IJGGSD
ISSN: 3155-7716
International Journal of Global Goals and Sustainable Development
RESEARCH | INNOVATION | INCLUSION | SUSTAINABLE FUTURES
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65339/ijggsd.V1.I1.76

The Leadership Practices of the School Heads in the Implementation of the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program in the Public Elementary Schools in Polangui North and South District, Division of Albay

Jose Alberto S. Bonafe[1], Jina-Luz Z. Alfelor[2]
[1]Master of Arts in Education Major in Administration and Supervision, University of Northeastern, Iriga City, Camarines Sur, Philippines
[2]University of Northeastern Philippines, Iriga City, Camarines Sur, Philippines

Email: jose.bonafe@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the implementation of the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program and the leadership practices of school heads in public elementary schools in Polangui North and South District, Division of Albay. Employing a descriptive-correlational research design, data were collected from 42 randomly selected school heads during School Year 2025–2026 using a validated researcher-made questionnaire and structured interview guide. Data were analyzed through weighted means, Kendall's coefficient of concordance, and chi-square tests. Findings revealed that ARAL implementation was rated Much Implemented (overall mean = 4.37), with identification of learners' needs ranking highest (4.46) and accessibility of learning resources lowest (4.28). Leadership practices were rated Much Employed (overall mean = 4.39), with collaborative leadership ranking highest (4.46) and resource mobilization lowest (4.28). No statistically significant agreement was found among respondents' rankings of the implementation dimensions or leadership practices ($p > 0.05$). The findings indicate substantial reported implementation and leadership engagement, although priorities varied across participating schools. Strengthening resource accessibility, instructional supervision, diagnostic assessment, professional development, and stakeholder collaboration is recommended. The study was limited to school-head reports from two districts and did not directly assess improvements in learner achievement. Its findings provide evidence for improving school-based academic recovery policies and institutional practices, contributing to educational and institutional sustainability through Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education) and Sustainable Development Goal 17 (Partnerships for the Goals).

Keywords: *ARAL Program, Collaborative Leadership, Educational Sustainability, Learning Resources, Resource Mobilization, School Heads, Stakeholder Support*

1. INTRODUCTION

Learning recovery is not achieved by providing remediation alone. Diagnostic assessment is needed to identify individual learning gaps and adapt instruction (Nizet et al., 2023), while a meta-analysis found that formative assessment had a positive, although modest, effect on reading achievement in K–12 settings (Xuan et al., 2022). In the Philippines, earlier evidence from rural tertiary learners documented difficulties associated with limited learning resources and internet connectivity, illustrating an access concern relevant to educational planning, although not directly evaluating ARAL (Bustillo & Aguilos, 2022). More recent ARAL studies reported implementation constraints involving resources, learner participation, parental support, and tutor workload (Aguinaldo, 2026; Taray & Mepieza, 2026). Leadership is equally important. Philippine research has examined connections between school heads' instructional leadership and their supervisory performance (Go & Eslabon, 2024; Montales & Digo, 2024). A review specifically addressing ARAL has also highlighted the value of distributed responsibilities among school heads, teachers, tutors, parents, and local partners (De Los Santos et al., 2025). However, these sources do not establish how the specified implementation components and leadership practices are perceived and ranked by school heads in Polangui North and South District. The present study addresses this local evidence gap by examining the extent of ARAL implementation, the leadership practices employed, and the degree of agreement in respondents' rankings as a basis for policy recommendations.

Assumptions of the Study

The study was guided by the assumption that ARAL implementation can be assessed through observable school-level processes: identification of learners' needs, provision of targeted intervention strategies, accessibility of learning resources, teachers' capacity, monitoring and evaluation, and stakeholders' support (Department of Education, 2025; Nizet et al., 2023). It further assumed that school heads' practices can be described through vision-driven academic recovery planning, instructional leadership, resource mobilization, decision-making, and collaborative leadership, dimensions consistent with recent educational leadership perspectives (UNESCO, 2024). For statistical testing, the study posited the null hypotheses that there would be no significant agreement among respondents in their rank orders of the six implementation dimensions and, separately, of the five leadership-practice dimensions. These were research assumptions to be examined, not predetermined findings.

Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to determine the leadership practices of school heads in implementing the ARAL Program in public elementary schools in Polangui North and South District, Division of Albay. Specifically, it sought to assess the extent of implementation in terms of identification of learners' needs, provision of targeted intervention strategies, accessibility of learning resources, teachers' capacity, monitoring and evaluation, and stakeholders' support; test the significance of agreement among respondents' rankings of these six implementation dimensions; assess the extent to which school heads employ vision-driven academic recovery planning, instructional leadership, resource mobilization, decision-making, and collaborative leadership; test the significance of agreement among respondents' rankings of these five leadership practices; and formulate policy recommendations grounded in the findings.

Theoretical or Conceptual Basis

The study was informed by contemporary instructional, vision-oriented, and distributed leadership perspectives. The UNESCO Global Education Monitoring Report identifies setting direction, focusing on learning, developing personnel, and fostering collaboration as central

dimensions of educational leadership (UNESCO, 2024). Instructional leadership informs school heads' support for teaching, supervision, and assessment-guided interventions, while vision-oriented leadership supports coherent academic recovery plans. Distributed and collective leadership explain how responsibility for implementation may be shared among teachers, administrators, and stakeholders. Eckert and Morgan (2023) found that collective leadership can support coordinated school improvement, while De Los Santos et al. (2025) applied distributed leadership specifically to ARAL implementation. The school-improvement implementation perspective also emphasizes the importance of planning, contextual conditions, staff engagement, and continuous adjustment (Education Endowment Foundation, 2024). Accordingly, the conceptual basis treats the six implementation dimensions as descriptions of how ARAL is carried out and the five leadership dimensions as descriptions of how school heads organize and support that work. It provides a framework for interpreting reported practices without presuming that the descriptive study establishes causal effects on learner achievement.

The study aligns principally with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education), particularly its emphasis on equitable access and improved learning outcomes. Assessing the identification of learning gaps, targeted interventions, resource accessibility, teacher capacity, and progress monitoring can inform more inclusive and evidence-based support for learners who need academic recovery (United Nations, 2025; Department of Education, 2025). It also relates to SDG 17 (Partnerships for the Goals) through its examination of stakeholders' support and collaborative leadership involving school personnel, families, and community partners (De Los Santos et al., 2025). Its relevance to sustainability is therefore educational, institutional, and community-oriented: it seeks evidence that may help schools sustain coordinated recovery practices and strengthen accountable implementation, without claiming that the study itself demonstrates long-term SDG impact.

2. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design, incorporating descriptive, evaluative, and correlational approaches to examine the leadership practices of school heads in implementing the ARAL Program. The descriptive approach assessed the extent of program implementation and leadership practices, while the evaluative approach examined their levels across the identified dimensions. Statistical analysis was also conducted to determine the significance of agreement among respondents' rankings of ARAL implementation indicators and leadership practices.

Research Locale or Study Setting

The study was conducted in public elementary schools in Polangui North and South District, Schools Division of Albay, Philippines, during School Year 2025–2026. These schools served as the setting for assessing the implementation of the ARAL Program and the leadership practices employed by school heads in supporting academic recovery initiatives.

Participants or Data Sources

The respondents consisted of 42 school heads from public elementary schools in Polangui North and South District, Division of Albay, during School Year 2025–2026. The study reported the use of random sampling in selecting respondents. These school heads provided information regarding the extent of ARAL Program implementation and the leadership practices employed in managing and supporting its implementation.

Research Instruments or Materials
Data were collected using a researcher-made structured questionnaire checklist and a structured interview guide. The questionnaire contained 123 items organized into two parts. The first assessed the extent of ARAL Program implementation in terms of identification of learners' needs, provision of targeted intervention strategies, accessibility of learning resources, teachers' capacity, monitoring and evaluation, and stakeholders' support. The second examined school heads' leadership practices in terms of vision-driven academic recovery planning, instructional leadership, resource mobilization, decision-making, and collaborative leadership. The questionnaire underwent validation by a panel of evaluators composed of professors, the research adviser, and the Dean of the Graduate School. Their comments and recommendations guided the revision and improvement of the instrument. Following validation, reliability testing yielded a coefficient of 0.91, indicating a high level of internal measurement consistency as reported in the study.

Data Gathering Procedure
A formal letter requesting permission to conduct the study was submitted to the Schools Division Superintendent of the Schools Division of Albay for endorsement. The study utilized the researcher-made questionnaire checklist and structured interview guide to gather information from the 42 school heads concerning ARAL Program implementation and their leadership practices. The collected responses served as the basis for evaluating the identified implementation and leadership dimensions.

Data Analysis
The collected data were analyzed using frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance (W), and the chi-square test. Frequency counts and percentages were used to summarize responses, while weighted means determined the extent of ARAL Program implementation and the leadership practices employed by school heads. A five-point rating scale was used, with responses interpreted from Not at All to Very Much Implemented for program implementation and from Not at All to Very Much Employed for leadership practices. Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance (W), together with its corresponding chi-square test, was employed to determine the significance of agreement among respondents' rankings of the implementation indicators and leadership-practice dimensions at the 0.05 level of significance.

Ethical Consideration
The researchers requested authorization to conduct the study through a formal letter submitted to the Schools Division Superintendent of Albay for endorsement. This constituted the documented administrative permission procedure for conducting research involving school heads in public elementary schools. The original manuscript did not specify additional procedures concerning informed consent, confidentiality, anonymity, voluntary participation, or institutional ethical review; therefore, these were not presumed or reported as completed.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Extent of Implementation of the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program

3.1.1 Identification of Learners' Needs

The findings revealed that the ARAL Program obtained an overall mean of 4.37, interpreted as Much Implemented. Among the six implementation dimensions, Identification of Learners'

Needs ranked first, with a mean of 4.46, also interpreted as Much Implemented. This indicates that identifying learners requiring academic assistance was the most highly rated component of ARAL implementation. The result underscores the importance of diagnostic assessment in identifying learning gaps and determining appropriate instructional interventions. Nizet, et al., (2023), emphasized that diagnostic assessment enables teachers to identify individual learning needs and adjust instruction accordingly. Similarly, Epetia, (2022), highlighted the importance of assessment and differentiated support in planning learning recovery programs. These findings support the need for updated learner profiles, systematic assessment, and evidence-based intervention planning to ensure that academic recovery activities address learners' actual needs.

3.1.2 Provision of Targeted Intervention Strategies

Provision of Targeted Intervention Strategies ranked second, with a mean of 4.41, interpreted as Much Implemented. This indicates that schools reported substantial implementation of remediation activities, differentiated learning tasks, and instructional interventions intended to address identified learning gaps. The finding emphasizes the importance of aligning intervention strategies with learners' assessed competencies. Nickow et al. (2024), in a systematic review and meta-analysis of experimental studies, found that tutoring programs produced positive effects on student achievement, particularly when delivered through structured and sustained academic support. These findings provide evidence for the potential value of focused tutoring and small-group interventions, although they do not directly measure the effectiveness of the ARAL Program in the schools under investigation. School heads should therefore ensure that intervention schedules, instructional materials, and teacher support are aligned with identified learning needs.

3.1.3 Stakeholders' Support

Stakeholders' Support ranked third, with a mean of 4.40, interpreted as Much Implemented. This indicates that stakeholder participation was among the more highly rated components of ARAL implementation, reflecting the reported involvement of parents, parent-teacher associations, local government representatives, and community partners in academic recovery activities. The finding highlights the relevance of school-community collaboration in sustaining educational interventions. Arguelles, and Sarsale, (2025), found that stakeholder engagement practices in Philippine rural and remote schools involved communication, collaboration, participatory decision-making, and continuous monitoring. Likewise, the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning Program Act recognizes the involvement of stakeholders in supporting program implementation (Republic of the Philippines, 2024). Strengthening communication and clearly defined stakeholder responsibilities may therefore contribute to more coordinated learner support.

3.1.4 Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and Evaluation ranked fourth, with a mean of 4.36, interpreted as Much Implemented. The result indicates that schools reported substantial implementation of learner progress monitoring, assessment documentation, and evaluation activities intended to determine the progress of academic recovery interventions. The finding emphasizes the importance of translating assessment information into instructional decisions. Xuan, Cheung, and Sun, (2022), found that formative assessment had a positive, although modest, effect on reading

achievement in K–12 classrooms. The Learning Generation Initiative, (2024), further emphasized that school leaders need the capacity to interpret educational data, identify problems, and develop corresponding improvement plans. These findings suggest that monitoring should extend beyond documentation and support evidence-based adjustments to instructional strategies and learner interventions.

3.1.5 Teachers' Capacity

Teachers' Capacity ranked fifth, with a mean of 4.33, interpreted as Much Implemented. The result indicates that teacher preparation, professional competencies, instructional support, and readiness to implement academic recovery activities were substantially implemented, although this dimension received a lower rating than learner identification, intervention strategies, stakeholder support, and monitoring. The result emphasizes the continuing need to strengthen teachers' professional competencies in differentiated instruction, assessment, remediation, and learner support. UNESCO (2024) identified developing personnel and supporting professional learning as important responsibilities of effective educational leadership. Similarly, Laguerta and Gamba (2024) documented instructional and administrative support needs associated with implementing an eight-week learning recovery program in Philippine elementary schools. These findings support the provision of mentoring, coaching, Learning Action Cell sessions, and needs-based professional development to strengthen teachers' capacity to implement ARAL interventions.

3.1.6 Accessibility of Learning Resources

Accessibility of Learning Resources obtained the lowest mean of 4.28, although it remained within the Much Implemented category. This indicates that learning resource accessibility was positively assessed but represented the lowest-rated component among the six dimensions of ARAL implementation. The finding highlights the importance of providing sufficient, appropriate, and inclusive instructional materials for academic recovery. Ogembo, and Awori, (2025), found that access to appropriate learning resources was important for the educational performance of learners with hearing impairment, while Bustillo, and Aguilos, (2022), documented difficulties associated with inadequate learning materials, poor connectivity, and limited educational resources in the Philippine countryside. Although these studies involved different educational settings, they demonstrate the importance of addressing resource accessibility. School heads should therefore prioritize resource inventories, contextualized materials, accessible learning formats, and equitable distribution of instructional resources for ARAL beneficiaries.

3.2 Agreement on the Rank Orders of ARAL Program Implementation

The statistical analysis revealed no significant agreement among respondents in ranking the six dimensions of ARAL implementation. Identification of Learners' Needs obtained Kendall's W = 0.45 and χ^2 = 12.15; Provision of Targeted Intervention Strategies, W = 0.45 and χ^2 = 10.80; Accessibility of Learning Resources, W = 0.54 and χ^2 = 14.58; Teachers' Capacity, W = 0.53 and χ^2 = 12.72; Monitoring and Evaluation, W = 0.27 and χ^2 = 7.29; and Stakeholders' Support, W = 0.42 and χ^2 = 12.60. All tests were reported as statistically nonsignificant at the 0.05 level ($p > 0.05$). Accordingly, the null hypothesis of no significant agreement was not rejected for any of the six dimensions. The absence of statistically significant agreement suggests variation in how respondents prioritized different components of program implementation. Such variation may

reflect differences in assessment approaches, instructional interventions, resource availability, teacher readiness, monitoring practices, and stakeholder engagement, although these possible explanations were not independently tested. Epetia, (2022), emphasized that learning recovery programs require attention to differences in learners' needs and educational conditions. Nickow et al. (2024) demonstrated the value of structured tutoring, while Bustillo, and Aguilos, (2022), identified educational resource limitations that can affect learning participation. Xuan, Cheung, and Sun, (2022), supported the instructional value of formative assessment, whereas Arguelles, and Sarsale, (2025), emphasized systematic stakeholder management. These studies support the recommendation to strengthen common assessment procedures, intervention monitoring, resource coordination, professional support, and stakeholder collaboration to promote greater consistency in ARAL implementation.

3.3 Extent of Leadership Practices Employed by School Heads in ARAL Program Implementation

3.3.1 Collaborative Leadership

The leadership practices employed by school heads obtained an overall mean of 4.39, interpreted as Much Employed. Among the five leadership dimensions, Collaborative Leadership ranked first, with a mean of 4.46, also interpreted as Much Employed. This indicates that collaboration was the most highly rated leadership practice among school heads implementing the ARAL Program. The finding emphasizes the importance of shared responsibilities and coordinated school improvement initiatives. Eckert, and Morgan, (2023), found that collective leadership can support school improvement through shared professional learning, teamwork, partnerships, and evidence-based practices. Similarly, De Los Santos et al. (2025) discussed the relevance of distributed leadership to ARAL implementation, emphasizing shared responsibilities among school heads, teachers, tutors, parents, and community partners. These perspectives support collaborative planning, regular coordination, and clearly assigned responsibilities in strengthening academic recovery initiatives.

3.3.2 Instructional Leadership

Instructional Leadership ranked second, with a mean of 4.42, interpreted as Much Employed. This indicates that school heads reported substantial engagement in instructional supervision, teacher guidance, intervention monitoring, and support for classroom practices associated with ARAL implementation. The finding highlights the importance of maintaining instructional leadership during academic recovery. UNESCO (2024) identified a focus on learning, teacher development, and instructional support as major dimensions of effective school leadership. Ulit, (2025), also reported that instructional leadership practices, particularly clear academic direction, supervision, and responsive professional support, were associated with perceived improvements in teaching and learning processes in the Philippine context. These findings support strengthening classroom observation, instructional coaching, assessment-based planning, and constructive feedback to teachers implementing ARAL interventions.

3.3.3 Decision-Making

Decision-Making ranked third, with a mean of 4.41, interpreted as Much Employed. The finding indicates that school heads reported substantial use of decision-making practices related to learner identification, intervention scheduling, resource allocation, teacher support, and

monitoring of academic recovery activities. The result underscores the importance of evidence-informed decisions in managing school-based interventions. The Learning Generation Initiative, (2024), emphasized that school leaders need to understand educational data, identify instructional problems, and translate findings into improvement plans. Lee, et al., (2025), examined school leaders' data-informed decision-making and demonstrated the importance of considering the forms of data used and the contexts in which decisions are made; their study did not establish a direct association between the data-use practices examined and student achievement. Consequently, the present finding supports strengthening decision-making procedures based on reliable learner assessments and monitoring records without assuming that reported data use necessarily results in improved learning outcomes.

3.3.4 Vision-Driven Academic Recovery Planning

Vision-Driven Academic Recovery Planning ranked fourth, with a mean of 4.39, interpreted as Much Employed. This indicates that school heads reported substantial implementation of planning practices related to academic recovery goals, intervention priorities, instructional coordination, and program direction. The finding highlights the importance of translating educational goals into organized implementation activities. UNESCO (2024) identified setting expectations and establishing a shared direction as essential school leadership responsibilities. The Education Endowment Foundation (2024) likewise emphasized a structured but flexible implementation process involving exploration, preparation, delivery, and sustainability. These perspectives support the development of measurable academic recovery objectives, clearly assigned responsibilities, appropriate intervention schedules, and systematic monitoring procedures aligned with school improvement priorities.

3.3.5 Resource Mobilization

Resource Mobilization ranked fifth, with a mean of 4.28, interpreted as Much Employed. Although all leadership practices received positive ratings, resource mobilization obtained the lowest mean, indicating that it was the least highly rated leadership dimension in the implementation of the ARAL Program. The result highlights the importance of strengthening resource planning, stakeholder partnerships, and accountability in educational resource management. Dimacali, et al., (2025), identified grants, donations, partnerships, fundraising activities, and resource-sharing arrangements as strategies used by Philippine public schools to generate additional resources. Caparoso, and Paglinawan, (2026), likewise found significant relationships between resource mobilization practices and adaptive leadership competence among school leaders. These studies support strengthening resource inventories, needs-based allocation, external partnerships, and transparent monitoring of resources intended for academic recovery activities.

3.4 Agreement on the Rank Orders of Leadership Practices Employed by School Heads

The statistical analysis revealed no significant agreement among respondents in ranking the five leadership practices employed in ARAL implementation. Vision-Driven Academic Recovery Planning obtained Kendall's W = 0.42 and χ^2 = 10.08; Instructional Leadership, W = 0.30 and χ^2 = 8.10; Resource Mobilization, W = 0.40 and χ^2 = 12.00; Decision-Making, W = 0.34 and χ^2 = 11.22; and Collaborative Leadership, W = 0.34 and χ^2 = 10.20. All tests were reported as statistically nonsignificant at the 0.05 level ($p > 0.05$). Thus, the null hypothesis of no significant agreement

was not rejected across the five leadership dimensions. The lack of statistically significant agreement suggests differences in respondents' rankings of leadership practices, which may be associated with variations in school priorities, instructional conditions, resource availability, and stakeholder participation. UNESCO (2024) emphasized that leadership practices must respond to institutional circumstances and educational needs. Ulit, (2025), highlighted the relevance of instructional support and contextual conditions, while Caparoso, and Paglinawan, (2026), emphasized resource mobilization and adaptive leadership competencies. Lee, et al., (2025), further demonstrated the importance of examining the context of school leaders' data use, whereas De Los Santos et al. (2025) emphasized shared leadership responsibilities in implementing ARAL. These perspectives support strengthening alignment among academic recovery planning, instructional supervision, resource management, decision-making, and collaboration while allowing schools to respond to their specific circumstances.

3.5 Policy Recommendations for Strengthening ARAL Program Implementation

Based on the findings, five policy recommendations were formulated to improve ARAL implementation and the leadership practices of school heads. These involve conducting scheduled diagnostic assessments and maintaining updated learner profiles; providing regular instructional coaching and mentoring for teachers and ARAL coordinators; strengthening guidance on the appropriate use of printed, digital, and supplementary learning resources; integrating ARAL-related training and Learning Action Cell sessions into professional development programs; and conducting regular reviews of learner progress and intervention results to guide instructional adjustments. Responsibility for these activities is distributed among teachers, ARAL coordinators, school heads, learning resource coordinators, public schools district supervisors, and school monitoring and evaluation personnel. These recommendations are consistent with the implementation framework established under Republic Act No. 12028 and the Department of Education's ARAL implementing guidelines, which provide the policy basis for targeted learning interventions and coordinated program support (Republic of the Philippines, 2024; Department of Education, 2025). The Education Endowment Foundation (2024) emphasized the importance of implementation planning, staff engagement, monitoring, and continuous improvement. UNESCO (2024) likewise identified instructional leadership, collaborative practices, personnel development, and strategic direction as essential dimensions of effective educational leadership. Taken together, these sources support strengthening school-based systems for learner assessment, instructional intervention, professional development, resource allocation, stakeholder participation, and continuous monitoring to improve the consistency and sustainability of ARAL implementation.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concluded that the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program was much implemented in public elementary schools in Polangui North and South District, Division of Albay, while the leadership practices of school heads were much employed. Identification of learners' needs emerged as the strongest implementation dimension, whereas accessibility of learning resources received the lowest rating. Collaborative leadership was the most highly rated leadership practice, while resource mobilization ranked lowest. These findings indicate that school heads demonstrated substantial engagement in coordinating academic recovery initiatives, supporting instruction, and facilitating stakeholder participation, although resource-related concerns require further attention. The absence of statistically significant agreement

among respondents' rankings of both implementation and leadership dimensions suggests differences in perceived priorities across the participating schools. Overall, the study provides localized evidence of ARAL implementation and school leadership practices, establishing an empirical basis for strengthening instructional supervision, resource management, stakeholder collaboration, and school-based academic recovery policies.

Based on the findings, school heads and ARAL coordinators should strengthen the implementation of systematic diagnostic assessments, maintain updated learner profiles, and ensure that intervention strategies address identified learning gaps. Priority should be given to improving the accessibility of learning resources through regular resource inventories, appropriate allocation of instructional materials, and stronger partnerships with parents, local government units, and community stakeholders. School heads and head teachers should sustain instructional leadership through classroom supervision, mentoring, coaching, and professional development activities focused on remediation and differentiated instruction. Public Schools District Supervisors and Education Program Supervisors should provide technical assistance in academic recovery planning, resource mobilization, and evidence-based decision-making. School Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinators should conduct periodic reviews of learner progress and implementation outcomes to support necessary instructional adjustments. Future researchers may examine the effectiveness of ARAL interventions in improving learners' numeracy skills, teachers' implementation challenges, stakeholder participation, and resource mobilization practices to inform further program improvements.

The study was limited to 42 school heads from public elementary schools in Polangui North and South District, Division of Albay, during School Year 2025–2026. Its descriptive-correlational design and reliance on a researcher-made questionnaire and structured interview guide focused on reported program implementation and leadership practices. Consequently, the findings may not represent conditions in other school districts or educational settings. The statistical analysis examined agreement among respondents' rankings rather than causal relationships or direct improvements in learners' academic achievement. Future investigations may involve additional school districts, broader respondent groups, longitudinal assessments, and direct measures of learner performance to provide a more comprehensive evaluation of ARAL implementation.

5. REFERENCES

Aguinaldo, M. (2026). Challenges encountered and strategies of the key stage 2 ARAL tutors in the implementation of the ARAL Program: Philippine education. *Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities,* *5*(2), 3528–3549. https://doi.org/10.62025/dwijmh.v5i2.335

Arguelles, R., & Sarsale, M. (2025). Stakeholder engagement practices in rural and remote schools: Insights from Filipino school leaders. *Issues in Educational Research, 35*(1), 42–60. https://www.iier.org.au/iier35/arguelles.pdf

Bustillo, E., & Aguilos, M. (2022). The challenges of modular learning in the wake of COVID-19: A digital divide in the Philippine countryside revealed. *Education Sciences, 12*(7), Article 449. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12070449

Caparoso, J. L., & Paglinawan, J. L. (2026). Psychological resilience, decision-making capability, and resource mobilization practices on adaptive leadership competence of school leaders. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science, 11*(4), 1056–1071. https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.110400071

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, 9(11), 929–934. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.91100076

Department of Education. (2025). *Implementing guidelines of the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program (DepEd Order No. 018, s. 2025)*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2025/06/13/june-13-2025-do-018-s-2025-implementing-guidelines-of-the-academic-recovery-and-accessible-learning-program/

Dimacali, V. N., Labao, N. M., Tayag, C. C., & Garcia, R. C. (2025). Exploring the external resource generation strategies of secondary public schools in San Luis, Pampanga. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 25*(3), 1399–1410. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2025.25.3.0877

Eckert, J., & Morgan, G. (2023). Collective leadership: A catalyst for school improvement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 31*, Article 80. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.31.7603

Education Endowment Foundation. (2024). *A school's guide to implementation* (3rd ed.). https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/implementation

Epetia, M. C. F. (2022, September 5). *Comments on Senate Bill No. 150, entitled "Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program Act": Describing the necessity of and the potential challenges in implementing learning recovery programs*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies. https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/document/1662510894_6317e72e79d60.pdf

Go, A. D. G., & Eslabon, R. T. (2024). School heads' instructional supervisory skills and teachers' performance. *Polaris Global Journal of Scholarly Research and Trends, 3*(1), 13–28. https://doi.org/10.58429/pgjsrt.v3n1a104

Laguerta, D. G. D., & Gamba, M. N. (2024). Teachers' perception and challenges in the 8-week learning recovery program. *International Journal of Novel Research and Development, 9*(4), f258–f266. https://ijnrd.org/papers/IJNRD2404535.pdf

Learning Generation Initiative. (2024). *Leaders in Teaching research note: School leader use of data for school improvement*. https://learninggeneration.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/LiT-Research-Note_School-leader-use-of-data_29.03.23.pdf

Lee, C., Camburn, E. M., & Sebastian, J. (2025). School context, school leaders' data-informed decision making, and student achievement: Evidence from Florida. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 36*(1), 45–70. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2024.2436889

Montales, J. C., & Digo, G. S. (2024). Correlational study on the performance of school heads and their instructional leadership practices. *International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies, 4*(3), 199–206. https://doi.org/10.55677/ijssers/V04I3Y2024-05

Nickow, A., Oreopoulos, P., & Quan, V. (2024). The promise of tutoring for PreK–12 learning: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the experimental evidence. *American Educational Research Journal, 61*(1), 74–107. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312231208687

Nizet, I., Maghnouj, S., & Klimova, V. (2023). *Addressing learning needs in the Asia-Pacific region: Teachers' guide on diagnostic assessment*. UNESCO Office Bangkok and Regional Bureau for Education in Asia and the Pacific. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/addressing-learning-needs-asia-pacific-region-teachers-guide-diagnostic-assessment

Ogembo, M. C., & Awori, B. B. (2025). Assessment of the accessibility level to available learning resources and their influence on performance of learners with hearing impairment in selected public junior secondary schools in Kisii, Kenya. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 9*(3S), 4670–4682. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.903SEDU0337

Republic of the Philippines. (2024). *Republic Act No. 12028: An act establishing an Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program and appropriating funds therefor*. https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/2/97912

Taray, K. D. L., & Mepieza, R. P. (2026). Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program implementation, teachers' challenges, and coping mechanisms in the Division of Bohol. *Pantao: The International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences, 5*(2), 2440–2451. https://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05021049

Ulit, J. (2025). Impact of school heads' instructional leadership on teaching and learning outcomes: Philippine's context. *Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities, 4*(3), 2109–2126. https://doi.org/10.62025/dwijmh.v4i3.188

UNESCO. (2024). *Global education monitoring report 2024/5: Leadership in education—Lead for learning*. https://doi.org/10.54676/EFLH5184

United Nations. (2025). *The sustainable development goals report 2025*. https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2025/

Xuan, Q., Cheung, A., & Sun, D. (2022). The effectiveness of formative assessment for enhancing reading achievement in K–12 classrooms: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, Article 990196. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.990196