

Implementation Gaps of the National Learning Recovery Program (NLRP) In the Schools Division of Sorsogon Province: An Analysis

RAUL A. TOCA 
Bicol College, Philippines

Originality: 100% • Grammarly: 95% • Plagiarism: 0%

ABSTRACT

Article history:

Received: 23 Sept 2025
Revised: 30 May 2026
Accepted: 13 Jun 2026
Published: 30 Jun 2026

Keywords — Implementation Gaps, National Learning Recovery, Action Taken, Opportunities, School Division

Persistent learning gaps in foundational literacy and numeracy have led education systems to implement learning recovery initiatives aimed at improving learner outcomes. In the Philippines, the Department of Education institutionalized the National Learning Recovery Program (NLRP) to address learning loss and strengthen instructional delivery. This study examined the implementation of the NLRP in the Schools Division of Sorsogon Province. Specifically, it aimed to identify implementation challenges, examine actions taken by school heads, explore opportunities in program implementation, and develop a localized implementation plan. An explanatory mixed-methods research design was employed. Quantitative data were collected using a researcher-developed survey questionnaire, while qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured interviews to further explain the quantitative results. Respondents consisted of public-school heads and teachers using total enumeration. Quantitative data



© Toca, R. A. (2026). Open Access. This article published by JPAIR Institutional Research is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0). You are free to share (copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format) and adapt (remix, transform, and build upon the material). Under the following terms, you must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. You may not use the material for commercial purposes. To view a copy of this license, visit: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

were analyzed using descriptive statistics, whereas qualitative data were analyzed through thematic analysis. Findings indicated that NLRP implementation was influenced by systemic challenges related to instructional alignment, teacher preparedness, resource availability, administrative support, monitoring practices, learning environments, and stakeholder engagement. School heads addressed these challenges through adaptive leadership actions, including instructional guidance, coordination efforts, and stakeholder involvement, although effectiveness varied across school contexts. Opportunities emerged in strengthened teacher collaboration, improved instructional practices, and enhanced leadership engagement. The effective learning recovery requires context-responsive implementation and coordinated support mechanisms, highlighting the importance of a localized framework to enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of learning recovery initiatives.

INTRODUCTION

Globally, persistent learning gaps in foundational literacy and numeracy remain a major challenge, particularly in low- and middle-income contexts, where many learners fail to attain minimum proficiency levels despite years of schooling (UNESCO, 2021; World Bank, 2022). These gaps, if unaddressed, widen over time and contribute to long-term educational inequities, prompting the adoption of learning recovery initiatives focused on targeted and differentiated instruction (Dietrichson et al., 2021).

Recent ASEAN and Asia Pacific scholarship confirms that instructional leadership significantly influences teacher self-efficacy and reform implementation, underscoring the need for strong leadership practices to translate policy into classroom outcomes (Elfira et al., 2024). Across ASEAN countries, education systems have similarly undertaken reform initiatives to strengthen instructional delivery and improve learning outcomes. Research in Southeast Asia demonstrates that instructional leadership plays a critical role in mediating reform implementation and ensuring alignment between national policies and school-level practice (Hallinger & Wang, 2020).

In the Philippines, learning recovery has become a national priority in response to sustained low achievement in reading and mathematics. The Department of Education institutionalized the National Learning Recovery Program (NLRP) through DepEd Order No. 013, s. 2023, establishing a policy framework to accelerate learning progress and realign learner competencies with curriculum standards (DepEd, 2023).

At the local level, the effectiveness of the NLRP depends on how national

policies are translated into practice. In the Schools Division of Sorsogon Province, variations in school capacity, teacher workload, resource availability, and monitoring practices influence the consistency of program implementation. Examining these implementation conditions is essential to understanding how learning recovery initiatives can be strengthened to achieve equitable and sustainable improvements in learner outcomes.

FRAMEWORK

The study was anchored on Ecological Systems Theory, Instructional Leadership Theory, and Change Theory, which were integrated into the Context–Leadership–Opportunity (CLO) Theory of NLRP Implementation. Ecological Systems Theory explained how interconnected environmental systems shaped implementation challenges, while Instructional Leadership Theory highlighted the mediating role of school heads in addressing these challenges through instructional and organizational actions. Change Theory explained how leadership responses-initiated processes of organizational change that led to emerging opportunities for improvement. Synthesized through the CLO Theory, these perspectives explained how contextual challenges influenced implementation, how leadership actions mediated these conditions, and how opportunities emerged as outcomes of adaptive leadership and change processes.

The conceptual framework of the study was anchored on the CIPP Evaluation Model, which guided the examination of the National Learning Recovery Program (NLRP) through the interrelated components of context, input, process, and product. Context focused on implementation challenges affecting program delivery, while input emphasized the leadership actions of school heads in responding to these challenges. The process component described how leadership actions were implemented through coordination, supervision, and adaptive management. The product component represented the opportunities that emerged from effective implementation, including improved instructional practices, enhanced teacher competencies, strengthened partnerships, and sustainable implementation practices. Overall, the framework explained how leadership actions transformed contextual challenges into opportunities for continuous improvement in NLRP implementation.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study sought to (1) examine the challenges encountered in the implementation of the National Learning Recovery Program (NLRP) in the

Schools Division of Sorsogon Province; (2) analyze the leadership actions undertaken by school heads in response to these implementation challenges; (3) determine the opportunities that emerged during the implementation of the NLRP as a result of leadership practices and contextual conditions; and (4) develop a localized implementation plan grounded in empirical findings to enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of learning recovery initiatives within the divisional context.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopted an explanatory sequential mixed-methods research design, integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches to generate a comprehensive understanding of implementation gaps in the National Learning Recovery Program (NLRP). The quantitative phase systematically examined the extent and nature of challenges encountered by program implementers across key operational dimensions, enabling the identification of discrepancies between policy intent and actual practice. Subsequently, the qualitative phase was conducted to contextualize and explain the quantitative findings by exploring school leaders' responses, decision-making processes, and contextual factors shaping program implementation. The integration of findings across phases strengthened the study's explanatory depth by linking empirically measured implementation challenges with leadership actions and emergent opportunities within local educational contexts.

Instrumentation

A researcher-developed instrument was used to collect quantitative and qualitative data on the implementation gaps of the National Learning Recovery Program (NLRP). The survey component measured implementation challenges across key dimensions using a four-point Likert scale and was administered to teachers and school heads involved in program delivery. Semi-structured interviews were subsequently conducted to explain and contextualize the survey findings by examining leadership responses, decision-making processes, and implementation opportunities, consistent with the explanatory mixed-methods design.

Respondents

The respondents of the study were school heads and teachers from public secondary schools implementing the National Learning Recovery Program

(NLRP) in the Schools Division of Sorsogon Province. Schools were purposively selected to represent variations in school size and contextual conditions across municipalities. School heads were included due to their leadership and managerial roles in program planning, supervision, and monitoring, while teachers were selected as they were directly involved in the delivery of learning recovery interventions. This combination ensured adequate representation of both leadership and instructional perspectives in examining NLRP implementation.

Sampling

The study employed total population sampling, a non-probability technique in which all individuals meeting the inclusion criteria were included as respondents. This comprised all school heads and teachers directly involved in the implementation of the National Learning Recovery Program (NLRP) in public secondary schools across the Schools Division of Sorsogon Province. The use of total population sampling ensured comprehensive coverage of implementation perspectives, minimized sampling bias, and strengthened the accuracy of findings by capturing the full range of leadership and instructional experiences across diverse school contexts.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed in accordance with the explanatory sequential mixed-methods design. Quantitative survey data were analyzed using weighted mean to determine the extent of implementation challenges across key program dimensions, with results interpreted using established Likert scale descriptors. Qualitative interview data were subjected to thematic analysis through systematic coding and categorization to identify recurring patterns, leadership actions, and contextual factors influencing implementation. Integration of quantitative and qualitative findings was achieved through meta-inference, enabling a comprehensive interpretation of implementation gaps, leadership responses, and emergent opportunities in the National Learning Recovery Program.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Challenges in the Implementation of the National Learning Recovery Program

Program content is a critical component of learning recovery as it determines the alignment of instructional activities with learners identified needs and competency levels. Strong overall agreement was observed regarding the adequacy of the program content of the National Learning Recovery Program (NLRP),

reflecting alignment with learning recovery goals and learner-centered principles. Higher ratings for inclusivity, learner participation, and baseline assessment use suggest that the program is perceived as relevant and responsive. However, lower ratings for content alignment with learner readiness and adaptability highlight challenges in applying standardized content across diverse classroom contexts.

Table 1
Program Content

Indicators	Over-all	
	TWM	AI
1. Release of Comprehensive policies detailing all components of the NLRP.	3.39	SA
2. Guidelines leading to consistent implementation of NLRP across schools.	3.34	SA
3. Content alignment with grade-level competencies, relevance to students' learning levels.	3.30	SA
4. The voluntary nature of the NLRP that leads to participation rates, especially among learners most in need of remediation.	3.52	SA
5. The content culturally responsive and inclusive for all students.	3.48	SA
6. Content relevance and adaptability.	3.33	SA
7. Baseline assessments to accurately identify students in need of intervention.	3.46	SA
AWM	3.40	SA
Legend:	4 3.26 – 4.00	Strongly Agree
	3 2.51 – 3.25	Agree
	2 1.76 – 2.50	Moderately Agree
	1 1.00 – 1.75	Disagree

These results show the need for greater instructional flexibility and clearer l
Teacher Preparedness

Teacher preparedness is central to the effective implementation of learning recovery initiatives, as it influences the quality and consistency of instructional delivery. Strong overall agreement suggests that teachers were generally prepared to implement learning recovery interventions, particularly in terms of training, instructional strategies, and use of technology. However, high agreement on workload demands and reliance on voluntary teacher effort points to role strain that may affect instructional quality and the sustained implementation of recovery programs.

Table 2*Teacher Preparedness*

Indicators	Over-all	
	TWM	AI
1. Time to prepare prior to the program's implementation.	3.44	SA
2. Orientation on NLRP goals, processes, and expected outcomes for teachers.	3.38	SA
3. Training to implement the new methods, tools, and approaches required by the NLRP.	3.42	SA
4. Training opportunities on strategies for addressing diverse student learning gaps and needs.	3.43	SA
5. Teacher's use of educational technology.	3.46	SA
6. Reliance on teacher volunteer's due workload and risk of burnout.	3.44	SA
7. Time for instruction to address significant learning gaps.	3.48	SA
AWM	3.44	SA
Legend: 4	3.26 – 4.00	Strongly Agree
3	2.51 – 3.25	Agree
2	1.76 – 2.50	Moderately Agree
1	1.00 – 1.75	Disagree

These results highlight the need for sustained professional development and structured instructional support to reduce teacher burden and strengthen program fidelity. Providing ongoing coaching, protected planning time, and workload adjustments may enhance instructional effectiveness and the long-term sustainability of learning recovery initiatives. Recent research shows that heightened instructional demands and insufficient support contribute to teacher stress and role strain, undermining instructional quality during recovery efforts (Kim & Asbury, 2020). Studies further emphasize that effective and sustained professional development is essential for building teacher capacity and supporting high-quality implementation of instructional reforms (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020).

Learning Resources

The availability and adequacy of learning resources play a vital role in supporting teachers' implementation of recovery interventions and learners' engagement in remediation activities. The results indicate that while learning resources were generally available, limitations in alignment, usability, and

equitable distribution constrained effective implementation of learning recovery interventions. Dependence on grade-level materials rather than remediation-focused resources reduced the effectiveness of accelerated learning, while disparities in access and delayed provision disrupted instructional continuity across schools. These patterns reflect broader challenges in integrating learning resources into daily instruction, particularly in resource-constrained contexts.

Table 3
Learning Resources

Indicators	Over-all	
	TWM	AI
1. Quantity of printers to support the production of the activity sheets.	3.42	SA
2. High-quality instructional materials tailored to NLRP objectives.	3.40	SA
3. Learning resources that are aligned with the specific goals of the NLRP.	3.39	SA
4. Essential learning materials, including textbooks, workbooks, and digital resources.	3.47	SA
5. Technological resources, such as computers and internet access, which are crucial for modern educational practices.	3.36	SA
6. Instructional guides and resources to support teachers in implementing NLRP.	3.60	SA
7. Resource allocation across schools creates disparities in NLRP implementation.	3.46	SA
AWM	3.44	SA
Legend:	4 3.26 – 4.00	Strongly Agree
	3 2.51 – 3.25	Agree
	2 1.76 – 2.50	Moderately Agree
	1 1.00 – 1.75	Disagree

These findings highlight the necessity for learning recovery programs to emphasize prompt access to remediation-aligned print and digital resources while ensuring equitable distribution across schools. Aligning curriculum priorities with instructional materials, enhancing usability, and mitigating access disparities may bolster instructional coherence and perpetuate learning recovery initiatives, particularly in underprivileged contexts (Alea et al., 2020; Kaffenberger, 2021; Woulfin & Gabriel, 2020; OECD, 2021; Reimers & Schleicher, 2020).

Administrative Support

Administrative support is essential in facilitating coordination, guidance, and oversight necessary for the organized implementation of learning recovery programs. The results indicate that administrative support mechanisms such as funding, transparency, and equity-focused actions were generally present, but gaps in instructional support and coordination limited coherent implementation at the school level. Lower ratings for instructional leadership suggest that administrative efforts were more structural than pedagogical, reducing the consistency of guidance provided to teachers during recovery implementation.

Table 4

Administrative Support

Indicators	Over-all	
	TWM	AI
1. Instructional support from the school head to help teachers implement the NLRP.	3.13	A
2. Schools structured opportunities for teachers to share best practices, strategies, and resources.	3.26	SA
3. Support in funding the NLRP.	3.40	SA
4. Coordination among stakeholders (e.g., school leaders, teachers, parents) in implementing NLRP.	3.31	SA
5. Administrative support for ensuring that all students, regardless of socio-economic background or geographic location, receive equitable support under the NLRP.	3.41	SA
6. Transparency between school administrators and the broader school community.	3.52	SA
7. Support for teacher well-being, contributing to burnout and turnover.	3.35	SA
AWM	3.34	SA
Legend:	4 3.26 – 4.00	Strongly Agree
	3 2.51 – 3.25	Agree
	2 1.76 – 2.50	Moderately Agree
	1 1.00 – 1.75	Disagree

These findings point to the need for administrative support systems that prioritize instructional leadership, coordinated decision-making, and teacher

support alongside managerial functions. Strengthening school leaders' instructional roles and reducing administrative fragmentation may improve implementation fidelity, enhance teacher well-being, and support the sustainability of learning recovery initiatives. Research indicates that effective administrative support depends on strong instructional leadership and coordinated implementation to translate policy initiatives into coherent school-level practice (Bush & Glover, 2014). Studies conducted during periods of disruption further emphasize that school leaders play a critical role in sustaining instructional focus and supporting teachers amid competing demands (Harris & Jones, 2020). Evidence also shows that inadequate administrative attention to teacher workload and well-being contributes to burnout, which undermines instructional quality and the sustainability of intervention programs (Madigan & Kim, 2021).

Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are fundamental to tracking learner progress and informing instructional adjustments during learning recovery implementation. The results suggest that monitoring and evaluation mechanisms were generally in place, but their instructional use was inconsistent. Lower ratings for screening assessments, consolidation of results, and timely posttest feedback indicate that assessment data were not systematically used to guide remediation planning. Monitoring practices appeared largely compliance-oriented rather than formative, limiting their effectiveness in informing instructional adjustments during learning recovery.

Table 5
Monitoring and Evaluation

Indicators				Over-all	
				TWM	AI
1.	Monitoring and evaluation processes.			3.35	SA
2.	Screening tests such as rapid assessments for reading and numeracy.			3.24	A
3.	Available results on NLRP have not been consolidated.			3.22	A
4.	Assessment of Students in NLRP			3.43	SA
5.	Prompt posttest results to evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions.			3.09	A
6.	Timely and effective assessment results that leads ability of group learners accordingly to their needs.			3.43	SA
7.	Teacher's training or tools needed to effectively monitor and assess students' progress in the recovery program.			3.59	SA
AWM				3.35	SA
Legend:	4	3.26 – 4.00	Strongly Agree	.	
	3	2.51 – 3.25	Agree		
	2	1.76 – 2.50	Moderately Agree		
	1	1.00 – 1.75	Disagree		

These findings highlight the need to strengthen formative assessment systems and data-use capacity at the school level. Shifting monitoring and evaluation from reporting-driven processes toward instructionally focused practices may enhance teachers' ability to identify learner needs, adjust interventions, and improve the effectiveness of learning recovery programs. Research shows that monitoring and evaluation systems enhance learning recovery only when assessment data are used formatively to guide instruction rather than for compliance purposes. Schools with stronger data-use practices are better able to translate assessment results into targeted instructional adjustments, while limited teacher capacity and delayed feedback constrain effective remediation (Mandinach & Schildkamp, 2021; Schildkamp et al., 2020).

Partnership

Partnerships with parents and external stakeholders are important in extending learner support beyond the classroom and sustaining learning recovery efforts. The results indicate that partnerships supporting the NLRP were present but uneven, with moderate agreement across indicators related to parental engagement, community involvement, and trust. Lower ratings on administrative

capacity to engage external partners and the presence of bureaucratic constraints suggest that partnership efforts were largely informal and inconsistently coordinated. These conditions limited the reinforcement of learning beyond the classroom and reduced the potential of partnerships to support sustained remediation, particularly for learners requiring additional support.

Table 6
Partnership

Indicators				Over-all	
				TWM	AI
1.	Parental support and engagement in NLRP activities.			3.35	SA
2.	Community involvement from local stakeholders.			3.46	SA
3.	Priorities among partners.			3.37	SA
4.	Distribution of partnership resources and benefits across schools and communities.			3.32	SA
5.	Administrative capacity or expertise to engage with external partners effectively.			3.17	A
6.	Trust between communities and external partners			3.37	SA
7.	Political and bureaucratic obstacles delaying partnership-based activities in the NLRP.			3.34	SA
AWM				3.35	SA
Legend:	4	3.26 – 4.00	Strongly Agree	.	
	3	2.51 – 3.25	Agree		
	2	1.76 – 2.50	Moderately Agree		
	1	1.00 – 1.75	Disagree		

Strengthening learning recovery requires more intentional, school-level partnership structures that clarify roles, streamline coordination, and actively support parent and community engagement. Enhancing leadership capacity for partnership management and reducing procedural barriers may improve the continuity of learner support at home and in the community. Purposeful collaboration with families and local stakeholders can extend instructional time, reinforce remediation strategies, and promote equitable access to learning supports. Research shows that structured family–school and community collaborations are positively associated with students’ academic achievement and well-being, reinforcing learning recovery efforts when roles and expectations are clearly defined (Gerdes & Geibel, 2022; Kelty & Wakabayashi, 2020). Action research further demonstrates that increased family engagement correlates with

improved academic performance and school participation (Hall, 2020).

Action Taken by the School Heads

This section presents the qualitative findings on the actions taken by school heads in addressing challenges in the implementation of the National Learning Recovery Program. The analysis is organized into emerging themes that reflect common leadership practices across schools.

Theme 1: Strengthening Instructional Guidance and Curriculum Prioritization

School heads reported taking deliberate actions to guide teachers in prioritizing essential learning competencies and adjusting instructional focus to support learning recovery. These actions included providing instructional directions, facilitating curriculum mapping, and clarifying expectations for recovery-oriented teaching. Teachers acknowledged that school heads offered guidance on pacing, lesson focus, and alignment of recovery activities with identified learner needs. The findings suggest that school heads assumed an instructional leadership role to address challenges related to program content and instructional alignment. By prioritizing essential competencies and streamlining instructional goals, school heads sought to mitigate curriculum overload and support teachers in delivering more focused and feasible recovery instruction. This leadership approach helped translate system-level recovery policies into actionable classroom practices.

These instructional guidance from school heads plays a critical role in ensuring coherence and feasibility in learning recovery implementation. When school leaders actively guide curriculum prioritization, teachers are better positioned to focus on addressing critical learning gaps rather than attempting full curriculum coverage. Institutionalizing instructional guidance mechanisms may enhance consistency and effectiveness of recovery initiatives across schools. Research indicates that instructional leadership focused on curriculum prioritization supports effective implementation of recovery and remediation programs (Harris & Jones, 2020; Hallinger & Wang, 2020). Studies also show that curriculum streamlining and clarity of instructional focus improve feasibility and instructional coherence during accelerated learning initiatives (OECD, 2021; Leithwood et al., 2020).

Theme 2: Capacity-Building and Professional Support for Teachers

School heads reported implementing actions aimed at enhancing teacher preparedness, including organizing school-based trainings, mentoring sessions,

and collaborative planning activities. Teachers noted that school heads provided opportunities for professional learning, peer collaboration, and instructional coaching to support the implementation of learning recovery strategies. These findings indicate that school heads responded to teacher preparedness challenges by emphasizing capacity-building and professional support. By facilitating collaborative learning structures and providing instructional feedback, school heads aimed to strengthen teachers' competence and confidence in delivering remediation and differentiated instruction required by the NLRP.

The results imply that sustained capacity-building efforts are essential for effective learning recovery implementation. School heads' actions in supporting teacher learning contribute to improved instructional quality and reduce implementation strain. Embedding professional development within school routines may enhance teacher readiness and promote more consistent recovery practices. Leadership research underscores the importance of capacity-building and professional support in strengthening teacher instructional practices. Sustained capacity-building is critical to effective learning recovery implementation. According to recent research, collaborative professional structures (like PLCs) can promote more consistent teaching practices across contexts and are linked to better teacher outcomes (Christensen & Jerrim, 2025). Sustained, well-supported professional development, including technology-enabled models, can enhance teacher learning and instructional improvement when designed to support active learning and feedback, according to research conducted both during and after the pandemic (Huang et al., 2024). For learning recovery specifically, international syntheses emphasize that recovery strategies work best when they include capacity-building and professional support for teachers and schools, alongside curricular and instructional adjustments (Minea-Pic, 2023; Vincent-Lancrin et al., 2022).

Theme 3: Resource Mobilization and Administrative Coordination

School heads described actions focused on mobilizing and allocating available resources to support NLRP implementation. These included coordinating the reproduction and distribution of learning materials, adjusting schedules, and managing logistical requirements. Teachers recognized these efforts as supportive, though resource constraints remained a concern. The findings suggest that school heads exercised administrative leadership to address resource-related challenges and ensure continuity of learning recovery activities. Through coordination and resource management, school heads attempted to mitigate limitations in materials and time that affected classroom implementation.

These findings imply that effective administrative coordination is necessary to sustain learning recovery initiatives, particularly in resource-constrained contexts.

Strategic resource management by school heads may help reduce implementation disruptions and support equitable access to recovery interventions. The way school leaders manage instructional materials and distribute resources is very important for making sure that recovery interventions are used fairly and consistently, especially when resources are limited (Ganon-Shilon et al., 2021; Schweig et al., 2022). More proof shows that managing schedules, staffing, and school routines from the office helps keep things running smoothly and keeps teachers interested during intervention implementation (McTigue et al., 2024). Research on implementation and recovery contexts underscores that proficient logistical coordination and organizational frameworks—encompassing leadership support and implementation climate—are essential for the longevity of school-based interventions (Melgarejo et al., 2020).

Emerging Theme 4: Strengthening Monitoring, Feedback, and Collaborative Partnerships

School heads reported actions aimed at improving monitoring and evaluation practices, such as tracking learner progress, conducting classroom observations, and coordinating with teachers and stakeholders. Teachers indicated that school heads facilitated communication with parents and community partners to support learner participation and program delivery. These findings indicate that school heads addressed monitoring and partnership challenges through coordination, communication, and feedback mechanisms. While monitoring practices were sometimes compliance-driven, school heads attempted to use available data and stakeholder support to sustain recovery efforts.

The results imply that strengthening feedback loops and collaborative partnerships may enhance the responsiveness and sustainability of learning recovery initiatives. When school heads foster shared responsibility among teachers and stakeholders, recovery programs are more likely to be supported beyond the classroom. The literature emphasizes that effective learning recovery initiatives depend on strong monitoring systems, continuous feedback loops, and collaborative partnerships led by school leaders. Effective learning recovery initiatives are strengthened by purposeful monitoring and feedback practices that enable school leaders to track learner progress and support instructional improvement. Research indicates that principals' use of classroom observations and formative feedback contributes to improved teaching quality when monitoring is oriented toward professional learning rather than compliance (López et al., 2021). Studies also emphasize the role of school–family–community partnerships, showing that leadership practices which foster collaboration and shared responsibility among teachers, parents, and community stakeholders

enhance learner engagement and support the sustainability of school-based programs beyond the classroom (Cummins, 2025; Epstein, 2018).

Meta-inference: Integration Explanation of NLRP Implementation Challenges

The integration of quantitative and qualitative findings showed clear convergence in explaining the implementation of the National Learning Recovery Program. Quantitative results indicated moderate to high levels of challenges across key implementation areas, while qualitative findings from school heads and teachers provided contextual explanations for how these challenges were experienced in practice. Qualitative data clarified that workload pressures, limited instructional flexibility, resource constraints, and varying school capacities contributed to the challenges identified quantitatively. The integration further revealed that leadership actions played a mediating role in managing these challenges, explaining variations in implementation effectiveness across schools. Overall, the integrated findings demonstrated that NLRP implementation was shaped by the interaction of contextual conditions and leadership responses rather than isolated factors.

Opportunities in the Implementation of the National Learning Recovery Program

Despite the challenges encountered in the implementation of the National Learning Recovery Program, the findings revealed several opportunities that emerged at the school level, highlighting areas for instructional, leadership, and collaborative improvement.

Theme 1: Strengthened Teacher Collaboration and Professional

School heads and teachers reported that the implementation of the NLRP created opportunities for increased collaboration among teachers, particularly through shared planning, peer support, and collective problem-solving related to remediation and differentiated instruction. These findings suggest that the learning recovery context encouraged teachers to work more collaboratively in addressing learners' needs. The shared responsibility for recovery interventions fostered

The emergence of collaborative practices implies that learning recovery initiatives can serve as catalysts for strengthening professional learning communities. Sustaining structured collaboration may enhance instructional coherence, support teacher learning, and contribute to continuous improvement beyond the recovery period. Research shows that structured teacher collaboration

supports the sustainability of instructional improvements by enabling shared responsibility and collective problem-solving, particularly during reform and recovery initiatives (Harris & Jones, 2020; OECD, 2021).

Theme 2: Improvement in Instructional Practices and Learner Responsiveness

Participants reported that the NLRP heightened teachers' awareness of learners' needs and encouraged the use of targeted and remedial instructional strategies. This indicates that the focus on learning recovery prompted instructional shifts toward greater responsiveness and differentiation, aligning teaching practices more closely with learner progress.

These findings imply that learning recovery initiatives can strengthen instructional practices when teachers are supported in adapting instruction based on learner needs. Studies indicate that targeted and differentiated instruction improves when teachers consistently use learner data to guide teaching decisions, making recovery gains more durable over time (Dietrichson et al., 2021; World Bank, 2022).

Theme 3: Enhanced Leadership Engagement and Instructional Oversight

School heads reported increased involvement in instructional supervision, monitoring, and teacher support during NLRP implementation. These findings suggest that the NLRP encouraged school heads to assume more active instructional leadership roles, strengthening alignment between leadership practices and teaching and learning processes.

The increased leadership engagement implies that learning recovery initiatives can reinforce instructional leadership practices. Sustaining active leadership involvement may improve coordination, accountability, and instructional support within schools. Research demonstrates that sustained parent and community engagement reinforces learner participation and supports the long-term viability of school-based interventions (Datnow & Park, 2022; UNESCO, 2021).

Theme 4: Strengthened Stakeholder and Community Engagement and Community Engagement

School heads reported improved communication and collaboration with parents and community stakeholders in supporting learner participation in recovery activities. These findings indicate that learning recovery efforts created opportunities to strengthen shared responsibility for learner support beyond the classroom.

The results imply that sustained stakeholder engagement can enhance the

reach and sustainability of learning recovery initiatives. Formalizing partnerships may reinforce learner support and contribute to long-term educational improvement. Research demonstrates that sustained parent and community engagement reinforces learner participation and supports the long-term viability of school-based interventions (Datnow & Park, 2022; UNESCO, 2021).

Meta-inference: Integration Explanation of NLRP Implementation Challenges

The integration of quantitative and qualitative findings showed clear convergence in explaining the implementation of the National Learning Recovery Program. Quantitative results indicated moderate to high levels of challenges across key implementation areas, while qualitative findings from school heads and teachers provided contextual explanations for how these challenges were experienced in practice. Qualitative data clarified that workload pressures, limited instructional flexibility, resource constraints, and varying school capacities contributed to the challenges identified quantitatively. The integration further revealed that leadership actions played a mediating role in managing these challenges, explaining variations in implementation effectiveness across schools. Overall, the integrated findings demonstrated that NLRP implementation was shaped by the interaction of contextual conditions and leadership responses rather than isolated factors.

The convergence of findings in this study aligns with broader evidence from international learning recovery initiatives, where implementation effectiveness has been shaped by contextual capacity, leadership responsiveness, and system-level support mechanisms (OECD, 2021; World Bank, 2022). Similar to findings in other post-pandemic recovery contexts, the interaction between leadership practices and structural conditions significantly influenced program coherence and sustainability. This suggests that the implementation gaps identified in the Schools Division of Sorsogon Province reflect systemic challenges common in large-scale recovery reforms rather than isolated local weaknesses.

Developed or localized implementation plan for the School Division of Sorsogon

The development of a localized implementation plan for the National Learning Recovery Program was necessary to address context-specific challenges identified in the study. School heads and teachers emphasized the need for a plan that aligns national guidelines with school-level realities, particularly in instructional capacity, monitoring practices, leadership coordination, resource management, and stakeholder engagement. The localized plan was viewed as

a practical guide for organizing learning recovery efforts, clarifying roles, and promoting more consistent and sustainable implementation across schools in the Schools Division of Sorsogon Province.

CONCLUSION

The implementation of the National Learning Recovery Program in the Schools Division of Sorsogon Province was shaped by interconnected instructional, organizational, and contextual factors that influenced program coherence and effectiveness. While both school heads and teachers encountered challenges related to instructional alignment, preparedness, resources, monitoring, and stakeholder engagement, school leaders employed adaptive instructional, administrative, and collaborative actions to address these constraints. The integration of quantitative and qualitative findings demonstrated that implementation issues were systemic rather than isolated and that leadership actions played a mediating role in managing contextual challenges. Despite these constraints, the implementation of the NLRP generated meaningful opportunities for strengthened teacher collaboration, improved instructional practices, enhanced leadership engagement, and increased stakeholder involvement. These conclusions show the importance of context-responsive leadership and coordinated support mechanisms, and they justify the development of a localized implementation plan as an evidence-based approach to strengthening the effectiveness and sustainability of learning recovery initiatives within the division.

LITERATURE CITED

- Alea, L. A., Fabrea, M. F., Roldan, R. D. A., & Farooqi, A. Z. (2020). Teachers' Covid-19 awareness, distance learning education experiences and perceptions towards institutional readiness and challenges. *International journal of learning, teaching and educational research*, 19(6), 127-144. <https://tinyurl.com/yc46t5mf>
- Banerjee, A. V., Banerji, R., Berry, J., Duflo, E., Kannan, H., Mukerji, S., Shotland, M., & Walton, M. (2020). From proof of concept to scalable policies: Challenges and solutions, with an application. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31(4), 73–102. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.31.4.73>

- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2014). School leadership models: What do we know? *School Leadership & Management*, 34(5), 553–571. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2014.928680>
- Christensen, A. A., & Jerrim, J. (2025). Professional learning communities and teacher outcomes: A cross-national analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 156, 104920. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104920>
- Cummins, N. (2025). Leadership and family–school–community partnerships in equity-focused school models. *International Journal of Educational Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13654802251397190>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute. <https://doi.org/10.54300/122.311>
- Datnow, A., & Park, V. (2022). *Professional collaboration with purpose: Teacher learning and student success*. Routledge.
- Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines. (2023, July 5). *Adoption of the National Learning Recovery Program in the Department of Education* (DepEd Order No. 13, 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/>
- Dietrichson, J., Filges, T., Seerup, J. K., Klokke, R. H., Viinholt, B. C. A., Bøg, M., & Eiberg, M. (2021). Targeted school-based interventions for improving reading and mathematics for students with or at risk of academic difficulties in Grades K–6: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 17(2), e1152. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1152>
- Elfira, Rasdiana, Fitrawati, Jasman, M. W., Reski, K., Anwar, A., & Enaldi. (2024, November). How does principal's instructional leadership shape teacher performance mediated by teacher self-efficacy in Indonesian education context?. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 9, p. 1401394). Frontiers Media SA. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1401394>
- Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

- Ganon-Shilon, S., Tamir, E., & Schechter, C. (2021). Principals' sense-making of resource allocation within a national reform implementation. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(5), 731–748. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220921191>
- Gerdes, J., Goei, S. L., Huizinga, M., & De Ruyter, D. J. (2022). True partners? Exploring family–school partnership in secondary education from a collaboration perspective. *Educational Review*, 74(6), 1033–1052. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2020.1778643>
- Hall, C. M. (2020). The Impact of Family Engagement on Student Achievement. *Networks: An Online Journal for Teacher Research*, 22(2), n2. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1264345>
- Hallinger, P., & Wang, R. (2020). Analyzing the intellectual structure of research on simulation-based learning in management education, 1960–2019: A bibliometric review. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 18(3), 100418. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2020.100418>
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2020). COVID-19 – school leadership in disruptive times. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(4), 243–247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2020.1811479>
- Huang, L., Liang, M., Xiong, Y., Wu, X., & Lim, C. P. (2024). A systematic review of technology-enabled teacher professional development during COVID-19 pandemic. *Computers & Education*, 223, 105168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.105168>
- Kaffenberger, M. (2021). Modelling the long-run learning impact of the COVID-19 learning shock: Actions to (more than) mitigate loss. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 81, 102326. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijeducdev.2020.102326>
- Kelty, N. E., & Wakabayashi, T. (2020). Family engagement in schools: Parent, educator, and community perspectives. *SAGE Open*, 10(4), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020973024>

- Kim, L. E., & Asbury, K. (2020). 'Like a rug had been pulled from under you': The impact of COVID-19 on teachers in England during the first six weeks of the UK lockdown. *British journal of educational psychology*, 90(4), 1062-1083. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12381>
- Ledwaba, R. G., & Sefotho, M. M. (2024). Curriculum adaptation for learners with diverse learning needs: A case of South African inclusive rural schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 44(4), Article 2510. <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v44n4a2510>
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
- López, A., et al. (2021). Principals' use of classroom observation and formative feedback for instructional improvement. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(6), 995–1013. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220962105>
- Madigan, D. J., & Kim, L. E. (2021). Does teacher burnout affect students? A systematic review of its association with academic achievement and student-reported outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 105, 101714. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101714>
- Mandinach, E. B., & Schildkamp, K. (2021). Misconceptions about data-based decision making in education: An exploration of the literature. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 69, 100842. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100842>
- McTigue, E. M., Solheim, O. J., Zimmer, W. K., & Uppstad, P. H. (2024). School leader support and teachers' engagement during implementation of a complex instructional intervention. *School Leadership & Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2024.2358038>
- Melgarejo, M., Lind, T., Stadnick, N. A., Helm, J. L., & Locke, J. (2020). Strengthening capacity for implementation of evidence-based practices in schools: The roles of leadership, implementation climate, and fidelity. *American Psychologist*, 75(8), 1105–1115. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000649>

- Minea-Pic, A. (2023). Catching up on lost learning opportunities: Research and policy evidence on key learning recovery strategies. *OECD Education Working Papers*, (292), 0_1-26. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/affc2672e70886b8a15ba007a14ce95a/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=54479>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2021). *Education at a glance 2021: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/b35a14e5-en>
- Reimers, F. M., & Schleicher, A. (2020). *A framework to guide an education response to the COVID-19 pandemic of 2020*. OECD Education Working Papers No. 224. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/6ae21003-en>
- Schildkamp, K., Poortman, C. L., & Ebbeler, J. (2020). Factors promoting and hindering data-based decision making in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 86, 102931. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102931>
- Schweig, J. D., McEachin, A., Kuhfeld, M., Mariano, L. T., & Diliberti, M. (2022). Allocating resources for COVID-19 recovery: A comparison of indicators of school need. *Educational Assessment*, 27(2), 152–169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2022.2087626>
- UNESCO. (2021). *Education in a post-COVID world: Nine ideas for public action*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379707>
- Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2022). Fostering students' creativity and critical thinking in science education. In *Education in the 21st century: STEM, creativity and critical thinking* (pp. 29-47). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-85300-6_3
- World Bank. (2022). *The state of global learning poverty: 2022 update*. World Bank. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/education/publication/state-of-global-learning-poverty>
- Woulfin, S., & Gabriel, R. E. (2020). Interconnected infrastructure for improving reading instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55, S109-S117. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.339>