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.I1.131

Certifying the Implementation of the Three-Term Academic Calendar and Curriculum Pacing Effectiveness: Context-Response Framework

Grace Ann Sarah P. Tampor
Doctor of Education, Major in Educational Management and Development, Graduate School, Cebu Technological University – Main Campus, Cebu City, Cebu, Philippines

Email: iemxarah@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examined the implementation of the Three-Term Academic Calendar and its relationship with curriculum pacing effectiveness as a basis for developing a Context-Response Framework. A quantitative descriptive-correlational research design with comparative and developmental components was employed, involving 100 respondents comprising nine school heads and master teachers and 91 teachers from four public elementary schools in Batuan District, Schools Division of Bohol, during School Year 2026–2027. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire using universal sampling and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Results revealed a very high extent of calendar implementation (M = 4.33, SD = 0.60) and very effective curriculum pacing (M = 4.51, SD = 0.52). Responsiveness to learner needs emerged as the strongest curriculum pacing dimension (M = 4.82), while balancing curriculum coverage and depth of learning remained a concern (M = 4.38). A weak positive relationship (r = 0.30) was reported between the variables, although its statistical significance requires verification. Major challenges included insufficient instructional time, frequent class suspensions, and overlapping school activities. The study concluded that favorable calendar implementation and curriculum pacing practices coexist with persistent instructional and scheduling constraints. Strengthening instructional-time protection, collaborative curriculum planning, coordinated assessments, and responsive learning interventions is recommended. The study was limited by its localized setting, perception-based measurements, correlational design, and reported sample-size inconsistencies. Its principal contribution is the Context-Response Framework, which provides a locally grounded approach to strengthening academic scheduling, curriculum alignment, instructional continuity, and evidence-based educational management in public elementary schools.

Keywords: *Academic Scheduling, Context-Response Framework, Curriculum Pacing, Elementary Education, Instructional Time, Quantitative Research, Three-Term Calendar*

1. INTRODUCTION

The organization of academic calendars and effective utilization of instructional time are essential to curriculum delivery, learning continuity, and educational quality. International evidence emphasizes that learning outcomes depend not only on the number of scheduled instructional days but also on their organization, effective use, and alignment with curriculum expectations. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2024) highlighted variations in instructional time across education systems, while the Global Education Evidence Advisory Panel (2023) emphasized the importance of curriculum prioritization, learning recovery, and targeted interventions following educational disruptions. Similarly, the UNESCO International Bureau of Education (2023) underscored the need to align curriculum requirements with available instructional time to prevent accelerated teaching and inadequate competency mastery. In the Philippines, instructional continuity remains a significant concern because of class suspensions, extreme weather conditions, school activities, and administrative responsibilities. The Second Congressional Commission on Education (EDCOM II, 2024) reported substantial losses in actual teaching days, while EDCOM II (2026a) emphasized protecting instructional time to strengthen curriculum implementation. In response, the Department of Education (DepEd, 2026) introduced the Three-Term Academic Calendar through DepEd Order No. 009, s. 2026, reorganizing School Year 2026–2027 into three academic terms comprising 201 class days. The reform establishes instructional and end-of-term blocks intended to improve curriculum pacing, assessment scheduling, remediation, and instructional continuity. In the Schools Division of Bohol, the reform requires school administrators and teachers to adjust instructional planning, competency distribution, assessment schedules, and learning-support activities. Chiu (2026) identified learning pacing, scheduling flexibility, and teacher workload as important implementation considerations. However, the effectiveness of the new calendar depends on how schools translate national requirements into responsive instructional practices. This study examined the implementation of the Three-Term Academic Calendar and curriculum pacing effectiveness among public elementary schools in Batuan District, Schools Division of Bohol, during School Year 2026–2027. It sought to provide empirical evidence for developing a Context-Response Framework that strengthens instructional-time management, curriculum alignment, learning interventions, and coordinated educational planning.

Research Problem

Effective curriculum implementation requires sufficient instructional time, appropriate competency sequencing, and responsiveness to learners' educational needs. However, disruptions, competing school activities, teacher workload, and curriculum congestion can reduce opportunities for meaningful learning. The Second Congressional Commission on Education (EDCOM II, 2024) identified persistent challenges in Philippine basic education, while EDCOM II (2025) emphasized strengthening foundational learning and improving teaching conditions. The EDCOM II Final Report (2026b) further reinforced the importance of coordinated educational reforms. International studies demonstrate the consequences of interrupted schooling. Di Pietro (2023) and Betthäuser et al. (2023) documented learning deficits associated with school closures, with varying effects across socioeconomic circumstances, learning areas, and educational contexts. Studies by Hermann Spitzer et al. (2023) and UNICEF Philippines (2024) further indicated that structured alternative learning arrangements can help sustain learning continuity. In the Philippine context, UNICEF Philippines (2024) and Parreño (2026) highlighted challenges involving instructional delivery, resources, institutional preparedness, teacher support, and educational continuity. These findings reinforce the need for academic scheduling systems that protect instructional time while accommodating contextual disruptions. Although the Three-Term Academic Calendar was designed to provide longer

instructional periods and organized learning interventions, limited local empirical evidence was available regarding its initial implementation and relationship with curriculum pacing effectiveness. Consequently, the central research problem concerned whether implementation of the new academic structure was associated with effective curriculum pacing in Batuan District. Specifically, the investigation addressed the organization of instructional blocks, protection of instructional time, assessment scheduling, implementation of remediation and enrichment, coordination of school activities, competency alignment, lesson progression, depth of learning, responsiveness to learner needs, and timely curriculum completion. It also examined implementation challenges and enabling conditions as a basis for developing a context-responsive academic framework.

Assumptions of the Study

The study was guided by the assumption that effective implementation of the Three-Term Academic Calendar may be associated with improved curriculum pacing through systematic instructional planning, protection of teaching time, and coordinated school activities. This assumption is consistent with the findings of Kraft and Novicoff (2024), who emphasized the relationship between instructional time and academic achievement and distinguished scheduled instructional time from productive academic learning time. The study further assumed that appropriate curriculum pacing requires alignment among learning competencies, instructional activities, assessment practices, and available instructional days. Barrot (2023) emphasized constructive alignment in curriculum implementation, while Bloom (1968) and the Global Education Evidence Advisory Panel (2023) highlighted the importance of formative assessment, corrective instruction, and enrichment in achieving competency mastery. Another assumption was that instructional pacing should accommodate differences in learner readiness, competency complexity, and learning needs. Sweller (1988) explained the importance of managing cognitive demands, while Trumble et al.'s (2024) systematic review supported distributing learning opportunities over time rather than concentrating instruction into excessively short periods. The study also assumed that effective calendar implementation requires coordination among school leaders, teachers, and educational stakeholders. Brooks and Brooks (2024) emphasized contextual adaptation in educational reform, while Mifsud's (2024) systematic review and Okiri and Hercz (2025) supported shared leadership and collaborative instructional management. May and Finch (2009) and UNESCO (2024) further emphasized stakeholder participation, collective implementation, and continuous evaluation in institutionalizing organizational changes. Consistent with the original null hypothesis, the study statistically examined the proposition that there is no significant relationship between the extent of implementation of the Three-Term Academic Calendar and curriculum pacing effectiveness among public schools in Batuan District.

Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the study was to examine the implementation of the Three-Term Academic Calendar and its relationship with curriculum pacing effectiveness among public elementary schools in Batuan District, Schools Division of Bohol, during School Year 2026–2027, as a basis for developing a Context-Response Framework. Specifically, the study aimed to describe the demographic and professional profiles of school heads, master teachers, and teachers in terms of personal characteristics, educational attainment, professional experience, positions, teaching assignments, and relevant training participation. It also sought to determine the extent of implementation of the Three-Term Academic Calendar in terms of instructional block organization, protection and utilization of instructional time, assessment and end-of-term activities, remediation and enrichment programs, and coordination of curricular and school activities. Furthermore, the study assessed curriculum pacing effectiveness based on

competency alignment, lesson sequencing and continuity, balance between curriculum coverage and depth of learning, responsiveness to learner readiness and learning needs, and timely completion of prescribed curriculum requirements. It also aimed to determine the significant relationship between the implementation of the Three-Term Academic Calendar and curriculum pacing effectiveness, identify challenges encountered during implementation, and develop a context-responsive academic three-term framework based on the findings. These objectives reflect the importance of systematic instructional organization, learner-centered curriculum delivery, and evidence-based educational management emphasized by DepEd (2026) and EDCOM II (2026a).

Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

The study was anchored in theories emphasizing instructional time, curriculum alignment, learner achievement, and educational management. Opportunity to Learn Theory, discussed by Carroll (1963) and Kraft and Novicoff (2024), highlights adequate instructional opportunities and curriculum alignment, while Academic Learning Time Theory, supported by Kraft and Novicoff (2024), emphasizes productive learning time. Constructive Alignment Theory (Biggs, 1996) and Mastery Learning Theory (Bloom, 1968) underscore competency alignment, assessment, remediation, and learner mastery. Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller, 1988) and Spacing and Distributed Practice Theory (Trumble et al., 2024) support appropriate lesson sequencing and balanced curriculum pacing. At the organizational level, Complex Adaptive Systems Theory (Dimmock et al., 2021; Brooks & Brooks, 2024), Systems Theory (von Bertalanffy, 1968), and Time-on-Task Theory (Carroll, 1963) emphasize contextual adaptation, coordinated educational processes, and effective instructional-time utilization. Curriculum Development Theory (Tyler, 1949) supports systematic curriculum planning and evaluation, while Tight-Loose Coupling Theory (Dimmock et al., 2021), Distributed Leadership Theory (Mifsud, 2024; Okiri & Hercz, 2025), and Normalization Process Theory (May & Finch, 2009) highlight policy flexibility, collaborative leadership, and continuous improvement. These theories are reinforced by Republic Act No. 10533 (2013), Republic Act No. 9155 (2001), Republic Act No. 11480 (2020), and relevant DepEd Orders, particularly DepEd Order No. 009, s. 2026 (DepEd, 2026), which establishes the Three-Term Academic Calendar. Collectively, these theoretical and policy foundations guided the examination of calendar implementation and curriculum pacing effectiveness and supported the development of the Context-Response Framework, emphasizing instructional-time protection, competency alignment, coordinated assessment, contextual flexibility, and continuous curriculum monitoring.

Sustainable Development Goal and Multidisciplinary Sustainability Relevance

The study primarily aligns with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4): Quality Education, which promotes inclusive, equitable, and quality education and lifelong learning opportunities. By examining instructional-time utilization, curriculum pacing, learning interventions, and competency mastery, the research addresses educational quality and the effective delivery of basic education. Di Pietro (2023) and Betthäuser et al. (2023) emphasized the importance of addressing learning losses and strengthening educational recovery, while the Global Education Evidence Advisory Panel (2023) recommended targeted instructional interventions and effective learning support. UNESCO (2024) likewise underscored the importance of teachers' working conditions in sustaining quality educational delivery. These perspectives support the study's focus on protecting instructional time, strengthening teacher support, and improving learning opportunities. The study also relates to educational resilience and institutional sustainability by addressing continuity during school disruptions. The UNESCO (2023) highlighted the role of educational technologies in supporting learning continuity, while the OECD (2025a) emphasized flexible instructional-time allocation across educational systems. These considerations

reinforce the importance of academic scheduling that accommodates varying school conditions without compromising curriculum standards. Through the proposed Context-Response Framework, the research contributes to educational and institutional sustainability by supporting systematic curriculum planning, efficient instructional-time management, coordinated educational leadership, responsive learning interventions, and continuous monitoring. Its emphasis on flexible scheduling and instructional continuity also supports community-level educational resilience when schools encounter disruptions. Overall, the study contributes to SDG 4 by providing a locally grounded basis for improving curriculum implementation and sustaining meaningful learning opportunities in public elementary schools.

2. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study utilized a quantitative descriptive-correlational design with comparative and developmental components. According to Creswell and Creswell (2023), quantitative research systematically measures variables using numerical data to describe conditions, compare groups, and determine statistical relationships. The descriptive component examined respondents' demographic and professional profiles, the extent of Three-Term Academic Calendar implementation, curriculum pacing effectiveness, and implementation challenges. The correlational component determined the relationship between calendar implementation and curriculum pacing, while the comparative component examined differences in perceptions between school heads/master teachers and teachers. The developmental component used the findings to formulate an academic scheduling framework responsive to local educational conditions.

Research Locale or Study Setting

The study was conducted in four public elementary schools in Batuan District, Schools Division of Bohol, Region VII–Central Visayas, Philippines. These were Batuan Central Elementary School-Main in Poblacion Sur, Batuan Central Elementary School-Annex in Poblacion Norte, Lungsod-Daan Elementary School in Poblacion Vieja, and Rizal Elementary School in Rizal, Batuan, Bohol. The schools served 165, 167, 94, and 156 learners, respectively, and operated under the same Department of Education policies governing the Three-Term Academic Calendar. Despite differences in enrollment, teaching personnel, facilities, and instructional resources, the schools shared responsibilities for curriculum delivery, instructional scheduling, assessment, and learning interventions. These settings provided the context for examining calendar implementation and curriculum pacing effectiveness.

Participants or Data Sources

The study employed universal sampling involving 100 respondents from the identified public elementary schools, comprising 9 school heads/master teachers and 91 elementary school teachers. Universal sampling was considered appropriate because the identified population was manageable and allowed the inclusion of all qualified participants. School heads and master teachers provided perspectives on instructional leadership, curriculum supervision, academic scheduling, and policy implementation, while teachers supplied classroom-level information concerning competency distribution, lesson pacing, assessment, remediation, enrichment, and instructional adjustments. Including both groups enabled the study to examine the consistency between administrative planning and classroom implementation.

Research Instruments or Materials

The primary research instrument was a modified, adapted structured questionnaire designed to assess Three-Term Academic Calendar implementation, curriculum pacing effectiveness, implementation challenges, and effective scheduling practices. Its development was guided by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2024) framework on instructional-time organization, Bertram et al. (2021) on curriculum pacing and learning quality, and the OECD (2025a) on instructional flexibility. The questionnaire was also aligned with DepEd Order No. 009, s. 2026 (DepEd, 2026), DepEd Order No. 010, s. 2024 (DepEd, 2024b), and DepEd Order No. 012, s. 2024 (DepEd, 2024a). The instrument covered respondents' demographic and professional profiles, instructional-block organization, instructional-time protection, assessment scheduling, remediation and enrichment, coordination of school activities, competency alignment, lesson progression, learning depth, responsiveness to learner needs, and curriculum completion. A five-point Likert-type scale was used to measure the major variables. Content validity was evaluated by experts in educational leadership, curriculum and instruction, educational planning, research, statistics, and elementary education using criteria such as clarity, relevance, and alignment with research objectives. The Content Validity Index (CVI) was identified as a measure of expert agreement. Following validation and revision, the instrument underwent pilot testing among comparable respondents excluded from the final sample. Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, with 0.70 identified as the generally acceptable reliability threshold.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher secured formal permission from the Schools Division Superintendent of the Schools Division of Bohol and coordinated with participating school administrators before conducting data collection. Qualified respondents were identified through the approved sampling procedure and informed about the study's objectives, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and their right to withdraw without penalty. Following informed consent, validated questionnaires were distributed in printed form or through a secure online survey platform, depending on accessibility and internet availability. Respondents were given approximately three to five working days to complete the instruments. Completed questionnaires were retrieved, checked for completeness, coded, encoded, and organized according to the research variables. The researcher verified data accuracy and maintained secure records before conducting statistical analysis. The collected information served as the basis for assessing calendar implementation, curriculum pacing effectiveness, implementation challenges, and effective scheduling practices.

Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical procedures. Frequency and percentage described respondents' demographic and professional characteristics, while mean and standard deviation summarized numerical variables. Weighted mean and standard deviation assessed the extent of Three-Term Academic Calendar implementation, curriculum pacing effectiveness, challenges, and effective practices using a five-point Likert-type scale. Ranking identified the most significant implementation concerns and commonly employed strategies. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient determined the strength and direction of the relationship between calendar implementation and curriculum pacing effectiveness, subject to assumptions of normality, linearity, independence, and absence of influential outliers. Spearman rank-order correlation was considered when parametric assumptions were not satisfied. An independent-samples t-test examined differences between school heads/master teachers' and teachers' perceptions, with the Mann-Whitney U test considered as a nonparametric alternative. Hypotheses were evaluated at the

0.05 level of significance. Microsoft Excel supported preliminary data organization, while appropriate statistical software was used for statistical computations. The findings provided the empirical foundation for developing the proposed academic scheduling framework.

Ethical Considerations

The study observed established ethical principles in educational research, including informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, anonymity, non-coercion, and responsible data management. Formal authorization was obtained from the appropriate educational authorities and participating schools before questionnaire administration. Respondents were informed about the research objectives, procedures, and academic purpose of data collection. Participation was voluntary, and respondents could decline or withdraw without penalty. To protect their identities, questionnaires were coded, personal information was excluded from reported findings, and electronic and printed records were maintained through restricted access and secure storage. All collected information was used exclusively for academic purposes, ensuring respect for respondents' rights, privacy, and professional responsibilities.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Demographic and Professional Profiles of Respondents

3.1.1 Age and Gender of School Heads and Master Teachers

The nine school heads and master teachers were predominantly female (77.78%), while males accounted for 22.22%. Most respondents belonged to the 51–60 age group, with a mean age of 53.42 years (SD = 5.45). These findings indicated that the instructional leadership group consisted primarily of experienced, mature educational personnel. The findings suggest that the respondents' professional maturity may support instructional supervision, curriculum planning, and policy implementation. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2026) emphasized the importance of school leadership characteristics and professional development, while Baptista (2026) highlighted the experiences of senior school leaders in curriculum management. Brooks and Brooks (2024) and Liguori et al. (2026) likewise underscored leadership experience, professional learning, and adaptability in educational reform.

3.1.2 Educational Attainment of School Heads and Master Teachers

Among the nine respondents, five (55.56%) held master's degrees, three (33.33%) had earned doctoral units, and one (11.11%) had completed a doctorate. All respondents therefore possessed graduate-level educational qualifications. These qualifications suggest substantial academic preparation for instructional leadership and curriculum management, although educational attainment alone does not establish leadership effectiveness. The OECD (2026) and OECD (2025b) emphasized the relationship between leadership preparation, instructional supervision, and professional development. Similarly, the Department of Education (DepEd, 2025) recognized the importance of appropriate professional qualifications in educational leadership.

3.1.3 Professional Experience and Leadership Responsibilities

The largest proportion of school heads and master teachers had served for 16–20 years (44.44%), followed by those with 21–25 years (33.33%) and 11–15 years (22.22%). Their average length of service was 18.56 years (SD = 3.91). Five respondents occupied Master Teacher I positions, while four held Master Teacher II positions. Most had also participated in six to eight relevant

professional development activities (66.67%). These findings indicate that the participating schools had experienced instructional personnel capable of contributing to curriculum supervision, teacher mentoring, and academic scheduling. UNESCO (2024) emphasized the importance of instructional leadership in school improvement. The findings also highlight the continuing need for professional development to support changing curriculum requirements and the implementation of the Three-Term Academic Calendar.

3.1.4 Demographic and Professional Profiles of Teachers

The 91 teacher respondents were predominantly female (90.11%), while males comprised 9.89%. The largest age group was 41–45 years (26.37%), followed by 26–30 years (25.27%). The manuscript reported a mean age of 41.34 years (SD = 7.84). Regarding educational attainment, 45.05% had earned master's degree units, 41.76% held bachelor's degrees, 8.79% had completed master's degrees, 3.30% had doctoral units, and 1.10% held doctorates. Most teachers had served for 6–10 years (29.67%), followed by 11–15 years (25.27%). Teacher III personnel accounted for 72.53% of respondents, while Teacher I personnel represented 26.37%. These findings indicate a teaching workforce with varied educational preparation, professional experience, and career development. The predominance of teachers with graduate-level coursework suggests continuing professional development, while differences in teaching experience may influence instructional planning and adaptation to curriculum reforms. The findings underscore the importance of sustained professional learning and collaborative instructional support in implementing the Three-Term Academic Calendar.

3.2 Extent of Implementation of the Three-Term Academic Calendar

3.2.1 Organization and Implementation of Instructional Blocks

The organization and implementation of instructional blocks obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.25 (SD = 0.68), interpreted as a Very High Extent. School heads and master teachers recorded a mean of 4.26 (SD = 0.65), while teachers obtained 4.25 (SD = 0.71). The systematic distribution of learning competencies according to available instructional days received the highest overall rating of 4.45 (SD = 0.54). The findings indicate that participating schools generally organized learning competencies and instructional schedules according to the prescribed academic terms. However, communicating and adjusting instructional-block schedules remained areas requiring attention. Effective implementation therefore depends on coordinated curriculum mapping, timely communication, and flexible instructional planning.

3.2.2 Protection and Effective Utilization of Instructional Time

Instructional-time protection and utilization obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.38 (SD = 0.58), interpreted as a Very High Extent. School heads and master teachers recorded 4.49 (SD = 0.59), while teachers obtained 4.27 (SD = 0.57). The effective use of classroom time for teaching and learning received the highest overall rating of 4.46 (SD = 0.53). These findings reflect favorable practices in protecting regular teaching periods and minimizing unnecessary interruptions. Nevertheless, differences between instructional leaders' and teachers' assessments suggest the need for continued monitoring of actual classroom time and stronger coordination of non-instructional responsibilities.

3.2.3 Scheduling and Management of Assessment and End-of-Term Activities

Assessment scheduling and end-of-term management obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.28 (SD = 0.62), interpreted as a Very High Extent. Advance communication of assessment schedules received the highest overall rating of 4.37 (SD = 0.56). School heads and master teachers recorded an average weighted mean of 4.30 (SD = 0.62). The results indicate that assessment schedules were generally communicated and organized effectively. However, sufficient time for administering, checking, recording, and analyzing assessments remained an important concern. UNESCO (2024) emphasized that effective educational leadership requires collaborative planning, instructional support, and organizational conditions conducive to teaching and learning.

3.2.4 Remediation, Intervention, Enrichment, and Learning-Support Activities

The implementation of remediation, intervention, enrichment, and learning-support activities obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.40 (SD = 0.58), interpreted as a Very High Extent. School heads and master teachers recorded 4.49 (SD = 0.52), while teachers obtained 4.31 (SD = 0.63). Providing enrichment activities for learners who had already achieved expected competencies received the highest overall rating of 4.53 (SD = 0.55). The findings demonstrate favorable implementation of differentiated learning support under the three-term structure. However, the systematic use of assessment results to identify learners requiring remediation remained an area for improvement. Strengthening assessment-informed interventions may help ensure that instructional support responds appropriately to learners' varying competency levels.

3.2.5 Coordination of Curricular, Co-Curricular, School, and Professional-Development Activities

The coordination of school and professional-development activities obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.36 (SD = 0.56), interpreted as a Very High Extent. School heads and master teachers recorded 4.33 (SD = 0.59), while teachers obtained 4.39 (SD = 0.53). Coordination of major activities across grade levels and learning areas received the highest overall rating of 4.51 (SD = 0.52). These results suggest effective collaboration in organizing school activities and preventing scheduling conflicts. Coordinated planning remains important in protecting instructional periods, managing teacher responsibilities, and maintaining curriculum continuity.

3.2.6 Overall Implementation of the Three-Term Academic Calendar

The overall extent of implementation obtained a weighted mean of 4.33 (SD = 0.60), interpreted as a Very High Extent. School heads and master teachers recorded 4.37 (SD = 0.59), while teachers obtained 4.30 (SD = 0.61). Remediation, intervention, enrichment, and learning-support activities received the highest overall domain rating of 4.40 (SD = 0.58), while instructional-block organization received the lowest at 4.25 (SD = 0.68). The findings indicate that the calendar was generally implemented effectively, particularly in supporting learners with different academic needs. Nevertheless, instructional-block organization and scheduling adjustments require continued improvement. UNESCO (2024) emphasized instructional leadership and collaborative planning, while UNICEF Philippines (2024) highlighted the importance of coordinated learning recovery and instructional continuity.

3.3 Curriculum Pacing Effectiveness

3.3.1 Alignment of Learning Competencies with Available Instructional Days

Curriculum pacing was assessed as Very Effective in aligning learning competencies with available instructional days. Teachers obtained an average weighted mean of 4.42 (SD = 0.56). The alignment of curriculum pacing guides with actual teaching days received a weighted mean of 4.48 (SD = 0.58), indicating favorable competency distribution and instructional planning. The findings suggest that teachers generally aligned curriculum requirements with the prescribed academic calendar. However, the manageability of competencies assigned to each term remained a concern. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2024) emphasized the importance of curriculum flexibility, coherent learning progression, and appropriate instructional-time allocation in addressing diverse educational needs.

3.3.2 Sequencing, Continuity, and Progression of Lessons and Competencies

The sequencing, continuity, and progression of lessons obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.42 (SD = 0.55), interpreted as Very Effective. School heads and master teachers recorded 4.44 (SD = 0.53), while teachers obtained 4.39 (SD = 0.58). The logical arrangement of competencies from prerequisite to advanced concepts received the highest overall rating of 4.46 (SD = 0.58). These findings indicate that participating schools generally maintained systematic lesson progression and continuity. Appropriate sequencing supports the connection between prior knowledge and new competencies, although adequate review and reinforcement remain necessary to sustain learner understanding and competency mastery.

3.3.3 Balance Between Curriculum Coverage and Depth of Learning

The balance between curriculum coverage and depth of learning obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.38 (SD = 0.57), interpreted as Very Effective. School heads and master teachers recorded 4.37 (SD = 0.57), while teachers obtained 4.40 (SD = 0.57). Providing sufficient time to explain important concepts thoroughly received the highest overall rating of 4.43 (SD = 0.52). Although the results were favorable, this domain received the lowest overall rating among the five curriculum pacing dimensions. The findings suggest that completing prescribed competencies while ensuring conceptual understanding, sufficient practice, and learner mastery remains challenging. The OECD (2024) emphasized the importance of flexible instructional time and curriculum organization to accommodate differences in learners' educational needs.

3.3.4 Responsiveness of Instructional Pacing to Learner Readiness, Achievement, and Learning Needs

Instructional responsiveness obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.82 (SD = 0.40), interpreted as Very Effective and representing the highest-rated curriculum pacing domain. School heads and master teachers recorded 4.79 (SD = 0.42), while teachers obtained 4.85 (SD = 0.38). Enrichment for advanced learners, additional support for struggling learners, and assessment-informed instructional decisions received the highest overall ratings of 4.85 (SD = 0.38). These findings indicate strong perceived responsiveness to differences in learner readiness, achievement, and competency mastery. Differentiated instruction, formative assessment, remediation, and enrichment were recognized as important practices for maintaining meaningful learning progression within the Three-Term Academic Calendar.

3.3.5 Timely Completion of Prescribed Competencies and Curriculum Requirements

The timely completion of curriculum requirements obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.49 (SD = 0.52), interpreted as Very Effective. School heads and master teachers recorded 4.81 (SD = 0.42), while teachers obtained 4.18 (SD = 0.62). Completing competencies within their assigned academic terms received the highest overall rating of 4.72 (SD = 0.45). However, teachers rated the completion of essential competencies before scheduled end-of-term assessments considerably lower at 3.43 (SD = 0.60). The difference between instructional leaders' and teachers' assessments suggests that classroom-level implementation presents greater challenges than administrative planning may indicate. Although schools generally accomplished prescribed curriculum requirements, completing essential competencies before assessment periods requires improved instructional scheduling, realistic competency distribution, and continuous monitoring.

3.3.6 Overall Curriculum Pacing Effectiveness

Curriculum pacing effectiveness obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.51 (SD = 0.52), interpreted as Very Effective. School heads and master teachers recorded 4.57 (SD = 0.49), while teachers obtained 4.45 (SD = 0.54). Responsiveness to learner readiness, achievement, and learning needs received the highest overall rating of 4.82 (SD = 0.40), while the balance between curriculum coverage and depth of learning received the lowest at 4.38 (SD = 0.57). The findings demonstrate generally favorable curriculum pacing practices, particularly in differentiated instruction and learner support. Nevertheless, maintaining sufficient instructional depth while completing prescribed competencies remains an important concern. OECD (2024) emphasized that effective curriculum implementation requires flexibility in instructional content, pedagogy, assessment, and learning time to accommodate diverse learning needs.

3.4 Relationship Between Three-Term Academic Calendar Implementation and Curriculum Pacing Effectiveness

The study reported a weak positive but statistically significant relationship between Three-Term Academic Calendar implementation and curriculum pacing effectiveness, with a correlation coefficient of $r = 0.30$ and a p-value of approximately 0.0015. Since the reported p-value was below the 0.05 significance level, the null hypothesis was rejected. The findings indicated that stronger calendar implementation was associated with higher curriculum pacing effectiveness, although the relationship did not establish causation. The findings were consistent with the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2024), which emphasized curriculum flexibility, appropriate instructional-time allocation, and responsive curriculum implementation. Similarly, UNESCO (2024) highlighted the importance of educational leadership, collaboration, teacher support, and systematic instructional planning. These findings support the development of the Context-Response Framework to strengthen curriculum alignment, instructional-time management, academic scheduling, and continuous monitoring.

3.5 Challenges in Implementing the Three-Term Academic Calendar and Curriculum Pacing

The most prominent challenge was insufficient instructional time for teaching difficult or complex competencies, followed by frequent class suspensions resulting from weather conditions, emergencies, and local events. Overlapping curricular, co-curricular, extracurricular, and school activities ranked third. Other challenges included difficulty redistributing competencies across the three academic terms, clustering of assessments and

performance tasks, differences in learner readiness, limited time for remediation, heavy teacher workload, difficulty recovering lost instructional time, and insufficient technical guidance and monitoring mechanisms. These findings indicate that effective curriculum pacing depends on more than compliance with the academic calendar. Instructional continuity, realistic competency distribution, coordinated assessment, and responsive learning interventions remain essential. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2024) emphasized flexibility in instructional-time allocation and curriculum implementation, while the Global Education Evidence Advisory Panel (2023) highlighted targeted learning interventions and regular assessment. UNESCO (2024) further emphasized collaborative leadership, teacher support, and continuous professional development. Collectively, these findings provide the basis for the Context-Response Framework, which seeks to strengthen coordinated scheduling, protect instructional time, and support responsive curriculum implementation.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concluded that the Three-Term Academic Calendar was implemented to a very high extent and that curriculum pacing was perceived as very effective among public elementary schools in Batuan District, Schools Division of Bohol, during School Year 2026–2027. School heads, master teachers, and teachers demonstrated favorable practices in instructional-time utilization, competency sequencing, learning interventions, and responsiveness to learners' needs. However, balancing curriculum coverage with meaningful learning remained a concern, alongside insufficient instructional time, class suspensions, overlapping activities, and assessment scheduling difficulties. Differences in the assessments of instructional leaders and teachers highlighted the importance of strengthening coordination between administrative planning and classroom implementation. Although the manuscript reported a weak positive relationship between calendar implementation and curriculum pacing effectiveness, its statistical significance requires verification. Overall, the findings supported the development of the Context-Response Framework as a practical approach to strengthening academic scheduling, curriculum alignment, instructional continuity, and responsive educational management.

The Department of Education should strengthen the implementation of the Three-Term Academic Calendar through clear curriculum-pacing guidelines, protected instructional periods, coordinated assessment schedules, and responsive learning-recovery mechanisms. The Schools Division of Bohol and Batuan District should utilize the developed Context-Response Framework to guide curriculum coordination, instructional monitoring, and school-specific technical assistance. School heads and master teachers should institutionalize collaborative curriculum mapping, realistic competency distribution, contingency scheduling, and regular monitoring of curriculum accomplishment. Teachers should strengthen differentiated instruction, formative assessment, remediation, and enrichment to balance curriculum completion with meaningful competency mastery. Curriculum planners and education program supervisors should coordinate school activities, prevent assessment congestion, and establish practical mechanisms for recovering instructional time lost to disruptions. Continuous professional development and stakeholder collaboration should also be maintained. Future researchers should validate the Context-Response Framework in other educational settings and examine its implementation, effectiveness, and implications for instructional quality and learner achievement.

The study was limited to public elementary schools in Batuan District, Schools Division of Bohol, during School Year 2026–2027, restricting the transferability of findings to other educational settings. Its quantitative descriptive-correlational design examined associations rather than causal relationships, while questionnaire-based assessments reflected respondents' reported implementation practices and perceptions of curriculum pacing effectiveness. The respondent population was confined to participating school heads, master teachers, and teachers. Additionally, the manuscript contained inconsistencies between the reported respondent count and the sample size used in the illustrative correlation analysis, requiring statistical verification. Future studies may examine broader educational settings and validate the developed framework through further implementation and evaluation.

5. REFERENCES

Baptista, V. E. G. (2026). Navigating the final stretch: A phenomenological study of retirable principals as curriculum leaders. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 10*(1), 5107–5140. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10100394

Barrot, J. S. (2023). K to 12 curriculum reform in the Philippines: Towards making students future ready. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 43*(4), 1193–1207. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2021.1973959

Bertram, C. A., Mthiyane, C. C. N., & Naidoo, J. (2021). The tension between curriculum coverage and quality learning: The experiences of South African teachers. *International Journal of Educational Development, 81*, Article 102353. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2021.102353

Betthäuser, B. A., Bach-Mortensen, A. M., & Engzell, P. (2023). A systematic review and meta-analysis of the evidence on learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature Human Behaviour, 7*, 375–385. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-022-01506-4

Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. *Higher Education, 32*, 347–364. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138871

Bloom, B. S. (1968). Learning for mastery. *Evaluation Comment, 1*(2), 1–12.

Brooks, J. S., & Brooks, M. C. (2024). Hot leadership, cool leadership: How education policies are implemented (and ignored) in schools. *Educational Policy, 38*(7), 1608–1637. https://doi.org/10.1177/08959048241268309

Carroll, J. B. (1963). A model of school learning. *Teachers College Record, 64*(8), 723–733. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146816306400801

Chiu, R. A. (2026, August 6). *DepEd shifts public schools to three grading periods under trimester calendar*. Philippine Information Agency. https://pia.gov.ph/news/deped-shifts-public-schools-to-three-grading-periods-under-trimester-calendar/

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Department of Education. (2024a, September 18). *Amendment to DepEd Order No. 010, s. 2024 (Policy guidelines on the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum)* (DepEd Order No. 012, s. 2024). https://www.deped.gov.ph/2024/09/18

Department of Education. (2024b, July 23). *Policy guidelines on the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum* (DepEd Order No. 010, s. 2024). https://www.deped.gov.ph/2024/07/23/july-23-2024-do-010-s-2024-policy-guidelines-on-the-implementation-of-the-matatag-curriculum/

Department of Education. (2025). *Amended qualification standards for Teacher I–III, Master Teacher I–IV, and School Principal I–IV positions, and the qualification standards for newly created Teacher IV–VII and Master Teacher V positions* (DepEd Order No. 019, s. 2025). https://www.deped.gov.ph/2025/06/24/june-24-2025-do-019-s-2025-amended-

qualification-standards-for-teacher-i-iii-master-teacher-i-iv-and-school-principal-i-iv-positions-and-the-qualification-standards-for-newly-created-t/

Department of Education. (2026, April 16). *Guidelines on the implementation of the three-term school calendar in basic education* (DepEd Order No. 009, s. 2026). https://www.deped.gov.ph/2026/04/16/april-16-2026-do-009-s-2026-guidelines-on-the-implementation-of-the-three-term-school-calendar-in-basic-education/

Di Pietro, G. (2023). The impact of COVID-19 on student achievement: Evidence from a recent meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review, 39*, 100530. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2023.100530

Dimmock, C., Tan, C. Y., Nguyen, D., Tran, T. A., & Dinh, T. T. (2021). Implementing education system reform: Local adaptation in school reform of teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Development, 80*, Article 102302. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2020.102302

Global Education Evidence Advisory Panel. (2023). *2023 cost-effective approaches to improve global learning: What does recent evidence tell us are "smart buys" for improving learning in low- and middle-income countries?* Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office, World Bank, UNICEF, & United States Agency for International Development.

Hermann Spitzer, M., Moeller, K., & Musslick, S. (2023). Assignment strategies modulate students' academic performance in an online learning environment during the first and second COVID-19 related school closures. *PLOS ONE, 18*(5), Article e0284868. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0284868

Kraft, M. A., & Novicoff, S. (2024). Time in school: A conceptual framework, synthesis of the causal research, and empirical exploration. *American Educational Research Journal, 61*(4), 724–766. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312241251857

Liguori, V., Gambi, L., & Vidoni, D. (2026). *School principals in the EU: A comparative analysis based on TALIS 2024*. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2766/3385642

May, C., & Finch, T. (2009). Implementing, embedding, and integrating practices: An outline of normalization process theory. *Sociology, 43*(3), 535–554. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038509103208

Mifsud, D. (2024). A systematic review of school distributed leadership: Exploring research purposes, concepts and approaches in the field between 2010 and 2022. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 56*(2), 154–179. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2022.2158181

Okiri, P. O., & Hercz, M. (2025). The tenets of distributed pedagogical leadership in educational contexts—A systematic literature review on perception and practice. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 53*(1), 47–64. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432231154444

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). *How is the school year organized in OECD countries?* Education Indicators in Focus, No. 86. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/a6385722-en

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2025a). *Education at a glance 2025: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/1c0d9c79-en

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2025b). *Results from TALIS 2024: The state of teaching*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/90df6235-en

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2026). *The value of school principals in TALIS 2024*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/a2cdb777-en

Parreño, S. J. (2026). Learning delivery modalities in Philippine basic education during the COVID-19 period. *Journal of Education and Learning Reviews, 3*(4), Article e3279. https://doi.org/10.60027/jelr.2026.e3279

Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2013/ra_10533_2013.html

Republic Act No. 11480. (2020). An act amending Section 3 of Republic Act No. 7797, otherwise known as "An Act to Lengthen the School Calendar from Two Hundred (200) Days to Not More Than Two Hundred Twenty (220) Class Days." https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/2/92127

Republic Act No. 9155. (2001). Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2001/ra_9155_2001.html

Second Congressional Commission on Education. (2024, June 19). *53 teaching days lost in SY 2023–2024—EDCOM 2, PIDS*. https://edcom2.gov.ph/53-teaching-days-lost-in-sy-2023-2024-edcom-2-pids/

Second Congressional Commission on Education. (2025). *Fixing the foundations: A matter of national survival* (EDCOM II Year Two Report). https://edcom2.gov.ph/media/2025/01/EDCOM-2-Year-2-Report-Fixing-the-Foundations-2025.pdf

Second Congressional Commission on Education. (2026a, March 4). *EDCOM 2 to DepEd: Protect 180 instructional days in proposed three-term calendar shift*. https://edcom2.gov.ph/edcom-2-to-deped-protect-180-instructional-days-in-proposed-three-term-calendar-shift/

Second Congressional Commission on Education. (2026b). *Turning point: A decade of necessary reform (2026–2035)* (EDCOM II Final Report). https://edcom2.gov.ph/publications/the-edcom-2-final-report/

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science, 12*(2), 257–285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4

Trumble, E., Lodge, J., Mandrusiak, A., & Forbes, R. (2024). Systematic review of distributed practice and retrieval practice in health professions education. *Advances in Health Sciences Education, 29*, 689–714. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-023-10274-3

Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. University of Chicago Press.

UNESCO International Bureau of Education. (2023, September 1). *Condensed curriculum: Maximizing learning outcomes, minimizing instructional time*. https://www.ibe.unesco.org/en/node/42

UNESCO. (2023). *Global Education Monitoring Report 2023: Technology in education—A tool on whose terms?* UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2024). *Global education monitoring report 2024/5: Leadership in education—Lead for learning*. https://www.unesco.org/gem-report/en/publication/leadership

UNICEF Philippines. (2024). *Support multigrade schools with digital technology: Learning recovery from Typhoon Odette in the Philippines*. https://www.unicef.org/philippines/reports/support-multigrade-schools-digital-technology

von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*. George Braziller.