



## Teacher-Perceived Implementation, Outcomes, and Support Conditions of a School-Based Remedial Program: A Mixed-Methods Institutional Evaluation

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21790174

**Rodjhun B. Navarro, LPT, PhD**

Vice-President for Research, Innovations, and Linkages, La Consolacion College Bacolod  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7889-5770> | [rnnavarro@lccbonline.edu.ph](mailto:rnnavarro@lccbonline.edu.ph)

**Rejay Y. Alvarado, LPT, MPM**

Head, Research and Creative Works Office, La Consolacion College Bacolod  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2662-5749> | [rejayalvarado@lccbonline.edu.ph](mailto:rejayalvarado@lccbonline.edu.ph)

**Mikhail Ivan A. Muchuelas**

Research, Innovations, and Linkages Staff, La Consolacion College Bacolod  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-2959-4414> | [mikhail.ivan.muchuelas@lccbonline.edu.ph](mailto:mikhail.ivan.muchuelas@lccbonline.edu.ph)

**Allan Joseph O. Dela Torre, LPT, MAT**

Subject Area Chairperson, Mathematics, IBED La Consolacion College Bacolod  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-0075-2653> | [allanjoephdelatorre@lccbonline.edu.ph](mailto:allanjoephdelatorre@lccbonline.edu.ph)

### Abstract

This study examined teachers' perceptions of the implementation, learner-related outcomes, and support conditions of the Integrated Basic Education Department Remedial Program of La Consolacion College Bacolod. It used a convergent mixed-methods secondary analysis of an internal evaluation survey completed by 35 teachers from November 7 to December 10, 2025. The researcher-developed questionnaire contained 19 five-point rating-scale items and four open-ended questions. Frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, and Cronbach's alpha were used for the quantitative data, while brief narrative responses were examined through content-informed thematic analysis and integrated with the numerical findings. The overall evaluation was Evident ( $M = 4.10$ ,  $SD = 0.70$ ). Program Implementation received the highest mean ( $M = 4.17$ ,  $SD = 0.67$ ), followed by Perceived Student Participation and Learning-Related Outcomes ( $M = 4.09$ ,  $SD = 0.78$ ), while Teacher Support and Resources received the lowest mean ( $M = 3.98$ ,  $SD = 0.84$ ). Teachers identified clear objectives, targeted learner support, individualized assistance, and reinforcement as program strengths, but described time allotment, scheduling, workload, coordination, and monitoring as persistent constraints. Fourteen respondents provided invariant ratings across all quantitative items; a sensitivity analysis excluding these cases yielded lower means but retained the same verbal interpretations. The findings suggest that the program had a favorable perceived instructional foundation, but its sustainability depended on more formal scheduling, workload recognition, coordination, monitoring, and resource support. The results represent teacher perceptions and implementation experiences and do not establish direct student achievement gains.

**Keywords:** remedial instruction, program evaluation, teacher perceptions, mixed methods, secondary data, institutional research

### Introduction

Persistent gaps in foundational learning have intensified concern over whether schools are enabling learners not merely to attend classes but to acquire the competencies needed for continued education and social participation. The World Bank and UNESCO define learning poverty as the inability of a child to read and understand a simple, age-appropriate text by age 10, adjusted for children who are out of school. In the Philippines, the 2024 Learning Poverty Brief continues to identify foundational learning as a serious concern, underscoring the need for schools to provide structured support to learners who have not yet mastered essential competencies (World Bank & UNESCO, 2024).

The scale of the challenge is also reflected in the Philippines' performance in the Programme for International Student Assessment. In PISA 2022, only 16% of participating Filipino students attained at least Level 2 proficiency in mathematics, while 24% reached the corresponding level in reading. Although international assessments cannot diagnose the needs of individual schools or learners, they illustrate the broader context in which educational institutions must identify learning difficulties early and provide appropriate academic support (Avvisati & Ilizaliturri, 2023).

One response to learning gaps is remedial instruction, broadly understood as additional and targeted teaching intended to help learners acquire competencies that they have not sufficiently mastered during regular instruction. Remediation may involve reteaching, scaffolded tasks, repeated practice, individualized assistance, one-to-one



tutoring, or small-group instruction. It differs from ordinary review because it is directed toward identified learning needs. However, the term is not implemented uniformly: in some schools it refers to a structured intervention guided by assessment and monitoring, while in others it consists mainly of occasional after-class sessions or additional worksheets.

Evidence suggests that targeted instructional support can improve learning when it is closely matched to learners' present levels of understanding. A meta-analysis of experimental tutoring studies found positive effects on student learning, with stronger results generally associated with frequent delivery, instruction during the school day, and implementation by teachers or trained paraprofessionals (Nickow et al., 2023). The Education Endowment Foundation (EEF, 2021) likewise reports that small-group tuition can produce meaningful progress, while emphasizing that effects vary according to targeting, staffing, preparation, frequency, and implementation quality.

The need for learning recovery became more visible following pandemic-related school disruption. Dela Cruz et al. (2025) found substantial learning losses and positive effects from tutoring interventions across several delivery formats. Yet the review also shows why learning recovery cannot be reduced to a single technique: outcomes vary across contexts, learner populations, subjects, and implementation conditions. A strategy that is effective under well-supported conditions may not yield the same results when teachers lack time, materials, administrative support, or reliable diagnostic information.

Within Philippine basic education, classroom assessment is expected to guide instructional decisions and support learner progress. Department of Education Order No. 8, s. 2015 treats classroom assessment as part of curriculum implementation, while its clarification provides that learners who have not mastered competencies should be given opportunities to catch up or make progress (DO 8, s. 2015 Policy Guidelines on Classroom Assessment for the K to 12 Basic Education Program, 2015; DO 29, s. 2015 Clarifications to DepEd Order No. 8, s. 2015, 2015). Remediation may therefore be understood as part of an assessment-instruction cycle in which identified difficulty leads to targeted support and further instructional adjustment.

Despite its potential, remedial instruction presents practical and ethical tensions. Additional instructional time may benefit struggling learners, but sessions conducted outside regular class hours can produce fatigue, attendance problems, scheduling conflicts, and unequal access among learners with different family or transportation conditions. Teachers may also be expected to diagnose needs, prepare differentiated materials, conduct additional sessions, document progress, and communicate with families while maintaining their regular teaching responsibilities. Remedial education is therefore both an instructional intervention and an organizational undertaking.

The distinction between program outcomes and perceived outcomes is also critical. Direct learning outcomes are ordinarily established through competency assessments, pre-intervention and post-intervention measures, progress records, or other student-level evidence. Teachers' reports that learners became more engaged, confident, or capable are valuable professional observations, but they are not independently verified achievement measures. A defensible institutional evaluation must therefore use perception data without converting them into causal claims.

Teachers nevertheless occupy an important position in evaluating school-based programs. They identify learners who require assistance, adapt instruction, coordinate schedules, communicate with families, and observe participation during implementation. Their accounts can reveal whether objectives are clear, procedures are workable, resources are sufficient, and institutional support enables consistent delivery. At the same time, their reports may be influenced by social desirability, institutional loyalty, workload concerns, or varying standards for judging improvement.

The Context-Input-Process-Product (CIPP) Evaluation Model offers a useful lens for examining these interacting conditions. Context concerns the needs that justify a program; input concerns resources and arrangements; process concerns actual implementation and monitoring; and product concerns intended and unintended results (Stufflebeam & Zhang, 2017). In remedial instruction, however, these dimensions may overlap. Scheduling, for example, can be treated as both an institutional input and an implementation process. The framework is therefore useful as an organizing lens rather than as proof that every component has been measured independently.

Existing research often concentrates on intervention effects or broad policy responses, while internal school evaluations commonly remain descriptive and unpublished. This creates a gap between external evidence about what targeted instruction can potentially achieve and local evidence about the organizational realities that shape implementation. Secondary analysis of institutional evaluation data can help address this gap when its claims are appropriately bounded and when quantitative ratings are interpreted alongside teachers' explanatory comments.

The Integrated Basic Education Department of La Consolacion College Bacolod administers a remedial program for learners who experience difficulty mastering expected competencies. From November to December 2025, teachers involved in the program completed an internal evaluation survey covering program implementation, perceived student participation and learning-related outcomes, teacher support and resources, and open-ended questions on strengths, challenges, and recommendations. The present study reanalyzed these data to determine how teachers experienced the program, which conditions supported its operation, and which structural constraints affected its sustainability.



## Research Questions

This study examined the teacher-perceived implementation, learner-related outcomes, and support conditions of the IBED Remedial Program using secondary data from the institutional evaluation survey. Specifically, it answered the following questions:

1. How did teachers assess the IBED Remedial Program in terms of: (a) program implementation, (b) perceived student participation and learning-related outcomes, and (c) teacher support and resources?
2. What strengths of the Remedial Program were identified by the teachers who participated in its implementation?
3. What challenges and constraints did teachers experience in implementing the Remedial Program?
4. What improvements did teachers recommend to strengthen the implementation and sustainability of the Remedial Program?
5. How did the open-ended responses explain, support, or qualify the quantitative evaluation results?

## Methodology

### Research Design

This study used a convergent mixed-methods secondary-data design. The quantitative and qualitative data were drawn from the same internal evaluation survey, analyzed separately, and integrated during interpretation. The quantitative component described teachers' assessments of program implementation, perceived student participation and learning-related outcomes, and teacher support and resources. The qualitative component used brief open-ended responses to explain, expand, or qualify the numerical patterns. Combining the two forms of evidence allowed the study to develop a more comprehensive account of program functioning than either strand could provide independently (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Because the survey had originally been administered for internal evaluation rather than for the present publication, the analysis constituted secondary research using an existing institutional dataset.

### Research Locale

The study was conducted at La Consolacion College Bacolod, a private educational institution in Bacolod City, Philippines. It focused on the Remedial Program of the Integrated Basic Education Department, which serves learners from Preschool through Senior High School. The program was intended to provide additional instructional support to learners who experienced difficulty mastering expected competencies. Teachers participated in identifying learners who required support, preparing remedial activities, delivering instruction, coordinating with advisers and academic leaders, and monitoring learner participation. The locale was relevant because the study examined the program within the actual institutional conditions in which scheduling, workload, instructional resources, communication, and administrative support operated.

### Sample Size and Sampling Technique

The secondary dataset contained 35 usable teacher responses submitted through Google Forms from November 7 to December 10, 2025. Nineteen respondents were from the Secondary level, 14 from the Elementary level, and two from Preschool. In terms of years of service, 17 had served for one to three years, five for four to six years, four for seven to ten years, and nine for more than ten years. The dataset included all available responses from teachers who indicated involvement in the implementation, facilitation, coordination, or supervision of the Remedial Program. All 35 cases contained complete ratings for the 19 quantitative items. Although each form contained entries in the open-ended fields, several entries were non-substantive, such as "none," "N/A," or punctuation marks. The substantive response counts were 25 for program strengths, 20 for challenges, 19 for recommendations, and six for additional comments.

### Research Instrument

Data were obtained using a researcher-developed Remedial Program Evaluation Survey prepared for the institution's internal evaluation. The instrument contained respondent-profile questions, 19 five-point rating-scale items, and four open-ended questions. Program Implementation comprised nine items addressing communication of objectives, learner identification, lesson planning, scheduling, resources, guidance, collaboration, and mission alignment. Perceived Student Participation and Learning-Related Outcomes comprised five items addressing teacher-observed competency mastery, confidence, perceived strategy effectiveness, attendance and engagement, and communication with parents or guardians. Teacher Support and Resources comprised five items addressing time allotment, access to materials, administrative instructions, monitoring and feedback, and overall organization. The open-ended questions asked what worked best, what challenges were encountered, what improvements were recommended, and whether respondents had additional comments.

### Conceptual Basis and Scoring

The questionnaire was informed by the CIPP Evaluation Model (Stufflebeam & Zhang, 2017). Items concerning program relevance and learner identification reflected context; materials, schedules, communication, and



administrative support represented input; instructional delivery, collaboration, coordination, and monitoring represented process; and teacher-observed participation and learning-related changes represented perceived product. Because several indicators could apply to more than one component, the study retained the three operational dimensions used in the original survey and treated CIPP as an organizing framework rather than as evidence of four independent scales.

The rating scale used the following interpretation: 4.50-5.00, Highly Evident; 3.50-4.49, Evident; 2.50-3.49, Moderately Evident; 1.50-2.49, Minimally Evident; and 1.00-1.49, Not Evident. These descriptors characterized the perceived extent to which each program feature was manifested. Ratings concerning learner mastery, confidence, and engagement were treated as teacher-perceived or teacher-observed outcomes rather than direct measures of student achievement.

### **Expert Review and Reliability**

Before administration, the instrument underwent expert content review by three reviewers with backgrounds in education and program evaluation. They examined the items for relevance, clarity, alignment with the intended program components, and appropriateness for the basic education setting. Their feedback informed revisions to wording, sequencing, and indicator specificity. No numerical content validity index was available in the secondary dataset; therefore, the study does not claim full psychometric validation.

Internal consistency was assessed during the secondary analysis. Cronbach's alpha was .953 for Program Implementation, .974 for Perceived Student Participation and Learning-Related Outcomes, .967 for Teacher Support and Resources, and .979 for the full 19-item scale. These coefficients indicate high consistency within the present dataset. However, very high alpha values can also reflect item similarity or redundancy and should not be interpreted as evidence of unidimensionality or full construct validity (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011).

### **Data-Gathering and Data Preparation**

The original survey was distributed electronically through Google Forms to teachers involved in the Remedial Program. Participation was voluntary and responses were treated as confidential institutional evaluation data. Google Forms automatically consolidated submissions in a spreadsheet. For the secondary analysis, the research team obtained the authorized institutional file, removed names and email addresses from the analytical dataset, and examined the records for completeness, duplicates, invalid values, and inconsistent categories. No duplicate email addresses or missing quantitative responses were found. Response dates were retained only to establish the data-collection period.

### **Quantitative Data Analysis**

Frequencies and percentages summarized grade-level assignment and years of service. Means and standard deviations were calculated for each item and for respondent-level composite scores in the three operational dimensions. An overall composite score was also calculated across all 19 items. Items were ordered from highest to lowest mean to identify comparatively stronger and weaker program features. Cronbach's alpha assessed internal consistency. No inferential subgroup comparisons were conducted because the sample was small, institution-specific, and unevenly distributed across categories.

The data-quality audit also examined invariant response patterns. A respondent was classified as invariant when the same rating was selected for all 19 quantitative items. Because 14 respondents met this criterion, a sensitivity analysis recomputed the dimension and overall means after excluding these cases. Spearman correlations among the three composite dimensions were also calculated as exploratory indicators of construct overlap; they were not used for prediction or causal inference.

### **Qualitative Data Analysis**

The brief open-ended responses were analyzed through a content-informed thematic procedure adapted from the stages of thematic analysis described by Braun and Clarke (2006). Two members of the research team independently read the responses, generated initial codes, and grouped recurring meanings into broader themes related to instructional strengths, time and scheduling, workload, learner differences, communication, resources, coordination, and recommended improvements. The researchers compared their coding and resolved differences through discussion. A simple coding matrix was retained as an audit trail. The analysis was primarily inductive, although the final interpretation considered the CIPP-informed program dimensions. Non-substantive entries were recorded but were not forced into themes. Because the responses were brief survey comments, the analysis was treated as thematic interpretation of concise written feedback rather than an in-depth qualitative inquiry.

### **Integration of Findings**

The quantitative and qualitative results were integrated through a joint display and narrative comparison. Qualitative findings were classified as converging with, expanding, or qualifying the numerical results. This process allowed the study to identify where open-ended comments supported favorable ratings and where they revealed operational concerns that were less visible in the means alone.



### Ethical Considerations and Researcher Positionality

The study observed ethical principles applicable to the secondary use of institutional evaluation data. Institutional authorization for research use was obtained from the La Consolacion College Bacolod Integrated Basic Education Department. The study was submitted to the LCCB Institutional Ethics Review Board and received the appropriate determination under reference 202526-118c. Only de-identified data were used for analysis. Qualitative excerpts were reported without combinations of characteristics that could reasonably reveal a respondent's identity, and access to the original file was restricted to the research team in password-protected institutional storage.

Because members of the research team held administrative or research roles within the institution, the possibility of social desirability and authority-related response effects was recognized. De-identification, aggregate reporting, independent coding of open-ended responses, and explicit separation of teacher perceptions from direct student outcomes were used to reduce interpretive overreach. The authors report no financial conflict of interest.

### Results

#### Respondent Profile

The dataset contained complete quantitative responses from 35 teachers. Most respondents were from the Secondary level ( $n = 19$ , 54.29%), followed by Elementary ( $n = 14$ , 40.00%) and Preschool ( $n = 2$ , 5.71%). Almost half had one to three years of service ( $n = 17$ , 48.57%), while nine (25.71%) had served for more than ten years.

**Table 1. Profile of the Respondents (N = 35)**

| Profile Variable                     | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Grade level: Preschool               | 2         | 5.71       |
| Grade level: Elementary              | 14        | 40.00      |
| Grade level: Secondary               | 19        | 54.29      |
| Years of service: 1-3 years          | 17        | 48.57      |
| Years of service: 4-6 years          | 5         | 14.29      |
| Years of service: 7-10 years         | 4         | 11.43      |
| Years of service: More than 10 years | 9         | 25.71      |

#### Overall Assessment of the Remedial Program

The overall composite mean was 4.10 ( $SD = 0.70$ ), interpreted as Evident. Program Implementation received the highest mean ( $M = 4.17$ ,  $SD = 0.67$ ), followed by Perceived Student Participation and Learning-Related Outcomes ( $M = 4.09$ ,  $SD = 0.78$ ). Teacher Support and Resources received the lowest mean ( $M = 3.98$ ,  $SD = 0.84$ ). All three dimensions remained within the Evident range, but the ordering suggests that teachers were less uniformly positive about the organizational conditions supporting implementation than about program structure and perceived learner-related changes.

**Table 2. Overall Teacher Assessment of the IBED Remedial Program (N = 35)**

| Dimension                                                     | Mean        | SD          | Interpretation |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| Program Implementation                                        | 4.17        | 0.67        | Evident        |
| Perceived Student Participation and Learning-Related Outcomes | 4.09        | 0.78        | Evident        |
| Teacher Support and Resources                                 | 3.98        | 0.84        | Evident        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                | <b>4.10</b> | <b>0.70</b> | <b>Evident</b> |

*Note. Dimension means and standard deviations were calculated from respondent-level composite scores.*

#### Program Implementation

Program Implementation was rated Evident ( $M = 4.17$ ,  $SD = 0.67$ ). The highest-rated indicators were clear communication of program objectives ( $M = 4.37$ ,  $SD = 0.69$ ) and systematic and fair identification of learners needing remediation ( $M = 4.34$ ,  $SD = 0.68$ ). Alignment with the institutional mission also received a favorable rating ( $M =$



4.26, SD = 0.74). The lowest-rated indicator was the manageability and coordination of the remedial schedule (M = 3.91, SD = 0.85).

**Table 3. Teacher Assessment of Program Implementation (N = 35)**

| Indicator                                                       | Mean        | SD          | Interpretation |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| Objectives were clearly communicated.                           | 4.37        | 0.69        | Evident        |
| Learner identification was systematic and fair.                 | 4.34        | 0.68        | Evident        |
| Remedial classes aligned with the institutional mission.        | 4.26        | 0.74        | Evident        |
| Lesson planning allowed interdisciplinary collaboration.        | 4.17        | 0.79        | Evident        |
| The program fostered collaboration among teachers and advisers. | 4.17        | 0.82        | Evident        |
| Materials and learning resources were appropriate.              | 4.14        | 0.85        | Evident        |
| Teachers received adequate guidance from heads or coordinators. | 4.11        | 0.80        | Evident        |
| The Schematic Webbing Week timeframe was sufficient.            | 4.06        | 0.87        | Evident        |
| The remedial schedule was manageable and well-coordinated.      | 3.91        | 0.85        | Evident        |
| <b>Dimension mean</b>                                           | <b>4.17</b> | <b>0.67</b> | <b>Evident</b> |

**Perceived Student Participation and Learning-Related Outcomes**

This dimension was rated Evident (M = 4.09, SD = 0.78). Informing parents or guardians about participation and progress received the highest mean (M = 4.14, SD = 0.73), followed by perceived effectiveness of remedial strategies (M = 4.11, SD = 0.83). Teacher-observed improvement in competency mastery received a mean of 4.06 (SD = 0.84), while increased confidence received the lowest mean in the dimension (M = 4.03, SD = 0.82). These ratings represent teacher observations rather than independently verified student achievement.

**Table 4. Teacher Assessment of Perceived Student Participation and Learning-Related Outcomes (N = 35)**

| Indicator                                          | Mean        | SD          | Interpretation |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| Parents or guardians were adequately informed.     | 4.14        | 0.73        | Evident        |
| Remedial strategies were perceived as effective.   | 4.11        | 0.83        | Evident        |
| Attendance and engagement were satisfactory.       | 4.09        | 0.85        | Evident        |
| Students showed improvement in competency mastery. | 4.06        | 0.84        | Evident        |
| Students demonstrated greater confidence.          | 4.03        | 0.82        | Evident        |
| <b>Dimension mean</b>                              | <b>4.09</b> | <b>0.78</b> | <b>Evident</b> |

**Teacher Support and Resources**

Teacher Support and Resources received the lowest dimension mean, although it remained Evident (M = 3.98, SD = 0.84). Clear administrative instructions received the highest rating in the dimension (M = 4.09, SD = 0.85), followed



by overall program organization ( $M = 4.06$ ,  $SD = 0.87$ ). Time allotment was the lowest-rated item in the questionnaire ( $M = 3.83$ ,  $SD = 1.04$ ) and showed the greatest variability, indicating less consistent experiences among teachers.

**Table 5. Teacher Assessment of Support and Resources ( $N = 35$ )**

| Indicator                                                    | Mean        | SD          | Interpretation |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| Administration provided clear instructions and expectations. | 4.09        | 0.85        | Evident        |
| Overall implementation was well organized.                   | 4.06        | 0.87        | Evident        |
| Support materials were accessible.                           | 4.00        | 0.80        | Evident        |
| Monitoring and feedback were adequate.                       | 3.94        | 0.87        | Evident        |
| Time allotment was sufficient.                               | 3.83        | 1.04        | Evident        |
| <b>Dimension mean</b>                                        | <b>3.98</b> | <b>0.84</b> | <b>Evident</b> |

#### **Program Strengths Identified by Teachers**

Twenty-five respondents provided substantive comments about what worked best. Four themes were identified.

##### ***Individualized and Focused Support***

Teachers frequently valued one-to-one assistance, personal attention, and the opportunity to work at a learner-appropriate pace. Illustrative comments included "When there is 1 on 1 approach," "One on one support, giving individualized attention," and "[S]tudents received the personal attention they needed to master difficult skills." These responses suggest that remediation created opportunities for closer assistance than regular whole-class instruction typically allowed.

##### ***Reinforcement and Repeated Practice***

Respondents identified drills, working activity sheets, repeated explanation, supplemental learning, and consistent practice as useful features. Teachers associated these activities with opportunities to revisit difficult lessons and strengthen retention through reinforcement rather than through a single exposure to content.

##### ***Support for Foundational Skills and Learning Gaps***

Teachers described the program as useful for reading, writing, numeracy, mathematics, science, and other foundational competencies. Several comments referred to diagnostic assessment, awareness of weaknesses, and targeted support for specific gaps. These responses indicate that teachers perceived the program as focused on identifiable needs rather than as general review alone.

##### ***Flexible Delivery***

A smaller group of respondents mentioned asynchronous and modular arrangements as useful in maintaining access under varying conditions. However, some teachers indicated that they had not yet conducted remedial classes or had limited exposure, showing that implementation experience was not uniform across all respondents.

#### **Challenges Encountered in Implementation**

Twenty respondents provided substantive comments about implementation challenges. Five themes emerged.

##### ***Time and Scheduling Constraints***

Time-related concerns were the most recurrent. Teachers described insufficient session time, difficulty identifying workable time slots, conflict with learners' regular schedules, and interruptions caused by calamities or other school activities. One respondent explained that remedial classes were often conducted after regular lessons, resulting in



fatigue and reduced focus among both teachers and learners. These comments directly explain the comparatively low ratings for time allotment and schedule manageability.

#### ***Teacher Availability and Workload***

Respondents reported difficulty balancing remediation with regular teaching responsibilities. Some indicated that full teaching loads and other assigned tasks reduced preparation time and made consistent implementation difficult. The concern extended beyond the duration of individual sessions to the absence of protected time within teachers' formal schedules.

#### ***Differences in Learner Needs***

Teachers identified varied learning levels, weak foundational skills, slow progress, and difficulty ensuring that explanations were understood by all participants. These comments indicate that learners assigned to remediation did not have uniform needs and that a single instructional approach was unlikely to be sufficient.

#### ***Communication and Parental Support***

Some respondents reported communication gaps or limited parental support. This finding qualifies the favorable quantitative rating for parent information: notification procedures may have been present, but active participation and consistent home support were not always secured.

#### ***Materials and Learning Venues***

A smaller number of responses referred to insufficient subject-specific materials, shared spaces, or logistical limitations. Although materials were rated favorably overall, these comments suggest that adequacy varied by subject, grade level, or type of learning difficulty.

#### ***Recommendations from Teachers***

Nineteen respondents provided substantive recommendations. Four priority themes were identified.

##### ***Formalize the Remedial Schedule***

The most frequent recommendation was to embed a regular remedial period in the official school or teacher schedule. Suggestions included a weekly protected period, increased frequency or duration, Saturday sessions, or summer remediation. The common principle was that remediation should not depend mainly on ad hoc after-class availability.

##### ***Recognize Remedial Teaching in Workload***

Several respondents recommended that remedial responsibilities be treated as part of the official teaching load or supported through workload adjustment, credit, or an appropriate incentive. They linked this recognition to adequate preparation time, sustained attention, and more consistent delivery.

##### ***Strengthen Planning, Coordination, and Monitoring***

Teachers recommended clearer preparation, stronger communication, closer monitoring, and designation of a coordinator or team responsible for learner lists, scheduling, documentation, and follow-through. They also suggested more systematic monitoring of learner needs and progress.

##### ***Match Teachers and Resources to Learner Needs***

Respondents proposed considering subject expertise and availability when assigning teachers. They also recommended more appropriate materials and, where possible, separate venues for different subjects or learner groups. These suggestions reflect the view that remediation requires alignment among learner needs, teacher expertise, instructional materials, and space.

#### ***Integrated Findings***

The qualitative findings largely converged with the favorable quantitative evaluation, while also expanding and qualifying it. Teachers' comments about one-to-one assistance, drills, reinforcement, and focused instruction supported the positive ratings for program implementation and perceived learner-related outcomes. In contrast, comments about after-class sessions, fatigue, competing workloads, and limited monitoring explained why teacher support and resources received the lowest dimension mean.

#### ***Table 6. Joint Display of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings***



| Quantitative Result                                                      | Qualitative Relationship                                                                                            | Integrated Inference                                                                            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Program objectives received the highest item rating.                     | Converged: teachers recognized the program purpose and recommended continuation.                                    | The program's intended purpose was generally understood by implementers.                        |
| Learner identification was rated favorably.                              | Expanded: comments referred to diagnostic assessment and attention to specific weaknesses.                          | Teachers perceived remediation as targeted toward identified learning needs.                    |
| Perceived learner-related outcomes were rated Evident.                   | Converged: teachers cited one-to-one support, drills, activity sheets, and reinforcement.                           | Favorable learner observations were associated with focused and repeated instructional support. |
| Schedule manageability and time allotment were among the lowest ratings. | Converged and expanded: teachers reported conflicts, after-class fatigue, and insufficient protected time.          | Scheduling was a central operational constraint despite favorable overall program perceptions.  |
| Teacher Support and Resources received the lowest dimension mean.        | Expanded: teachers requested workload recognition, coordination, monitoring, materials, and appropriate assignment. | Program sustainability depended on stronger organizational support for implementers.            |

### Data Quality and Sensitivity Analyses

Fourteen respondents (40.00%) selected the same rating across all 19 quantitative items. Eight selected 5 throughout, four selected 4 throughout, and two selected 3 throughout. These invariant patterns may represent genuinely uniform evaluations, but they may also indicate limited differentiation among items, acquiescent responding, or item redundancy.

When the 14 invariant cases were excluded, all composite means decreased but remained in the Evident range: Program Implementation,  $M = 4.00$ ; Perceived Student Participation and Learning-Related Outcomes,  $M = 3.86$ ; Teacher Support and Resources,  $M = 3.69$ ; and Overall,  $M = 3.88$ . Thus, the broad interpretation was directionally stable, although the full-sample means were more favorable.

**Table 7. Sensitivity Analysis of Composite Means**

| Dimension                                                     | Full Sample (n = 35) | Non-Invariant Cases (n = 21) | Interpretation |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Program Implementation                                        | 4.17                 | 4.00                         | Evident        |
| Perceived Student Participation and Learning-Related Outcomes | 4.09                 | 3.86                         | Evident        |
| Teacher Support and Resources                                 | 3.98                 | 3.69                         | Evident        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                | <b>4.10</b>          | <b>3.88</b>                  | <b>Evident</b> |

Exploratory Spearman correlations showed strong positive relationships among Program Implementation and Perceived Student Participation and Learning-Related Outcomes ( $\rho = .779$ ), Program Implementation and Teacher Support and Resources ( $\rho = .847$ ), and Perceived Student Participation and Learning-Related Outcomes and Teacher Support and Resources ( $\rho = .886$ ). These coefficients indicate that respondents who rated one aspect favorably tended to rate the other aspects favorably. They also suggest possible conceptual overlap or a general evaluation tendency and were not interpreted as evidence of causation or prediction.

### Discussion

#### Clarity and Perceived Instructional Value

The study found that teachers generally perceived the Remedial Program as clearly implemented and instructionally useful. Program Implementation received the highest mean, particularly for communication of objectives, learner



identification, and mission alignment. These findings suggest that teachers understood the program's purpose and generally viewed its referral procedures as purposeful. The qualitative comments strengthened this interpretation by describing diagnostic attention, targeted assistance, drills, and repeated practice. The results are consistent with the principle that assessment should guide instructional response and with evidence that targeted support is most useful when aligned with learners' current levels of understanding (DO 8, s. 2015 Policy Guidelines on Classroom Assessment for the K to 12 Basic Education Program, 2015; Nickow et al., 2023).

The findings also show, however, that clarity of purpose did not automatically produce ease of implementation. Schedule manageability was the lowest-rated program-implementation item, revealing a difference between a program that is conceptually understood and one that is operationally sustainable. This distinction is central to institutional research because favorable attitudes toward a program do not remove the practical constraints faced by implementers.

### **Perceived Learner-Related Benefits and Evidentiary Limits**

Teachers generally reported favorable learner participation, engagement, confidence, and improvement in mastery. Their comments linked these observations to individualized attention, deeper explanation, activity sheets, and repeated practice. This pattern is consistent with research indicating that targeted tutoring and small-group support can benefit learners when delivered with sufficient focus and intensity (EEF, 2021; Nickow et al., 2023). Individualized assistance may also provide affective support for learners who have experienced repeated academic difficulty.

These findings must remain bounded by the nature of the dataset. The study did not include student records, achievement tests, pretest-posttest measures, or comparison groups. The ratings therefore provide evidence of teacher-perceived learner-related change rather than direct evidence that the program caused academic gains. This distinction prevents an internal satisfaction measure from being treated as an outcome evaluation beyond what the available data can support.

### **Scheduling, Workload, and Institutional Sustainability**

Teacher Support and Resources received the lowest dimension mean, and time allotment was the lowest-rated item with the greatest variability. The open-ended responses explained this result through accounts of after-class sessions, fatigue, competing teaching responsibilities, limited preparation time, and teacher availability. These concerns support the broader view that remedial interventions depend not only on instructional techniques but also on staffing, scheduling, and organizational capacity (Dela Cruz et al., 2025; EEF, 2021).

The most important institutional tension was therefore not opposition to remediation but the mismatch between its perceived educational value and the time formally available for implementation. A program that relies heavily on voluntary effort, informal coordination, or after-class availability may function initially but remain vulnerable to inconsistent delivery. Teachers' recommendations for a protected schedule and workload recognition reflect a call for institutionalization rather than simply additional convenience.

Monitoring and coordination were also less favorable than initial administrative communication. This suggests that clear instructions at the beginning of a program may not be sufficient without ongoing feedback, documentation, and responsibility for follow-through. Within a CIPP-informed interpretation, these are process concerns because they affect fidelity, consistency, and the capacity to improve implementation over time (Stufflebeam & Zhang, 2017).

### **Measurement and Response-Quality Considerations**

The statistical audit identified invariant ratings among 40% of respondents and very high internal consistency coefficients. The sensitivity analysis showed that the overall conclusions remained stable after invariant cases were excluded, but the lower means indicate that these response patterns contributed to the favorable magnitude of the full-sample results. The strong correlations among the dimensions likewise suggest that the scales captured interconnected perceptions and may also reflect item overlap or a general halo effect.

These findings do not invalidate the survey, but they caution against treating small differences among dimension means as substantively precise. The survey is more defensible as a broad institutional evaluation of interrelated program conditions than as a fully validated measure of independent constructs. Revising repetitive items and encouraging respondents to evaluate each statement separately may improve future administrations.

### **Institutional Implications**

The findings support four priorities. First, remediation should be considered within a protected scheduling arrangement that balances instructional needs with teacher and learner well-being. Second, remedial responsibilities should be reviewed in relation to formal workload expectations. Third, coordination and monitoring should be clarified through defined responsibility, standardized documentation, and regular follow-up. Fourth, teacher assignment and instructional resources should be matched more closely to subject-specific and learner-specific needs. These priorities preserve the program's perceived instructional strengths while addressing the organizational conditions that teachers identified as limiting sustainability.



### Limitations

The study was limited to a single private-school setting and a small, unevenly distributed sample of 35 teachers. The findings are therefore context-specific and are not statistically generalizable to other schools. The analysis relied exclusively on teacher reports and did not include direct student achievement measures, attendance records, or other independent outcome evidence. Some respondents had limited exposure to implementation, and the open-ended response set was brief and uneven, with only six substantive additional comments.

The survey was originally developed for internal evaluation rather than for publication. Although it underwent expert review and demonstrated high internal consistency, no numerical content validity index or factor-analytic evidence was available. The presence of invariant responses, high correlations among dimensions, and possible item redundancy further limits claims about the distinctness of the scales. Social desirability and institutional loyalty may also have influenced responses because the program was evaluated within the respondents' own institution. These limitations were addressed through de-identification, cautious interpretation, sensitivity analysis, and explicit separation of perceived outcomes from direct achievement evidence.

### Conclusion

Teachers generally perceived the IBED Remedial Program as purposeful, organized, and responsive to learners who required additional support. Its strongest perceived features were clear objectives, systematic learner identification, individualized assistance, reinforcement, and focused attention to learning gaps. Teachers also reported favorable learner participation and learning-related changes, but these findings represent professional observations rather than verified achievement gains.

The main weakness was not a lack of perceived instructional value but the organizational conditions surrounding implementation. Time allotment, schedule manageability, workload, coordination, and monitoring were comparatively weaker and were repeatedly identified in the open-ended responses. The sensitivity analysis confirmed that the broad positive interpretation remained after invariant cases were excluded, although the exact magnitude of the ratings should be interpreted cautiously.

The study concludes that the program had a favorable perceived instructional foundation, but its sustainability depended on stronger institutional arrangements. Formal scheduling, workload recognition, coordinated monitoring, and appropriate resource and teacher assignment are necessary if the program is to move from a valued initiative to a consistently supported component of learner assistance.

### Recommendations

First, the Integrated Basic Education Department should review the feasibility of a protected remedial schedule that reduces dependence on ad hoc after-class sessions. The schedule should balance instructional intensity with teacher workload, learner fatigue, transport, and family circumstances.

Second, the institution should clarify how remedial responsibilities are recognized in faculty workload. Preparation, delivery, documentation, coordination, and parent communication require time and should not be treated solely as informal additions to regular teaching duties.

Third, program coordination and monitoring should be strengthened through defined responsibility, standardized referral and reporting procedures, and regular review of participation and teacher-observed progress. Subject-appropriate materials and teacher assignments should be aligned with the competencies and learner needs being addressed.

Finally, the evaluation instrument should be reviewed before future administration. Repetitive items may be reduced or clarified, the CIPP-informed domains may be represented more distinctly, and respondents should be instructed to evaluate each item independently. Future internal evaluations using similar data should continue to distinguish teacher-perceived outcomes from directly measured student achievement.

### References

- Avvisati, F., & Ilizaliturri, R. (2023). PISA 2022 results (Volume I and II) - Country notes: Philippines. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. [https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2022-results-volume-i-and-ii-country-notes\\_ed6fbcc5-en/philippines\\_a0882a2d-en.html](https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2022-results-volume-i-and-ii-country-notes_ed6fbcc5-en/philippines_a0882a2d-en.html)
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dela Cruz, N. A., Adona, A. J., Molato-Gayares, R., & Park, A. (2025). Learning loss and recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review of evidence. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 115, 103271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2025.103271>



DO 8, s. 2015 Policy Guidelines on Classroom Assessment for the K to 12 Basic Education Program. (2015). <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/>

DO 29, s. 2015 Clarifications to DepEd Order No. 8, s. 2015 (Policy Guidelines on Classroom Assessment for the K to 12 Basic Education Program). (2015). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2015/07/10/do-29-s-2015-clarifications-to-deped-order-no-8-s-2015-policy-guidelines-on-classroom-assessment-for-the-k-to-12-basic-education-program/>

Education Endowment Foundation. (2021, July 31). Small group tuition. <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/small-group-tuition>

Nickow, A., Oreopoulos, P., & Quan, V. (2023). The promise of tutoring for PreK-12 learning: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the experimental evidence. *American Educational Research Journal*, 61(1), 74-107. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312231208687>

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Zhang, G. (2017). *The CIPP evaluation model: How to evaluate for improvement and accountability*. Guilford Publications.

Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53-55. <https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd>

World Bank & UNESCO. (2024). *Philippines - Learning poverty brief 2024*. World Bank. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/099090524085540633>