating appropriate assessment tools, also received high ratings. These reflect tutors' preparedness in managing instructional resources effectively.

The category mean of 4.11, interpreted as “Ready,” suggests ARAL Tutors are adequately prepared in resource preparation. They can access, organize, and develop instructional materials and logistical requirements essential for ARAL sessions. While the findings show strong readiness, especially in access to materials, there is room to improve in creating differentiated resources to better address diverse learner needs. Nevertheless, the results indicate resource preparation is not a major barrier to effective ARAL Program implementation.

Training and Professional Development

Table 2.3 Level of Readiness of the ARAL Tutors in the implementation of ARAL programs along Training and Professional Development

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. I have attended sufficient orientations/trainings about ARAL.	3.58	Ready
2. I receive coaching/mentoring to improve my ARAL facilitation.	3.47	Ready
3. I actively seek CPD related to intervention/reading/numeracy.	3.44	Ready
4. I feel confident implementing strategies learned from training.	3.80	Ready
5. I share practices/learn from peers through LAC Sessions	3.58	Ready
Category Mean	3.57	Ready

The table shows the readiness level of ARAL Tutors in training and professional development. All indicators had weighted means from 3.44 to 3.80, interpreted as “Ready.” Feeling confident in implementing strategies learned from training had the highest mean (3.80). This indicates tutors generally feel capable of applying what they learned in ARAL sessions. Attendance in orientations and trainings (3.58) and sharing practices through LAC sessions (3.58) also received high ratings. This suggests collaborative learning and formal training contribute positively to tutors’ preparedness.

The category mean of 3.57, interpreted as “Ready,” shows ARAL Tutors have adequate exposure to training and professional development. However, slightly lower ratings for coaching and mentoring (3.47) and actively seeking continuing professional development (3.44) suggest room to strengthen support mechanisms. Overall, the findings indicate that while tutors are sufficiently prepared through training, enhancing mentoring, coaching, and continuous learning opportunities may further improve their readiness to implement the ARAL Program effectively.

Familiarity with the ARAL Program Guidelines/ Procedures

Table 2.4 Level of Readiness of ARAL Tutors in the implementation of ARAL Programs along Familiarizing the ARAL Program Guidelines

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. I understand the official ARAL guidelines (learner selection, scheduling, documentation).	4.07	Ready
2. I can complete required forms/reports for ARAL accurately and on time.	3.96	Ready
3. I can explain ARAL processes to learners and parents/guardians.	4.13	Ready
4. I can coordinate effectively with school heads and focal persons for ARAL.	3.98	Ready
5. I can coordinate effectively with the school heads and focal persons for ARAL.	4.00	Ready
Category Mean	4.03	Ready

The table shows that ARAL Tutors are generally ready to familiarize themselves with the ARAL Program guidelines. All indicators had weighted means from 3.96 to 4.13, interpreted as “Ready.” The highest-rated item is the ability to explain ARAL processes to learners and parents or guardians (4.13), showing tutors are confident in communicating program procedures and expectations. Understanding the official ARAL guidelines (4.07) and coordinating effectively with school heads and focal persons (4.00) also received high ratings, reflecting tutors’ familiarity with the program’s operational requirements.

The overall category mean of 4.03, interpreted as “Ready,” suggests ARAL Tutors clearly understand the program guidelines and can comply with documentation, coordination, and implementation requirements. This readiness shows tutors are well-oriented with ARAL policies and procedures, essential for smooth program implementation. While the findings are positive, continued orientation and support may further improve consistency in documentation and coordination across schools.

Level of Readiness of Aral Tutors

Table 2.5 Level of Readiness of ARAL Tutors in the implementation of ARAL Programs

Dimensions	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. Instructional Planning	3.95	Ready
2. Resource Preparation	4.11	Ready
3. Training and Professional Development	3.57	Ready
4. Familiarity with the ARAL Guidelines and Procedures	4.03	Ready
Category Mean	3.92	Ready

The table summarizes the readiness of ARAL Tutors across four key dimensions: instructional planning, resource preparation,

training and professional development, and familiarization with ARAL guidelines. All dimensions had weighted means from 3.57 to 4.11, all interpreted as “Ready.” Resource preparation had the highest mean (4.11), followed by familiarization with the guidelines (4.03). This shows tutors are most prepared in accessing and organizing instructional resources and understanding program procedures. Instructional planning (3.95) and training and professional development (3.57) also met the readiness level, though the latter had the lowest mean among the four dimensions.

The category mean of 3.92, interpreted as “Ready,” suggests ARAL Tutors are generally prepared to implement the ARAL Program. They possess the necessary planning skills, instructional resources, program familiarity, and training exposure for effective implementation. However, the lower mean in training and professional development indicates a need for continued capacity-building initiatives, such as enhanced coaching and sustained professional learning opportunities, to strengthen tutors’ readiness and ensure consistent program implementation across schools.

Table 3 Instructional Competence

This table illustrates the Instructional Competence of ARAL Tutors in terms of Pedagogical Skills, Classroom Management, Assessment and Feedback Practices, and Learner Engagement Strategies.

Pedagogical Skills

Table 3.1 Instructional Competence along with Pedagogical Skills

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. I use explicit instruction (modeling, guided practice, independent practice) in ARAL.	4.00	Competent
2. I differentiate tasks (by content, process, product) to meet learner levels.	3.93	Competent
3. I scaffold learning with prompts, visuals, and step-by-step supports.	3.91	Competent
4. I integrate evidence-based literacy/numeracy strategies relevant to ARAL goals.	3.89	Competent
5. I adapt pace and difficulty based on ongoing learner performance.	3.87	Competent
Category Mean	3.92	Competent

Table 3.1 shows that ARAL Tutors demonstrate a competent level of pedagogical skills. All indicators obtained weighted means from 3.87 to 4.00, interpreted as “Competent.” The highest-rated practice is explicit instruction such as modeling, guided practice, and independent practice, with a weighted mean of 4.00. This shows tutors consistently apply structured teaching approaches during ARAL sessions. Differentiating tasks (3.93) and scaffolding learning through prompts and visuals (3.91) also received high ratings, showing tutors respond to varying learner needs and levels.

The category mean of 3.92, interpreted as “Competent,” suggests ARAL Tutors effectively apply sound pedagogical strategies aligned with ARAL goals. They integrate evidence-based literacy

and numeracy strategies, adjust pacing and difficulty, and provide instructional support based on learners’ progress. These results indicate tutors possess the pedagogical competence needed to facilitate meaningful learning interventions, which is critical to the successful implementation of the ARAL Program.

Classroom Management

Table 3.2 Instructional Competence along with Classroom Management.

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. I establish and consistently reinforce clear routines for ARAL sessions.	3.98	Competent
2. I maximize engaged time by minimizing transitions and disruptions.	3.96	Competent
3. I implement positive behavior supports and corrective feedback fairly.	4.11	Competent
4. I keep ARAL group sizes and seating conducive to focused intervention.	4.11	Competent
5. I maintain a safe, inclusive, and respectful learning environment.	4.20	Highly Competent
Category Mean	4.07	Competent

Table 3.2 shows that ARAL Tutors demonstrate a competent level of instructional competence in classroom management. Most indicators have weighted means from 3.96 to 4.11, interpreted as “Competent.” Establishing clear routines (3.98) and minimizing disruptions to maximize engaged time (3.96) show tutors organize ARAL sessions effectively. The use of positive behavior supports and maintaining appropriate group size and seating arrangements both scored a higher weighted mean of 4.11, reflecting tutors’ ability to maintain order and focus during intervention sessions.

Maintaining a safe, inclusive, and respectful learning environment obtained the highest weighted mean of 4.20, interpreted as “Highly Competent.” This suggests tutors prioritize learner well-being and create a positive atmosphere for learning. The overall category mean of 4.07, interpreted as “Competent,” indicates ARAL Tutors are generally effective in managing classroom routines, behavior, and learning conditions. These results imply strong classroom management supports smooth implementation of ARAL interventions and enhances learners’ engagement and focus during sessions.

ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK PRACTICES

Table 3.3 Instructional Competence along with Assessment and Feedback Practices

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. I use quick checks (e.g., exit slips, oral drills) to monitor learning each session.	4.04	Competent

2. I provide timely, specific feedback that guides next steps.	4.07	Competent
3. I track learner progress systematically using simple tools/trackers.	4.09	Competent
4. I adjust subsequent sessions based on assessment results.	4.02	Competent
5. I communicate progress to learners and parents/guardians regularly.	4.16	Competent
Category Mean	4.08	Competent

Table 3.3 shows that ARAL Tutors demonstrate a competent level in assessment and feedback practices. All indicators had weighted means from 4.02 to 4.16, interpreted as “Competent.” The highest-rated practice is regularly communicating learner progress to learners and parents or guardians, with a weighted mean of 4.16. This shows tutors value transparency and stakeholder involvement in monitoring progress. Tracking learner progress using simple tools (4.09) and providing timely, specific feedback (4.07) also received high ratings. This indicates tutors effectively monitor learning and guide learners toward improvement.

The overall category mean of 4.08, interpreted as “Competent,” suggests ARAL Tutors consistently apply appropriate assessment strategies to inform instruction. Their use of quick checks, adjustment of sessions based on assessment results, and regular communication of learner progress reflect data-driven and learner-centered practices. These findings show assessment and feedback effectively support learning interventions and contribute positively to the successful implementation of the ARAL Program.

Learner Engagement Strategies

Table 3.4 Instructional Competence along with Learner Engagement Strategies

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. I use quick checks (e.g., exit slips, oral drills) to monitor learning each session.	4.09	Competent
2. I provide timely, specific feedback that guides next steps.	4.09	Competent
3. I track learner progress systematically using simple tools/trackers.	4.02	Competent
4. I adjust subsequent sessions based on assessment results.	4.00	Competent
5. I communicate progress to learners and parents/guardians regularly.	4.07	Competent
Category Mean	4.05	Competent

Table 3.4 shows that ARAL Tutors demonstrate a competent level of instructional skill in learner engagement. All indicators had weighted means from 4.00 to 4.09, interpreted as “Competent.”

The highest scores were in using quick checks to monitor learning (4.09) and providing timely, specific feedback (4.09). This shows tutors actively keep learners engaged and informed about their progress. Tracking learner progress (4.02) and communicating it to parents or guardians (4.07) also received high ratings, highlighting consistent monitoring and collaboration.

The overall category mean of 4.05, interpreted as “Competent,” suggests ARAL Tutors effectively sustain learner engagement during intervention sessions. They adjust instruction based on learner performance, provide meaningful feedback, and maintain regular communication with learners and stakeholders. These findings show tutors use learner-centered strategies that promote active participation and responsiveness, essential for achieving the ARAL Program’s goals.

Level of Instructional Competence

Table 3.5 Level of Instructional Competence of ARAL Tutors

Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1. Pedagogical Skills	3.92	Competent
2. Classroom Management	4.07	Competent
3. Assessment Feedback Practices	4.08	Competent
4. Learner Engagement	4.05	Competent
Overall Weighted Mean	4.03	Competent

Table 3.5 shows the overall instructional competence of ARAL Tutors in four key areas: pedagogical skills, classroom management, assessment and feedback practices, and learner engagement. All areas had weighted means from 3.92 to 4.08, all interpreted as “Competent.” Among these, assessment and feedback practices had the highest mean (4.08), followed by classroom management (4.07) and learner engagement (4.05). Pedagogical skills, though slightly lower, still earned a competent rating with a mean of 3.92. These results show that tutors consistently apply effective instructional strategies across teaching aspects.

The overall weighted mean of 4.03, interpreted as “Competent,” suggests ARAL Tutors have a strong level of instructional competence needed for effective program implementation. Tutors can manage learning sessions, engage learners, provide meaningful feedback, and apply appropriate teaching strategies. The findings show that instructional competence is a strength among ARAL Tutors and can support learner progress and the successful delivery of ARAL interventions.

Conclusions

The findings of the study revealed that ARAL Tutors in the Camalaniugan District are generally composed of female, middle-aged, married, and economically stable professionals with varied but relevant educational backgrounds, mostly holding master’s level qualifications and occupying Teacher III positions. In terms of readiness, the tutors demonstrated an overall “Ready” level across instructional planning, resource preparation, training and professional development, and familiarity with ARAL guidelines, indicating adequate preparedness for program implementation. Likewise, their instructional competence was rated as “Competent” across pedagogical skills, classroom management, assessment and

feedback practices, and learner engagement strategies, showing that they possess the necessary teaching capabilities to effectively deliver ARAL interventions. Overall, the results suggest that ARAL Tutors are sufficiently prepared and competent to implement the program, although certain areas such as continuous professional development still require strengthening.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, it is recommended that the Department of Education and school administrators strengthen continuous professional development programs, particularly focusing on coaching, mentoring, and specialized ARAL-related training to further enhance teacher readiness. Provision of sustained capacity-building activities such as regular Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions and targeted workshops on differentiated instruction and assessment strategies is also encouraged. School leaders may further support tutors by improving access to instructional resources and reducing administrative workload to allow more focus on teaching and intervention delivery. Additionally, future programs should prioritize addressing gaps in training and professional development to ensure consistent improvement in instructional competence and more effective implementation of the ARAL Program across schools.

Declaration of no Conflict of Interest

The author hereby declares no conflict of interest and this article is her original work.

REFERENCES

1. Alcosero, A., Carcueva, H., Abasolo, M. C., Arranchado, W. M., & Cabanilla, A. J. (2023). Preparedness of regular teachers in the implementation of inclusive education in the Philippines: A meta-synthesis. *International Journal of Research in Engineering and Science*, 11(3), 259–266. <https://www.ijres.org/papers/Volume-11/Issue-3/1103259266.pdf>
2. American Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences. (2026). Implementing academic recovery and accessible learning (ARAL) programs: A case study. <https://www.arjonline.org/papers/arjhss/v12-i1/6.pdf>
3. Bond, M., Bedenlier, S., Marín, V. I., & Händel, M. (2020). Emergency remote teaching in higher education: Mapping the first global online semester. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 17(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00206-5>
4. Bongco, R. T., & David, A. P. (2020). Filipino teachers' experiences as curriculum policy implementers in the evolving K to 12 landscape. *Issues in Educational Research*, 30(1), 19–34. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1243578>
5. Caspe, G. M. F., & Sarrosa, A. J. V. (2025). Teacher readiness for the implementation of the enhanced K–10 curriculum: Basis for support mechanism program. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(6), 2308–2345.
6. Ceremonia Cerda, J. Q. (2024). Contextual analysis of curriculum development in the Philippines: Progress and challenges. *Global Scientific Journal*, 12(11).

7. Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2020). School context and teacher well-being: The mediating role of coping strategies. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 86, 102889. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102889>
8. Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>
9. De Los Santos, H. B., Montecillo, F. T., & Escarlos, G. S. (2025). Learning recovery through distributed leadership: A review on the implementation of DepEd's ARAL program. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*.
10. Department of Education. (2020). DepEd programs and projects profile (as of December 31, 2020). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/DepEd-Programs-and-Projects-Profile_2020.pdf
11. Department of Education. (2021). DepEd programs and projects profile.
12. Department of Education. (2022). Basic education monitoring and evaluation framework (DepEd Order No. 29, s. 2022).
13. Department of Education. (2023). DepEd Order No. 013, s. 2023: Adoption of the National Learning Recovery Program. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
14. Department of Education. (2023). DepEd Order No. 014, s. 2023: Policy guidelines on the implementation of the National Learning Camp.
15. Department of Education. (2023). MATATAG curriculum. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/matatag-curriculum>
16. Department of Education. (2024). Implementing Rules and Regulations of Republic Act No. 12028.
17. Department of Education. (2024). What is ARAL Law? Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Law.
18. Department of Education. (2025). DepEd Order No. 018, s. 2025: Implementing guidelines of the ARAL program.
19. Department of Education – Region II. (2025). Division Memorandum Nos. 160, 348, 552, & 738, s. 2025.
20. Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181–199.
21. Desimone, L. M., & Garet, M. S. (2020). Best practices in teachers' professional development. *Psychology, Society & Education*, 12(3), 313–328.
22. Dizon, P. L. B. (2020). Adaptation and implementation of the new normal educational system in the Philippine setting.
23. Fuentes, M. B. (2025). Teacher experiences, challenges, and support needs in the implementation of the Philippine MATATAG curriculum. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(12).
24. Fullan, M. (2016). *The new meaning of educational change* (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.

25. Fullan, M. (2021). *Leading in a culture of change* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
26. GMA News Online. (2023). DepEd adopts recovery program to address learning loss amid COVID-19 pandemic.
27. Hattie, J. (2023). *Visible learning: The sequel*. Routledge.
28. Hwang, G. J., Wang, S. Y., & Lai, C. L. (2021). Effects of a social regulation-based online learning framework. *Computers & Education*, 160, 104030.
29. Moon, O. (2023). Teachers' readiness and teaching performance in inclusive education. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 6(1).
30. OECD. (2020). *Teachers and school leaders as valued professionals*. OECD Publishing.
31. Palestina, R. L., Pangan, A. D., & Ancho, I. V. (2020). Curriculum implementation facilitating and hindering factors. *International Journal of Education*, 13(2), 91–103.
32. Prudente, M. S., Garcia, J. A. S., Mistades, V. M., Roleda, L. S., & Talaue, F. T. (2024). Systematic review of professional development programs for teachers in the Philippines. *EDCOM II*.
33. Quijano, G. (2023). Assessing the K-12 program implementation in the Philippines. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, 14(1).
34. Republic Act No. 12028. (2024). *Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program Act*.
35. Schildkamp, K., Poortman, C. L., Luyten, H., & Ebbeler, J. (2020). Data-based decision-making in schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 31(2). Stronge, J. H. (2018). *Qualities of effective teachers* (3rd ed.). ASCD.
36. UNESCO. (2020). *Education in a post-COVID world: Nine ideas for public action*. UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*.
37. Ubanan, G. G., & Libradilla, D. L. (2026). Implementation of the ARAL program and its contribution to addressing learning gaps. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*.
38. Wiliam, D. (2021). *Embedded formative assessment* (2nd ed.). Solution Tree Press.