



An Instructional Leadership Framework for Reading Program Implementation: A Case Study

Carla Pamela C. Alo*

Bukidnon State University

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.1026EDU0308>

Received: 14 May 2026; Accepted: 19 May 2026; Published: 09 June 2026

ABSTRACT

The study explored the Instructional Leadership of reading teachers, reading coordinators, and school administrators in small, medium, and large schools of Quezon III, Division of Bukidnon during the school year 2025-2026. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews and analyzed following the two-phase analysis of Yin's case study approach (Yin, 2014). The nine participants were purposively selected to provide rich, experience-based insights into the dynamics of reading program implementation. The recommendations of the study emphasize the importance of collaboration, instructional leadership, and data-driven practices in strengthening reading program implementation among all stakeholders. The findings revealed three within cases. The three cases are Case 1: Reading Teachers, Case 2: Reading Coordinators, and Case 3: School Administrators. From the response, six themes emerged in cross case analysis. First, Theme 1: Collaboration Improves Instruction and Outcomes, Theme 2: Reflective Practice through Formal and Informal Learning Communities, Theme 3: Contextualized and Adaptive Instructional Practices, Theme 4: Shared Responsibility and Complementary Roles, Theme 5: Development of Collaborative Routines and Structures, and Theme 6: Data-Driven and Experience-Based Decision Making. Lastly, The Instructional Leadership Framework for Reading Program Implementation serves as a guide for school leaders in effectively implementing the reading programs. The study found that the successful implementation of reading programs in public schools depends on the collaborative efforts of reading teachers, reading coordinators, and school administrators who work together to address learners' diverse literacy needs despite challenges such as limited resources, absenteeism, and inconsistent parental support. The recommendations of the study emphasize the importance of collaboration, instructional leadership, and data-driven practices in strengthening reading program implementation among all stakeholders.

Keywords: Reading Program Implementation, Instructional Leadership, Case Study, Collaboration

INTRODUCTION

In the pursuit of improving literacy outcomes, the effective implementation of reading programs remains a key priority in Philippine basic education. Central to this effort is the role of instructional leadership, which ensures that teaching and learning processes are purposeful, coordinated, and responsive to learners' needs. Through program alignment, school leaders contextualize national policies like the Department of Education's reading initiatives into school-based strategies; through mentoring and coaching, they build teachers' capacity to deliver differentiated and learner-centered instruction; and through resource mobilization, they maximize available school and community support.

Reading remains a persistent challenge in the Department of Education, as many learners continue to struggle with basic literacy skills despite ongoing interventions and reforms. Assessments have repeatedly shown that a significant number of students fall below expected reading proficiency levels, particularly in comprehension, which affects their overall academic performance across subject areas. As a result, reading difficulties persist as a critical educational problem that calls for strengthened instructional leadership, targeted interventions, and

sustained collaboration among schools, families, and communities to ensure that all learners achieve functional literacy.

Reading difficulties continue to persist across different grade levels, signaling the need for sustained and context-responsive solutions. This concern is also evident at the local level, Division of Bukidnon, where schools cater to a growing and diverse learner population with varied linguistic backgrounds and learning needs. Despite continuous interventions, studies within the district reveal that many learners still experience reading difficulties as they progress to higher grade levels, indicating persistent gaps in foundational literacy skills (Quimbo, 2019). These challenges are further compounded by contextual factors such as large class sizes, limited materials, absenteeism, child labor, learner diversity and varying levels of parental and community support are evident making reading not only a classroom issue but a systemic concern that requires sustained, localized, and data-driven solutions.

Instructional leadership plays a critical role in shaping effective teaching and learning processes, particularly in the implementation of school-based programs aimed at improving learner outcomes. In the context of basic education, it is widely recognized as a key driver of school improvement and academic success. Instructional leaders ensure that literacy initiatives are not only well-designed but also consistently executed and sustained. School leaders, particularly principals, master teachers, and reading coordinators, take an active role in guiding teachers through clear program alignment with Department of Education mandates, while also adapting strategies to suit the unique needs of their learners. In the context of reading program implementation, instructional leadership involves closely monitoring learners' reading progress, supporting teachers through contextualized reading programs such as "Mama, Maestra Pabasaha Ko", "A Mixed Method on Carilla, Marungko and Fuller", "ILO (Instructional Learning Opportunity) Program", "Bawat Batang Minsamongan Bumabasa", "Feeding Programs", "Peer Reading", and "Reading Habits". Moreover, instructional leaders facilitate collaboration among teachers, engage parents and the community, and mobilize limited resources to support reading activities both in school and at home.

The Instructional Leadership Framework for Reading Program Implementation contributes significantly by providing a structured and collaborative approach to improving literacy instruction and learner outcomes. The framework strengthens teachers' instructional practices through differentiated and learner-centered strategies that address diverse reading abilities and learning needs. It promotes continuous professional growth by encouraging collaboration through LAC sessions, mentoring, co-planning, and reflective practice, allowing teachers to share effective strategies and improve classroom instruction. The framework also enhances teachers' ability to use data-driven assessment and monitoring in identifying learners' reading difficulties and implementing timely interventions. The framework supports teachers through instructional leadership, resource provision, innovation, and community engagement, enabling them to adapt effectively to contextual challenges such as large class sizes, limited resources, absenteeism, and varying parental support. Overall, the framework empowers teachers to become active instructional leaders who contribute to sustainable reading program implementation and holistic learner development.

METHODOLOGY

The Instructional Leadership Framework for Reading Program Implementation contributes significantly by providing a structured and collaborative approach to improving literacy instruction and learner outcomes. The framework strengthens teachers' instructional practices through differentiated and learner-centered strategies that address diverse reading abilities and learning needs. It promotes continuous professional growth by encouraging collaboration through LAC sessions, mentoring, co-planning, and reflective practice, allowing teachers to share effective strategies and improve classroom instruction. The framework also enhances teachers' ability to use data-driven assessment and monitoring in identifying learners' reading difficulties and implementing timely interventions. The framework supports teachers through instructional leadership, resource provision, innovation, and community engagement, enabling them to adapt effectively to contextual challenges such as large class sizes, limited resources, absenteeism, and varying parental support. Overall, the framework empowers teachers to become active instructional leaders who contribute to sustainable reading program implementation and holistic learner development.

The study utilized purposive sampling to select participants who represented three distinct cases based on their roles in reading program implementation: the Best Reading Teacher, the Reading Coordinator, and the School Administrator. These participants were drawn from diverse educational settings, including small, medium, and big schools, and were considered information-rich cases due to their varied experiences and specialized expertise. Anchored on the case study principles of Yin (2018), the researcher followed a systematic inquiry process that explored real-life phenomena within their context and captured the meanings participants attributed to their experiences. Consistent with Yin's approach, data were collected through semi-structured interviews, allowing a flexible yet guided discussion that enabled in-depth exploration of each case while maintaining alignment with the research questions.

Research Locale

This study was conducted in the Division of Bukidnon, which was limited to the 3 elementary schools. The three participating schools were chosen because they were active implementers of DepEd's mandated reading programs. Schools were identified into three categories: large school which had twenty-one teachers; medium-sized school which had ten teachers; and small school which had six teachers. The study was conducted where the researcher was also affiliated. All schools were active implementer of the reading programs and mandate of the Department of Education (i.e., CRLA and PHIL-IRI) making them suitable for the case. These reading programs were closely monitored by the Department of Education- Division of Bukidnon through BOSY, MOSY and EOSY (beginning, middle and end of school year) assessment reports and memorandum's strict compliance through the department's official site, group chats, division reports, and national reports. The sites were chosen due to its accessibility to the researcher, type of school, enrolment of learners and number of teachers. These indicated that the research sites were appropriately aligned with the study's context, thereby reinforcing the validity of the school's selection.

Varied reading programs, festive reading events, quarterly reading assessments, and reading recognition were held. In the previous years, the municipality had launched "Basa, Quezon", a municipal-wide reading activity. Reading materials were displayed and presented creatively. Quarterly, school ICTs were tasked to report reading progress. These results were presented in an LSB (Local School Board) meeting where gaps were addressed and best practices were recognized. Benchmarking was also possible as you wished. In our district, our PSDS had adapted such strategy. In the end of school year rites, a recognition program was held. A certificate was given to the teachers for such commendable recognitions. During in-service trainings reading programs, strategies, and innovations were shared and adapted. Every school year, each district would host action research funded by the Local School Board. Recently, ReadLens and Echotext were launched across the municipality as innovative initiatives aimed at strengthening literacy assessment and enhancing reading instruction practices at the school level. Pilot testing was conducted, and reechoed via LAC session. In the coming school year, it would be implemented as municipal-wide initiative.

Research Participants

This study involved a purposive selection of key participants who played vital roles in the implementation and management of reading programs within their respective schools. Specifically, three (3) reading teachers, three (3) reading coordinators, and three (3) school administrators were chosen as participants. One participant per category was drawn from a small, medium, and large school within the Quezon III District, Division of Bukidnon. This composition ensured representation across different school categories, allowing for a more comprehensive understanding of reading program implementation in diverse school contexts within the district.

To identify the reading teachers the following qualifications must be met: must have at least three years of teaching experience in reading or literacy-related instruction must have completed relevant professional development or training focused on reading or literacy, should have implemented reading innovations or strategies that demonstrate effective classroom practice, may have received recognition or awards related to reading instruction or literacy initiatives, and must show evidence of an outstanding reading assessment result, demonstrating strong learner outcomes or program effectiveness, and lastly recommended by the school head.

To identify the reading coordinator, the teacher must be a DepEd employee with at least three (3) years of relevant teaching experience and a strong commitment to literacy development as a reading advocate. He or she should demonstrate proven competence in planning, implementing, and managing reading-related initiatives within the school. The role likewise required the ability to coordinate with stakeholders and sustain instructional support systems that promote learners' reading proficiency and overall literacy growth. Most importantly must have an office order for the ancillary task.

As a school administrator, he/she was identified as a key informant who played a critical role in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of school-wide reading programs. The school administrator was a DepEd-employed school head with at least three (3) years of experience in educational leadership and management. This participant was selected based on their direct oversight of instructional programs and their active involvement in promoting literacy initiatives within the school.

As the instructional leader, the school administrator was responsible for ensuring that reading programs were effectively implemented, adequately supported, and aligned with DepEd policies and standards. They provided leadership in mobilizing resources, supervising teachers, and fostering a culture of reading within the school. Through their experiences and insights, the school administrator offered valuable perspectives on the successes, challenges, and improvement strategies in sustaining effective reading program implementation.

The purpose of this selection procedure was to guarantee that the individuals taking part in the study possessed substantial experience and expertise related to the reading programs of the department of education. The meticulous selection criteria were devised to ensure diversity of perspectives while fulfilling the particular demands delineated for the study. The researcher considered the experiences of reading teachers, reading coordinators and school administrators on the conducts of reading programs in different-sized schools for the school year 2025-2026.

Research Tool

The researcher had developed a data gathering tool such as in the form of interview guide questions that would help the researcher gather relevant experiences, these guide questions would help the researcher to gather in-depth information on the study entitled "An Instructional Leadership Framework for Reading Program Implementation: A Case Study". A case study that involved one-on-one conversations between a researcher (or interviewer) and a participant. The goal of these interviews was to gather detailed information, personal insights, perspectives, and experiences on a specific topic, issue, or phenomenon. The developed tool was validated by the (3) panel of experts. The instruments were improved for the usefulness of the research study by going through the validation process by subject matter experts, which eventually added to the reliability of the data gathered. Through the process of validation, the questions were made more reliable and valid, collecting opinions, gathering experiences, recording insights pertaining to the reading program implementation. Three best reading teachers, three reading coordinators, and three school administrators participated in a rigorous procedure to assess and interview the participants for semi-structured questionnaire. The specialists provided insightful feedback, and the instruments were carefully revised based on their comments and suggestions.

The initial part of the interview involved a formal introduction of both the researcher and the participant to establish rapport and clarity of purpose. The interview proper began with factual and experience-based questions designed to elicit authentic and reflective responses. It explored key aspects such as the challenges encountered, the learning environment, availability of resources, and the use of progress monitoring tools. Furthermore, it examined the extent of collaboration among school personnel and the wider community, the positive outcomes achieved, the strategies employed during implementation, and the insights and lessons learned following the execution of the program. The second part of the interview focused on the participants' reflective insights, providing opportunities for both formal and informal discussions that deepened the understanding of their experiences. It examined how classroom practices were aligned with the reading program and how collaboration among stakeholders ensured coherence in implementation. The discussion further explored how priorities were balanced, roles were complemented, and joint practices were developed to support program goals.

In addition, it highlighted the impact of collaborative efforts on learners' reading development, the processes involved in mobilizing resources, the interventions employed to address emerging challenges, and the extent of external support received. The interview synthesized the key insights gathered from both the descriptive and reflective segments, allowing participants to articulate their overall realizations and recommendations. It provided an opportunity to clarify significant points, affirm shared experiences, and highlight best practices that may inform future implementation of reading programs.

Data Gathering Procedure

Strict adherence to ethical protocols in data gathering was observed throughout the study. Upon securing approval from the Research Ethics Committee (REC), the researcher obtained a formal letter of permission from the Dean of the College of Education to conduct the study. This letter was then submitted, either personally or through official online channel, to the Schools Division Office, where an endorsement from the Schools Division Superintendent was duly granted. Subsequently, the endorsed letter was forwarded to the Public Schools District Supervisor to facilitate and authorize the conduct of data collection within the identified schools.

The researcher emphasized the voluntary engagement of each best reading teachers, reading coordinators, and school administrators in the study by obtaining their explicit consent, demonstrating their commitment to ethical principles to protect the participants' rights, and guaranteeing that their participation in the study was completely voluntary. In the conduct of the study, the researcher discussed to the participants the rationale of the study and the ways on how they would answer the questions to get valid information. Participants were encouraged to freely answer and use the language that they could communicate better in and were comfortable with. They were assured of the confidentiality of their answers. The use of audio recording was utilized in the data gathering and ensured confidentiality of the matter discussed. Each interview lasted approximately 15 minutes, with an additional 10 minutes for probing, for a maximum of 25 minutes per participant.

Participation also involved reviewing anonymized transcriptions during member checking, estimated at 15 minutes. Thus, the total time commitment did not exceed 40 minutes, spread across two encounters, ensuring minimal disruption to teachers' professional responsibilities. The information gathered was accessed by the researcher alone, and upon completion of the study the recorded conversation was automatically and permanently be deleted and destroyed. The recording was for the research and nothing else.

Ethical Considerations

The researcher obtained explicit consent from each reading teacher, reading coordinator, and school administrator before they participated in the study. Participants in the study were recruited based from the result and advises from Stage 1. Recruitment followed a stepwise procedure beginning with endorsement from division and approval from district, followed by school heads' endorsement, and finally individual invitations to participants. The result suggested to choose schools from the same district that the researcher belonged. These schools were categorized small, medium and large. Since this was a case study, one school was chosen from each category. Once the schools were recognized, teachers' designation in the identified schools was the next priority. In a case where there was a change of school/s a recommendation from the public schools district supervisor was catered.

The consent process was conducted following the guidelines provided by DepEd Bukidnon and served as proof of the participants' voluntary engagement in the research. Informed consent and the autonomy of participants were prioritized to ensure that their participation was voluntary and based on a clear understanding of the study's purpose and procedures. This informed consent contained information about the study, its purpose, procedures, benefits and participants' rights enabling them to make a voluntary and informed decision about whether or not to participate. After confirming the interest of participants to participate in the research, a consent form was given. Through the consent forms, anonymity and confidentiality were ensured as part of the participants' right to privacy.

Confidentiality was preserved by anonymizing responses, removing identifiers from transcripts, and storing audio recordings in a password-protected device accessible only to the researcher. In a case where there was conflict in beliefs, tension in relationship, dispute in management, disagreement of opinion, and friction in strategies the researcher conducted the session separately, and a distant location was designated on each participant to avoid coercion. To effectively handle conflict amongst participants, it was best to foster open communication, active listening, and a problem-solving approach. If the conflict aggravated, a public schools district supervisor's presence was highly appreciated as inclusion in the matter.

To gather authentic responses, the researcher encouraged the participants to use language that they were comfortable with to share their own experiences. The participants were also given an option to opt-out or withdraw their participation in the study without any consequences. Participants were excluded from the study if they had less than one year of teaching experience, were not currently involved in any reading programs, or declined to provide informed consent. Additionally, individuals who were on extended leave or who had participated in similar research within the last six months were also excluded to prevent potential bias. The participant/s may discontinued anytime without the need to provide reasons, failure to meet inclusion criteria and other related issues. The anticipated risk was mild discomfort when discussing challenges in program implementation. To mitigate this, participants may declined to answer any question or withdraw at any time. Interviews were conducted in private spaces to ensure comfort and confidentiality. The benefits outweighed risks, as the findings informed evidence-based improvements in reading programs, directly benefiting teachers, learners, and administrators.

The researcher provided these essential pieces of information to the participants through the consent letter and verbal communication during the first meeting with the participants. Once the result was already interpreted, the result was conveyed to the participants' opportune hours, and was described briefly. The process on conveying was the same as how the data was gathered; separately, differently, and distantly. The conclusions of the researcher were also disclosed and expressed to the participants in a professional manner.

To acknowledge participants' time and contribution, modest tokens (e.g., school supplies or certificates of appreciation) were provided. These were non-coercive, reasonable, and proportionate to the time required, ensuring they did not unduly influence participation. Incentives in research were provided for participants to motivate involvement, ensure continued participation, improve data quality and acknowledge participants' contribution. In this study, tokens were heartily given as incentives to express appreciation and gratitude to the participants' involvement. The incentive aimed to create a positive experience for participants, encourage continued engagement, and foster goodwill without exerting undue influence on their decision to participate.

The principal investigator (PI) was a Teacher I under the Department of Education, currently teaching at the elementary level. Although the PI did not specialize in reading as a content area, she possessed relevant experience in classroom teaching and in implementing DepEd-mandated literacy programs, such as CRLA, and Phil-IRI. This background provided her with familiarity on the practical challenges encountered in reading instruction. Furthermore, the PI was undertaking a Master of Arts in Education major in Educational Administration, equipping her with competencies in research methodology, educational leadership, and program implementation. The study was conducted under the guidance of a thesis adviser who not only held expertise in reading education and qualitative research design but also regularly taught and handled learning areas that focused on the development of reading skills. The thesis adviser's specialization ensured that the PI received proper direction in designing, implementing, and analyzing the study, thereby strengthening the validity, rigor, and ethical compliance of the research. Although the researcher was employed as a Teacher I under DepEd, she had no supervisory or evaluative role over the participants, which minimized the risk of undue influence.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed following the procedures and framework established by the case study methodology. Following the collection of data through structured interview using purposive sampling, the transcribed data were subjected to rigorous analysis to unveil the experiences of best reading teachers, reading coordinators, and school administrators across different school sizes.

The preliminary step in this method was to gather the raw data from the participants. Responses from the participants were transcribed manually. The information gathered was analyzed to generate overall meaning. The general ideas, tone of ideas, credibility, and depth of the gathered responses were screened. Data were sorted and arranged accordingly. After this step, the data analysis continued using Robert K. Yin's approach to multiple-case study analysis, data in this research were analyzed in two sequential stages: within-case analysis and cross-case analysis.

In the first stage, within-case analysis, each case represents similarity in role. All data gathered from interviews, documents, and other relevant sources were organized and examined separately for each participant group. The researcher carefully coded responses, identified emerging themes, and developed a detailed narrative for each case. This process allowed for an in-depth understanding of the unique experiences, challenges, strategies, and outcomes of each individual case without comparison to others at this stage.

Patterns and meanings were interpreted within the specific context of each case to preserve its distinct characteristics. In the second stage, cross-case analysis, the researcher compared the findings across the three cases. Using Yin's replication logic, similarities and differences among the cases were systematically identified and analyzed. Themes that appeared consistently across all cases were highlighted as common patterns, while unique or contrasting findings were examined to explain contextual variations. This comparative process strengthened the robustness of the findings by allowing the researcher to draw broader conclusions about the implementation of reading programs across different settings. The combination of within-case and cross-case analysis ensured both depth and breadth of understanding, consistent with Yin's structured and rigorous approach to multiple-case study research. The writing of the report will involve presenting the analysis, with detailed explanations of the themes supported by direct quotes from the participants. The researcher will also interpret the findings and relate them to the study's research questions and relevant literature.

Thematic analysis will follow Braun and Clarke's (2006) six phases: familiarization, coding, theme generation, theme review, theme definition, and report writing. To ensure trustworthiness, multiple strategies will be adopted: (1) inter-coder validation through consultation with the adviser, (2) member checking by returning transcriptions and emerging themes to participants for accuracy, (3) maintaining an audit trail of coding decisions, (4) using verbatim quotes to ensure confirmability, and (5) triangulation of interview and document review. These steps guarantee rigor, credibility, and transparency in addressing the research questions.

The findings of the research study are applicable to another context or group as a guide. With the thorough description and explanation, a reliable setting and detailed responses from the participants, readers and researchers can site relevant findings. Lastly, the information was consolidated and finalized. The data were grouped according to significant responses, formulated meanings, clustered themes, and major themes. Narrative presentations were also done with quotations from the original texts to help communicate their meanings to the readers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study presents a comprehensive synthesis of findings that capture the complexity of reading program implementation within public schools. It draws from the lived experiences of key stakeholders and organizes these insights into interconnected dimensions that reflect how instructional leadership operates in practice. The framework highlights the importance of collaboration, showing how both structured and informal interactions contribute to alignment, shared learning, and continuous improvement. It also emphasizes the role of data and assessment in guiding instructional decisions, ensuring that teaching practices remain responsive to learners' needs. Furthermore, the study underscores the value of differentiated and adaptive strategies that address the diverse abilities of learners while promoting meaningful engagement in reading. Leadership is portrayed as a shared and dynamic process, supported by clear roles, mentoring, and collective responsibility among school actors. Ultimately, the instructional framework offers a holistic and context-responsive model that integrates collaboration, innovation, and learner-centered practices to enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of reading program implementation.

The findings emphasize the distinct yet interconnected roles of reading teachers, reading coordinators, and school administrators. It highlights that effective reading program implementation is not the responsibility of a single actor but a shared endeavor across different levels of the school system. As articulated, “Case 1: Reading Teachers” underscores the critical role of teachers in tailoring instruction to meet varied learner profiles while actively engaging parents as partners in literacy development. At the next level, “Case 2: Reading Coordinators” emphasizes the coordinators’ function in guiding instructional practices, ensuring that interventions remain flexible, responsive, and aligned with learners’ needs. Meanwhile, “Case 3: School Administrator” positions school leaders as enablers who create supportive conditions through strategic leadership and strong collaboration with stakeholders. Collectively, these roles reflect a cohesive system where differentiation, instructional support, and leadership are aligned toward a common goal.

This framework presents a comprehensive and multi-dimensional understanding of reading program implementation by organizing key findings into six interconnected themes that reflect the dynamics of instructional leadership in practice. It begins with “Theme 1 – Collaborative Professional Engagement as the Core of Implementation,” where collaboration is positioned as the foundation of success. The second pillar “Theme 2 – Data-Driven and Assessment-Guided Instructional Practices,” emphasizes the centrality of evidence in teaching. In “Theme 3 – Differentiated and Responsive Instructional Strategies,” the framework underscores responsiveness to learner diversity. Further, “Theme 4 – Instructional Leadership through Role Complementarity and Shared Responsibility,” highlights how leadership is distributed across actors. The framework also recognizes contextual realities in “Theme 5 – Innovation, Resourcefulness, and Contextual Adaptation,” where challenges become opportunities. Finally, “Theme 6 – Learner-Centered Outcomes and Holistic Development,” places learners at the center, emphasizing.

The “Instructional Leadership Framework of the School Reading Program Implementation” presents a structured and integrative model that explains how various elements within the school system interact to achieve improved reading outcomes. It illustrates that effective implementation is not linear but a dynamic process shaped by the interplay of instructional practices, leadership roles, and contextual factors.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings and themes of the study, the following recommendations are proposed for each group to strengthen the implementation of reading programs. These recommendations are grounded in the identified patterns of collaboration, data-driven practices, differentiated instruction, and shared instructional leadership that emerged across participants. They aim to provide actionable and context-responsive strategies that support continuous improvement, enhance stakeholder engagement, and ultimately contribute to more effective and sustainable reading outcomes.

For Reading Teachers

1. Strengthen the use of differentiated and learner-centered instructional strategies to effectively address diverse reading abilities and promote inclusive literacy development.
2. Engage in continuous collaboration and reflective practice through LAC sessions and peer discussions to share effective strategies and improve classroom instruction.
3. Utilize data-driven assessment and monitoring tools regularly to identify learners’ needs and provide timely, targeted interventions.

For Reading Coordinators

1. Facilitate structured and sustained collaboration among teachers by organizing regular meetings, mentoring sessions, and professional learning communities.
2. Lead the use of assessment data to guide instructional decisions, ensuring that interventions are aligned with learners’ reading levels and progress.



3. Provide technical support and instructional guidance to teachers to ensure consistency and quality in program implementation.

For School Administrators

1. Promote distributed instructional leadership by encouraging shared responsibility and collaboration among teachers, coordinators, and stakeholders.
2. Allocate adequate resources, time, and support systems to sustain reading program implementation and innovation.
3. Strengthen stakeholder engagement, including parents and the community, to extend literacy support beyond the classroom.

For Curriculum Implementers

1. Ensure that reading programs are aligned with curriculum standards while allowing flexibility for contextual adaptation.
2. Integrate assessment-driven and differentiated strategies into curriculum design to support diverse learners.
3. Develop and provide contextualized and culturally relevant instructional materials to enhance learner engagement.

For DepEd Officials

1. Provide policy support and clear guidelines that reinforce collaborative and data-driven reading program implementation.
2. Invest in capacity-building programs and professional development for teachers, coordinators, and school leaders.
3. Strengthen monitoring and evaluation systems to ensure effective implementation and continuous improvement of reading programs.

For Teacher-Researchers

1. Conduct further studies on innovative and context-responsive reading interventions to improve literacy outcomes.
2. Document and share best practices and successful strategies to contribute to evidence-based teaching.
3. Explore the impact of instructional leadership and collaboration on reading achievement to inform policy and practice.

For Learners

1. Actively participate in reading activities and develop consistent reading habits both in school and at home.
2. Engage with diverse and meaningful reading materials to enhance comprehension and motivation.
3. Collaborate with peers and seek support from teachers and parents to improve reading skills and confidence.

These recommendations reflect the study's emphasis on collaboration, data-driven instruction, differentiation, and shared leadership as key drivers of effective and sustainable reading program implementation. They highlight the importance of collective effort among stakeholders in ensuring that instructional practices are aligned and responsive to learners' needs. By promoting the use of assessment and evidence-based strategies, these recommendations support continuous improvement and informed decision-making in reading instruction. They also reinforce the need for flexible and differentiated approaches that address diverse learner abilities and contexts. In addition, the emphasis on shared leadership ensures that responsibility is distributed across all actors, fostering accountability, innovation, and long-term sustainability of reading programs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researcher extends sincere acknowledgment to the following individuals whose invaluable support, trust, and encouragement significantly contributed to the successful realization of this intellectual pursuit. To

Dr. Joy M. Mirasol, President of Bukidnon State University, for her steadfast support in the Graduate School Programs. Her leadership has opened meaningful opportunities for teachers and administrators to pursue advanced studies, thereby fostering their professional growth, enhancing their competencies, and empowering them to contribute more effectively to the field of education; to Dr. Victoria V. Gazo, CESO V, Schools Division Superintendent of Bukidnon, whose leadership and support were instrumental in the successful conduct of this study. Her approval, guidance, and encouragement allowed the researcher to access the necessary schools and resources, ensuring the smooth implementation of data collection; to Dr. Hazel Jean M. Abejuela, Vice President for Academic Affairs, for the continuous support to the Graduate Programs that gave teachers meaningful opportunities to pursue advanced studies; to Dr. Sheila Ann Del Rosario, Dean of the College of Education, for her inspiring leadership and steadfast encouragement.

To Dr. Bernadette S. Binayao, the research adviser, for her invaluable guidance, expertise, insightful feedback, patience and unwavering support throughout the conduct of this study; to the thesis committee: Dr. Lolita A. Dulay, the Chair; Dr. Jay Fie A. Luzano; Dr. James Russo A. Taga; and Ms. Mary Jean Pelegrino-Saavedra, the secretary, who keeps every suggestion and recommendation accurate. Your expertise and careful review of the research design, methodology, and analysis significantly contributed to the clarity, rigor, and academic quality of the work; to All the researcher's professors in this entire academic endeavor for imparting their knowledge and skills that helped her grow as a professional;

To Dr. Rolando D. Acoriba, Jr., Public Schools District Supervisor of Quezon III, his valuable insights, coordination, and assistance in facilitating communication with schools and teachers ensured the smooth gathering of data; to Sir Jelmar S. Bangod, School Head of Lipa Elementary School, for his invaluable support, guidance, cooperation, consideration and encouragement throughout the conduct of this study; and to the reading teachers, reading coordinators, and school administrators from the selected small, medium, and large schools of Quezon III, your willingness to share your experiences, strategies, and reflections on reading program implementation provided the essential data that formed the foundation of this research.

The researcher sincerely expresses her deepest gratitude to her family for their unwavering love, encouragement, and understanding throughout the completion of this study.

Above all, the researcher humbly gives thanks to the Almighty God for His divine guidance, wisdom, countless blessings, and strength in overcoming challenges, making this endeavor possible.

REFERENCES

1. Abulencia, A. S., & Villena, D. K. (2022). Instructional leadership practices and reading performance among elementary learners in the Philippine basic education context.
2. Almagro, et al. (2024). Management strategies and parental involvement in implementing reading programs for non-readers.
3. Amada, M. G. S., & Idul, M. M. (2025). Structured reading sessions during Catch-Up Friday: A quasi-experimental investigation. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5(7), 280–286. <https://doi.org/10.47760/cognizance.2025.v05i07.019>
4. Aureada, J. U. (2021). The instructional leadership practices of school heads. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 2(2), 75–89. <https://doi.org/10.53378/346106>
5. Banathy, B. H. (1991). *Systems design of education: A journey to create the future*. Educational Technology Publications.
6. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.

7. Bernabe, R. V. (2024). Effectiveness of Marungko approach in enhancing the reading performance among Grade 1 pupils of San Antonio Elementary School. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 50(12), 510–521. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i121718>
8. Bersabal, et al. (2024). Implementation challenges and effectiveness of the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) in improving reading instruction.
9. Bertalanffy, L. von. (1968). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*. George Braziller.
10. Cañete, J., Alimento, A., Cuyos, C., Suson, L., Tan, R., & Fulgencio, M. (2025). Implementation of play-based learning and its relationship to the social skills of kindergarten learners. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 48(5).
11. Casingal, et al. (2025). Longitudinal study on the effectiveness of the Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (CRLA) in improving learners' reading proficiency in multilingual contexts.
12. Cervantes, C. (2025). Home visitation of Key Stage 1 learners: Basis for enhancement program. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 43(8).
13. Cimena, et al. (2024). Factors affecting reading difficulties among learners including absenteeism, language barriers, and parental involvement.
14. Cruz, P. S., Dionisio, M. F., & Polintan, M. D. L. (2023). Parent-teacher collaboration towards enhanced reading comprehension of students. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies (IJAMS)*, 3(2), 455–468.
15. Delos Reyes, M. P. (2022). System-wide coordination and reading program implementation in Philippine public schools.
16. Department of Education. (2015). DepEd Order No. 12, s. 2015. Department of Education.
17. Department of Education. (2016). DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016: The Learning Action Cell (LAC) as a K to 12 Basic Education Program school-based continuing professional development strategy for the improvement of teaching and learning. Department of Education.
18. Department of Education. (2016). DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2016: Policy guidelines on daily lesson preparation for the K to 12 Basic Education Program. Department of Education.
19. Department of Education. (2017). DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017: Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). Department of Education.
20. Department of Education. (2017). Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). Department of Education. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/DO_s2017_042-1.pdf
21. Department of Education. (2018). DepEd Order No. 14, s. 2018: Policy guidelines on the administration of the revised Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI). Department of Education.
22. Department of Education. (2018). Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI). Department of Education.
23. Department of Education. (2020). DepEd Order No. 27, s. 2020: Strengthening the implementation of the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI). Department of Education.
24. Department of Education. (2023). DepEd Order No. 32, s. 2023. Department of Education.
25. Department of Education. (2023). National Educators Academy of the Philippines (NEAP) leadership development initiatives. Department of Education.
26. Department of Education. (2024). Division Memorandum No. 199, s. 2024. Department of Education Division Office.
27. Department of Education. (2025). DepEd Order No. 10, s. 2025: Guidelines for the implementation of the 2025 Department of Education summer programs. Department of Education.
28. Department of Education. (2025–2026). Succeeding Division Memoranda on the implementation of CRLA and Phil-IRI. Department of Education Division Office.
29. Department of Education. (n.d.). School-Based Management (SBM) Framework. Department of Education.
30. Garcia, R., & Dela Cruz, P. (2021). Collaborative leadership and reading program implementation in Philippine schools.
31. Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(4), 423–451.
32. Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142.

33. Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247.
34. Hallinger, P., & Wang, W.-C. (2015). *Assessing instructional leadership with the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale*. Springer.
35. He, P., Guo, F., & Abazie, G. A. (2024). School principals' instructional leadership as a predictor of teacher's professional development. *Asian- Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 9, Article 63. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00244-9>
36. Labajo, C. G. R. (2024). Parental involvement and its relationship to literacy skill of pre-school children. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies (IJAMS)*, 4(4).
37. Lim, J., & Bautista, R. (2023). Transformational leadership and literacy intervention effectiveness in Philippine schools.
38. Mercado, L., & Santiago, E. (2023). Reading performance and systems alignment in basic education schools in the Philippines.
39. Moises, R. D., & Maguate, G. S. (2023). School Learning Action Cell and professional development. *International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Science (IJLRHSS)*, 6(7), 127–133.
40. Paiste, A. L., Perido, D. M., Pasicolan, M. B., Siangco, M. B., Daria, M. O., & Talledo, M. R. B. (2026). Guided or guarded: Teachers' experiences on instructional supervision. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 10(2), 5801–5809. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10200427>
41. Quimbo, R. (2019). Reading difficulties among learners in Quezon III District, Division of Bukidnon.
42. Republic Act No. 9155. (2001). Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
43. Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
44. Reyes, M., et al. (2022). Distributed leadership and literacy outcomes in Philippine basic education.
45. Rillo. (2025). Coping mechanisms and essential themes in reading program implementation in the new normal.
46. Santos, J., & Cruz, A. (2023). Data-driven instructional leadership and reading intervention effectiveness in public schools.
47. Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
48. Tolentin, C. (2023). Implementation and challenges of reading intervention programs in face-to-face classes. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 14(2). <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=22053>
49. Torres, L., & Navarro, S. (2021). Transformational leadership practices and reading intervention success among teachers.
50. Ulit, J. (2025). Impact of school heads' instructional leadership on teaching and learning outcomes: Philippine's context. *DWI Journal of Multidisciplinary Humanities*. <https://www.dwijmh.org/index.php/dwijmh/article/view/188>
51. Vargas, J. A., & Ducot, L. (2025). Impact of remedial reading programs on pupils' reading proficiency. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 44(2).
52. Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
53. Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.