INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

PREPAREDNESS AND PRACTICE OF GRADE 5 TEACHERS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REVISED K TO 12 CURRICULUM IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

JERECHO F. MAGNO
College Instructor
Republic Colleges of Guinobatan, Inc., Guinobatan, Albay
magnojerecho@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study determined the preparedness and practice of Grade 5 teachers on the implementation of the revised K to 12 curriculum in public elementary schools, as a basis for the preparation of a professional development plan. Conducted in the East District of one of the municipalities in the 3rd District of Albay, it employed the descriptive research method utilizing the survey technique. Eighty-six (86) Grade 5 teachers from public elementary schools served as respondents. Statistical tools used included Frequency Count, Percentage Technique, Weighted Mean, F-Test (ANOVA), and Spearman Rank-Order Coefficient of Correlation. The extent of preparedness along all five variables averaged 3.10 (Much Prepared). The level of practice along all variables averaged 3.14 (Much Practiced). No significant difference was found in the extent of preparedness (F = 1.65 < tabular F = 2.87) nor in the level of practice (F = 1.66 < tabular F = 2.87) among the variables. There was no significant relationship between the extent of preparedness and level of practice (rs = 0.850

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

< tabular rs = 1.000). A Professional Development Plan was prepared to strengthen teachers' preparedness and practice on the revised K to 12 curriculum.

Keywords: *Preparedness, Practice, Grade 5 Teachers, Revised K to 12 Curriculum, Learning Delivery, Pedagogical Approach, Technology Integration, Learning Resources, Assessment of Learning, Professional Development Plan*

INTRODUCTION

The education curriculum is dynamic and responsive to the needs of the community. Curriculum reform in education involves a dynamic and rigorous process designed to ensure that the developed curriculum is responsive to societal needs. Republic Act No. 10533 (Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013) aims to craft a well-designed curriculum grounded on empirical research and aligned with the national vision of quality education for all basic education learners. The goal is to make education more learner-centered and sensitive to the needs, circumstances, diversity, and cognitive and cultural capacities of students.

DepEd Order No. 10, s. 2024 provides policy guidelines on the implementation of the revised K to 12 curriculum, ensuring educators are prepared and equipped to implement the updated curriculum effectively. The revised K to 12 Curriculum emphasizes the development and dissemination of Training Resource Packages—including session guides and assessment tools—to equip educators with the necessary knowledge and skills. Despite this, many public elementary schools continue to struggle with its practical implementation due to challenges

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

such as limited teacher training, insufficient instructional materials, and the demands of integrating technology into instruction.

This study determined the preparedness and practice of Grade 5 teachers regarding the implementation of the revised K to 12 curriculum for the school year 2025–2026, aiming to provide significant insights into areas for improvement and to serve as a basis for the preparation of a professional development plan.

Statement of the Problem

This study determined the preparedness and practice of Grade 5 teachers on the implementation of the revised K to 12 curriculum in public elementary schools as a basis for the preparation of a professional development plan. Specifically, it answered the following questions:

1. What is the extent of preparedness of Grade 5 teachers on the implementation of the revised K to 12 curriculum along: (a) Learning Delivery; (b) Pedagogical Approach; (c) Technology Integration; (d) Learning Resources; and (e) Assessment of Learning?

2. Is there a significant difference in the extent of preparedness of Grade 5 teachers among the variables?

3. What is the level of practice of Grade 5 teachers on the implementation of the revised K to 12 curriculum along the same variables?

4. Is there a significant difference in the level of practice of Grade 5 teachers among the variables?

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

5. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of preparedness and level of practice of Grade 5 teachers among the variables?

6. What professional development plan can be designed to aid teachers in the implementation of the revised K to 12 curriculum?

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on three theories. Experiential Learning Theory by David Kolb (2015) holds that teachers and students build knowledge through active exploration and reflection on real-world experiences, underpinning the importance of hands-on curriculum implementation. Theory of Productivity by Herbert J. Walberg (1981) highlights how teacher quality, effort, and available resources optimize learning outcomes—reinforcing the need to assess factors affecting the successful implementation of the revised K to 12 curriculum. Scaffolding Theory by Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976) provides the basis for understanding how structured support helps teachers guide learners through new standards and performance-based tasks, gradually fostering learner independence. Together, these theories affirm that effective management strategies are essential in fostering continuous growth and development within educational institutions.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive research design utilizing the survey technique. The descriptive method was used to accurately and systematically describe the population,

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

situation, and phenomena related to the preparedness and practice of Grade 5 teachers on the implementation of the revised K to 12 curriculum. The survey technique was the primary data collection tool through structured questionnaires administered to the respondents.

Participants of the Study

The respondents were 86 Grade 5 teachers from public elementary schools (32 from rural schools and 54 from urban schools) in the East District of a 1st-class municipality in Albay. Total enumeration was used, covering all Grade 5 teachers who have participated in seminars and training related to the revised K to 12 curriculum implementation.

Table 1

Respondents of the Study

Public Elementary Schools	**Number of Grade 5 Teachers**
Rural	32
Urban	54
Total	**86**

Research Instrument

Two sets of instruments were utilized. Part I was a survey questionnaire on the extent of preparedness of Grade 5 teachers on the revised K to 12 curriculum implementation. Part

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

II covered the level of practice of Grade 5 teachers along the same variables. A 4-point Likert scale was used: for preparedness—4-Very Much Prepared (VMP), 3-Much Prepared (MP), 2-Moderately Prepared (MLP), 1-Not Prepared (NP); and for practice—4-Very Much Practiced (VMP), 3-Much Practiced (MP), 2-Moderately Practiced (MLP), 1-Not Practiced (NP).

Validity of the Research Instrument

The research instrument was validated by five (5) jurors who assessed content validity, format, organization, and presentation. Their feedback was used to refine the instrument to ensure it accurately measures the intended constructs.

Data Gathering Procedures

A written request for permission was submitted to the Schools Division Superintendent with the recommendation of the Dean of the Graduate School. Upon approval, coordination with School Heads was undertaken to identify qualified respondents. The researcher personally administered and retrieved all 86 survey questionnaires, achieving a 100% retrieval rate.

Table 2

Distribution and Retrieval of the Research Instruments

Public Elementary Schools	Distributed	Retrieved	Percentage (%)
Rural	32	32	100

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

Urban	54	54	100
Total	**86**	**86**	**100**

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using: (1) Frequency Count to determine the number of responses per indicator; (2) Percentage Technique to describe the distribution of answers; (3) Weighted Mean to determine the extent of preparedness and level of practice; (4) F-Test (ANOVA) to determine significant differences among the five variables; and (5) Spearman Rank-Order Coefficient of Correlation to determine the significant relationship between the extent of preparedness and the level of practice. The decision rule was to reject the null hypothesis if the computed value equals or exceeds the tabular value.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Extent of Preparedness Along Learning Delivery

Table 3 presents the extent of preparedness of Grade 5 teachers along Learning Delivery. All indicators are described as Much Prepared, with an average of 2.97. Using varied modes of instruction (e.g., face-to-face, modular, blended learning) had the highest weighted mean of 3.06, while implementing differentiated instruction to accommodate different learning styles had the lowest weighted mean of 2.80. This implies that while teachers are prepared in offering multiple instructional modalities driven by institutional policies, differentiated instruction—which demands higher pedagogical skill and flexibility—needs additional support.

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

Galang (2021) confirmed that teachers face significant challenges in curriculum adjustment, sustaining student engagement, and accessing adequate resources, which affect the consistent application of differentiated instruction.

Table 3

Extent of Preparedness of Grade 5 Teachers on the Revised K to 12 Curriculum Along Learning Delivery

Learning Delivery Indicators	4	3	2	1	WM	VI
1. Adapts teaching strategies to suit diverse learner needs and contexts.	20	52	10	2	3.03	MP
2. Uses varied modes of instruction (e.g., face-to-face, modular, blended learning).	29	39	12	0	3.06	MP
3. Implements differentiated instruction to accommodate different learning styles.	17	36	32	2	2.80	MP
4. Adjusts pacing of lessons based on learners' mastery levels.	24	39	14	3	2.91	MP
5. Provides remediation or enrichment activities as needed.	22	47	16	0	3.05	MP

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

Average					**2.97**	**MP**

Scale: 3.50–4.00 Very Much Prepared (VMP); 2.50–3.49 Much Prepared (MP); 1.50–2.49 Moderately Prepared (MLP); 1.00–1.49 Not Prepared (NP)

Extent of Preparedness Along Pedagogical Approach

Table 4 shows the extent of preparedness along Pedagogical Approach, with an average of 3.00 (Much Prepared). Promoting inclusive education practices for diverse learners had the highest weighted mean of 3.20, while using performance-based and authentic assessments had the lowest weighted mean of 2.73. Teachers are most prepared in promoting inclusivity because this is strongly emphasized in teacher education programs and institutional policies. However, complex practices like performance-based and authentic assessments remain challenging, as confirmed by Ignacio et al. (2022), who noted that gaps in policy execution and limited resources constrain the effective implementation of more demanding instructional strategies.

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

****

Table 4

Extent of Preparedness of Grade 5 Teachers on the Revised K to 12 Curriculum Along Pedagogical Approach

Pedagogical Approach Indicators	4	3	2	1	WM	VI
1. Applies inquiry-based and learner-centered teaching strategies.	17	41	26	2	2.85	MP
2. Aligns teaching with the Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs).	30	41	15	0	3.17	MP
3. Integrates contextualization and localization in lessons.	31	33	19	3	3.07	MP
4. Uses performance-based and authentic assessments.	15	43	18	10	2.73	MP
5. Promotes inclusive education practices for diverse learners.	32	41	11	2	3.20	MP
Average					**3.00**	**MP**

Scale: 3.50–4.00 Very Much Prepared (VMP); 2.50–3.49 Much Prepared (MP); 1.50–2.49 Moderately Prepared (MLP); 1.00–1.49 Not Prepared (NP)

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

Extent of Preparedness Along Technology Integration

Table 5 presents the extent of preparedness along Technology Integration, with an average of 2.98 (Much Prepared). Conducting online quizzes or assessments had the highest weighted mean of 3.35, while participating in webinars or online training for instructional technology had the lowest weighted mean of 2.29. Teachers are highly prepared in online assessments due to the accessibility and user-friendliness of digital tools (e.g., Google Forms), whereas participation in webinars is hindered by limited internet access, time constraints, and lack of institutional support. Barrot (2023) noted that while the K to 12 curriculum reform emphasizes digital literacy, the successful realization of these goals depends on teachers' access to training and resources.

Table 5

Extent of Preparedness of Grade 5 Teachers on the Revised K to 12 Curriculum Along Technology Integration

Technology Integration Indicators	4	3	2	1	WM	VI
1. Uses digital tools (e.g., DepEd Commons, Google Classroom) in instruction.	19	47	18	2	2.97	MP
2. Creates and uses multimedia materials to support lessons.	24	39	22	1	3.03	MP

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

3. Conducts online quizzes or assessments.	48	24	10	4	3.35	MP
4. Communicates with students or parents through messaging apps or online platforms.	37	37	8	4	3.24	MP
5. Participates in webinars or online training for instructional technology.	9	26	32	19	2.29	MLP
Average					**2.98**	**MP**

Scale: 3.50–4.00 Very Much Prepared (VMP); 2.50–3.49 Much Prepared (MP); 1.50–2.49 Moderately Prepared (MLP); 1.00–1.49 Not Prepared (NP)

Extent of Preparedness Along Learning Resources

Table 6 shows preparedness along Learning Resources, averaging 3.10 (Much Prepared). Integrating real-life materials and local resources into lessons and accessing DepEd resource portals for updated learning content both had the highest weighted mean of 3.19, while developing supplementary learning materials aligned with MELCs had the lowest weighted mean of 2.97. While teachers are adept at using existing resources, creating customized materials requires additional time, expertise, and support—highlighting a key area for targeted professional development. Mapolisa et al. (2021) confirmed that while

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

contextualized teaching guides students' learning and fosters essential skills, developing new materials demands considerably more effort.

Table 6

Extent of Preparedness of Grade 5 Teachers on the Revised K to 12 Curriculum Along Learning Resources

Learning Resources Indicators	4	3	2	1	WM	VI
1. Develops supplementary learning materials aligned with MELCs.	22	46	11	7	2.97	MP
2. Selects and adapts materials to suit learners' local context.	28	43	9	6	3.08	MP
3. Collaborates with colleagues to create or improve instructional materials.	27	43	13	3	3.09	MP
4. Integrates real-life materials and local resources into lessons.	30	43	12	1	3.19	MP
5. Accesses DepEd resource portals for updated learning content.	32	38	16	0	3.19	MP
Average					**3.10**	**MP**

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

****

Scale: 3.50–4.00 Very Much Prepared (VMP); 2.50–3.49 Much Prepared (MP); 1.50–2.49 Moderately Prepared (MLP); 1.00–1.49 Not Prepared (NP)

Extent of Preparedness Along Assessment of Learning

Table 7 reveals preparedness along Assessment of Learning, with an average of 3.46 (Much Prepared). Adapting and selecting diverse assessment forms (written exams, performance tasks, projects, digital assessments) had the highest weighted mean of 3.62 (Very Much Prepared), while adapting clear competency-based performance standards and proficiency levels had the lowest weighted mean of 3.27 (Much Prepared). Teachers feel most confident in diverse assessment forms—practical, familiar, and flexible—while competency-based standards require deeper understanding of skill progression and are more abstract to implement consistently. Tyler (2021) affirmed that systematic use of diverse evaluations is central to improving curriculum outcomes and school accountability.

Table 7

Extent of Preparedness of Grade 5 Teachers on the Revised K to 12 Curriculum Along Assessment of Learning

Assessment of Learning Indicators	4	3	2	1	WM	VI
1. Ensures that summative assessments reflect MELCs and higher-order thinking skills.	52	23	9	2	3.45	MP

****

****

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

2. Adapts and selects diverse assessment forms (written exams, performance tasks, projects, digital assessments).	57	25	4	0	3.62	VMP
3. Uses rubrics, answer keys, rating scales, and consistent scoring practices for fairness and reliability.	46	38	1	1	3.50	MP
4. Adapts clear competency-based performance standards and proficiency levels.	43	27	12	4	3.27	MP
5. Adjusts clear, timely, and meaningful feedback to parents and learners.	47	31	7	1	3.44	MP
Average					**3.46**	**MP**

Scale: 3.50–4.00 Very Much Prepared (VMP); 2.50–3.49 Much Prepared (MP); 1.50–2.49 Moderately Prepared (MLP); 1.00–1.49 Not Prepared (NP)

Significant Difference in the Extent of Preparedness Among the Variables

Table 8 presents the results of the F-Test ANOVA on the extent of preparedness. The computed F-value of 1.65 is less than the tabular F-value of 2.87 at 0.05 level of significance and 24 degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis is accepted — there is no significant difference in the extent of preparedness of Grade 5 teachers among the five variables. This implies a

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

consistent level of readiness, suggesting that professional development programs and available resources have effectively supported teachers in maintaining uniform preparedness across all domains. Abragan et al. (2022) confirmed that structured training and resource support are critical for effective curriculum implementation and consistent teacher preparedness.

Table 8

Significant Difference in the Extent of Preparedness of Grade 5 Teachers on the Revised K to 12 Curriculum Among the Variables

Variables – Extent of Preparedness	**WM**	**df**	**SS**	**MS**	**F**
1. Learning Delivery	2.97				
2. Pedagogical Approach	3.00				
3. Technology Integration	2.98				
4. Learning Resources	3.10				
5. Assessment of Learning	3.46				
Average	**3.10**				
Sources of Variation	**df**	**SS**	**MS**	**F-Computed**	**F-Tabular**

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

Between Groups	4	9.66	2.41	1.65	2.87
Within Groups	20	29.20	1.46		
Total	24	38.85			
Level of Significance: 0.05					
Remark: Not Significant | Null Hypothesis: Accepted					

Level of Practice Along Learning Delivery

Table 9 reveals the level of practice along Learning Delivery, with an average of 3.26 (Much Practiced). Both adapting teaching strategies to suit diverse learner needs and contexts and using varied modes of instruction had the highest weighted mean of 3.41, while implementing differentiated instruction had the lowest weighted mean of 3.03. Teachers are adept at adjusting their teaching strategies and employing multiple modalities, yet fully implementing differentiation for varied learning styles remains an area for growth. Loza (2024) observed that while teachers see the benefits of the curriculum, limited training and insufficient resources constrain the consistent application of more demanding practices.

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

Table 9

Level of Practice of Grade 5 Teachers on the Revised K to 12 Curriculum Along Learning Delivery

Learning Delivery Indicators	4	3	2	1	WM	VI
1. Adapts teaching strategies to suit diverse learner needs and contexts.	49	27	6	4	3.41	MP
2. Uses varied modes of instruction (e.g., face-to-face, modular, blended learning).	47	29	8	2	3.41	MP
3. Implements differentiated instruction to accommodate different learning styles.	36	17	33	0	3.03	MP
4. Adjusts pacing of lessons based on learners' mastery levels.	39	24	12	11	3.06	MP
5. Provides remediation or enrichment activities as needed.	46	27	12	1	3.37	MP
Average					**3.26**	**MP**

Scale: 3.50–4.00 Very Much Practiced (VMP); 2.50–3.49 Much Practiced (MP); 1.50–2.49 Moderately Practiced (MLP); 1.00–1.49 Not Practiced (NP)

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

Level of Practice Along Pedagogical Approach

Table 10 shows the level of practice along Pedagogical Approach, averaging 3.17 (Much Practiced). Promoting inclusive education practices for diverse learners had the highest weighted mean of 3.30, while using performance-based and authentic assessments had the lowest weighted mean of 2.97. Although teachers are committed to inclusive learning environments, they are not yet fully leveraging authentic assessments that reflect students' complex skills. Republic Act 10533 encourages inclusive teaching approaches, yet their effectiveness depends heavily on assessment strategies that capture the full range of student abilities.

Table 10

Level of Practice of Grade 5 Teachers on the Revised K to 12 Curriculum Along Pedagogical Approach

Pedagogical Approach Indicators	4	3	2	1	WM	VI
1. Applies inquiry-based and learner-centered teaching strategies.	41	26	17	2	3.23	MP
2. Aligns teaching with the Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs).	41	23	15	7	3.14	MP

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

3. Integrates contextualization and localization in lessons.	38	33	12	3	3.23	MP
4. Uses performance-based and authentic assessments.	32	30	13	11	2.97	MP
5. Promotes inclusive education practices for diverse learners.	41	32	11	2	3.30	MP
Average					**3.17**	**MP**

Scale: 3.50–4.00 Very Much Practiced (VMP); 2.50–3.49 Much Practiced (MP); 1.50–2.49 Moderately Practiced (MLP); 1.00–1.49 Not Practiced (NP)

Level of Practice Along Technology Integration

Table 11 presents the level of practice along Technology Integration, averaging 3.04 (Much Practiced). Using digital tools (e.g., DepEd Commons, Google Classroom) in instruction had the highest weighted mean of 3.50, while participating in webinars or online training for instructional technology had the lowest weighted mean of 2.35 (Moderately Practiced). Teachers are highly comfortable integrating accessible digital platforms into their lessons, while webinars and online training engage less frequently due to time constraints, limited internet access, and lack of institutional support. Galang (2021) confirmed that these persistent challenges hinder teachers' engagement in professional development, constraining overall technological competence.

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

****

Table 11

Level of Practice of Grade 5 Teachers on the Revised K to 12 Curriculum Along Technology Integration

Technology Integration Indicators	4	3	2	1	WM	VI
1. Uses digital tools (e.g., DepEd Commons, Google Classroom) in instruction.	57	19	6	4	3.50	MP
2. Creates and uses multimedia materials to support lessons.	37	25	22	2	3.15	MP
3. Conducts online quizzes or assessments.	41	17	24	4	3.13	MP
4. Communicates with students or parents through messaging apps or online platforms.	31	37	12	6	3.08	MP
5. Participates in webinars or online training for instructional technology.	9	26	37	14	2.35	MLP
Average					**3.04**	**MP**

Scale: 3.50–4.00 Very Much Practiced (VMP); 2.50–3.49 Much Practiced (MP); 1.50–2.49 Moderately Practiced (MLP); 1.00–1.49 Not Practiced (NP)

****

****

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

Level of Practice Along Learning Resources

Table 12 shows the level of practice along Learning Resources, averaging 2.87 (Much Practiced). Developing supplementary learning materials aligned with MELCs had the highest weighted mean of 3.08, while selecting and adapting materials to suit learners' local context had the lowest weighted mean of 2.69. Teachers regularly create additional resources to directly address student needs, but adapting materials to local contexts requires more effort, creativity, and knowledge of community resources, making it harder to implement consistently. Aranda (2022) confirmed that while teachers strive to support essential competencies, contextual material adaptation remains a complex area requiring targeted professional development.

Table 12

Level of Practice of Grade 5 Teachers on the Revised K to 12 Curriculum Along Learning Resources

Learning Resources Indicators	4	3	2	1	WM	VI
1. Develops supplementary learning materials aligned with MELCs.	32	36	11	7	3.08	MP
2. Selects and adapts materials to suit learners' local context.	14	37	29	6	2.69	MP

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

3. Collaborates with colleagues to create or improve instructional materials.	23	38	13	12	2.84	MP
4. Integrates real-life materials and local resources into lessons.	30	34	17	5	3.03	MP
5. Accesses DepEd resource portals for updated learning content.	32	28	6	10	2.72	MP
Average					**2.87**	**MP**

Scale: 3.50–4.00 Very Much Practiced (VMP); 2.50–3.49 Much Practiced (MP); 1.50–2.49 Moderately Practiced (MLP); 1.00–1.49 Not Practiced (NP)

Level of Practice Along Assessment of Learning

Table 13 presents the level of practice along Assessment of Learning, averaging 3.35 (Much Practiced). Adapting and selecting diverse assessment forms had the highest weighted mean of 3.44, while adapting clear competency-based performance standards and proficiency levels had the lowest weighted mean of 3.29. Teachers show consistent application of practical and flexible assessment strategies, yet competency-based evaluation demands additional guidance due to its complexity in calibrating standards across diverse learners. Sharma and Raval (2022) confirmed that systematic curriculum evaluation—particularly competency-based approaches—requires ongoing professional development to be implemented effectively.

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

Table 13

Level of Practice of Grade 5 Teachers on the Revised K to 12 Curriculum Along Assessment of Learning

Assessment of Learning Indicators	4	3	2	1	WM	VI
1. Ensures that summative assessments reflect MELCs and higher-order thinking skills.	52	19	9	6	3.36	MP
2. Adapts and selects diverse assessment forms (written exams, performance tasks, projects, digital assessments).	52	23	8	3	3.44	MP
3. Uses rubrics, answer keys, rating scales, and consistent scoring practices for fairness and reliability.	35	44	7	0	3.33	MP
4. Adapts clear competency-based performance standards and proficiency levels.	45	27	8	6	3.29	MP
5. Adjusts clear, timely, and meaningful feedback to parents and learners.	47	25	11	3	3.35	MP
Average					**3.35**	**MP**

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

****

Scale: 3.50–4.00 Very Much Practiced (VMP); 2.50–3.49 Much Practiced (MP); 1.50–2.49 Moderately Practiced (MLP); 1.00–1.49 Not Practiced (NP)

Significant Difference in the Level of Practice Among the Variables

Table 14 presents the F-Test ANOVA results on the level of practice. The computed F-value of 1.66 is less than the tabular F-value of 2.87 at 0.05 level of significance and 24 degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis is accepted — there is no significant difference in the level of practice of Grade 5 teachers among the variables. This implies that teachers generally perceive themselves as equally active in applying various instructional practices across all domains, reflecting uniformity in professional practices. Gomez et al. (2020) confirmed that consistent teacher engagement across instructional domains is a positive indicator for effective and equitable curriculum execution.

Table 14

Significant Difference in the Level of Practice of Grade 5 Teachers on the Revised K to 12 Curriculum Among the Variables

Variables – Level of Practice	WM	df	SS	MS	F
1. Learning Delivery	3.26				
2. Pedagogical Approach	3.17				

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

3. Technology Integration	3.04				
4. Learning Resources	2.87				
5. Assessment of Learning	3.35				
Average	**3.14**				
Sources of Variation	**df**	**SS**	**MS**	**F-Computed**	**F-Tabular**
Between Groups	4	9.88	2.47	1.66	2.87
Within Groups	20	29.90	1.49		
Total	24	39.78			
Level of Significance: 0.05					
Remark: Not Significant | Null Hypothesis: Accepted					

Significant Relationship Between Extent of Preparedness and Level of Practice

Table 15 presents the results of the Spearman Rank-Order Coefficient of Correlation. The computed rs-value of 0.850 is less than the tabulated rs-value of 1.000 at 0.05 level of significance and 4 degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis is accepted — there is no significant relationship between the extent of preparedness and the level of practice of Grade

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

5 teachers among the variables. This implies that teachers' perceptions of their preparedness do not always translate into effective classroom implementation. Contextual and institutional factors—such as limited time, insufficient instructional materials, large class sizes, and competing administrative responsibilities—can hinder the application of knowledge. DepEd Order No. 10, s. 2024 underscores the need for systemic support mechanisms and enabling school environments to bridge the gap between perceived preparedness and actual practice.

Table 15

Significant Relationship Between the Extent of Preparedness and Level of Practice of Grade 5 Teachers on the Revised K to 12 Curriculum Among the Variables

Variable	Preparedness (x)	Practice (y)	Rank (x)	Rank (y)	D	D^2
1	2.97	3.26	5	2	3	9
2	3.00	3.17	3	3	0	0
3	2.98	3.04	4	4	0	0
4	3.10	2.87	2	5	-3	9
5	3.46	3.35	1	1	0	0
Sum	**15.51**	**15.69**				**18**
Mean	**3.10**	**3.14**				
Level of Significance: 0.05	df: 4	Tabular rs: 1.000	Computed rs: 0.850			

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

Remark: Not Significant | Null Hypothesis: Accepted						

Summary of Findings

1. The extent of preparedness along all variables was Much Prepared: Learning Delivery (WM = 2.97), Pedagogical Approach (WM = 3.00), Technology Integration (WM = 2.98), Learning Resources (WM = 3.10), and Assessment of Learning (WM = 3.46). Overall average: 3.10 (Much Prepared).

2. There is no significant difference in the extent of preparedness among the variables (F = 1.65 < F-tabular = 2.87, p > 0.05). Null hypothesis accepted.

3. The level of practice along all variables was Much Practiced: Learning Delivery (WM = 3.26), Pedagogical Approach (WM = 3.17), Technology Integration (WM = 3.04), Learning Resources (WM = 2.87), and Assessment of Learning (WM = 3.35). Overall average: 3.14 (Much Practiced).

4. There is no significant difference in the level of practice among the variables (F = 1.66 < F-tabular = 2.87, p > 0.05). Null hypothesis accepted.

5. There is no significant relationship between the extent of preparedness and level of practice among the variables (rs = 0.850 < tabular rs = 1.000, p > 0.05). Null hypothesis accepted.

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

6. A Professional Development Plan was prepared to strengthen teachers' competencies and instructional practices on the revised K to 12 curriculum.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are formulated:

1. Provide sustained training where teachers collaboratively design performance-based tasks and rubrics aligned with MELCs, followed by classroom tryouts and peer feedback, to strengthen confidence and consistency in using authentic assessments.

2. Conduct workshops and LAC sessions focused on designing authentic tasks, creating rubrics, and aligning performance assessments with MELCs to address the gap in performance-based and authentic assessment practice.

3. Develop incentive programs and integrate ICT training into teachers' IPCRF targets. Providing flexible schedules, improving access to devices and internet connectivity, and promoting easy-to-use online learning platforms may increase teachers' engagement in technology-related professional development.

4. Offer workshops on developing supplementary learning resources and on localizing materials to suit learners' cultural, community, and real-life contexts. A shared school repository of contextualized and MELC-aligned instructional materials may be established to support teachers.

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

****

5. Conduct capacity-building on unpacking MELCs, creating clear learning targets, and crafting student-friendly performance standards. Standardized rubrics and regular assessment review sessions should be encouraged to refine and align assessment practices.

6. Use LAC Sessions as structured platforms to address identified weak areas by focusing on differentiated instruction, assessment, technology integration, and resource development. Peer mentoring, sharing of best practices, and collaborative planning should be encouraged.

7. Strengthen instructional monitoring and coaching mechanisms through regular classroom observations, post-observation conferences, and coaching sessions focused on differentiated instruction, assessment practices, and effective use of learning resources.

8. Allocate protected time for collaborative planning and reflective practice by embedding it into the school calendar. Scheduled time for lesson study, reflection on assessment results, and joint material development enables teachers to refine instructional strategies and ensure consistent alignment with MELCs across grade levels.

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

****

References

1987 Philippine Constitution. Article XIV: Education, Science and Technology, Arts, Culture, and Sports, Section 5. (4)

Republic Act No. 10533. Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. Retrieved from https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2013/05/15/republic-act-no-10533/

Abragan, F., Abarcas, V., Aquino, I. M., & Bagongon, R. E. (2022). Research review on K-12 curriculum implementation in the Philippines: A generic perspective. European Journal of Educational and Social Sciences, 7(1), 1–8.

Alvarado, C. C. P. (2023). Communicative competence in spiral progression curriculum: A study reinforcing the implementation of MATATAG curriculum in the Philippines. Journal of Humanities and Education Development, 5(6), 11–29.

Alugar, R. B., & Itaas, E. C. (2021). Exploring the implementation of curriculum quality audit in a Philippine State University. International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 13(2), 1620–1639.

Aranda, M. R. R. (2022). Learning challenges in the new senior high school English curriculum in the Philippines. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 21(11), 315–333.

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.

****

****

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

Cabardo. (2021). Transformation or evolution?: Education 4.0, teaching and learning in the digital age. Higher Education Pedagogies, 5(1), 223–246. https://doi.org/10.1080/23752696.2020.1816847

Diquito, T. (2024). Basic education curriculum under the newly implemented K to 10 (MATATAG) curriculum in the Philippines: The case of science education. American Journal of Education and Technology (AJET), 3(3), 123–132.

Galang, A. D. (2021). Teachers' critical reflections on the new normal Philippine education issues: Inputs on curriculum and instruction development. International Journal of Social Learning (IJSL), 1(3), 236–249.

Gomez, I., Montenegro-Rueda, M., Molina-Fernández, E., & Fernández-Batanero, J. M. (2020). Mapping teacher collaboration for school success. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 32(4), 631–649. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2021.1925700

Ignacio, L. B., Cristobal, A. G. A., & David, P. C. (2022). Impact of policy implementation on education quality: A case study on Philippines' low ranking in international and local assessment programs. Asian Journal on Perspectives in Education, 3, 41–54.

Irmano, K. J. V., Inocian, R. B., Tabunag, J. A., Compuesto, C. D. M., & Gualiza, W. (2023). The philosophy of the human person curriculum in the Philippines: Basis for COVID-19 model of curriculum revision. Cogent Education, 10(1), 2216488.

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

Jaca, C., & Baroman, J. (2021). Challenges and extent of readiness among teachers on the implementation of the kindergarten curriculum in select public elementary schools in the Philippines. International Journal of Elementary Education, 10(4), 134–144.

Kromydas. (2021). Active learning augmented reality for STEAM education — A case study. Education Sciences, 10(8), 198. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10080198

Loza, J. F. (2024). How can teachers embrace curriculum change: Perceptions on the implementation of MATATAG curriculum. Philippine Journal of Educational Change, 15(3), 77–91.

Mapolisa, L. (2021). Alternate assessments and monitoring student progress in inclusive classrooms. In Routledge eBooks (pp. 302–321). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003043874-15

Markham, Z. J. (2025). Illuminating teacher lived experiences in the new revised curriculum. Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 43(5), 609–619.

Mendoza, K. J. A., Asio, J. M. R., & Soriano, I. D. (2022). The General Education Curriculum in the Philippines: A policy analysis.

Palestina, R. L., Pangan, A. D., & Ancho, I. V. (2020). Curriculum implementation facilitating and hindering factors: The Philippines context. International Journal of Education, 13(2), 91–104.

Raval, J. (2020). Beyond the four walls: Curriculum evaluation as a critical process in understanding the elements that facilitate learning for teachers. International

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRISE), 1(9), 39–44.

Sasan, J. M., Seblos, K., & Gier, R. A. (2024). Assessing the implementation of senior high school mathematics curriculum: Teachers' and students' perceptions in Calbayog City Division, Philippines. European Journal of Education and Pedagogy, 6(1), 61–65.

Sharma, S., & Raval, J. (2022). Reforming teacher education for inclusion in developing countries in the Asia Pacific region. Asian Journal of Inclusive Education, 1(1), 3–16.

Sivesind, J. (2023). The pandemic dilemma: A mixed-methods study of student-centered science education in the COVID-19 pandemic. Digital Commons @ West Chester University.

Tupas, R., & Linas-Laguda, C. C. P. (2020). Blended learning approach in Philippine basic education curriculum in new normal. Universal Journal of Educational Research, 8(11), 5505–5512.

Tyler, F. P. (2021). Blended learning — An approach in Philippine basic education curriculum in new normal: A review. Universal Journal of Educational Research, 8(11), 5505–5512.

Yunting, M. J. D. C., Santos, M. M. C. R., Ampong Jr., M. A. H. C., Mejos, M. D. P., & Monreal, M. J. A. Evaluating teachers' perceptions on the first year of MATATAG curriculum implementation among selected schools: A quantitative analysis.

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

Bieleke, M., Animos, E., & Javorn, R. (2020). Learning delivery and educational practice. International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRISE), 1(9), 39–44.

Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2023). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. Applied Developmental Science, 24(2), 97–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791

Melike, O. K. (2020). The factors predicting pre-service teachers' achievement in teacher training classrooms. Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 87, 1–22. http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2020.87.8

Taylor, S. (2023). Weighted mean: Definition, uses, and practical example. Corporate Finance Institute. Retrieved from https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/data-science/weighted-mean/

Department of Education. (2012). K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum. Department of Education, Philippines.

Department of Education. (2013). Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) of Republic Act No. 10533, Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/DO_s2013_43.pdf

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

Department of Education. (2015). DepEd Order No. 8, s. 2015: Policy Guidelines on Classroom Assessment for the K to 12 Basic Education Program. Retrieved from https://www.deped.gov.ph/2015/04/01/do-8-s-2015/

Department of Education. (2019). Policy Guidelines on the K to 12 Basic Education Program. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/DO_s2019_021.pdf

Department of Education. (2021). DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2021: Policy guidelines on the provision of learning resources and instructional materials. Department of Education, Philippines.

Department of Education. (2022). DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2022: Adoption of the Basic Education Development Plan 2030. Retrieved from https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/DO_s2022_024.pdf

Department of Education. (2024). DepEd Order No. 10, s. 2024: Policy Guidelines on the Revised K to 12 Curriculum. Retrieved from https://www.deped.gov.ph/

McCombes, S. (2019). Descriptive research: Definition, types, methods and examples. Retrieved October 2022 from Scribbr.

Newcastle University. (n.d.). Numeracy, maths and statistics — Academic Skills Kit. Retrieved from https://www.ncl.ac.uk/webtemplate/ask-assets/external/maths-resources/statistics/

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE
ISSN: 2704-3010
Volume VII, Issue III
March 2026
Available online at https://www.instabrightgazette.com

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). TALIS 2018 results (Volume I): Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/1d0bc92a-en