



REVISITING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EIGHT-WEEK CURRICULUM PROGRAM IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

MADONNA L. NABATA

Teacher III

Maninila Elementary School

madonna.nabata@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

This study determined the level of implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program in selected public elementary schools in one municipality of Albay during the School Year 2025–2026. Specifically, it examined the level of implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program in terms of objectives, activities and instructional materials, teachers and school head engagement, and assessment. It also determined whether a significant difference existed in the level of implementation of the program, identified the challenges encountered by teachers and school heads, and determined the strategies implemented to address the identified challenges. A descriptive research design using survey techniques was employed in the study. The statistical tools used were frequency count, percentage, weighted mean, and Kruskal–Wallis H test. The respondents consisted of thirty-three (33) school heads and one hundred twenty (120) elementary teachers handling Grades 1 to 3 classes in selected public elementary schools.

Findings revealed that two of the four variables demonstrated full implementation. Assessment obtained the highest weighted mean of 3.84 interpreted as Fully Implemented (FI), and Activities and Instructional Materials obtained the lowest with weighted mean of 3.49 Moderately Implemented (MF). Results further showed a significance difference exist among the four variables on the level of implementation of Eight-Week Curriculum. Moreover, the insufficient resources such as learning materials and equipment exhibited as the major the challenges in its implementation. To address challenges, teachers most commonly

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



implemented strategy was developing additional learning materials to be utilized in learning centers.

In view of the findings and conclusions drawn, various recommendations were deduced. Continuous implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program to improve reading and numeracy skills of early grade learners. Teachers and school head should strengthen instructional planning to effectively implement intervention programs. Educational leaders and policy makers should strengthen resource distribution and management to address disparities access to instructional materials. Prepared Action Plan may adopt to address various challenges in the implementation of intervention curriculum program. Future researchers may conduct a similar study to support the results of this research.

INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic caused many young learners to fall behind, especially in reading and numeracy. To help them catch up with the essential learning competencies they missed during the pandemic, the Department of Education Region V introduced the Eight-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum, a short but focused program that identifies students' learning gaps and provides activities to strengthen their skills. Even with this program, some learners still struggle, so it's important to look at how it is being implemented, what challenges teachers and students face, and which strategies work best. The findings can make the program more effective and ensure students get the support they need to reach grade-level skills.

The implementation of the Eight-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum was anchored on DepEd Order No. 34, series of 2022, which directed regional offices to implement contextualized learning interventions under the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (BE-LCP) mandated by Republic Act No. 11494. In line with this mandate, Regional Memorandum No. 104, series of 2022, formally introduced the Eight-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum for Grades 1 to 3 as a three-year program. The intervention curriculum utilized assessment tools such as the Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (CRLA) and the Albay Numeracy

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Assessment Tool (ALNAT) to determine learners' academic levels. Further support for the program's continued implementation was reinforced through Regional Memorandum No. 393, series of 2023, which provided full backing to teachers and the school community.

This study aimed to assess the level of implementation of the Eight-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum, identify the challenges encountered during its implementation, and examine the strategies employed to address these challenges. The results of the study served as a basis for the development of an action plan intended to further strengthen the program and enhance its effectiveness in improving learners' literacy and numeracy skills.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study utilized a descriptive research design with survey techniques to provide a clear and accurate picture of how the Eight-Week Curriculum was implemented in public elementary schools. Descriptive research is a type of research that systematically describes the characteristics, behaviors, or conditions of a particular population or phenomenon without manipulating variables (McCombes, 2023). It is appropriate for this study because it allows the researcher to assess the level of implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum in terms of objectives, activities, instructional materials, teacher and school head engagement, and assessment, while identifying challenges and strategies used during implementation.

Survey technique involves administering standardized questionnaires to a selected sample and ensuring consistent data collection (Babbie, 2009). This method is particularly useful because it allows the researcher to collect consistent and reliable data from a large number of respondents efficiently.

A modified researcher-made questionnaire was used to assess the level of implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program in public elementary schools. It also identified challenges faced by teachers and school heads and the strategies they employed to address these challenges.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Research Instrument

This study used a modified questionnaire checklist employing the survey technique, adapted from Regional Memorandum No. 426, s. 2023 on the Eight-Week Curriculum Program, to address the study’s specific objectives. The instrument was divided into three parts to gather comprehensive data from school heads and teachers regarding the implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum, the challenges encountered, and the strategies applied to overcome these challenges.

Part I assessed the level of implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum across four key areas: objectives, activities and instructional materials, teacher and school head engagement, and assessment. Respondents rated each item using a 4-point Likert scale (4 = Fully Implemented, 3 = Moderately Implemented, 2 = Partially Implemented, 1 = Rarely Implemented), reflecting their experiences and perceptions of program execution. This part provided insight into how effectively the program was applied in classrooms and how closely teachers and school heads followed the guidelines set by the DepEd memorandum.

Part II identified the challenges faced by respondents during program implementation. Teachers and school heads were asked to indicate common obstacles from a provided list—such as insufficient resources, lack of training, time constraints, and resistance from students—or specify other challenges under Others. This part allowed the researcher to pinpoint factors that hindered smooth implementation and highlighted areas where support or intervention might be needed.

Part III are the strategies applied to address challenges encountered during the implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum. Respondents could select from a list of strategies, including modifying lesson maps, collaborating with co-teachers, integrating ICT tools, developing additional learning materials, and applying alternative assessments, with the option to indicate other strategies under Others. This part provided a practical understanding of how teachers and school heads adapted to difficulties and ensured that the curriculum was effectively implemented despite constraints.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher followed key steps to facilitate data collection. With endorsement from the Dean of the Graduate School, a permission letter was submitted to the Schools Division Superintendent. After approval, permission were sought from the School District Supervisors and School Heads.

The distribution of research questionnaires was carefully planned to avoid disrupting regular class schedule. The researcher personally administered the surveys, providing clarifications as needed. A total of 153 questionnaires—68 from the District A and 85 from the District B were eventually collected, achieving a 100 percent response rate. Some questionnaires were not retrieved immediately due to the teachers' respondents being busy or school heads attending trainings and seminars. Other teachers needed additional time to complete the instrument due to class suspensions and school activities. To address this, the researcher made multiple follow-up visits to each school to ensure complete retrieval. Despite these challenges, the researcher was able to successfully collect the required data through proper coordination from the respondents.

After all questionnaires were collected, the data were tallied and sent to a statistician for statistical processing. The processed results were then systematically organized and presented by the researcher, forming the basis for drawing conclusions and developing relevant recommendations for drawing conclusions and developing relevant recommendations based on the study's findings.

Statistical Tool

To appropriately analyze the data that was collected, quantitative analysis was employed. The researcher used the following statistical tools of data: Frequency count, percentage technique, weighted mean, and Kruskal-Wallis Test or H-test.

Frequency count. It is a statistical method used to organize a set of scores or responses and indicate the number of times each score occurs (Malim and Birch 1997). This study employed frequency count to determine the number of survey questionnaires distributed

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



and retrieved, as well as to summarize the respondents' answers in each category regarding the level of implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program.

Percentage technique. It is a descriptive statistical tool used to determine how a part relates to a whole. It is widely used in research to describe data distribution, make comparisons, and interpret results more clearly and meaningfully (Calmorin and Calmorin, 2012). In this study, percentages were computed to determine the proportion of responses for each indicator in the survey questionnaire. This computation was applied to present the data in a more interpretable form, allowing for better understanding of response distribution related to the implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program.

Weighted Mean. It is a statistical measure that considers the varying importance of different values by adjusting for their sample sizes. It is calculated by multiplying each variable by its sample size, summing the products, and dividing by the sum of all the sample sizes, (Taylor and Francis, 2019). It was utilized in the study to assess the level of implementation based on Linkert scale items. It determined the average level of implementation among variables. The formula for computing weighted mean is:

$$\bar{X}_w = \frac{\sum(w_i x_i)}{\sum w_i}$$

Where:

- \bar{X}_w = weighted mean
- x_i = individual score or value
- w_i = weight assigned to each score (frequency)
- $\sum(w_i x_i)$ = sum of the products of weights and scores
- $\sum w_i$ = sum of the weights

Kruskal-Wallis Test or H-test. The Kruskal-Wallis test is a nonparametric statistical test that compares the ranks of three or more independent groups to determine whether their population distributions differ, serving as the nonparametric counterpart of one-way ANOVA (Kruskal & Wallis, 1952). In this study, the H-test was used to determine whether there were significant differences in the level of implementation along objectives, activities and

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



instructions, teachers and school heads engagement, and assessment in the Eight-Week Curriculum.

The formula for computing the h-test is:

$$H = \frac{12}{N(N+1)} \sum \frac{R_i^2}{n_i} - 3(N+1)$$

Where:

H = Kruskal–Wallis test statistic

N = total number of observations across all groups

R_i = sum of ranks for each group

n_i = number of observations in each group

REVISITING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EIGHT-WEEK CURRICULUM IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

This chapter provides an in-depth presentation of the findings, interpretations, implications, and relevance derived from the gathered data. The discussion includes the level of implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program along objectives, activities and learning materials, teachers and school heads, and assessment, the significant difference in the level of implementation among the variables, the challenges encountered, the strategies applied, and the action plan are also discussed and presented.

Level of Implementation of Eight-Week Curriculum Program Along Objectives

The effective implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program is essential in achieving its intended objectives and ensuring meaningful learning outcomes. Assessing the level of implementation along its objectives provides insight into how effectively teachers carry out the program in actual classroom practice.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Table 3 exhibits the level of implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program along its objectives. It was found out that the indicator Ensures the holistic development of learners by providing them with opportunities that will enable them to acquire foundational and readiness skills in school obtained the highest weighted mean of 3.68, interpreted as Fully Implemented (FI), indicating that teachers consistently delivered learning experiences that support learners’ foundational and readiness skills. Meanwhile, the indicator Provides access to a comprehensive educational program for all learners in Grades 1–3 who experience loss received the lowest weighted mean of 3.49, interpreted as Moderately Implemented (MI), this suggest that some learners experiencing learning loss may not have been fully accommodated. The average weighted mean of 3.60, interpreted as Fully Implemented (FI), reflects a generally high level of implementation of the program along its objectives. The Eight-Week Curriculum Program was generally fully implemented, with teachers effectively promoting holistic and foundational learner development, though learners experiencing learning loss require additional support to fully meet program objectives.

Table 3
Level of Implementation of Eight-Week Curriculum Program Along Objectives

Indicators	N = 153				Level of Implementation	
	4	3	2	1	WM	VI
1. Provides foundational skills to learners in literacy and numeracy for them to catch up and be grade-level ready	101	47	5	0	3.63	FI
2. Ensures the holistic development of learners by providing them with opportunities that will enable them to acquire foundational and readiness skills in school	105	47	1	0	3.68	FI
3. Provides access to a comprehensive educational program for all learners in Grade 1-3 who experience loss.	77	75	0	1	3.49	MI
Average					3.60	FI

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Range of Weighted Mean (WM)	Verbal Interpretation
3.50 – 4.00	Fully Implemented (FI)
2.50 – 3.49	Moderately Implemented (MI)
1.50 – 2.49	Partially Implemented (PI)
1.00 – 1.49	Rarely Implemented (RI)

This result aligns with Dianela et al. (2023) who found that the 8-Week Learning Recovery Program improved reading competencies in Grade 3 learners. However, the moderate implementation of providing access to a comprehensive program for learners experiencing learning loss highlights the need for additional support and action planning at the division level.

These results imply that while teachers strongly implemented objectives related to foundational and readiness skills, providing comprehensive support for all learners experiencing learning loss was implemented to a lesser degree and needs further strengthening. Therefore, it is recommended that schools enhance program monitoring and provide additional support mechanisms to ensure equitable access and full implementation of all curriculum objectives.

Level of Implementation of Eight-Week Curriculum Program Along Activities and Instructional Materials

The level of implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program along activities and instructional materials reflects how well teachers use strategies and resources. Assessing this helps determine the effectiveness of classroom practices in achieving program objectives.

Table 4 presents the level of implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program along activities and instructional materials. The activity, Utilizes lesson map as guide in finding the strategies and materials that are appropriate for each ability group obtained the highest weighted mean of 3.74, interpreted as Fully Implemented (FI), indicating that teachers effectively planned and organized instructional materials based on the needs of learners. In

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



contrast, the activity Ensures literacy center has book corners, videos, phonic lessons, puppets, worksheets, and manipulative materials recorded the lowest weighted mean of 3.15, interpreted as Moderately Implemented (MI), highlighting that the provision and organization of literacy center resources need improvement. It indicates that the program was implemented satisfactorily across activities and instructional materials, though certain areas require further attention. The Eight-Week Curriculum Program was generally implemented, with effective use of planning tools, though literacy centers require additional support for optimal learning outcomes.

Table 4

Level of Implementation of Eight-Week Curriculum Program Along Activities and Instructional Materials

Activities and Instructional Materials Indicators	N = 153				Level of Implementation	
	4	3	2	1	WM	VI
1. Utilizes lesson map as guide in finding the strategies and materials that appropriate for each ability group.	118	30	5	0	3.74	
2. Employs learning centers to address the development of literacy and numeracy skills of learners are strategically placed in the classrooms.	80	72	1	0	3.52	
3. Ensures literacy center has book corners, videos, phonic lessons, puppets, worksheets and manipulative materials.	44	88	21	0	3.15	
4. Ensures numeracy center has Math manipulatives, number charts, number cards, math games and worksheets among others.	71	60	22	0	3.32	
5. Ensures that the classroom is spacious and well-ventilated for learning centers.	80	65	7	1	3.46	
6. Ensures the availability of printed lesson map in Mother Tongue, Filipino, English and Mathematics in the classroom.	98	46	8	1	3.58	

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



7. Secures coded and printed worksheets are available in the classroom.	82	64	7	0	3.49	
8. Provides additional worksheets develop by teachers suited to the context learners.	74	60	19	0	3.36	
9. Provides remedial instruction to learners who need additional practice and enhancement during remedial sessions.	111	29	13	0	3.64	
10. Provides additional learning materials accessible to learners to enhance their learning.	93	60	0	0	3.61	
Average					3.49	
Range of Weighted Mean (WM)						
3.50 – 4.00	Fully Implemented (FI)					
2.50 – 3.49	Moderately Implemented (MI)					
1.50 – 2.49	Partially Implemented (PI)					
1.00 – 1.49	Rarely Implemented (RI)					

This outcome supports the findings of Bebis et al. (2023), who emphasized that remedial instruction and thoughtfully designed learning materials enhance reading comprehension, while inconsistencies in implementation can limit the program’s overall effectiveness. It highlights the importance of consistent program implementation and adequate support for teachers to ensure that all learners benefit fully from the Eight-Week Curriculum Program.

These findings suggest that schools should provide additional training and resources to strengthen the development and management of learning centers. Ensuring that instructional materials are consistently organized and accessible can enhance learner engagement and support skill development across literacy and numeracy activities.

It is recommended that schools provide additional training and resources for the development and management of learning centers to maximize the effectiveness of instructional activities. Moreover, teachers should be encouraged to collaborate and share best practices to address challenges and improve instructional strategies across all learning centers.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Level of Implementation of Eight-Week Curriculum Program Along Teachers and School Heads

The level of implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program along teachers and school heads shows how well administrators and teachers are prepared and supported to carry out the program effectively.

As shown from Table 5, the data on the level of implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program along teachers and school heads show that the indicator Early grade teachers are oriented about the implementation of eight-week curriculum obtained the highest weighted mean of 3.80, interpreted as Fully Implemented (FI), indicating that teachers were well-informed and prepared to carry out the program. In comparison, the school head provides timely feedback and technical assistance to teachers as a result of regular monitoring and evaluation of early grade teachers recorded the lowest weighted mean of 3.20, interpreted as Moderately Implemented (MI), this suggest a need for more consistent administrative support. The program was implemented effectively, with an average weighted mean of 3.52, interpreted as Fully Implemented (FI), although certain areas still require attention.

Table 5
Level of Implementation of Eight-Week Curriculum Program Along Teachers and School Heads Engagement

Teachers and School Heads Engagent Indicators	N = 153				Level of Implement-ation	
	4	3	2	1	WM	VI
1. School head is well oriented about the implementation of eight-week curriculum.	93	60	0	0	3.61	
2. Early grade teachers are oriented about the implementation of eight-week curriculum	127	21	5	0	3.80	
3. School head fully supports teachers by not giving extra assignments or tasks to focus on regular function as classroom teachers.	65	73	15	0	3.33	
4. Teachers do to take part in trainings, workshops, conferences and competitions or orientations at least	111	34	8	0	3.67	

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



the completion of eight-week curriculum.						
5. Teachers who implement the eight-week curriculum are not required to write lesson plans instead they utilized the lesson map as guide to conduct of daily lessons.	105	42	6	0	3.65	
6. Early grade teachers retain to their teaching assignments and not move to intermediate level.	109	38	6	0	3.67	
7. Focus group discussions or small learning action all sessions to process daily learning experiences with other teachers are organized by the school head for adjustments and continuous improvements of contextualized curriculum.	64	57	32	0	3.21	
8. The school head provides timely feedback and technical assistance to teachers as a result of regular monitoring and evaluation of early grade teachers.	56	72	25	0	3.20	
Average					3.52	
Range of Weighted Mean (WM)						
3.50 – 4.00						Verbal Interpretation
2.50 – 3.49						Fully Implemented (FI)
1.50 – 2.49						Moderately Implemented (MI)
1.00 – 1.49						Partially Implemented (PI)
						Rarely Implemented (RI)

These results support the findings of Miña and Caballes (2023), who reported that the success of the Eight-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum depended greatly on well-oriented teachers and consistent support, emphasizing that

both teacher preparedness and administrative guidance are critical for program effectiveness.

The findings imply that while teachers are well-oriented and supported in implementing the Eight-Week Curriculum Program, school heads should provide more consistent feedback and technical assistance. Strengthening monitoring, guidance, and administrative support can enhance teachers' performance and ensure more effective and sustained program implementation.

It is recommended that school heads strengthen their monitoring and supervisory practices by providing more regular feedback and technical assistance to early grade teachers

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



during the implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program. Schools may also conduct regular learning action sessions and collaborative discussions among teachers to address challenges and share effective teaching strategies.

Level of Implementation of Eight-Week Curriculum Program Along Assessment

Table 6 shows the level of implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program along with assessment. The table includes five indicators that reflect how teachers carried out pre-tests, formative assessments, post-tests, and analysis of assessment results during program implementation.

The data reveal that the indicator, Pre-test administers in Week 1 to determine specific difficulties of learners and Formative assessment regularly administers to learners who undergoing remedial instruction to check their progress obtained the highest weighted mean of 3.88, interpreted as Fully Implemented (FI). This indicates that teacher’s prioritized identifying learners’ difficulties at the start of the program to guide instruction. Meanwhile, Analyze and interpret the results assessments received the lowest weighted mean of 3.80, also interpreted as Fully Implemented (FI). This suggests that while teachers consistently collect assessment data, interpreting and utilizing the results for instructional improvement may require more support, time, or training.

This aligns with the findings of Laguerta and Gamba (2023), who reported that while teachers actively conduct assessments during the Eight-Week Learning Recovery Program, they continue to face challenges in interpreting assessment data due to limited training and preparation time.

Table 6
tLevel of Implementation of Eight-Week Curriculum Program Along Assessmen

Assessment Indicators	N = 153				Level of Implementation	
	4	3	2	1	WM	VI

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



1. Pre-test administers in Week 1 to determine specific difficulties of learners.	140	8	5	0	3.88	
2. Evaluates procedure in conducting pre-test using prescribe Self-Assessment Tool rubric for each subject area	132	15	6	0	3.82	
3. Formative assessment regularly administers to learners who undergoing remedial instruction to check their progress.	134	19	0	0	3.88	
4. Post-test administers to all learners in Week 10 of the implementation of the program.	132	16	5	0	3.83	
5. Analyze and interpret the results assessments.	128	20	5	0	3.80	
Average					3.84	
Range of Weighted Mean Verbal Interpretation (WM)						
3.50 – 4.00	Fully Implemented (FI)					
2.50 – 3.49	Moderately Implemented (MI)					
1.50 – 2.49	Partially Implemented (PI)					
1.00 – 1.49	Rarely Implemented (RI)					

This shows that teachers are committed to track student’s progress and using assessment result to guide their instruction. Pre-tests help identify learning gaps, formative assessments monitor improvement, and post-tests evaluate overall program effectiveness. To address this, it is recommended that teachers receive training on how to analyze and interpret assessment results, participate in collaborative sessions with school heads to review data and plan interventions, be given sufficient time within the program to work with assessment results, and use simplified tools or guides to interpret results consistently and effectively.

Significant Difference in the Level of Implementation of Eight-Week Curriculum Program Among the Variables

Table 7 presents the significant difference in the level of implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program among the variables: Objectives, Activities and Instructional Materials, Teacher and School Heads Engagement and Assessment

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



The data were analyzed using weighted means, ranks, and the Kruskal-Wallis h-test.

The computed H value of 11.525 was higher than the tabular chi-square value of 7.815 at the 0.05 level of significance with 3 degrees of freedom. The results indicate that there is a significant difference in the level of implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program among the variables. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

Table 7
Significant Difference in the Level of Implementation of Eight-Week Curriculum Program Among the Variables

Objectives		Activities and Learning Materials		Teachers and School Heads		Assessment	
Weighted Mean	Rank (R ₁)	Weighted Mean	Rank (R ₂)	Weighted Mean	Rank (R ₃)	Weighted Mean	Rank (R ₄)
3.63	13	3.74	7	3.61	14.5	3.88	1.5
3.68	8	3.52	17	3.8	5.5	3.82	4
3.49	18.5	3.15	26	3.33	22	3.88	1.5
		3.32	23	3.67	9.5	3.83	3
		3.46	20	3.65	11	3.8	5.5
		3.58	16	3.67	9.5		
		3.49	18.5	3.21	24		
		3.36	21	3.2	25		
		3.64					
		3.61					
n ₁ =3	ΣR ₁ = 39.5	n ₂ =10	ΣR ₂ = 175	N ₃ =8	ΣR ₃ = 121	N ₄ =5	ΣR ₄ = 15.5
Degree of Freedom		: 3					
Level of Significance		: 0.05					
Tabular x ² value		: 7.815					
Computed H value		: 11.525					
Remark:		: Significant					
Null Hypothesis:		: Rejected					
Alternative Hypothesis		: Accepted					

The findings are supported by the study of Juliana (2025), which reported that the 8-

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
 Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
 Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Week Learning Recovery Curriculum significantly improved the literacy and numeracy skills of Grade 3 learners, although implementation varied across different curriculum components, and recommended continuous, data-driven interventions with adequate teacher support to ensure consistent program delivery.

This implies that schools should prioritize strengthening the provision of learning materials, enhancing teacher support, and ensuring proper monitoring of curriculum activities. It is recommended that school administrators provide targeted training for teachers, improve access to instructional resources, and establish regular monitoring and feedback mechanisms to achieve uniform and effective implementation of all curriculum components.

Challenges Encountered During the Implementation of Eight-Week Curriculum Program

Table 8 presents the various challenges faced by teachers and school heads while implementing the Eight-Week Curriculum Program. These challenges reflect the real-world difficulties in delivering the program, such as limited resources, time constraints, diverse learner needs, and the need for additional training and support.

The data show that 86 percent of respondents reported insufficient resources, such as learning materials and equipment, as the highest challenge, indicating that resource limitations are a major barrier to effective program implementation. In contrast, 12 percent indicated inadequate training with the new program as the lowest challenge encountered suggesting that most teachers felt adequately prepared to implement the curriculum.

The findings align with the study of Acob et al. (2023), which identified similar difficulties in the implementation of the 8-Week Curriculum, particularly the lack of instructional resources and the need for additional time for remediation activities. Their study emphasized that teachers required continuous training and adequate instructional materials to effectively support learners' progress.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Table 8

Challenges Encountered During the Implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program

Challenges Encountered	N=153	
	Frequency	Percent
1. Ambiguous learning objectives	20	13
2. Insufficient resources (e.g. Learning materials, equipment)	131	86
3. Lack of training or professional development	42	27
4. Resistance to the program by students	28	18
5. Lack of time for preparation and planning	87	57
6. Limited administrative support	42	27
7. Difficulty in assessing students effectively	31	20
8. Lack of parent's support and cooperation	96	63
9. Classroom factor (space, ventilation)	42	27
10. Too many tasks to be performed	72	47
11. Lots of documentary reports	59	39
12. Uncooperative guardians/parents and community	42	27
13. Low motivation to perform duties and responsibilities	27	18
14. Inadequate training with the new program	19	12
15. Peer Pressure	41	27
16. Age factor	28	18
17. Difficulty adopting new program	40	26
18. Lack of skills in the new program	40	26
19. Learners Attitude towards learning	91	59

The results imply that effective implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program relies heavily on the availability of adequate instructional materials, sufficient preparation time, and ongoing teacher support. Insufficient learning materials contribute to increase teacher's workload and longer preparation time. Addressing these challenges is essential to ensure that learners achieve the intended learning outcomes and that the program is delivered consistently and effectively.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



It is therefore recommended that schools provide sufficient instructional materials and allocate adequate preparation time for teachers to effectively implement the program. In addition, school administrators should strengthen teacher support through collaborative activities such as learning action sessions and professional sharing of strategies and best practices.

Strategies Implemented to Address Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of Eight-Week Curriculum Program

Table 9 shows the strategies implemented by teachers to address challenges encountered during the implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program.

The data reveal that the highest strategy applied was the develops of additional learning materials to be utilized in learning centers 81 percent, which indicates that teachers prioritize creating their own resources to overcome limitations. Meanwhile, the lowest strategy applied was request insufficient supplies from stakeholders (21 percent), which indicates that seeking external assistance was the least utilized approach.

This relates to the findings of Dionglay et al. (2023), who emphasized that improvements in pupils' performance were achieved primarily through teacher-led interventions, such as consistent implementation of the Eight-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum, rather than reliance on outside assistance. Their study highlights that teacher-initiated strategies play an important role in helping learners improve their reading proficiency.

The results show that teachers often relied on their own initiative and creativity to handle challenges, highlighting how important it is for them to be proactive and adaptable to make the Eight-Week Curriculum Program work, even with limited external support. To improve implementation, it is recommended that school leaders provide more guidance and support, such as regular training, access to materials and opportunities for teachers to plan.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Table 9

Strategies Implemented to Address Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program

Strategies	N=153	
	Frequency	Percent
1. Modifies lesson maps and activities to suits learner’s need.	115	75
2. Initiate focus group discussion to seek guidance and feedback from school head and co-teachers on eight-week curriculum implementation.	71	46
3. Collaborates with other teachers from other school to share strategies and best practices.	105	69
4. Integrates ICT tools (video lessons, ppts, games, etc.) to increase participation.	110	72
5. Develops additional learning materials to be utilize in learning centers.	124	81
6. Use personal resources for additional learning materials.	103	67
7. Seek assistance of other co-teachers to develop learning materials	94	61
8. Request insufficient supplies from stakeholders for the implementation the eight-week curriculum.	32	21
9. Modifies assessment tools to suits learners’ abilities.	95	62
10. Utilizes variety of assessment methods (written, oral, performance-based) for formative assessment.	74	48
11. Develops alternative assessments for learners with special needs.	66	43
12. Integrates contextualized tasks in assessments.	95	62

An Action Plan in Addressing Challenges in the Curriculum Implementation Prepared by the Researcher

An Action Plan was developed to address the key challenges encountered by teachers and school heads during the implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program. Several concerns were identified as major issues affecting program implementation, including

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>

insufficient resources, lack of parental support, learners' attitudes, limited preparation time, excessive paperwork, and heavy workloads. These challenges may hinder teachers' ability to effectively deliver instruction and achieve the intended learning outcomes of the program.

The development of the Action Plan is anchored on DepEd Order No. 029, s. 2022, which adopts the Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (BEMEF) to guide the systematic monitoring and evaluation of educational programs and initiatives. This policy ensures that appropriate tools, processes, and approaches are utilized in monitoring program implementation and evaluating its effectiveness.

This action plans aims to provide practical and strategic interventions to address the identified challenges in the implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program. It outlines the specific challenges, corresponding objectives, proposed strategies and activities, responsible personnel, required resources and budget, timeline, and success indicators. Through this plan, schools are provided with a structured guide to strengthen curriculum implementation and support teachers in ensuring that learners benefit from the intended learning outcomes of the program.

CONCLUSIONS

From the significant findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The Eight-Week Curriculum Program was effectively fully implemented, especially in objectives and assessment, though learning materials, activities, and teacher and school head engagement need improvement.
2. There was a significant difference exists among the variables in the implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program.
3. Encouraging teachers to improve instructional planning and time management may enhance the implementation of differentiated learning strategies. Teachers may also participate in professional learning communities and seek technical support to further strengthen remedial teaching practices.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VII, Issue III

March 2026

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



4. School heads may intensify monitoring, supervision, and technical assistance to teachers to ensure effective implementation of the Eight-Week Curriculum Program. Providing timely feedback and guidance may help improve instructional practices and address challenges encountered during program implementation.

5. The action plan serves as a strategic guide to ensure continuous improvement and the sustainable implementation of the program.



Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Almarode, J., et al. (2021). *Reinvesting and rebounding*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Babbie, E. R. (2010). *The practice of social research* (12th ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE.

DePoy, E. (2024). *Introduction to research: Understanding and applying multiple strategies*. Elsevier Health Sciences.

Malim, T., & Birch, A. (1997). *Research methods and statistics*. Macmillan Press Ltd.

Mickan, P., & Wallace, I. (2020). *Routledge handbook of language education curriculum design*. Routledge.

Mohan, R. (2023). *Measurement, evaluation and assessment in education*. PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd.

Patton, M. Q. (2001). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Sharma, L. (2020). *Curriculum to classroom: A handbook to prompt thinking around primary curriculum design and delivery*. John Catt Educational.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Triola, M. F. (2004). Elementary statistics: Updates for the latest technology (9th ed.).
Addison-Wesley.

B. THESIS / DISSERTATIONS

Andes, M. B., & Chua, V. L. (n.d.). Enhancing the DepEd monitoring tool on the 8-Week Curriculum to enhance curriculum implementation. [Unpublished manuscript].

Acob, R., et al. (2023). Eight-week curriculum for Key Stage 1 learners: Its impact on the improvement of their academic performance. *International Education Trend Issues*, 1(2), 114–119.

Battaglia, M., & Lebedinski, L. (2022). With a little help from my friends: Medium-term effects of a remedial education program targeting Roma minority. *Economics of Education Review*, 86, 102196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2021.102196>

Bebis, D. R., & Prieto, S. (2023). Effectiveness of remedial classes in enhancing Grade 3 learners' reading performance. *Wesleyan Student Research*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.54788/wsr.v2i2.43>

Brown, L., Gjicali, K., Kim, H. Y., Dolan, C. T., Frisoli, P., Bwary, M., & Aber, J. L. (2023). Evaluating program enhancement strategies for remedial tutoring. *AERA Open*, 9(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584231209268>

Carbonari, M. V., Davison, M., DeArmond, M., Dewey, D., Dizon-Ross, E., Goldhaber, D., ... & Staiger, D. O. (2024). The impact and implementation of academic interventions

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VII, Issue III

March 2026



Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>

during COVID-19: Evidence from the Road to Recovery Project. AERA Open, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584241281286>

Díaz, M., et al. (2022). The power of curriculum to transform education. Inter-American Development Bank.

Gul, R., & Khilji, G. (2021). Exploring the need for a responsive school curriculum to cope with the COVID-19 pandemic in Pakistan. *Prospects*, 51(1), 503–522.

Juliana, J. (2025). The effectiveness of an 8-week learning recovery curriculum program on improving literacy and numeracy among Grade 3 students. *Perfect Education Fairy*, 3(1), 15–20. <https://doi.org/10.56442/pef.v3i1.1066>

Kuhfeld, M., Soland, J., Lewis, K., Ruzek, E., & Johnson, A. (2022). The COVID-19 school year: Learning and recovery across 2020–2021. *AERA Open*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584221099306>

Nguyen, Y. T. X., Ha, X. V., & Tran, N. H. (2022). Vietnamese primary school teachers' needs for professional development in response to curriculum reform. *Education Research International*, 2022(1), 4585376.

UNESCO. (2021). The state of the global education crisis: A path to recovery. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/state-global-education-crisis-path-recovery>

Wolforth, S., & Newman, J. (2024, April 8). What we know about accelerating student achievement and helping young people thrive. American Institutes for Research. <https://www.air.org/resource/blog-post/what-we-know-about-accelerating-student-achievement-and-helping-young-people>

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



C. ARTICLES/JOURNALS

Alvarado, J., & Galigao, R. (2024). Curriculum implementation effectiveness across educational systems: A comparative study in Asia, Europe, North America, and South America. *Pantao Journal*, 3(4).

Arevalo, J. S. (2023). Effectiveness of the remedial reading instructions in improving the literacy levels of the Grade 4 pupils. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 3(6), 2799–0664.

Berlinski, S., Busso, M., & Marcelletti, S. (2024). Remedial education: Evidence from a sequence of experiments in Colombia. *Journal of Human Resources*, 59(1). <https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.0320-10801R2>

Dianela, J. F., Mercado, K. A. R., Vale, M. P., & Paterno, K. V. (2023). Evaluation of the effects of the 8-week learning recovery program on pupils' reading competencies. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*, 10(11). <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2023.1011010>

Diazgranados Ferráns, S., Lee, J., Ohanyido, C., Hoyer, K., & Miheretu, A. (2022). The cost-effectiveness of an accelerated learning program in Nigeria. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 15(4), 655–686. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2022.2037799>

Dionglay, E., Bembo, A., & Janer, S. (2023). Effectiveness of 8-week learning recovery curriculum in improving reading performance. *Journal Pendidikan Progresif*, 13(3), 971–978.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Domanico, J. D., & Embile, R. F. (2025). The effectiveness of the 8-week learning recovery curriculum in improving numeracy skills. *Pantao: The International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(2), 128. <https://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS0402128>

Gunaban, M. G., & Panolong, K. (2021). Enhanced MELCs-based curriculum in reading and writing skills in a blended pedagogy. *International Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 3(4), 16–32.

Hamid, S. L. S. A., Jawawi, R., Salleh, S. M., & Jaidin, J. H. (2025). From disruption to recovery: Strategic education policy for post-pandemic Brunei. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(5), 5406–5412. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.905000417>

Masugod, J. B., & Baguio, J. B. (2025). Remedial teaching practices of teachers and learning progressions of learners. *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, 31(6), 1198–1210. <https://doi.org/10.9734/jsrr/2025/v31i63209>

Miña, C., & Caballes, D. (2023). Evaluation of the implementation of the 8-week learning recovery curriculum in numeracy. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 17(3), 59–69.

Sumbilon, M. R., Sombilon, E. C., & Paglinawan, J. L. (2024). Teaching-learning resources and professional engagement on curriculum implementation practices. *International Journal of All Research Writings*, 6(5), 76–96.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



D.INTERNET SOURCES

Beg, F. (2023). Enhancing secondary-school learning: The role of remedial camps and teacher flexibility. VoxDev Policy Synthesis. <https://voxdev.org/topic/education/enhancing-secondary-school-learning-role-remedial-camps-and-teacher-flexibility>

Bevans, R. (2023, June 22). An introduction to t tests. Scribbr. <https://www.scribbr.com/statistics/t-test/>

Calipay, C. (2020). DepEd-Bicol to give psycho-social aid to teachers, learners. Philippine News Agency. <https://www.pna.gov.ph/articles/1106461>

Calipay, C. (2022, December). DepEd-5 cites progress in pupils under learning recovery program. Philippine News Agency. <https://www.pna.gov.ph/articles/1190665>

Cambridge University Press. (n.d.). Challenge. Cambridge Dictionary. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/challenge>

CueMath. (n.d.). Weighted mean – Formula | How to calculate weighted mean? <https://www.cuemath.com/weighted-mean-formula/>

Gulzar, A. A. (2021). Different types of curriculum. EDUCARE. <https://educarepk.com/different-types-of-curriculum.html>

Kenton, W. (2025, March). ANOVA: Definition, formula, and examples. Investopedia. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/a/anova.asp>

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>

Selvan, T. (2021). Curriculum implementation. ResearchGate.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350448835_Curriculum_Implementation

Taylor & Francis. (2019). Weighted mean.
https://taylorandfrancis.com/knowledge/Medicine_and_healthcare/Medical_statistics_%26_computing/Weighted_mean/

Teach Pinas. (2020, June 20). Adoption of the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan for SY 2020–2021. <https://www.teachpinas.com/adoption-of-the-basic-education-learning-continuity-plan-for-sy-2020-2021/>

E. DEPED ORDERS / ISSUANCES

Department of Education. (2004). DO 10, s. 2004 – Implementation of the Enhanced 8-Week Early Childhood Experience (ECE) for Grade I. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2004/02/23/do-10-s-2004-implementation-of-the-enhanced-8-week-early-childhood-experienced-ece-for-grade-i/>

Department of Education. (2015, April 1). DO 8, s. 2015: Policy guidelines on classroom assessment for the K to 12 basic education program. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2015/04/01/do-8-s-2015-policy-guidelines-on-classroom-assessment-for-the-k-to-12-basic-education-program/>

Department of Education. (2020). Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (BE-LCP). Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VII, Issue III

March 2026



Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>

Department of Education. (2022, June 17). DepEd Order No. 026, s. 2022: Implementing guidelines on the establishment of School Governance Council. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/DO_s2022_026.pdf

Department of Education. (2023, July 5). Adoption of the National Learning Recovery Program (DepEd Order No. 013, s. 2023). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2023/07/05/july-5-2023-do-013-s-2023-adoption-of-the-national-learning-recovery-program-in-the-department-of-education/>

DepEd Order No. 021, s. 2019: Policy guidelines on the K to 12 basic education program. (2019). EdukNasyon. <https://eduknasyon.blogspot.com/2019/08/deped-order-no-021-s-2019-policy.html>

Supreme Court of the Philippines. (2020, September 11). An act providing for COVID-19 response and recovery interventions. TheE-Library. <https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/2/92610>

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza
