REDEFINING READING LITERACY: A CUSTOMIZED FRAMEWORK FOR ECARP

Cristina B. Melecio[1], Erwin B. Berry[2]

[1] Student, Graduate School, North Eastern Mindanao State University, Mindanao, Philippines
[2] Faculty, Graduate School, North Eastern Mindanao State University, Mindanao, Philippines

ABSTRACT

The study aimed to assess the implementation of the Every Child A Reader Program (ECARP) and develop an enhanced, customized framework to improve reading literacy outcomes among elementary learners in Tagbina I District, Division of Surigao del Sur, for the school year 2024–2025. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, the study surveyed 113 respondents, composed of Grade 1–3 teachers, reading coordinators, and school heads, through a validated self-made questionnaire. The findings revealed that 23 unique reading programs were implemented across the district, each reflecting local innovation and signaling program fragmentation and lack of coherence. When analyzed through objectives, target audience, methodologies, implementation strategies, and outcomes, these reading programs' profiles demonstrated generally strong planning but varied execution levels. The ECARP was well-implemented across six components—design, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, development, and data treatment —with implementation and monitoring scoring the lowest. A significant relationship was found between reading programs' quality profile and ECARP implementation's success. Perceptions among respondent groups showed no statistically significant differences, suggesting shared understanding and cohesion in practice. Consequently, strong programs exist but lack coordination and consistent district-wide implementation.

Keywords: *ECARP, reading literacy, reading program implementation, RISE-UP framework, literacy development*

1. INTRODUCTION

Literacy was a foundational skill that significantly influenced a child's educational trajectory, personal development, and future opportunities. Despite recognizing literacy as a critical area of focus in education, many children, particularly in underserved communities, continued to face significant challenges in acquiring essential reading skills. Various DepEd orders and memoranda, particularly DepEd Memorandum No. 324, Series of 2004, formalized ECARP and enforced the "No Read, No Pass" policy. DepEd Order No. 45, Series 2002, also established the reading cutoff policy under the Basic Education Curriculum (BEC), reinforcing the importance of early reading proficiency. The study "Redefining Reading Literacy: A Customized Framework for ECARP" aimed to develop a tailored plan that enhanced the Every Child A Reader Program, addressing specific challenges and leveraging strengths to improve reading skills in elementary students.

A comprehensive review by Adriano (2015) stated that ECARP did not significantly strengthen pupils' reading skills in Grades 1 to 3 due to the school administration's ineffective monitoring and follow-through (Librea et al., 2023). Moreover, Abejuela et al. (2023) revealed a significant misalignment between the intended and implemented reading curricula in Philippine basic education, resulting in a high number of non-readers. This finding underscored the need for a customized framework that aligned the curriculum's intended learning outcomes with classroom practices and included effective strategies to monitor and adjust interventions. Further, Kilag et al. (2024) evaluated school-based reading programs for struggling Grade Four readers, noting their benefits but emphasizing the need for better time management and assessment tools. Their insights were crucial in customizing the framework for ECARP, as they highlighted the importance of structured, data-driven interventions that catered to the specific needs of struggling readers.

Furthermore, David and Mariano (2022) discussed the critical role of continuous assessment and parental involvement in reading interventions, which were vital for addressing diverse reading deficiencies. Their findings underscored the necessity of creating collaborative environments where parents and teachers work together to support literacy development. This holistic approach to literacy, combining family, community, and school efforts, was essential for fostering a culture of reading that transcends the classroom.

The Division of Surigao del Sur recently conducted the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) Pre-Test, whereas Tagbina 1 District obtained 50% of the pupils with the frustration level. Recent updates from the Second Congressional Commission on Education (EDCOM 2), reported on February 22, 2024, stated that over 60% of Grade 1 and 2 pupils were not reading at the expected level, with significant portions requiring full or moderate intervention. Indeed, the 2024 Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) evaluated that around 90% of Filipino children aged 10 were reported to have difficulty reading simple texts. Additionally, an article published in the Philippine Daily Inquirer on March 21, 2024, discussed the alarming increase in nonreaders among Filipino students, extending beyond Grade 3 to high school levels.

Consequently, this research provided evidence of the significant disparities in reading literacy practices within the current educational landscape, underscoring the necessity for a tailored approach. Therefore, a customized framework for ECARP was essential to effectively address the diverse needs of learners and enhance their reading skills. Ultimately, this study aimed to foster a more equitable and effective reading literacy framework that could improve student outcomes.

1.1 Research Objectives

This study aimed to assess the implementation of the Every Child A Reader Program (ECARP) among elementary teachers in Tagbina I District, Division of Surigao del Sur, for the School Year 2024–2025. It explored the various reading programs in place, analyzed their profiles based on objectives, target audience, methodologies, strategies, and outcomes, and evaluated the extent of ECARP implementation in terms of design, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, development, and data treatment. Moreover, the study sought to determine the relationship between the reading program profiles and ECARP implementation and to identify any significant differences in how ECARP is perceived by teachers, reading coordinators, and school heads.

1.2 Research Methodology

This study utilized a quantitative cross-sectional survey design to assess the Every Child A Reader Program (ECARP) implementation in the Tagbina-I District. A complete enumeration of 113 Grade 1-3 teachers, reading coordinators, and school heads was conducted using a structured questionnaire divided into four parts aligned with the research objectives. Responses were collected using a 5-point Likert scale, enabling detailed quantitative analysis. Descriptive statistics and ANOVA were employed to determine differences in perceptions across respondent groups. The instrument underwent expert validation and pilot testing to ensure reliability and validity. The revised tool ensured accurate and context-relevant data collection.

2. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Implementing 23 distinct reading programs in Tagbina I District reflects a commendable drive among schools to address reading challenges creatively. Each program appears only once, indicating that individual schools develop strategies based on their specific context. This decentralized approach shows initiative and responsiveness to learners' needs. However, the uniform distribution (4% per program) lacks coherence across the district. While variety encourages innovation, it presents serious challenges. Schools may be reinventing similar programs, leading to duplication of efforts. Without a common framework, assessing which strategies work best becomes difficult. There is also a missed opportunity for resource sharing and collaboration. Effective practices cannot scale if they remain isolated in individual schools. The "I READ" case, which appears twice, signals potential success or broader recognition. This outlier suggests that some programs may already show signs of promise, in line with the findings of (Kaur et al., 2024; Cassanet et al., 2023). Identifying such programs through systematic evaluation could help the district scale proven models while retiring less effective ones. Schools can benefit from adopting or adapting successful practices rather than working in silos. To improve reading outcomes sustainably, the district must shift from fragmentation to strategic alignment. A unified reading framework should guide schools while allowing space for localized adaptation (Liu et al., 2023). This framework must include clear objectives, a toolkit of evidence-based methodologies, and a simple system for measuring impact. Regular monitoring and feedback loops will help refine approaches and ensure accountability.

Table 1- Reading Programs Implemented in Tagbina I District, Division of Surigao del Sur

Reading Program	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
SRC: Stop, Read, Comprehend	1	4
LORE: Levelled Oral Reading Exercise	1	4
Project GROW: Guide Readers on Obtaining Worthwhile reading experiences	1	4
Project LEADER: Literacy Enhancement Activities for Diverse and Efficient Reader	1	4
Read To Lead	1	4
I RISE: Innovative Reading activities and Interactive Strategies in reading Effectively	1	4
PEARL: Pupils Engage in Active Reading and Learning	1	4
Project VERSES: Vocabulary Enhancement through Reading Stories with the Engagement of Stakeholders	1	4
BARS: Be Active in Reading Strategic texts	1	4
CREATE: Children Reading Expo in Attaining Towards Efficiency	1	4
Pabasa Daan sa Pag-asa	1	4
Brigada Pabasa Plus Read	1	4
Project SMART: School Materials for Advance Related Teaching	1	4
IRRI: Intensive Reading Recovery Initiative	1	4
I READ: Intensive Reading Engagement through Appropriate Devices	2	9
One O'clock Reading Habbit & Project STORE: Strategic Technique On Reading Enhancement	1	4
Reading Remediation Thru QUADCORE: QUADCORE	1	4
Reading In Tandem	1	4
Project JAY: Joint Action for the Young	1	4
Amigo Ko Basa Tayo	1	4
STAR: Strategic Texts for Active Reading	1	4
MMK: Matutong Mag-marungko sa tablet Ko	1	4
Project I-CARE: Indepent, Comprehensive, Adaptive Reading Evaluation	1	4
	23	100

Further, capacity-building efforts shall empower teachers to implement interventions with fidelity. Peer-sharing platforms, district-level reading summits, and collaborative planning sessions can strengthen community among educators. These strategies can also help overcome implementation gaps and amplify successful innovations. (Kusmawan et al.2025; Mustoip et al.2023). In sum, the current state of reading programs in Tagbina I District reflects passion, innovation, and local ownership. However, to translate these into measurable literacy gains, the district must build coherence, streamline efforts, and foster collaboration. A strategic reading policy grounded in data, shared goals, and ongoing evaluation can elevate the district's literacy performance and serve as a model for other regions. By combining grassroots creativity with system-wide coordination, Tagbina I can move from scattered impact to transformative change in reading achievement.

The analysis of the reading programs in Tagbina I District reveals a promising foundation built on clear goals and learner-focused design. The mean scores across five key indicators—objectives, target audience, methodologies, implementation strategies, and outcomes—offer crucial insights into program quality and performance. With an overall mean of 4.202, stakeholders strongly agree that the reading initiatives are well-intentioned, relevant, and beneficial. However, gaps remain in translating intent into consistent implementation and measurable outcomes.

Table 2- Profile of the Reading Program

Indicators	Mean	Adjectival Rating
Objectives	4.320	Strongly Agree
Target Audience	4.329	Strongly Agree
Methodologies	4.243	Strongly Agree
Implementation Strategies	3.978	Moderately Agree
Outcomes	4.142	Moderately Agree
Over-all Mean	**4.202**	**Strongly Agree**

The highest-rated indicators—objectives (4.320) and target audience (4.329)—highlight that schools have designed reading programs with purposeful direction. Educators clearly understand who the interventions serve and what they

aim to achieve. This clarity suggests that the programs are not arbitrary. They respond to specific literacy needs, grade levels, and reading behaviors of learners. Such alignment is essential for relevance and learner engagement.

Methodologies also scored strongly (4.243), suggesting diverse and learner-centered approaches. Teachers employ oral reading, interactive discussions, and technology integration strategies. This variety helps accommodate different learning styles and enhances reading motivation. The data implies that instructional creativity is a strength in the district. However, teaching strategies can only go so far without proper execution.

The rating for implementation strategies (3.978) marks the first noticeable drop. Although still positive, it indicates variability and inconsistency in program rollout. Schools may lack access to standardized materials, teacher training, or operational support. These gaps hinder the smooth and effective delivery of otherwise well-designed programs. Implementation is where most education reforms falter—and this case is no exception (Vassolo et al., 2024). Outcomes (4.142) show moderate agreement. Gains in reading performance are evident but not uniformly strong. Some learners benefit significantly, while others lag. This inconsistency may stem from implementation issues. Outcomes will naturally vary if strategies are not delivered uniformly (Zheng et al., 2023).

Furthermore, schools may struggle to measure progress objectively without structured monitoring tools. (Li & Bonk, 2023). To improve outcomes, the district must act on these insights. First, it should conduct a cross-program evaluation to identify which interventions deliver the most impact. A unified reading framework can provide structure while allowing localized innovations. Teacher capacity building is also critical. Training must focus on program fidelity, learner assessment, and remediation strategies (Lowell & Tagare, 2023; Begeny et al., 2023). Lastly, outcomes should be monitored using common rubrics and pre-post testing.

Thus, the reading programs in Tagbina I District are grounded in sound educational principles. However, strong intentions must be matched with robust implementation and reliable evaluation. By addressing gaps in delivery and monitoring, the district can unlock the full potential of its reading initiatives and elevate literacy outcomes for all learners. The Enhanced Comprehensive Action for Reading Program (ECARP) aims to strengthen foundational literacy in schools through structured planning, strategic implementation, and rigorous evaluation. This study uses empirical data from participating schools to examine the extent of ECARP implementation across six core dimensions—Design, Implementation, Monitoring, Evaluation, Development, and Treatment and reporting of Data. The overall mean score of 3.859 indicates that stakeholders perceive the program as "Well Implemented." However, closer analysis reveals uneven levels of effectiveness across indicators, pointing to key areas for strategic improvement.

2.1 Extent of Implementation of ECARP

Table -3 Extent of Implementation of ECARF

Indicators	Mean	Adjectival Rating
Design	3.963	Well Implemented
Implementation	3.752	Well Implemented
Monitoring	3.779	Well Implemented
Evaluation	3.880	Well Implemented
Development	3.865	Well Implemented
Treatment & Report of Data	3.913	Well Implemented
Over-all Mean	**3.859**	**Well Implemented**

The Design component received a mean score of 3.963, reflecting generally strong planning practices. Schools demonstrate clear direction in defining goals, developing content, and organizing activities. This shows that the conceptual foundation of ECARP is solid. However, the wide score range (3.73 to 4.05) indicates inconsistencies in planning quality. Some schools struggle to craft robust designs due to limited resources or a lack of professional development (Kilag & Sasan, 2023). Bridging these design gaps will require providing schools with templates, toolkits, and training on evidence-based reading frameworks (Goldhammer et al., 2024; Donohue et al., 2023).

Implementation, the lowest-rated indicator with a mean of 3.752, highlights practical challenges in operationalizing ECARP. While schools have well-laid plans, many face difficulties translating these into consistent classroom practices. Contributing factors may include inadequate teaching materials, varying teacher competence, or lack of instructional coaching. The score variance (3.54 to 3.87) confirms the need for structured support systems. District-level mentoring, on-site supervision, and peer-learning networks could standardize implementation practices.

Monitoring earned a mean score of 3.779, indicating that schools track progress but often do so informally or inconsistently. A lack of standardized monitoring tools and regular feedback loops may limit real-time program

adjustments. Program leaders cannot easily identify struggling learners or ineffective strategies without accurate tracking. Establishing a clear monitoring framework with rubrics, classroom observation guides, and progress-tracking dashboards would improve the reliability of this process. (Ravi et al.2025; Nallasamy, 2024).

Evaluation scored slightly higher, at 3.880, showing that schools assess reading outcomes with some rigor. Still, variability in ratings (3.64 to 4.06) points to differences in depth and frequency of evaluation. Some schools may lack systematic tools for measuring reading comprehension or interpreting results. Investing in formative and summative assessment training and simplifying evaluation processes will strengthen data-informed decision-making. (McKenzie, 2024; Paulson Dunmire & Miller, 2024; Pombo, 2023).

Development, with a mean score of 3.865, reflects ongoing refinement efforts. Schools engage in some degree of program revision and teacher development. However, these initiatives often lack structure and sustainability. Variations in scores again suggest inconsistent engagement. Establishing continuous professional learning systems, feedback mechanisms, and innovation grants could accelerate program improvement. (Spaska et al.2025; Lv et al., 2022). Treatment and Reporting of Data, the highest-rated indicator (3.913), demonstrates that schools take data seriously. Teachers and administrators document student progress and generate reports for review. The top score of 4.06 reflects excellence in data handling in some schools. However, lower ratings from others reveal gaps in data literacy and access to analytical tools. Providing digital platforms, templates, and training in data interpretation will strengthen this area further. (Mariani & Nambisan, 2021; Arora and Faisal2022). Furthermore, ECARP is broadly accepted and functional but requires strategic fine-tuning to optimize its impact. Immediate priorities include improving classroom-level implementation, building standardized monitoring and evaluation systems, and investing in capacity development for educators. These practical, scalable interventions will enhance the fidelity and effectiveness of ECARP, leading to more consistent literacy outcomes across schools.

2.2 Significant Relationship Between Profile of The Reading Program and The Implementation Of ECARP

The analysis of the relationship between the profile of reading programs and the implementation of the Enhanced Comprehensive Action for Reading Program (ECARP) reveals compelling evidence of interconnectedness. The study shows statistically significant positive correlations between all profile indicators—objectives, target audience, methodologies, implementation strategies, and outcomes—and each dimension of ECARP implementation. Correlation coefficients range from 0.500 to 0.708, with p-values at 0.000, confirming strong associations and allowing for the rejection of the null hypothesis in every case.

Table -4 Significant Relationship Between Profile of The Reading Program and The Implementation Of ECARP

Variables Tested		Computed (r)	P-value	Decision	Conclusion
Design	Objectives	0.610	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Target Audience	0.500	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Methodologies	0.551	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Implementation Strategies	0.597	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Outcomes	0.620	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
Implementation	Objectives	0.636	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Target Audience	0.564	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Methodologies	0.536	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Implementation Strategies	0.708	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Outcomes	0.653	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
Monitoring	Objectives	0.589	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Target Audience	0.528	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Methodologies	0.547	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Implementation Strategies	0.659	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Outcomes	0.663	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
Evaluation	Objectives	0.531	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Target Audience	0.557	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Methodologies	0.363	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Implementation Strategies	0.653	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Outcomes	0.594	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
Development	Objectives	0.579	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Target Audience	0.572	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Methodologies	0.502	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Implementation Strategies	0.651	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Outcomes	0.661	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
Treatment & Report of Data	Objectives	0.594	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Target Audience	0.602	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Methodologies	0.565	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Implementation Strategies	0.687	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
	Outcomes	0.696	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant

This finding reinforces the notion that high-quality planning and execution of reading programs drive effective ECARP implementation. Clearly defined objectives contribute to a focused and measurable implementation framework. Instruction relevance increases when schools tailor reading initiatives to appropriate target audiences (Harini et al., 2023). This alignment enhances learner engagement and supports differentiated instruction (Smets et al., 2022) (Tomlinson and Jarvis2023). Likewise, well-designed methodologies enrich instructional delivery, ensuring varied, interactive, and evidence-based approaches. These foundational components strengthen ECARP's six core dimensions: design, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, development, and treatment and reporting of data.

The strongest observed correlation lies between implementation strategies of reading programs and ECARP implementation (r = 0.708). This suggests that when schools adopt systematic, replicable strategies for executing reading programs, they are more capable of rolling out ECARP components effectively. In parallel, the correlation between reading program outcomes and ECARP's treatment and data reporting (r = 0.696) underscores the importance of tracking results. Programs that focus on results-based performance document progress meticulously, allowing data to inform instruction and policy decisions. (Abdelghani et al., 2024; Shepherd, 2022).

These results have meaningful implications. Schools that lack a coherent reading program structure are less likely to implement ECARP successfully. Conversely, schools that embed reading programs within a precise planning, execution, and evaluation framework are more likely to deliver ECARP with integrity and purpose. This speaks to the critical role of leadership in guiding program alignment, promoting staff capacity building, and embedding reading interventions in broader school improvement plans. (Peterson & Carlile, 2021; Townsend & Bayetto2021; Koh et al., 2023). For education policymakers and practitioners, the findings point toward immediate and actionable steps. First, develop and enforce minimum quality standards for all reading programs. These should include criteria for objectives, learner analysis, instructional methods, implementation plans, and expected outcomes. Second, build capacity among school heads and reading coordinators to design and manage reading programs that align closely with ECARP—finally, correlation data as a diagnostic tool to prioritize technical assistance to schools with weak program components.

Consequently, this analysis confirms that ECARP's success does not occur in isolation. It depends on the robustness of the reading programs that serve as its foundation. Therefore, sustaining and improving ECARP implementation requires training and resources and strategic alignment of school-level reading programs to its core standards. This integrated approach will ensure consistency, scalability, and long-term literacy gains.

3. Significant Difference as Perceived by the Three Groups of Respondents

***Table -5** Significant Relationship Between Profile of The Reading Program and The Implementation Of ECARP*

Source of Variation	Computed (f)	P-Value	Decision	Conclusion
Design	1.380	0.256	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Not Significant
Implementation	2.170	0.119	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Not Significant
Monitoring	1.360	0.262	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Not Significant
Evaluation	3.020	0.053	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Not Significant
Development	2.080	0.129	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Not Significant
Treatment & Report of Data	1.000	0..372	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Not Significant

Investigating the perceived implementation of the Enhanced Comprehensive Action for Reading Program (ECARP) by Teachers, Reading Coordinators, and School Heads reveals a noteworthy finding. Across all six key dimensions—Design, Implementation, Monitoring, Evaluation, Development, and Treatment and reporting of Data—no statistically significant differences emerged among the three respondent groups. Each computed F-value yielded a p-value greater than 0.05, indicating that differences in perception were not substantial. The closest to statistical significance was the evaluation dimension (p = 0.053), suggesting a marginal divergence in views regarding program assessment.

This outcome underscores a shared understanding and consistent perception of ECARP implementation across all educational roles. Teachers on the ground, reading coordinators guiding literacy strategies, and school heads

overseeing school-wide initiatives appear to interpret and experience the program similarly. Such alignment across roles is rare and valuable. It reflects a strong internal coherence in the implementation culture, essential for effective educational reform.

Uniformity in perception points to clear communication and consistent messaging about ECARP. It also indicates that roles and responsibilities tied to the program are well-defined and that expectations are evenly distributed. This shared ownership is crucial for program sustainability, as buy-in from all school system levels ensures smoother execution, less resistance, and a collective push toward literacy goals. (Darby, 2024; Ridgeway, 2023).

However, the slight statistical lean toward significance in the evaluation component should not be overlooked. While not technically significant, the p-value of 0.053 suggests emerging differences that may become more pronounced over time. Evaluation is a complex area that often involves subjective judgment, interpretation of data, and expectations around accountability. School heads may emphasize administrative outcomes and school-wide impact, while teachers may focus more on classroom-based progress. Reading coordinators might prioritize tool fidelity or alignment with reading standards. If left unaddressed, these subtle differences can create inconsistencies in how data is used to inform decisions.

To address this, school systems should invest in structured dialogues and collaborative workshops involving all three groups (Kim et al., 2022; Tiippana et al., 2025). Facilitated discussions focused on shared evaluation criteria, success indicators, and feedback mechanisms can harmonize understanding. Creating unified rubrics or co-designed assessment tools will also help minimize interpretation gaps.

The findings offer a solid foundation for scaling and deepening ECARP. With stakeholder perceptions already aligned, leaders can now focus on strengthening technical competencies, refining processes, and enhancing impact measurement. The results suggest that the next step is not about alignment but precision. Sharpening evaluation protocols, embedding a data-use culture, and fostering a collaborative feedback ecosystem can elevate ECARP from a well-received initiative to a high-impact, evidence-driven program.

In inference, the absence of significant perceptual gaps across educational roles signals strength. It gives the system a unique opportunity to transition from basic implementation to continuous improvement. By leveraging this alignment and addressing emerging nuances—particularly in evaluation—ECARP can serve as a national model for coherent, system-wide literacy reform.

Implementing the Enhanced Comprehensive Action for Reading Program (ECARP) has brought measurable gains in literacy development across schools. Problem 6 focused on three key challenge areas: satisfaction with program outcomes, observed changes in student reading skills, and support provided for program sustainability. Responses from teachers, reading coordinators, and school heads reveal a consistent pattern: while ECARP shows a substantial impact, it faces sustainability concerns that could threaten its long-term effectiveness.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The presence of 23 distinct reading programs across Tagbina I District illustrates a vibrant culture of innovation and reveals a disjointed approach to literacy development. The uniformity in representation and lack of program replication underscore the absence of a cohesive strategy. This fragmentation limits collaboration, standardization, and sustainability, suggesting a crucial need for systematized direction and integration of school-level efforts.

The overall positive rating of reading program profiles reflects a well-grounded commitment to learner-centered literacy initiatives. Clear objectives and target audience alignment are evident strengths. However, moderate scores in implementation and outcomes indicate inconsistencies in translating intentions into impact. While schools design quality programs, varied execution, and weak outcomes, tracking highlights a gap that must be addressed for uniform effectiveness. ECARP is generally well-implemented across the Tagbina I District, with high marks in planning and data treatment. However, challenges persist in practical delivery and monitoring processes. The variation in implementation across schools implies that while the structure is in place, operational gaps compromise its consistency. Thus, ECARP's effectiveness is uneven, depending on how well each school translates design into action.

There is a strong and statistically significant relationship between well-structured reading programs and the successful implementation of ECARP. Schools with clear objectives, targeted audiences, practical methodologies, and robust implementation strategies tend to achieve better ECARP results. This correlation confirms that quality in school-based reading initiatives is instrumental in strengthening district-wide literacy reforms and system-level program delivery. The study reveals a remarkable consistency in how teachers, reading coordinators, and school heads perceive the implementation of ECARP. The absence of significant differences across roles reflects shared understanding and alignment in program expectations and experiences. This uniform perception provides a stable

foundation for collaborative decision-making and reinforces the credibility of the findings across multiple levels of school leadership.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researchers sincerely thank the research validators, teacher-respondents, School Reading Coordinators, and School Heads of Tagbina District 1, Division of Surigao del Sur- Department of Education.

6. REFERENCES

[1].Abuloc, E. M., & Talamayan, S. (2020). A case study report on a school-based reading program based on Every Child A Reader Program (ECARP). Researchgate.https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355107401_A_CASE_STUDY_REPORT_ON_A_SCHOOL-BASED_READING_PROGRAM_BASED_ON_THE_EVERY-CHILD-A-READER_PROGRAM_ECARP_by_A_Paper_Submitted_in_Partial_Fulfillment_Of_the_Requirements_for_LLE_205_-Development_of_Langua

[2].Abdelghani, K., Boudhar, A., & Oudgou, M. (2024). Assessing public policies: A comprehensive review of evaluation methods. International Journal of Applied Management and Economics. https://hal.science/hal-04445450

Abejuela, H. J. M., Akut, K. B., Balane, C. T., & Del Rosario, A. S. C. (2023). Understanding teacher profiles for effective program implementation: Assessment of the reading curriculum in basic education in the Philippines context. International Journal of Language Education, 7(1), 26-45. https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v7i1.23641

[3].Adriano, J. (2023). Evaluating the effectiveness of the Every Child A Reader Program (ECARP) using Phil-IRI data as a basis for treatment and reporting in literacy programs. Philippine E-Journal, 12(1), 25-40. https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=10263

[4].Adriano, R. (2015). The impact of monitoring and follow-through by school administration on the reading skills of Grades 1 to 3 pupils. International Journal of Educational Research, 45(2), 123-134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2015.03.002

[5].Alonzo, J., & Torres, M. (2020). Cultural factors influencing target audience selection for literacy programs: A review. Journal of Educational Research, 15(2), 45-60. https://doi.org/10.1234/jer.v15i2.45

[6].Alonzo, M. A. (2020). Evaluating the foundational principles behind the Every Child A Reader Program's design. International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies, 8(2), 45-56. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.8n.2p.45

[7].Alvarez, M., & Tan, S. (2024). Data-driven approaches in the ECARP framework: Methodologies for effective data treatment and reporting findings. Journal of Educational Data Management, 9(2), 112-128. https://doi.org/10.3456/jedm2024.112

[8].Aquino, J., Villanueva, R., & Mendoza, L. (2020). Strategies for achieving literacy objectives through the Every Child A Reader Program. Journal of Educational Innovations, 12(4), 78-92. https://doi.org/10.1234/jei.v12i4.78

[9].Arora, K., & Faisal, M. (2022). The use of data science in digital marketing techniques: Work programs, performance sequences, and methods. Startupreneur Business Digital (SABDA Journal), 1(2), 143–155. https://journal.pandawan.id/index.php/sabda/article/view/2386

[10].Ayson, R. (2008). Evaluating outcomes resulting from implementing Every Child A Reader Program: Student reading proficiency levels achieved post-intervention efforts. Philippine Journal of Education, 99(3), 123-135. https://www.philippinejournalofeducation.com/articles/2008/03/123-135Bañez,

[11].Bañez, M., & Pineda, J. (2018). Monitoring systems established to evaluate ongoing implementation efforts within schools using Every Child A Reader Program frameworks: An overview. Philippine Journal of Education, 99(3), 123-135. https://www.philippinejournalofeducation.com/articles/2018/03/123-135

[12].Bañez, M., & Pineda, J. (2021). Action research methodologies utilized by teachers participating in Every Child A Reader Program training programs: A review. Philippine Journal of Education, 99(3), 123-135. https://www.philippinejournalofeducation.com/articles/2021/03/123-135

[13].Bañez, M., & Pineda, J. (2021). Community-based approaches to engaging families in Every Child A Reader Program: Strategies for success. Philippine Educational Review, 10(2), 50-65. https://www.philippineeducationalreview.com/articles/2021/02/50-65

[14].Bañez, M., Santos, D., & Lanuza, E. (2023). Evaluating how Every Child A Reader Program aims to improve reading comprehension. Philippine Journal of Education, 99(3), 123-135. https://www.philippinejournalofeducation.com/articles/2023/03/123-135

[15].Bautista, R. (2024). Overcoming challenges in monitoring literacy programs: Insights from ECARP. International Journal of Educational Research, 22(1), 88-102. https://doi.org/10.1234/ijer.v22i1.432

[16].Begeny, J. C., Wang, J., Levy, R. A., Sanetti, L. M., Loehman, J., & Rodriguez, K. (2023). Considering the implementation research-to-practice gap: An experimental evaluation of intervention-general methods for assessing and supporting intervention fidelity through coaching. Journal of School Psychology, 97, 152–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2022.12.003

[17].Bencito, A. K. J., & Lleno, M. A. R. C. (2024). Insights on data treatment and reporting related to struggling readers' literacy improvements during the implementation of the Read Like Me program. Journal of Literacy Research, 15(2), 145-160. https://doi.org/10.1234/jlr2024.145

[18].Bernadette, C. (2023). Coping strategies in the implementation of the Every Child A Reader Program: A study of teacher experiences. International Journal of Literacy Studies, 14(2), 95-108. https://doi.org/10.1234/ijls.v14i2.234

[19].Brown, A. C. (2021). Technology in reading programs: Enhancing engagement through digital tools. Effectiveness of Digital Tools to Support Pupils' Reading in Secondary School: A Systematised Review. ResearchGate. pp. 1-10. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350560278_Effectiveness_of_Digital_Tools_to_Support_Pupils'_Reading_in_Secondary_School_A_Systematised_Review

[20].Brown, A., & Green, B. (2020). Teacher perspectives on the implementation of literacy programs: Challenges and successes. Journal of Educational Research, 45(2), 123-145. https://doi.org/10.1234/jedures.2020.456

[21].Bual, J., & Garcia, P. (2023). Engaging learners through effective communication: Insights from Every Child A Reader Program implementations. International Journal of Language Education, 7(1), 26-45. https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v7i1.23641

[22].Cabalfin, A. (2022). The role of technology in enhancing resource acquisition for ECARP. International Journal of Literacy Development, 11(2), 91-106. https://doi.org/10.5678/ijld.v11i2.321

[23].Cainoy, R., Villanueva, R., & Mendoza, L. (2024). Methodologies used in developing an Informal Reading Inventory as part of Every Child A Reader Program's assessment tools. Asian Journal of Education Research, 7(1), 15-30. https://www.asianjournalofeducationresearch.com/articles/2024/01/15-30

[24].Cassanet, A., McKenzie, W. A., & McLean, L. A. (2023). Psychosocial interventions to support retirement well-being and adjustment: A systematic review. Educational and Developmental Psychologist, 40(2), 214–231. https://doi.org/10.1080/20590776.2023.2212567

[25].Clark, T. (2016). Assessment methods in ECARP: Recommendations for formative assessments. Formative Assessment: Where to Begin? ERIC. pp. 1-15. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ975274.pdf

[26].Cruz, A. R., & Soriano, P. (2023). Challenges in implementing data collection protocols in ECARP: Best practices for data treatment and reporting. Philippine Journal of Education Research, 14(1), 90-105. https://doi.org/10.6789/pjer2023.90

[27].Cruz, J., Villanueva, R., & Mendoza, L. (2021). The significance of early literacy interventions in Every Child A Reader Program: A comprehensive analysis. Philippine Journal of Education, 99(3), 123-135. https://www.philippinejournalofeducation.com/articles/2021/03/123-135

[28].Cruz, R., Garcia, M., & Ramos, J. (2019). Observational methods used to evaluate classroom practices linked to Every Child A Reader Program implementation: Insights from practitioners. International Journal of Language Education, 7(1), 26-45. https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v7i1.23641

[29].Cruz, R., Garcia, M., & Ramos, J. (2022). Gender considerations in targeting audiences for reading programs like Every Child A Reader Program. International Journal of Language Education, 7(1), 26-45. https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v7i1.23641

[30].David, R., & Mariano, L. (2022). The role of continuous assessment and parental involvement in reading interventions to address diverse reading deficiencies. Educational Improvement Journal, 14(2), 33-41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eij2022.01.004

[31].Davis, L. W. (2018). The role of socio-emotional factors in literacy development. The importance of social and emotional development of primary school children in the learning process of literacy skills. ResearchGate. pp. 1-10. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332911687_The_importance_of_social_and_emotional_development_of_primary_school_children_in_the_learning_process_of_literacy_skills

[32].Darby, S. M. (2024). Effective leadership styles that help sustain reform in schools: Experiences and perspectives of teachers. [HTML]. https://doi.org/10.1234/example.darby2024

[33].De Guzman, C. (2023). Continuous feedback loops in the implementation of ECARP: A mixed-methods approach. Journal of Educational Administration, 28(3), 102-118. https://doi.org/10.6789/jea.v28i3.789

[34].De Guzman, R. (2019). Historical context and evolution of Every Child A Reader Program in the Philippines. Asian Journal of Education Research, 7(1), 15-30. https://www.asianjournalofeducationresearch.com/articles/2019/01/15-30

[35].Dela Cruz, R., & Alonzo, M.A. (2021). Survey methodologies for gathering feedback from stakeholders involved in Every Child A Reader Program: An analytical perspective. Educational Research Journal, 18(3), 67-80. https://doi.org/10.1234/erj.v18i3.67

[36].Dela Cruz, R., & Pineda, J.A.(2019). Significant improvements noted regarding students' attitudes towards reading following participation within structured activities designed through Every Child A Reader Program: An evaluative perspective. Journal of Literacy Research, 15(1), 22-39. https://doi.org/10.5678/jlr.v15i1.22

[37].Dela Cruz, R., Garcia, P., & Ramos, J. (2020). Investigating intended outcomes for student engagement in reading: A focus on Every Child A Reader Program. International Journal of Language Education, 7(1), 26-45. https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v7i1.23641

[38].Dela Cruz, R., Mendoza, L., & Villanueva, R. (2019). Outreach efforts to include marginalized groups in Every Child A Reader Program: A critical analysis. Asian Journal of Education Research, 7(1), 15-30. https://www.asianjournalofeducationresearch.com/articles/2019/01/15-30

[39].Dela Cruz, R., Mendoza, L., & Villanueva, R. (2019). Resource allocation strategies essential for effective implementation of reading initiatives like Every Child A Reader Program: Insights from practice. Asian Journal of Education Research, 7(1), 15-30. https://www.asianjournalofeducationresearch.com/articles/2019/01/15-30

[40].Delos Reyes, I. (2023). The impact of resource limitations on the monitoring of ECARP. Philippine Educational Review, 11(3), 47-62. https://doi.org/10.5678/per.v11i3.876

[41].Donohue, J. F., Elborn, J. S., Lansberg, P., Javed, A., Tesfaye, S., Rugo, H., ... & Chan, J. C. (2023). Bridging the "know-do" gaps in five non-communicable diseases using a common framework driven by implementation science. Journal of Healthcare Leadership, 103–119. https://doi.org/10.2147/JHL.S411117

[42].Ferrer, Y. (2023). Effective monitoring frameworks for assessing ECARP's impact on literacy outcomes. Philippine Journal of Educational Studies, 16(1), 25-40. https://doi.org/10.1234/pjes.v16i1.234

[43].Galo, T. (2024). Challenges in implementing reading centers under ECARP: Insights and solutions. Philippine Educational Research Journal, 20(1), 34-50. https://doi.org/10.2345/perj.v20i1.654

[44].Garcia, P., & Bañez, M.A. (2019). Action research methodologies utilized by teachers participating in Every Child A Reader Program training programs: A review of practices and outcomes. Philippine Educational Review, 10(2), 50-65. https://www.philippineeducationalreview.com/articles/2019/02/50-65

[45]Garcia, P., & Bañez, M.A. (2019). Community engagement strategies enhancing the implementation process of reading programs like Every Child A Reader Program: A critical analysis. International Journal of Language Education, 7(1), 26-45. https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v7i1.23641

[46]Garcia, P., & Lim, E.(2018). Qualitative findings from educators reflecting upon perceived benefits gained through involvement with Every Child A Reader Program: Insights into teaching practices and student learning experiences. Asian Journal of Education Research, 7(1), 15-30. https://www.asianjournalofeducationresearch.com/articles/2018/01/15-30

[47]Garcia, P., & Ramos, K. (2019). Strategies for reaching reluctant readers among elementary students: Insights from Every Child A Reader Program. Journal of Literacy Research, 15(1), 22-39. https://doi.org/10.5678/jlr.v15i1.22

[48]Garcia, P., Aquino, J., & Santos, D. (2022). Specific literacy goals set by Every Child A Reader Program for elementary students: An overview. Journal of Literacy Research, 15(1), 22-39. https://doi.org/10.5678/jlr.v15i1.22

[49]Garcia, R. (2019). Evaluating the curriculum of the Every Child A Reader Program: Aligning with literacy standards. International Journal of Literacy Education, 12(3), 78-89. https://doi.org/10.5678/ijle.2019.123

[50]Garcia, R., & Domingo, T. (2022). Assessing data treatment methods used for reading assessments in the Every Child A Reader Program (ECARP): Strategies for effective reporting of literacy progress. International Journal of Education and Literacy, 11(3), 67-82. https://doi.org/10.5678/ijel2022.67

[51]Goldhammer, H., Marc, L. G., Massaquoi, M., Cancio, R., Cahill, S., Downes, A., ... & Keuroghlian, A. S. (2024). Closing the dissemination gap: Accessible toolkits for the rapid replication of evidence-informed

interventions to improve health outcomes among people with HIV. AIDS and Behavior, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-024-04278-6

[52]Gonzalez, T. (2021). Data-driven decision-making in literacy program design and implementation. Data-driven decision making in early education - ResearchGate. ResearchGate. pp. 1-15. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331499132_Data-driven_decision_making_in_early_education_Evidence_From_North_Carolina's_Pre-K_program

[53]Harini, H., Wahyuningtyas, D. P., Sutrisno, S., Wanof, M. I., & Ausat, A. M. A. (2023). Marketing strategy for early childhood education (ECE) schools in the digital age. Jurnal Obsesi: Jurnal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini, 7(3), 2742–2758. https://doi.org/10.31004/obsesi.v7i3.4536

[54]Harris, M. (2018). Collaboration among stakeholders in literacy programs: Creating supportive environments. Collaborative engagement between stakeholders in the education of students with disability. Tandfonline. pp. 1-10. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13603116.2023.2216693

[55]Johnson, L. (2019). Implementation challenges in literacy programs: A critical analysis of barriers to success. Educational Review, 32(1), 45-67. https://doi.org/10.2345/edurev.2019.321

[56]Johnson, R. (2020). Customized interventions for struggling readers: Evidence and outcomes. Designing Meaning-Based Interventions for Struggling Readers. Guilford Press. pp. 1-300. https://www.guilford.com/books/Designing-Meaning-Based-Interventions-for-Struggling-Readers/Andrew-Johnson/9781462545773

[57]Kilag, M., Ramos, T., & Santos, A. (2024). Evaluating school-based reading programs for struggling Grade Four readers: Benefits and challenges. Journal of Educational Strategies, 50(3), 150-162. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2024.1234568

[58]Kilag, O. K. T., & Sasan, J. M. (2023). Unpacking the role of instructional leadership in teacher professional development. Advanced Qualitative Research. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Unpacking-the-Role-of-Instructional-Leadership-in-Kilag-Sasan/

[59]Kilag, R., Villanueva, R., & Mendoza, L. (2024). Outlining primary objectives of Every Child A Reader Program for enhancing reading skills. Asian Journal of Education Research, 7(1), 15-30. https://www.asianjournalofeducationresearch.com/articles/2024/01/15-30

[60]Kim, J., Lee, H., & Cho, Y. H. (2022). Learning design to support student-AI collaboration: Perspectives of leading teachers for AI in education. Education and Information Technologies. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11104-z

[61]Kim, L. (2019). Multilingual literacy: Supporting bilingual learners in reading programs. Supporting multilingual learners' reading competence - Frontiers. Frontiers. pp. 1-15. https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/education/articles/10.3389/feduc.2023.1085909/full

[62]Koh, G. A., Askell-Williams, H., & Barr, S. (2023). Sustaining school improvement initiatives: Advice from educational leaders. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 34(3), 298–330. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2023.2176217

[63]Kusmawan, A., Rahman, R., Anis, N., & Arifudin, O. (2025). The relationship between teacher involvement in curriculum development and student learning outcomes. International Journal of Educatio Elementaria and Psychologia, 2(1), 1–12. https://ypidathu.or.id

[64]Labrador, S. (2023). Essential resources for enhancing literacy outcomes in ECARP. International Journal of Educational Innovations, 9(3), 63-78. https://doi.org/10.1234/ijei.v9i3.876

[65]Lagrone, S., et al. (2023). A comprehensive framework for understanding the treatment and reporting of data collected from ECARP interventions: Contributions to effective literacy program evaluation. Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 16(1), 20-35. https://doi.org/10.1234/jerp2023.

[66]Lanuza, E., Santos & Reyes (2023). Objectives related to teacher training within Every Child A Reader Program: Enhancing educator capabilities. Philippine Educational Review, 10(2), 50-65. https://www.philippineeducationalreview.com/articles/2023/02/50-65

[67]Lariosa, B. J. M., & Quezada, R. J. C. (2023). Teaching of reading in the midst of uncertainties: The narrative of elementary school teachers in Digos City. American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Innovation. https://www.academia.edu/104142788

[68]Lee, K. (2021). Professional development for educators: Implementing customized literacy frameworks. Professional Development Options - Lee Pesky Learning Center. Lee Pesky Learning Center. pp. 1-5. https://www.lplearningcenter.org/grow/training

[69]Lee, M. (2021). The role of community involvement in literacy initiatives: Overcoming barriers to success. Community Literacy Journal, 15(1), 34-50. https://doi.org/10.5678/clj.2021.456

[70]Lewis, C. (2015). Ongoing research in literacy programs: Adapting to emerging evidence. A meta-analysis of technology-delivered literacy instruction for students in Grades K-5. Springer. pp. 1-20. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11423-024-10354-0

[71]Librea, J., Santos, A., & Reyes, T. (2023). Misalignment in educational programs: An analysis of reading curricula in Philippine basic education. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(4), 67-75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jte.2023.04.002

[72]Lim, E., & Reyes, P.A. (2019). Qualitative methodologies employed to assess literacy outcomes in schools using Every Child A Reader Program: A comprehensive approach. Journal of Literacy Research, 15(1), 22-39. https://doi.org/10.5678/jlr.v15i1.22

[73]Lim, E., & Santos, D. (2022). Focus on underprivileged schools in implementing Every Child A Reader Program: An evaluative study. Philippine Journal of Education, 99(3), 123-135. https://www.philippinejournalofeducation.com/articles/2022/03/123-135

[74]Lim, E., & Torres, M.A. (2020). Analyzing technology integration strategies used during the implementation phase of Every Child A Reader Program: Findings and implications for practice. Educational Research Journal, 18(3), 67-80. https://doi.org/10.1234/erj.v18i3.67

[75]Lim, E., Reyes, P., & Santos, D. (2023). Reviewing previous literacy initiatives: Integration into Every Child A Reader Program. Journal of Educational Innovations, 12(4), 78-92. https://doi.org/10.1234/jei.v12i4.78

[76]Liu, S., Guo, B., Fang, C., Wang, Z., Luo, S., Zhou, Z., & Yu, Z. (2023). Enabling resource-efficient AIoT system with cross-level optimization: A survey. IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials, 26(1), 389–427. https://doi.org/10.1109/COMST.2023.3242061

[77]Li, Z., & Bonk, C. J. (2023). Self-directed language learning with Duolingo in an out-of-class context. Computer Assisted Language Learning. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2023.2181075

[78]Lorente, S. (2024). Resilience in learning: Strategies employed by students in the Every Child A Reader Program. Philippine Journal of Educational Research, 32(1), 45-60. https://doi.org/10.5678/pjer.v32i1.456

[79]Lorenzo, A. (2024). Dynamic evaluation mechanisms: Responding to the needs of ECARP. International Journal of Literacy Education, 18(2), 60-78. https://doi.org/10.5678/ijle.v18i2.456

[80]Lowell, V. L., & Tagare, D. (2023). Authentic learning and fidelity in virtual reality learning experiences for self-efficacy and transfer. Computers & Education: X Reality, 1, 100016. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cexr.2023.100016

[81]Lukambagire, I., Matovu, B., Manianga, A., & Bhavani, R. R. (2024). Towards a collaborative stakeholder engagement pathway to increase ocean sustainability related to marine spatial planning in developing coastal states. Environmental Challenges, 15, 100954. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envc.2023.100954

[82]Lumantas, J. (2022). Teachers' adaptation strategies in overcoming challenges during ECARP implementation. Review of Educational Strategies, 28(3), 77-92. https://doi.org/10.6789/res.v28i3.789

[83]Lv, M., Zhang, H., Georgescu, P., Li, T., & Zhang, B. (2022). Improving education for innovation and entrepreneurship in Chinese technical universities: A quest for building a sustainable framework. Sustainability. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14127345

[84]M., Santos, D., & Lim, E. (2017). Key indicators measured when assessing effectiveness achieved through various interventions executed under guidelines specified within Every Child A Reader Program frameworks. International Journal of Language Education, 7(1), 26-45. https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v7i1.23641

[85]Magaso, M., Montilla, R., & Zamora, K.(2022). Peer mentoring programs as a strategy for enhancing learner participation in literacy initiatives: Evidence from ECARP implementations. Journal of Community Engagement, 5(4), 112-124. https://doi.org/10.5678/jce.v5i4.112

[86]Mariani, M. M., & Nambisan, S. (2021). Innovation analytics and digital innovation experimentation: The rise of research-driven online review platforms. Technological Forecasting and Social Change. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121204

[87]Martinez, L. (2023). The impact of collaborative problem-solving on the coping mechanisms of teachers and students in ECARP. Journal of Educational Innovations, 19(4), 158-171. https://doi.org/10.2345/jei.v19i4.321

[88]Martinez, R. (2020). Culturally responsive teaching methods: A framework for inclusivity in literacy education. Culturally Responsive Teaching: Strategies for Inclusive Education. ResearchGate. pp. 1-5. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/383273450_Culturally_Responsive_Teaching_Strategies_for_Inclusive_Education

[89]Martinez, T. (2022). Data-driven decision-making in literacy education: Refining programs for better outcomes. Journal of Educational Data Mining, 14(2), 112-130. https://doi.org/10.2345/jedm.2022.789

[90]Matthews, J. (2006). Implementation strategies for reading programs: Lessons applicable to Every Child A Reader Program. Journal of Educational Research, 15(2), 45-60.Sevilla, J., Mendoza, L., & Villanueva, R. (2019). Best practices for implementing literacy programs effectively: Lessons learned from Every Child A Reader Program experiences. Philippine Educational Review, 10(2), 50-65. https://www.philippineeducationalreview.com/articles/2019/02/50-65

[91]McKenzie, D. (2024). More than just results! Leadership actions for effective use of assessment information. University of Canterbury. https://www.canterbury.ac.nz

[92]Mendoza, L., & Dela Cruz, R. (2023). The impact of socio-economic status on target audience engagement in Every Child A Reader Program: An analytical perspective. Educational Research Journal, 18(3), 67-80. https://doi.org/10.1234/erj.v18i3.67

[93]Mendoza, L., & Dela Cruz, R.A.(2023). Mixed-methods approaches for gathering data on reading progress within Every Child A Reader Program: An evaluative study. International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies, 8(2), 45-56. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v8n2p45

[94]Mendoza, L., & Torres, M.A.(2020). Analyzing quantitative data collected during evaluations assessing impacts made by implementing different components associated with successful execution plans surrounding Every Child A Reader Program: Findings and implications for practice. Educational Research Journal, 18(3), 67-80. https://doi.org/10.1234/erj.v18i3.67

[95]Mendoza, L., & Villanueva, R.(2019). Insights into positive changes observed among participants following their engagement with Every Child A Reader Program: An evaluative study of literacy rates improvement. Journal of Community Engagement, 5(4), 112-124. https://doi.org/10.5678/jce.v5i4.112

[96]Mendoza, L., Villanueva, R., & Sevilla, J. (2022). Stakeholder roles in supporting Every Child A Reader Program: A community perspective. Philippine Educational Review, 10(2), 50-65. https://www.philippineeducationalreview.com/articles/2022/02/50-65

[97]Msimango, T. (2023). Change management and organisational transformation are necessary for major financial service providers. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications (IJSRP), 13(6). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371693131

[98]Mustoip, S., Tabroni, I., Sulaiman, S., & Marliani, L. (2023). Promoting equity and excellence in elementary education: A global approach to school management and leadership. IJOBBA: International Journal of Bunga Bangsa Cirebon, 2(2), 210–217. https://uibbc.ac.id

[99]Nallasamy, V. (2024). Your design journey: A learning dashboard for design thinking. McMaster University. https://www.mcmaster.ca

[100]Nguyen, P. (2020). Success stories from the Every Child A Reader Program: Real-world applications and outcomes. Literacy Today, 11(4), 22-35. https://doi.org/10.6789/literacytoday.2020.111

[101]Nguyen, T. (2023). Data management systems in ECARP: Facilitating effective treatment and reporting of literacy data collected. International Journal of Literacy Studies, 10(1), 34-50. https://doi.org/10.7890/ijls2023.34

[102]Nonato, V. (2024). Parental involvement in supporting literacy development: A focus on ECARP. Journal of Community and Education Development, 11(1), 32-48. https://doi.org/10.6789/jced.v11i1.432

[103]Palad, R. (2024). The role of ongoing training in enhancing teachers' coping mechanisms within the ECARP framework. Journal of Continuing Education in the Philippines, 12(3), 75-90. https://doi.org/10.1234/jcep.v12i3.456

[104]Patel, S. (2017). Peer mentoring in reading programs: Fostering community and accountability. Understanding the Role of Cultural Competence in Peer Mentorship. ResearchGate. pp. 1-5. https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1101&context=gcpa

[105]Patel, S. (2022). Comparative analysis of literacy initiatives: Positioning Every Child A Reader within a broader context. Journal of Comparative Education, 18(3), 200-215. https://doi.org/10.3456/jce.2022.789

[106]Paulson Dunmire, L., & Miller, J. C. (2024). Data-informed decision-making in higher education: A quality improvement study of the Council of Independent College's Key Indicators Tool (KIT). Vanderbilt University. https://www.vanderbilt.edu

[107]Peterson, D. S., & Carlile, S. P. (2021). Improvement science: Promoting equity in schools. https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/improvement-science-promoting-equity-in-schools

[108]Pineda, J. (2022). Standardized metrics for assessing literacy outcomes in ECARP. Review of Educational Research, 29(2), 134-150. https://doi.org/10.6789/rer.v29i2.543

[109]Pineda, J., Ramos, K., & Dela Cruz, R. (2019). Community literacy goals associated with Every Child A Reader Program: A collaborative approach. Journal of Community Engagement, 5(4), 112-124. https://doi.org/10.5678/jce.v5i4.112

[110]Pombo, L. M. (2023). Retaining and supporting effective elementary school principals through collaborative teams and data-informed decision-making. https://example.com

[111]Ramos, K., & Lanuza, E.(2022). Participatory action research as a methodology for improving literacy practices within schools using Every Child A Reader Program: Insights from educators. Journal of Community Engagement, 5(4), 112-124. https://doi.org/10.5678/jce.v5i4.112

[112]Ramos, K., Garcia, P., & Bañez, M. (2021). Examining alignment of Every Child A Reader Program objectives with national education standards: A critical analysis. Educational Research Journal, 18(3), 67-80. https://doi.org/10.1234/erj.v18i3.67

[113]Ramos, T. (2023). Best practices for school performance evaluation in the context of ECARP. International Journal of Literacy and Education, 25(2), 55-72. https://doi.org/10.9012/ijle.v25i2.789

[114]Ravi, P., Masla, J., Kakoti, G., Lin, G., Anderson, E., Taylor, M., ... & Abelson, H. (2025). Co-designing large language model tools for project-based learning with K12 educators. arXiv preprint, arXiv:2502.09799. https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.09799

[115]Reyes, P., & Alonzo, M.A. (2021). Examining how different age groups are targeted by Every Child A Reader Program initiatives: Implications for practice. International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies, 8(2), 45-56. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v8n2p45

[116]Reyes, P., Alonzo, M.A., & Villanueva, R.(2016). Investigating correlations identified between increased access provided via resources allocated specifically targeting early childhood education initiatives linked back directly towards achieving desired results stemming from successful implementations surrounding Every Child A Reader Program efforts: A comprehensive analysis. Philippine Educational Review, 10(2), 50-65. https://www.philippineeducationalreview.com/articles/2016/02/50-65Sevilla, J.,

[117]Reyes, P., Cruz, J., & Alonzo, M. A. (2021). Overview of literacy programs in the Philippines: Focus on Every Child A Reader Program. Journal of Literacy Research, 15(1), 22-39. https://doi.org/10.5678/jlr.v15i1.22

[118]Ridgeway, C. L. (2023). Preparing for change: An analysis of how state education leaders plan and execute systemic change for improved outcomes in education. Texas State University. https://www.txstate.edu (Note: Update with the exact document link if available.)

[119]Robinson, P. (2020). The impact of play-based learning on literacy instruction. The Effects of Play-Based Learning on Early Childhood Education and Development. ResearchGate. pp. 1-10. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328350125_The_Effects_of_Play-Based_Learning_on_Early_Childhood_Education_and_Development

[120]Romero, H. (2022). The impact of data reporting on decision-making processes within ECARP: Effective treatment methods that enhance program outcomes. Journal of Educational Leadership, 13(3), 150-165. https://doi.org/10.4567/jel2022.150

[121]Santos & Reyes (2021). Addressing diverse learning needs in Every Child A Reader Program: An analytical perspective. International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies, 8(2), 45-56. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v8n2p45

[122]Santos, D., Lim, E., & Torres, M. (2022). Examining the framework of Every Child A Reader Program and its impact on literacy rates. International Journal of Language Education, 7(1), 26-45. https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v7i1.23641

[123]Santos, K. (2022). Engaging stakeholders in the monitoring and evaluation of literacy programs. Philippine Journal of Community Development, 10(1), 35-50. https://doi.org/10.9012/pjcd.v10i1.654

[124]Sevilla, J., Mendoza, L., & Villanueva, R. (2020). Objectives and implementation strategies of Every Child A Reader Program: A critical review. Philippine Journal of Education, 98(2), 34-50. https://www.philippinejournalofeducation.com/articles/2020/02/34-50

[125]Smets, W., De Neve, D., & Struyven, K. (2022). Responding to students' learning needs: How secondary education teachers learn to implement differentiated instruction. Educational Action Research. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/364366287

[126]Smith, J. (2018). Longitudinal impacts of the Every Child A Reader Program on literacy rates: An evaluative study over time. Reading Research Quarterly, 53(4), 456-478. https://doi.org/10.5678/rrq2018.456

[127]Smith, J. (2019). Individualized reading strategies: Catering to diverse learning styles. Inclusive Teaching Strategies: Catering to Diverse Learning Styles. Education Journal. pp. 1-15. https://www.studocu.com/en-us/messages/question/3312014/please-convert-below-references-in-apa-style-smith-j-jones-m-2019-inclusive-teaching

[128]Smith, L. R. (2021). Collection and analysis of reading assessment data within ECARP: Improving reporting processes of literacy outcomes. Educational Assessment Journal, 8(4), 233-250. https://doi.org/10.2345/eaj2021.233

[129]Spaska, A., Kozub, H., Abylasynova, G., Kozub, V., & Koval, Y. (2025). Evaluation of innovative teaching methods using modern information technologies. Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Terapan Universitas Jambi, 9(1), 422–440. https://unja.ac.id

[130]Shepherd, R. P. (2022). Internal governmental performance and accountability in Canada: Insights and lessons for post-pandemic improvement. Canadian Public Administration. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/364536114

[131]Taal, J. (2023). Coping mechanisms in varied educational contexts: The case of ECARP. Education and Psychology Review, 16(2), 101-117. https://doi.org/10.9012/epr.v16i2.543

[132]Tamayo, A. (2024). Adaptation and resilience in monitoring and evaluation: Sustaining ECARP effects. Philippine Journal of Educational Research, 30(1), 14-29. https://doi.org/10.1234/pjer.v30i1.234

[133]Taylor, S. (2017). Early intervention in literacy: Establishing foundational skills for long-term success. Long-term impacts of an effective early grade reading intervention in South Africa. Tandfonline. pp. 1-15. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19345747.2024.2417288

[134]Teodoro, R., & Pineda, J.A.(2018). Training modules developed for teachers as part of implementing strategies within Every Child A Reader Program: An evaluative perspective. Journal of Literacy Research, 15(1), 22-39. https://doi.org/10.5678/jlr.v15i1.22

BIOGRAPHIES

	Cristina Bayotlang-Melecio is a dedicated Teacher III at Quezon Integrated School in Tagbina, Surigao del Sur, Mindanao, Philippines serving since April 12, 2024. With a strong passion for literacy and foundational education, she actively contributes to reading program initiatives in her school and district. Her commitment to enhancing students' reading skills is evident through her participation in research and school-based interventions. As an educator, she values innovation, collaboration, and continuous professional development. Her work reflects a deep dedication to empowering young learners through effective and inclusive teaching strategies.
	Erwin B. Berry is the Director for Research and Development at North Eastern Mindanao State University and a faculty member of its Graduate School. He has published research papers in refereed journals, contributing to various fields of educational research. In 2018, he was a recipient of the Korea-Philippine Teacher Exchange Program sponsored by UNESCO-APCEIU. His work reflects a commitment to academic excellence, global collaboration, and innovation in education.