

Instructional Leadership Support and Community-Based Reading Projects: Basis for Development of Outcomes-Based Approach

Janice P. Angeles, LPT^a, Judelin S. Alvarez, PhD^b

^ajaniceangeles08@gmail.com

^bjudelinalvarez@cns.edu.ph

Mabini Colleges, Inc., Governor Panotes Avenue,
Daet, Camarines Norte, 4600, Philippines

Abstract

This study explored the relationship between instructional leadership support and community-based reading projects in the San Vicente-San Lorenzo Ruiz District, aiming to develop an outcomes-based approach. It assessed administrative support systems like training, mentoring, quality assurance, and research and their impact on reading initiatives in elementary schools, focusing on program scope, beneficiaries, activities, and evaluation. Using a quantitative-descriptive design, the study surveyed 190 elementary teachers and 17 barangay councils in Camarines Norte, Philippines.

Findings revealed partial implementation of leadership support systems and reading projects, with limited coverage in training, mentoring, and quality assurance (mean scores: 1.94-2.02) and incomplete execution of reading initiatives (mean scores: 1.91-1.94). Significant correlations were found between leadership support and project effectiveness, particularly in quality assurance and mentoring ($r = .653$ to $.632$). Challenges like limited parental involvement were identified (mean score: 3.31).

The study proposed "PROJECT WE CARE" to address gaps in leadership support and improve reading project implementation through enhanced training, mentoring, and quality assurance. It calls for stronger leadership, community outreach, and resource mobilization to address challenges and recommends future research to evaluate the long-term outcomes of such initiatives.

Keywords: Instructional Leadership, Community-Based Reading Projects, Outcomes-Based Approach, Literacy Enhancement, Educational Support Systems

1. Introduction

Community-based reading is a pedagogical strategy that integrates meaningful community engagement with reading instruction, emphasizing reciprocal learning and reflection to enhance the reading experience (Overstreet, 2020). Such programs are designed to facilitate deeper reading engagement through guidance, context provision, foundational knowledge, and the development of functional literacy and intellectual analysis (Gustavus.edu, n.d.). The essence of these programs lies not only in community involvement during reading instruction but also in the promotion of broader community immersion and support systems that address the specific challenges faced by at-risk readers and learners. These initiatives provide a holistic framework for improving literacy outcomes within vulnerable populations by involving community stakeholders in the learning process.

Collaborative community-based reading projects are integral to the broader framework of school-community relations, as noted by Gaskin (2022). Such projects enable school professionals and community partners to work together, fostering collective endeavors aimed at supporting the literacy development of school-age children, particularly those at risk of falling behind in their reading abilities (Bajaj, 2023). These collaborations offer crucial opportunities for the community and schools to jointly advocate for the academic advancement of struggling learners. However, these projects also demand transparent, valid, and reliable outcomes, which means they must go beyond mere compliance with collaborative agreements between schools and communities.

To achieve effective and measurable outcomes, the implementation of a community-based reading program must embrace an outcomes-based approach. This method, which focuses on results and performance, ensures accuracy, validity, and transparency in assessing learners' reading profiles, status, and achievements. The importance of such an approach becomes more apparent considering the contemporary educational challenges, particularly the transition period following the pandemic. Unlike previous studies conducted during stable academic periods, this research highlights the need to assess community-based reading projects in the context of post-pandemic challenges, which makes this study uniquely positioned to address modern educational gaps.

One of the central issues identified in this research is the sporadic nature of community-based reading projects, which are typically implemented only during specific events like Brigada Pagbasa and Brigada Eskwela. These initiatives often face sustainability challenges, with limited implementation periods affecting their long-term efficacy. Additionally, the serious reading difficulties among at-risk learners—ranging from phonemic issues to poor reading comprehension—exacerbate the challenges faced by these programs. Teachers and volunteers often struggle to match their instruction with the learners' specific needs within the limited timeframe, creating immense pressure to achieve significant improvements in reading competence in a short period.

Moreover, the integration of an outcomes-based approach in these reading initiatives presents another challenge, as many project implementers and volunteers lack the necessary training and familiarity with this methodology. This gap in knowledge hinders the successful implementation of results-driven strategies. Thus, this study seeks to explore how school administrators in the San Vicente-San Lorenzo Ruiz District provide instructional leadership support and interventions for schools implementing community-based reading programs. The research aims to uncover how these leaders address the identified gaps, particularly in integrating outcomes-based approaches to enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of community-based reading initiatives.

1.1. Objective of the Study

This study assessed the instructional leadership support and community-based reading projects in the San Vicente-San Lorenzo Ruiz District to develop an outcomes-based approach. It investigated the support systems provided by administrators, focusing on trainings, mentoring, quality assurance, and research-based support systems and their impact on the implementation of community-based reading projects. Specifically, the study examined the level of implementation of these reading projects in terms of program scope, beneficiaries, tasks and activities, and assessment and monitoring. Additionally, it explored the relationship between instructional leadership support and the effectiveness of reading projects, identified challenges encountered during implementation, and suggested outcomes-based approaches to improve the implementation of community-based reading projects.

2. Methodology

This study employed a quantitative-descriptive correlational research design. The quantitative-descriptive method was used to describe and discuss the instructional leadership support systems provided by the group of administrators, along with the implementation of an outcome-based approach to community-based reading projects, the level of implementation of community-based reading projects, challenges encountered by the respondents during the implementation of community-based reading projects, and suggested outcomes-based approaches to improve the implementation of community-based reading projects.

The correlational method was used to examine the relationship between instructional leadership support and community-based reading projects.

2.1. Population, Sample Size, and Sampling Technique

The San Vicente-San Lorenzo Ruiz District has 17 public elementary schools with 163 elementary teachers, 10 school heads, and 14 Master Teachers. The study included all 190 respondents, consisting of teachers, school principals, school heads, master teachers, and 17 barangay councils responsible for education. The respondents were selected based on their active involvement in community-based reading projects and their experience in overseeing collaborative reading programs. This comprehensive selection ensured a holistic perspective on the implementation and support of community-based reading projects in the district.

2.2. Data Gathering Procedures

The data-gathering procedures began by addressing ethical considerations, securing approvals from school leaders, district, and division committees, and obtaining informed consent from all respondents. Permissions were granted by the Schools Division Superintendent of Camarines Norte, the Public Schools District Supervisor of San Vicente-San Lorenzo Ruiz District, and barangay captains in both areas. The study involved 190 respondents, including school principals, heads, Master Teachers, teachers, and barangay councils. Respondents' information was treated confidentially, in compliance with the Data Privacy Act, with names anonymized. Ethical standards ensured that participants were informed of their rights, including consent, withdrawal, and access to survey results.

Once ethical approval was secured, the data-gathering process proceeded, using survey tools to collect information on instructional leadership support, the implementation level of community-based reading projects, and the challenges faced. The survey, developed by the researcher, was validated by reading specialists and tested with 20 non-respondents from the Talisay District, demonstrating excellent reliability and internal consistency. The questionnaire had three parts: gathering data on instructional leadership support, project implementation, and challenges encountered. The high Cronbach-alpha values of the subscales confirmed the instrument's reliability for the study.

2.3. Statistical Treatment of Data

Descriptive statistics were applied in this study for the treatment, analysis, and interpretation of gathered data. Specifically, the percentage method was used to treat data on the conduct of community-based reading projects in the elementary schools in the San Vicente-San Lorenzo Ruiz District in terms of the scope of reading projects, beneficiaries, project tasks and activities, and project assessment and monitoring. Frequency count and weighted mean were utilized to analyze the instructional leadership support systems provided by the

group of administrators, encompassing training, mentoring, quality assurance, and research-based support systems, as well as the challenges encountered in the implementation of these projects.

To determine the significant relationship between instructional leadership support and the implementation of community-based reading projects, the Pearson Correlation Coefficient (r) was applied, as outlined by Turney (2022).

Shown below is the formula for Pearson r :

$$R = \frac{N(\sum xy) - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{[N\sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2][N\sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2]}}$$

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 was used to perform the correlation analysis and examine the relationship between the variables, ensuring a robust statistical treatment of the data.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Instructional Leadership Support Systems

The study's findings, presented in Tables 1 to 4, reveal only partial implementation of instructional leadership support systems, particularly in training programs in the San Vicente-San Lorenzo Ruiz District. The average weighted mean of 2.02 indicates that while training on the legal foundations of community-based reading programs is somewhat addressed (weighted mean of 2.05), there is a clear deficiency in stakeholder engagement training (weighted mean of 1.98). This lack of comprehensive training is a significant barrier to effectively implementing these projects, as highlighted by Johnson et al. (2023). The insufficient focus on stakeholder engagement, crucial for successful school-community partnerships, reinforces concerns raised by Taseer et al. (2023). Furthermore, the lack of training on outcome-based approaches and remediation best practices conflicts with Van Alten et al. (2019), who stress the importance of evidence-based practices and clear learning outcomes in addressing at-risk readers' needs.

Table 1. Instructional Leadership Support Systems in terms of Training Programs

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Trainings on the legal foundations of community- based reading programs.		2.05	PI
Trainings on the stakeholders' engagement in community-based trainings.		1.98	PI
Trainings on the developmental reading projects that align with community-based reading program.		2.03	PI
Trainings on procedures and methods of implementing community-based reading.		2.02	PI
Trainings on outcome-based approach to community-based reading projects.		2.01	PI
Trainings on the best practices on implementing remediation in reading for at risk readers with community support.		2.03	PI
Average Weighted Mean		2.02	PI
Rating Scale:	Descriptive Interpretation:		
3.25 – 4.00	Fully Implemented (FI)		
2.50 – 3.24	Implemented (I)		
1.75 – 2.49	Partially Implemented (PI)		
1.00 – 1.74	Not Implemented (NI)		

The study's analysis of mentoring in instructional leadership support systems, shown in Table 2, indicates partial implementation with an average weighted mean of 2.02. Technical assistance and mentoring for community-based reading programs scored the highest, with a mean of 2.06, reflecting some teacher support. However, the lowest mean of 1.97 for knowledge sharing highlights a major gap in collaborative professional

learning, essential for program management and supervision. This gap suggests a need for more comprehensive mentoring that includes best practices and aligns with outcomes-based education (OBE), as emphasized by Sims and Fletcher-Wood (2021) and Johnson et al. (2023). The findings stress the importance of strengthening mentoring to improve the design, implementation, and evaluation of reading projects, fully integrating OBE principles, as advocated by Biggs et al. (2022).

Table 2. Instructional Leadership Support Systems in Terms of Mentoring

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Instructional mentoring on OBE support to community-based reading programs.		2.02	PI
Technical assistance and mentoring services on community-based reading programs managed by teachers.		2.06	PI
Feedbacking and mentoring on the implemented community-based reading projects of teachers with OBE integration.		2.03	PI
Instructional mentoring to teachers on the practices of adapting community-based projects to OBE.		2.02	PI
Knowledge sharing for teachers along the best practices of managing and supervising the community-based reading programs.		1.97	PI
Average Weighted Mean		2.02	PI
Rating Scale:	Descriptive Interpretation:		
3.25 – 4.00	Fully Implemented (FI)		
2.50 – 3.24	Implemented (I)		
1.75 – 2.49	Partially Implemented (PI)		
1.00 – 1.74	Not Implemented (NI)		

Table 3's analysis shows a partial implementation of quality assurance in instructional leadership support systems, with an average weighted mean of 1.94. The highest mean of 1.99 for strategic intervention tools indicates some focus on evidence-based interventions (Hall et al., 2023). However, the lowest mean of 1.88 for validating teachers' outputs, such as innovations and research proposals, highlights a critical gap, contrasting with Johnson et al. (2023)'s emphasis on teacher-led innovation. These findings suggest a need for more comprehensive quality assurance processes to enhance community-based reading programs and fully leverage teacher creativity, as highlighted by Hallahan (2020) in the context of differentiated instructional materials.

Table 3. Instructional Leadership Support Systems in Terms of Quality Assurance

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Validation of teacher-made reading materials that are used during the reading program.		1.93	PI
Quality assurance of strategic intervention tools developed by the teachers used during the community-based reading program.		1.99	PI
Validation of teacher-made assessment tools for community-based reading program.		1.95	PI
Quality assurance of handbooks, manuals and other educational tools on supporting the best practices applied by the teachers in support of the community-based reading program.		1.94	PI
Validation of the concrete outputs of teachers such as innovation and research proposals for community-based reading projects in support of the community-based reading program.		1.88	PI
Average Weighted Mean		1.94	PI
Rating Scale:	Descriptive Interpretation:		
3.25 – 4.00	Fully Implemented (FI)		
2.50 – 3.24	Implemented (I)		
1.75 – 2.49	Partially Implemented (PI)		
1.00 – 1.74	Not Implemented (NI)		

Table 4's findings show partial implementation of research-based support systems in instructional leadership, with an average weighted mean of 1.96. The highest mean of 2.00 for professional guidance on basic

research underscores the importance of teacher research (Yuan et al., 2022). However, the lowest mean of 1.93 for knowledge sharing on action research highlights a significant gap, contrasting with Savin-Baden and Major (2023)'s advocacy for action research. The study also points to incomplete adoption of digital and technological support in research, with a weighted mean of 1.97, aligning with Greenhow et al. (2022)'s emphasis on technology integration. These gaps suggest the need for more comprehensive support to enable teachers to effectively utilize research and digital tools in community-based reading programs, resonating with insights from Setyaningsih and Kharismawati (2020), Weikert (2018), Finlay (2020), and Hicks (2018) on enhancing reading skills through diverse methodologies.

Table 4. Instructional Leadership Support Systems in Terms of Research-based Support System

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Knowledge sharing on conducting action research in line with the integration of outcome-based approach to community-based reading program.		1.93	PI
Technical assistance and guidance to teachers in conducting experimental research on the outcome-based implementation of community-based reading program.		1.96	PI
Professional guidance for teachers in conducting basic research about the implications of community-based reading programs to learners' literacy.		2.00	PI
Research-based orientation to teachers on conducting educational studies on how to maximize digital and technological support to the implementation of community-based reading program.		1.97	PI
Instructional leadership and guidance to teachers in implementing descriptive studies on the development and utilization of strategic interventions integrated in the implementation of community-based reading program.		1.95	PI
Average Weighted Mean		1.96	PI
Rating Scale:	Descriptive Interpretation:		
3.25 – 4.00	Fully Implemented (FI)		
2.50 – 3.24	Implemented (I)		
1.75 – 2.49	Partially Implemented (PI)		
1.00 – 1.74	Not Implemented (NI)		

3.2. Implementation of Community-Based Reading Projects

The study's data, shown in Tables 5 to 8, indicates partial implementation of community-based reading projects in the San Vicente-San Lorenzo Ruiz District, with an overall average weighted mean of 1.94. These projects address the reading difficulties of at-risk learners and cover language-related content (weighted mean of 1.95) but fall short in inclusivity and focus on all grade-level reading skills (weighted mean of 1.93). This gap suggests current efforts are not comprehensive enough to meet the diverse needs of all learners, as noted by Hall et al. (2023) and the National Reading Panel (2020). The findings call for a more robust approach to reading instruction, advocating for a balanced literacy approach, as recommended by Pressley et al. (2023), to ensure inclusivity and address all essential reading components across grade levels.

Table 5. Level of Implementation of Community-based Reading Projects in terms of the Scope of Reading Projects

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Interpretation
The community-based reading projects are inclusive for all grade level learners.		1.93	PI
The community-based reading program in our school focuses on the services for at risk readers only.		1.94	PI
The community-based reading program in our school evolves on addressing variety of prevalent reading difficulties of the at-risk learners.		1.95	PI
The community-based reading program in our school evolves on all relevant grade level reading skills and competencies.		1.93	PI
The community-based reading program in our school covers all the language-related content knowledge and instructional concepts related to grade level reading.		1.95	PI
Average Weighted Mean		1.94	PI

Rating Scale:	Descriptive Interpretation:
3.25 – 4.00	Fully Implemented (FI)
2.50 – 3.24	Implemented (I)
1.75 – 2.49	Partially Implemented (PI)
1.00 – 1.74	Not Implemented (NI)

The results in Table 6 show partial implementation of community-based reading projects for beneficiaries, with an average weighted mean of 1.94. While the projects aim to serve all grade levels (highest mean of 1.97), there are gaps in effectively supporting at-risk readers (lowest mean of 1.91). This highlights the need for more targeted and equitable support, as stressed by Hall et al. (2023). The findings call for a balanced reading instruction approach that caters to both high- and low-ability groups, consistent with Smale-Jacobse (2019). The lack of comprehensive support across reading levels could hinder literacy development, as noted by Fletcher et al. (2021). A strategic, inclusive plan is necessary to improve the reach and effectiveness of these reading programs.

Table 6. Level of Implementation of Community-based Reading Projects in terms of the Scope of Reading Projects

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
The community-based reading projects are inclusive for all grade level learners.	1.93	PI
The community-based reading program in our school focuses on the services for at risk readers only.	1.94	PI
The community-based reading program in our school evolves on addressing variety of prevalent reading difficulties of the at-risk learners.	1.95	PI
The community-based reading program in our school evolves on all relevant grade level reading skills and competencies.	1.93	PI
The community-based reading program in our school covers all the language-related content knowledge and instructional concepts related to grade level reading.	1.95	PI
Average Weighted Mean	1.94	PI

Rating Scale:	Descriptive Interpretation:
3.25 – 4.00	Fully Implemented (FI)
2.50 – 3.24	Implemented (I)
1.75 – 2.49	Partially Implemented (PI)
1.00 – 1.74	Not Implemented (NI)

The results from Table 7 reveal a partial implementation of project tasks and activities for community-based reading projects in the San Vicente-San Lorenzo Ruiz District, with an average weighted mean of 1.91. Remedial reading sessions are somewhat addressed (mean of 1.94), but the distribution of reading materials to at-risk readers is insufficient (mean of 1.89). This indicates a lack of essential resources and engaging activities, as noted by Vinterek et al. (2022) and Duke and Cartwright (2021). Additionally, reading progress assessments are not systematic enough (mean of 1.91), which is crucial for effective interventions, as Panadero and Lipnevich (2022) suggest. Parental involvement is also underutilized (mean of 1.90) despite its potential to boost literacy, as highlighted by Taseer et al. (2023). The findings emphasize the need for a more comprehensive literacy support system that improves resource delivery, activity diversity, assessment, and family engagement.

Table 7. Level of Implementation of Community-based Reading Projects in terms of Project Tasks and Activities

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
The community-based reading program in our school highlights remedial reading sessions and services for the learners.	1.94	PI
The community-based reading program in our school includes the distribution of reading materials for at risk readers.	1.89	PI
The community-based reading program in our school highlights individual and collaborative reading tasks and instructional activities for at risk readers.	1.93	PI

The community-based reading program in our school highlights the administering of reading assessment activities and procedures for pupil- beneficiaries.	1.91	PI
The community-based reading program in our school highlights the promotion of collaborative activities that involve the parents in instructional mentoring and remediation for the learners with reading barriers and difficulties.	1.90	PI
Average Weighted Mean		1.91 PI
Rating Scale:	Descriptive Interpretation:	
3.25 – 4.00	Fully Implemented (FI)	
2.50 – 3.24	Implemented (I)	
1.75 – 2.49	Partially Implemented (PI)	
1.00 – 1.74	Not Implemented (NI)	

The analysis in Table 8 shows a partial implementation of assessment and monitoring practices for community-based reading projects in the San Vicente-San Lorenzo Ruiz District, with an average weighted mean of 1.91. While rubrics and evaluation tools are somewhat used (mean of 1.93), the management by Master Teachers (mean of 1.85) indicates the underutilization of experienced educators, as noted by Hennessy et al. (2022). The findings call for a stronger monitoring framework, supported by Schildkamp et al. (2020), and advocate for greater teacher and community leader involvement, as emphasized by Taseer et al. (2023). A comprehensive plan incorporating training, standardized reporting, and technology use, as suggested by Mandinach and Schildkamp (2021), could enhance the effectiveness of these reading projects, aligning with the research of Setyaningsih and Kharismawati (2020), Finlay (2020), and Hicks (2018).

Table 8. Level of Implementation of Community-based Reading Projects in terms of Project Assessment and Monitoring

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
The community-based reading program in our school is closely monitored by the school principal or school head.	1.92	PI
The monitoring committee of the reading program is managed by the Master Teachers.	1.85	PI
The school uses rubrics and evaluation tools for project monitoring of community-based reading program.	1.93	PI
The school assigned monitoring committee for the reading project.	1.91	PI
The school mandates every teacher to report every development and outcomes of the reading project.	1.92	PI
The school collaborates with the community leaders in monitoring and feedbacking for the reading projects.	1.92	PI
Average Weighted Mean		1.91 PI
Rating Scale:	Descriptive Interpretation:	
3.25 – 4.00	Fully Implemented (FI)	
2.50 – 3.24	Implemented (I)	
1.75 – 2.49	Partially Implemented (PI)	
1.00 – 1.74	Not Implemented (NI)	

3.3. Relationship Between the Instructional Leadership Support and the Level of Implementation

The results in Table 9 reveal strong positive correlations between instructional leadership support and the implementation of community-based reading projects in the San Vicente-San Lorenzo Ruiz District. Training programs show significant correlations with all aspects of project implementation, especially in assessment and monitoring ($r = .554$), beneficiaries ($r = .541$), and project scope ($r = .539$). This suggests that well-designed training enhances educators' ability to implement effective reading projects, aligning with Hennessy et al. (2022).

Mentoring also plays a crucial role, showing strong correlations with beneficiaries ($r = .626$) and project assessment and monitoring ($r = .597$). These findings imply that mentoring helps educators reach beneficiaries and develop robust assessment practices, consistent with the findings of Sims and Fletcher-Wood (2021). Quality assurance correlates strongly with project scope ($r = .653$) and assessment ($r = .632$), indicating that systematic quality control is vital for comprehensive project implementation, as emphasized by Elmore

(2019).

Table 9. Relationship Between Instructional Leadership Support and the Level of Implementation of Community-Based Reading Projects

Instructional Leadership Support	Scope of Reading Project		Beneficiaries Project		Tasks and Activities Project		Assessment and Monitoring	
	.r	Sig	.r	Sig	.r	Sig	.r	Sig
Training Program	.539**	.000	.541**	.000	.503**	.000	.554**	.000
Mentoring	.592**	.000	.626**	.000	.543**	.000	.597**	.000
Quality Assurance	.653**	.000	.631**	.000	.576**	.000	.632**	.000
Research-based Support System	.569**	.000	.544**	.000	.573**	.000	.585**	.000

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Research-based support further strengthens project implementation, especially in assessment and monitoring ($r = .585$). This underscores the importance of evidence-based practices in education, as advocated by Van Dyk et al. (2019). The consistent correlations across all dimensions highlight the positive relationship between leadership support and project outcomes.

These findings suggest that instructional leadership support significantly improves the implementation of community-based reading projects. Investing in such support systems enhances educators' skills in assessment, monitoring, and reaching project beneficiaries, ensuring the effectiveness of reading initiatives.

3.4. Challenges Encountered by the Respondents

The study identified significant challenges in implementing community-based reading projects, with "limited parental support and involvement" being the most prevalent issue (weighted mean 3.31), consistent with Hornby and Lafaele's (2023) emphasis on parental involvement in education. "Limited funds and financial sources" had the lowest mean (3.08), suggesting that while financial issues exist, they are less critical, echoing Dueda et al.'s (2022) research on utilizing funds and community partnerships to mitigate financial limitations.

Table 10. Challenges Encountered by the Respondents in the Implementation of Community-based Reading Projects

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Limited funds and financial sources		3.08	E
Limited parental support and involvement		3.31	E
Limited support from community leaders and members		3.27	E
Severity of reading disabilities of learners		3.22	E
Remoteness or distance of learners' residences or communities where the reading projects are conducted		3.20	E
Limited trainings for teachers on the practices to support the implementation of community-based reading projects		3.22	E
Poor attendance or absenteeism among the pupil-beneficiaries of community-based reading projects		3.23	E
Doubts on the transparency of results of reading assessments for community-based reading projects		3.23	E
Average Weighted Mean		3.22	E
Rating Scale:		Descriptive Interpretation:	
3.25 – 4.00		Highly Encountered (HE)	
2.50 – 3.24		Encountered (E)	
1.75 – 2.49		Seldom Encountered (SE)	
1.00 – 1.74		Not Encountered (NE)	

The overall weighted mean of 3.22 suggests these challenges are notable but not overwhelming, highlighting the need for strategies to boost parental involvement, community resources, and effective fund use. These findings point to the importance of developing outcomes-based strategies that increase engagement and outreach. The challenges, including limited funds, parental support, and logistical issues, align with those in

related studies by Mauhay et al. (2022), Idulog et al. (2023), Pocaan et al. (2022), and Ladines (2023). However, this study focuses on challenges specific to outcome-based approaches, emphasizing the need to address financial constraints, teacher training, and transparency in assessments to improve program success.

3.5. Suggested Innovation to Improve the Implementation of Community-based Reading Projects

"PROJECT WE CARE (Weaving Excellence through Collaborative Approaches for Reading Enhancement)" was developed based on the study's findings on the Outcome-based Approach to Community-Based Reading Projects in San Vicente-San Lorenzo Ruiz District (Appendix L). The proposal aims to enhance community-based reading projects and improve literacy outcomes by addressing key areas such as training, mentoring, quality assurance, and research integration.

The project tackles limited parental involvement, a major challenge identified by the study and supported by Hornby and Lafaele (2023), through various initiatives. These include parent workshops, a parent-teacher communication platform, family reading nights, and differentiated reading activities for all learners. The proposal also offers one-on-one tutoring and small group interventions for at-risk readers, addressing equity issues and building trust with parents.

To ensure sustainability and continuous improvement, PROJECT WE CARE incorporates strategies such as grant writing, community partnerships, and a monitoring committee led by master teachers. By creating multiple pathways for involvement and grounding its approach in solid research and best practices, the proposal aims to enhance parental engagement and student literacy outcomes in the district.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

The study reveals partial implementation of instructional leadership support systems in the San Vicente-San Lorenzo Ruiz District, with gaps in training programs, mentoring, quality assurance, and research-based support systems. Community-based reading projects show limited inclusivity and reach, with partial implementation of tasks, activities, and assessment practices. However, significant positive correlations between instructional leadership support and the implementation of community-based reading projects underscore the critical role of comprehensive leadership support in enhancing literacy initiatives.

Key challenges include limited parental support and involvement, highlighting the importance of community engagement in reading initiatives. The development of "PROJECT WE CARE" demonstrates the potential for an outcomes-based approach to enhance literacy outcomes through comprehensive volunteer training, ongoing mentorship, and robust quality assurance mechanisms. This multifaceted approach incorporates collaborative partnerships, structured training, community engagement, and data-driven decision-making.

Recommendations include reviewing and enhancing training programs, expanding reading projects to cover a wider range of grade-level skills and learner groups, strengthening quality assurance and mentoring efforts, and implementing targeted interventions to improve parental involvement and secure financial resources. Future research should explore the long-term impact of "PROJECT WE CARE" and similar initiatives, focusing on the sustainability of outcomes-based approaches and the continuous improvement of community-based reading projects through longitudinal studies and best practice development.

Acknowledgments

I gratefully acknowledge the divine guidance of the Almighty God, whose grace illuminated my path and sustained my spirit throughout this journey of discovery and learning. My deepest gratitude goes to Dr. Ela

N. Regondola, EdD, my esteemed research adviser and statistician. Your unwavering commitment, profound insights, and invaluable guidance have been instrumental in shaping every aspect of this research. Your mentorship has enriched my academic journey and inspired me to strive for excellence. I am indebted to the members of the Thesis Advisory Committee: Dr. Erlinda J. Porcincula, PhD; Dr. Nomelita S. Lo, EdD; Dr. Helen B. Abordo, DPM; and the esteemed Dean of the Graduate School, Dr. Sonia S. Carbonell, PhD. Your collective wisdom, constructive feedback, and encouragement have significantly strengthened this study. To Excelsa F. Buan, my school principal, I express heartfelt appreciation for your unwavering support, understanding, and belief in the significance of this research. To the dedicated school heads and teachers at public elementary schools and Barangay Council Committee of Education in the San Vicente-San Lorenzo Ruiz District, Camarines Norte, your collaboration and willingness to participate in this study are deeply appreciated. Your invaluable insights and contributions have enriched the depth and relevance of my research findings. Lastly, to my beloved family, cherished loved ones, supportive friends, and esteemed colleagues, your enduring patience, encouragement, and unwavering belief in my capabilities have been a constant source of strength. Your presence in my life has made this journey not only academically fulfilling but also personally enriching and memorable. This research would not have been possible without the collective support and inspiration of each individual mentioned above. I am profoundly grateful for the privilege to undertake this scholarly endeavor, guided by the wisdom and encouragement of these exceptional individuals and cherished loved ones.

References

- Bajaj, S. (2023). *Outcome based education vs. Traditional education: key differences*. SoftwareSuggest Blog. Retrieved <https://tinyurl.com/mr4amjas>.
- Biggs, J., Tang, C., & Kennedy, G. (2022). *Teaching for quality learning at university 5e*. McGraw-hill education (UK). <https://tinyurl.com/4mxm8bmt>
- Duca, S. R., Zimmerman, E. B., Vaughn, L. M., Dias, S., & Harris, J. (2022). A guide to selecting participatory research methods based on project and partnership goals. *Journal of Participatory Research Methods*, 3(1). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.35844/001c.32605>
- Duke, N. K., & Cartwright, K. B. (2021). The science of reading progresses: Communicating advances beyond the simple view of reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56, S25-S44. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.411>
- Elmore, R. F. (2019). *School reform from the inside out: Policy, practice, and performance*. Harvard Education Press. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED568807>
- Finlay, M. L. (2020). *Perceptions of reading academic intervention services and the effectiveness of a district-wide remedial reading program*. St. John's University (New York). Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/3bcw6y4p>
- Fletcher, J. M., Savage, R., & Vaughn, S. (2021). A commentary on Bowers (2020) and the role of phonics instruction in reading. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33(3), 1249-1274. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09580-8>
- Gaskin, S. (2022). *Outcomes-based assessment. The key to teaching critical thinking*. www.pearson.com. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/yc6njnt9>.
- Greenhow, C., Graham, C. R., & Koehler, M. J. (2022). Foundations of online learning: Challenges and opportunities. *Educational Psychologist*, 57(3), 131-147. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1080/00461520.2022.2090364>
- Gustavus.edu (n.d.). *What is community-based learning? - bridging theory and practice | John S. Kendall Center for Engaged Learning*. Retrieved from <https://gustavus.edu/kendallcenter/faculty.php>.
- Hall, C., Dahl-Leonard, K., Cho, E., Solari, E. J., Capin, P., Conner, C. L., ... & Kehoe, K. F. (2023). Forty years of reading intervention research for elementary students with or at risk for dyslexia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 58(2), 285-312. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.477>
- Hallahan, D. P., Pullen, P. C., Kauffman, J. M., & Badar, J. (2020). Exceptional learners. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of education*. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/39cbupmh>
- Hennessy, S., D'Angelo, S., McIntyre, N., Koomar, S., Kreimeia, A., Cao, L., ... & Zubairi, A. (2022). Technology use for teacher professional development in low-and middle-income countries: A systematic review. *Computers and Education Open*, 3, 100080. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2022.100080>
- Hicks, J. (2018). *The effectiveness of reading interventions for middle school students with learning disabilities* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University). <https://tinyurl.com/yc484cpr>
- Hornby, G., & Lafaele, R. (2023). Barriers to parental involvement in education: An explanatory model. In *Mapping the Field* (pp. 121-136). Routledge. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2010.488049>
- Idulog, M. V., Gadiano, R., Toledo, E., Hermosada, M., Casaldon, H., Mariposa, M., ... & Bautista, R. (2023). Filipino students' reading

- abilities: A note on the challenges and potential areas for improvement. *International Journal of Education and Teaching Zone*, 2(2), 233–242. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.57092/ijetz.v2i2.128>
- Johnson, C. C., Walton, J. B., Strickler, L., & Elliott, J. B. (2023). Online teaching in K-12 education in the United States: A systematic review. *Review of Educational Research*, 93(3), 353–411. <https://tinyurl.com/3jdtmncz>
- Ladines, J. H. C. (2022). Assessment on the implementation of reading intervention program in the new normal. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 104(1). <https://doi.org/10.47119/ijrp1001041720223544>
- Mandinach, E. B., & Schildkamp, K. (2021). Misconceptions about data-based decision making in education: An exploration of the literature. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 69, 100842. <https://tinyurl.com/4j35eaks>
- Mauhay, R. C. A., & Villena, A. C. D. (2022). Impact study on literacy and reading program among pupils of SHL restoration village. *Sustainable Development*, 10(1), 27–33. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/4wbfxzs5>
- National Reading Panel. (2020). Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching children to read. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. <https://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/product/247>
- Overstreet, M. (2020). *Innovative community reading programs spread the love of literacy*. BOOK RIOT. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/4cfkyk5v>
- Panadero, E., & Lipnevich, A. A. (2022). A review of feedback models and typologies: Towards an integrative model of feedback elements. *Educational Research Review*, 35, 100416. <https://tinyurl.com/47dbxca8>
- Pocan, J. M., Bailon, L. L., & Pocan, J. P. T. (2022). Strategic reading intervention for left-behind learners in the Philippines. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 25(2), 367–378. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v25i2.5087>
- Pressley, T., Allington, R. L., & Pressley, M. (2023). Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching. Guilford Publications. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/yuwfwcbz>
- Savin-Baden, M., & Major, C. (2023). Qualitative research: The essential guide to theory and practice. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003377986>
- Schildkamp, K., van der Kleij, F. M., Heitink, M. C., Kippers, W. B., & Veldkamp, B. P. (2020). Formative assessment: A systematic review of critical teacher prerequisites for classroom practice. *International journal of educational research*, 103, 101602. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101602>
- Setyaningsih, W. H., & Kharismawati, M. (2020). The existence of the reading community and its effect in improving human resources quality. *KnE Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v4i12.7620>
- Sims, S., & Fletcher-Wood, H. (2021). Identifying the characteristics of effective teacher professional development: a critical review. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, 32(1), 47–63. <https://tinyurl.com/y2ezp28z>
- Smale-Jacobse, A. E., Meijer, A., Helms-Lorenz, M., & Maulana, R. (2019). Differentiated instruction in secondary education: A systematic review of research evidence. *Frontiers in psychology*, 10, 2366. Retrieved from <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31824362/>
- Taseer, N. A., Khan, S. A., Yasir, W., Kishwer, R., & Iqbal, K. (2023). Impact of Family Involvement on Academic Achievement at Higher Secondary Level. *Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 3(2), 1–10. <https://tinyurl.com/4mcv7bfa>
- Van Alten, D. C., Phielix, C., Janssen, J., & Kester, L. (2019). Effects of flipping the classroom on learning outcomes and satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 28, 100281. <https://tinyurl.com/2ux5aytx>
- Van Dyk, N., Behan, F. P., & Whiteley, R. (2019). Including the Nordic hamstring exercise in injury prevention programmes halves the rate of hamstring injuries: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 8459 athletes. *British journal of sports medicine*, 53(21), 1362–1370. <https://tinyurl.com/2rtwwesc>
- Vinterek, M., Winberg, M., Tegmark, M., Alatalo, T., & Liberg, C. (2022). The decrease of school related reading in Swedish compulsory school—trends between 2007 and 2017. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 66(1), 119–133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2020.1833247>
- Weikert, D. E. (2018). *Effectiveness of reading intervention program types in increasing comprehension for intermediate school students* (Doctoral dissertation, Concordia University (Oregon)). <https://tinyurl.com/wa7ezrt6>
- Yuan, R., Liao, W., Wang, Z., Kong, J., & Zhang, Y. (2022). How do English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) teachers perceive and engage with critical thinking: A systematic review from 2010 to 2020. *Thinking skills and creativity*, 43, 101002. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2022.101002>