

Enhancing Reading Outcomes through Evidence-Based SIPs: Contextualizing Management Intervention Framework

Maya, Joanne Carandang,^a Eden C. Callo²

^ajoanne.maya@deped.gov.ph, eden.callo@lspu.edu.ph

Laguna State Polytechnic University San Pablo Campus, San Pablo City, 4000, Philippines

DepEd-San Isidro National High School(Malvar), San Isidro Malvar 4233, Philippines

Abstract

This study employed a descriptive-correlational design to examine how School Improvement Plan (SIP) strategies in 23 junior high schools affect student reading outcomes. Surveys from administrators, teachers, and parents measured how SIP elements—input, planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation—influenced reading motivation, habits, and engagement. The main finding was that integrating evidence-based SIP strategies into daily school routines, particularly through institutionalization and ongoing capacity-building, led to significant improvements in reading outcomes. Students showed increased interest and engagement in reading, but regular habits still lagged. The study found that having SIP resources alone is insufficient; integrating them into school culture and providing continuous training are essential for reading achievement. Stakeholder consensus confirmed that collaboration through SIP is vital to fostering literacy. No literature was cited in this summary. Keywords: school improvement, reading motivation, institutionalization, student engagement, evidence-based strategies, junior high schools, literacy programs.

Keywords: *School Improvement Plan; Reading Motivation; Institutionalization; Student Engagement; Literacy Programs*

1. Introduction

According to Republic Act No. 9155, commonly known as the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, this strategy seeks to promote School-Based Management (SBM) by devolving educational governance to schools. It sought to empower school leaders and workers, boost community participation and involvement, and improve the responsiveness, efficiency, and effectiveness of education delivery by implementing a more strategic and transparent school planning and communication process. Within this policy framework, the School Improvement Plan (SIP) served as the foundation for educational planning and accountability at the school level.

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) is a three-year strategic plan that outlines a school's primary goals, evidence-based treatments, and performance targets. School administrators, teachers, parents, students, and community stakeholders collaborated to create SIPs that ensure shared responsibility for student learning outcomes. The SIP's initiatives include projects within the Continuous Improvement Program (CIP), the establishment of Learning Action Cells (LACs) for professional collaboration, and the development of the School Report Card (SRC) as a platform for transparency and accountability. As a result, SIP is a dynamic framework that takes data-driven decision-making and stakeholder participation into account to improve quality and equity in education. The evidence-based, learner-centered paradigm ensured that all educational initiatives led to improved learning outcomes, such as higher student engagement and better academic performance across diverse student populations.

Despite all of these methodical efforts, the challenge of low reading performance among secondary pupils persists. Reading is an essential skill that significantly impacts scholastic progress across all subject areas. However, many Filipino kids attend high school without having achieved the required reading competency in elementary school. Learners, commonly referred to as "stale readers," continue to struggle with comprehension, fluency, and vocabulary

development, resulting in difficulty understanding topic content, diminished academic motivation, and an increased chance of school failure or dropout.

As a teacher and researcher, I have seen how difficult it is to make significant changes in kids' reading skills. Secondary schools often place less emphasis on reading education than primary schools, where literacy development is a primary instructional goal. Secondary educators face a challenge in addressing the curriculum while also accommodating pupils who have yet to master fundamental reading skills. Taken together, these issues indicate a lack of system-wide and school-wide reading intervention frameworks linked to existing SIPs. Teachers are frequently permitted to devise their own tactics, resulting in inconsistent practices that may not be evidence-based or connected with overall school goals.

Furthermore, schools sometimes face challenges such as inadequate resources, high class sizes, and content-heavy curricula, making it difficult to maintain customized reading treatments. These factors highlight the critical need to contextualize evidence-based reading interventions within the SIP process, allowing schools to strategically align goals, allocate resources, track progress, and institutionalize practices that improve literacy outcomes. Without a consistent, data-driven approach, schools risk undertaking fragmented efforts that fail to address the root causes of poor reading performance.

The situation necessitates fast and comprehensive action. If secondary pupils' reading issues are not addressed, the gap between proficient and struggling readers will widen, harming not only academic progress but also long-term social and economic opportunities. SIPs can be used more effectively by school leaders, teachers, and other stakeholders to address this challenge, bridge the literacy gap, and improve overall educational quality.

Thus, the purpose of this dissertation, "Reading Outcomes in Evidence-Based School Improvement Plans (SIPs): Contextualizing an Intervention Framework," was to develop and propose a contextualized framework to better integrate successful reading treatments into school improvement plans. It aims to assess the current SIP practices of selected secondary schools in Batangas Province's District III, investigate how these practices influence reading outcomes, and identify how goal alignment, resource planning, stakeholder engagement, and instructional leadership can all work together to improve reading skills.

Finally, this study aimed to improve teachers' and school leaders' ability to create, administer, and sustain evidence-based reading programs that are responsive to learners' different needs. Schools can ensure that their development efforts yield meaningful, measurable increases in literacy by using data- and research-based SIP methods. This study was intended to add to the ongoing national discourse on school reform, accountability, and equal access to excellent education, in accordance with the ideals outlined in Republic Act No. 9155 and the Department of Education's commitment to learner-centered governance.

Statement of the Problem

The study aimed to identify an evidence-informed school improvement plan among principals, teachers, and parents to enhance students' reading outcomes.

It sought to answer the following questions:

1. How do the respondents assess the level of effectiveness of the Evidence-Based School Improvement Plan strategies in terms of:
 - 1.1 Input
 - 1.1.1 Evidence gathering;
 - 1.1.2 Context mapping; and
 - 1.1.3 Stakeholder engagement?
 - 1.2 Plan
 - 1.2.1 Goal Alignment;
 - 1.2.2 Strategic Design; and
 - 1.2.3 Resource Planning?
 - 1.3 Implementation
 - 1.3.1 Instructional Leadership
 - 1.3.2 Teacher Engagement; and
 - 1.3.3 Stakeholder Support?
 - 1.4 Monitoring and Evaluation
 - 1.4.1 Program Tracking; and
 - 1.4.2 Data Reflected Sessions?
2. What is the level of strategy of reading outcomes as perceived by participants in terms of:
 - 2.1 Reading Motivation

- 2.2 Reading Habit
- 2.3 Reading Engagement
- 3. Is there a significant relationship between evidence-based SIP implementation and reading outcomes of students in terms of:
 - 3.1 Reading Motivation
 - 3.2 Reading Habit
 - 3.3 Reading Engagement
- 4. Does institutionalization mediate the effectiveness of Evidence-based SIP Strategies, and on Reading Outcomes?
- 5. Which Evidence-based SIP strategies significantly affect the students' reading outcomes?

2. Methodology

This study employed a quantitative research design to examine the relationship between Evidence-Based SIP strategies and reading outcomes. Respondents included school heads, teachers, and parents from selected secondary schools in District III, Batangas Province.

A researcher-made questionnaire was used to measure SIP components (input, plan, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, institutionalization) and reading outcomes (motivation, habit, engagement). The instrument underwent validation and reliability testing.

Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and regression analysis to determine relationships and predictive effects among variables. Mediation analysis was also conducted to examine the role of institutionalization.

1. Results and Discussion

The study's findings on how Evidence-Based School Improvement Plans (EB-SIPs) enhance reading outcomes.

Table 4
Summary of the Level of Implementing Evidence Input

Input	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Evidence gathering	3.786	.3767	Extremely Effective
Context Mapping	3.714	.4281	Extremely Effective
Stakeholder Support	3.719	.3958	Extremely Effective
Overall	3.7396	.36058	Extremely Effective

Legend: 1.0-1.80 (slightly effective/Strongly Disagree 1.81-2.60 (Disagree/Moderately Effective), 2.61-3.20 (Moderately Agree/Very Effective), 3.21-4.00 (Agree/Extremely Effective)

Table 4 presents the summary level of implementing input: evidence gathering had the highest mean of 3.786 (SD = .3767) and was interpreted as extremely effective. This indicates that the school demonstrates practices for collecting, analyzing, and using data on students' reading performance to inform decision-making. This finding highlights that data-driven approaches are well established.

In contrast, context mapping has the lowest mean score of 3.714 (SD = .4281), which is interpreted as extremely effective. It suggests that while contextualizing strategies based on learners' environment and experiences is practiced. It is less emphasized than other input components, so further refinement of the tools accessible for contextual mapping is needed. It helps school teams identify local enablers and barriers to literacy development, so

interventions target actual needs rather than perceived gaps. Brakema et al (2021) and OECD (2016) suggest that systematic contextual inquiry permits schools to collect relevant evidence, student reading data, community profiles, and teacher capacity assessments to inform target planning. Include adapted local experiences and develop instruments to continue reading improvement.

In the researcher's teaching environment, input involves providing reading assessment procedures and developing an intervention plan or matrix to guide the implementation of reading strategies. This process is followed by engaging parents to help them understand their child's situation using the collected data.

In summary, the perception of the intervention framework's inputs, focusing on Evidence Gathering, Context Mapping, and Stakeholder Support, got an overall mean score of 3.7396 (SD = 0.36058), observed as extremely effective. This high score demonstrated that data gathering through assessments and well-planned strategies encourages parents and other stakeholders to participate and to help the school's literacy achievements.

The findings indicated that combining evidence-based practices, local context, and stakeholder involvement formed a strong foundation for the program. Recent studies reported that strong instructional inputs and supportive school systems were associated with improved reading outcomes (UNESCO, 2022).

Table 8
Summary of the Level of Implementing Evidence-Plan

Plan	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Goal Alignment	3.786	.3620	Extremely Effective
Strategic Design	3.725	.3908	Extremely Effective
Resource Planning	3.695	.4061	Extremely Effective
Overall Mean	3.7357	.35605	Extremely Effective

Table 8 presents a summary of the implementation of evidence-plan components and goal alignment, which had the highest mean score of 3.786 (SD = .3620) and was interpreted as extremely effective. This shows the school has strong alignment between its reading goals and classroom instructional practices. Objectives are clear, measurable, and consistently integrated into teaching and learning.

Resource planning has the lowest mean score, 3.695 (SD = .4061), and is perceived as extremely effective. This suggests that the allocation of resources, such as materials, training, and support systems, is evident but less emphasized than other planning components that require additional intervention materials and teacher training.

In summary, the data from the School Improvement Plan (SIP) on Goal Alignment, Strategic Design, and Resource Planning are perceived by respondents as extremely effective, with a mean score of 3.7357 (SD = 0.35605). Specifically, reading improvement targets are perceived as sensible, aligned with the reading strategies, personnel and material allocation, professional development, and monitoring processes, and with the school's objectives.

At the researcher's school, improving reading skills is a main goal in the School Improvement Plan (SIP). This focus builds on the recently launched ARAL Program. The school sets reading targets based on students' needs and uses proven reading strategies. Teachers have clear roles in running reading programs, and resources like reading proven modules, assessment tools, and intervention materials are provided to support effective teaching.

The findings suggested that goal alignment, strategic design, and resource allocation are coherently integrated. This supports the premise that well-structured planning processes are essential for achieving sustainable improvements in reading outcomes, as they provide clear direction, informed strategies, and sufficient support mechanisms (OECD, 2019).

Table 12***Summary of the Level of Implementation***

Implementation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Instructional Leadership	3.7173	.40776	Extremely Effective
Teachers Engagement	3.764	.3826	Extremely Effective
Stakeholder Support	3.669	.4246	Extremely Effective
Overall	3.7169	.36481	Extremely Effective

Legend: 1.0-1.80 (slightly effective/Strongly Disagree 1.81-2.60 (Disagree/Moderately Effective), 2.61-3.20 (Moderately Agree/Very Effective), 3.21-4.00 (Agree/Extremely Effective)

In contrast, stakeholder support has the lowest mean score of 3.669 (SD = .4246), perceived as extremely effective. This suggests that while parents, community members, and other stakeholders support reading initiatives, their level of engagement is less emphasized than that of teachers. It shows that stakeholder participation across contexts is infrequent due to their limited presence on the school premises. Despite this, the findings affirm that stakeholder support remains an important component of the planning process. However, there is still room to strengthen collaboration and partnerships to enhance the sustainability of reading programs.

In summary, the respondents' assessment of the Implementation component of the Evidence-Based School Improvement Plan (SIP), with a focus on instructional leadership, teacher engagement, and stakeholder support, is presented. The overall mean score of 3.7169 (SD = 0.36481) indicated that implementation was extremely effective, suggesting that the planned SIP strategies were not only well-designed but also carried out with a high degree of consistency and fidelity. This finding aligned with the study's conceptual framework, in which implementation served as the critical link between planning and actual improvements in reading outcomes. It further suggested that respondents shared a common perception that SIP practices were actively implemented in their respective schools.

The findings indicated that the Implementation component of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) was extremely effective. This was attributed to strong leadership, active teacher participation, and supportive stakeholder involvement, all of which work together as interconnected elements. This aligns with Systems Theory, which suggests that coordination among various components of the school system leads to improved outcomes.

International evidence supports this, indicating that schools with strong instructional leadership, collaborative teaching methods, and active stakeholder engagement are more likely to achieve sustained improvements in reading performance (UNESCO, 2022; OECD, 2019).

With more guided leadership, focused goals for teaching reading literacy, activating teachers' responsiveness to teaching reading, and encouraging consistent collaboration through real experiences with parents to aid reading advocacy, true collaboration wouldn't be impossible.

Table 13 shows that the highest level of effectiveness within the Program Tracking is observed in Indicator 5, with a mean of 3.78 (SD = .430). This suggests that, in the monitoring process, teachers actively participate in evaluation discussions. This high score reflects a healthy, collaborative culture in which educators are not just subjects of monitoring but integral partners in reflecting on program outcomes.

Table 15***Summary of the Level of Implementing Evidence-Monitoring and Evaluation***

Monitoring and Evaluation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Program Tracking	3.7173	.40776	Extremely Effective
Data Use and Reflection	3.739	.402	Extremely Effective
Overall	3.752	.381	Extremely Effective

Legend: 1.0-1.80 (slightly effective/Strongly Disagree 1.81-2.60 (Disagree/Moderately Effective), 2.61-3.20 (Moderately Agree/Very Effective), 3.21-4.00 (Agree/Extremely Effective)

Table 15 presents a summary of the level of evidence-monitoring and evaluation components, with the highest mean of 3.739 (SD = .402), indicating extreme effectiveness. This indicates that the school effectively utilizes assessment data and reflection processes to inform instructional decisions and improve reading programs.

In the program tracking, the lowest mean of 3.7173 (SD = .40776) is interpreted as extremely effective. This implies that program tracking remains essential to ensuring continuity and consistency in the implementation of reading initiatives. Although it was consistently implemented, respondents perceived it as a routine or technical process rather than a highly visible instructional practice.

Overall, the respondents' assessment of the Monitoring and Evaluation component of the Evidence-Based School Improvement Plan (SIP) focuses on program tracking and data-driven reflection processes. The overall mean of 3.752 (SD = 0.381) indicated that monitoring and evaluation practices were extremely effective, suggesting that schools had established systematic mechanisms for tracking, reviewing, and improving reading interventions. This result reflected the study's framework, in which monitoring and evaluation served as a critical feedback loop, ensuring continuous improvement in SIP implementation.

In summary, the results indicated that both program tracking and data reflection processes functioned effectively, supporting continuous improvement in reading interventions. The integration of systematic monitoring and collaborative reflection demonstrated a mature implementation of evidence-based practices, in which feedback was actively used to refine strategies. Research further supported that schools with strong monitoring and evaluation systems—characterized by regular data use, collaborative analysis, and responsive adjustments—demonstrated higher levels of student achievement, particularly in literacy (OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2022).

Additionally, the findings indicated that tracking mechanisms, data use, and reflective practices were well coordinated and contributed to the sustainability of reading programs. From a systems perspective, this component ensured that the SIP remained dynamic and responsive, rather than static. International evidence supported the view that effective monitoring and evaluation systems were a cornerstone of successful school improvement initiatives, enabling schools to translate plans into measurable learning gains (OECD, 2019).

Table 16
Summary of the Assessed Level of Implementation

Evidence-Based SIPS	Mean	SD	Interpretation
INPUT	3.7396	.36058	Extremely Effective
Evidence Gathering	3.786	.3767	Extremely Effective
Context Mapping	3.714	.4281	Extremely Effective
Stakeholder Support	3.719	.3958	Extremely Effective
PLAN	3.7357	.35605	Extremely Effective
Goal Alignment	3.786	.3620	Extremely Effective
Strat	3.725	.3908	Extremely Effective
Resource	3.695	.4061	Extremely Effective
IMPLEMENTATION	3.7169	.36481	Extremely Effective
Instructional Leadership	3.7173	.40776	Extremely Effective
Teachers Engagement	3.764	.3826	Extremely Effective
Strategic Design	3.669	.4246	Extremely Effective
Monitoring and Evaluation	3.752	.381	Extremely Effective
Program Tracking	3.766	.3907	Extremely Effective
Data Reflected Session	3.739	.402	Extremely Effective
Overall	3.731	.347	Extremely Effective

Legend: 1.0-1.80 (slightly effective/Strongly Disagree 1.81-2.60 (Disagree/Moderately Effective), 2.61-3.20 (Moderately Agree/Very Effective), 3.21-4.00 (Agree/Extremely Effective)

Table 16 summarizes the assessed levels of implementation. The overall indicators of the Evidence-Based School Improvement Plan (EB-SIP) strategies Monitoring and Evaluation had the highest mean of 3.752 (SD = .381), which is perceived as extremely effective. This indicates that the school demonstrates strong practices in assessing, tracking, and utilizing data to improve reading programs. The result suggests that systematic monitoring, coupled with reflective use of data, plays a crucial role in ensuring that reading interventions are continuously improved.

Implementation has the lowest mean score (M = 3.710, SD = .4022), indicating it is extremely effective. It implies that while practices are present, such as teachers' engagement, stakeholders support their consistency; within the system, it may still be developing.

In conclusion, the findings indicate that all components of EB-SIP strategies—input, plan, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation are perceived as extremely effective, with an overall mean of 3.731 (SD = .347). This implies that a well-functioning, integrated system of school-improvement practices supports reading outcomes, with each component contributing meaningfully.

Part II. Mediation: Institutionalization

Table 19
Summary of Assessed Level of Institutionalization

Institutionalization	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Capacity Building	3.718	.4067	Extremely Effective
Policy Integrity and Replication	3.703	.4396	Extremely Effective
Overall	3.710	.4022	Extremely Effective

Legend: 1.0-1.80 (slightly effective/Strongly Disagree 1.81-2.60 (Disagree/Moderately Effective), 2.61-3.20 (Moderately Agree/Very Effective), 3.21-4.00 (Agree/Extremely Effective)

Table 19 summarizes the assessed level of the Institutionalization component; capacity building has the highest mean score of 3.718 (SD = .4067), indicating it is extremely effective. This implies that the school actively supports professional development and continuous learning opportunities for teachers, thereby strengthening their ability to implement effective reading strategies and improve instruction.

On the other hand, policy integrity and replication have the lowest mean, 3.703 (SD = .4396), which is perceived as extremely effective. This indicates that, while policies supporting reading programs are in place, there is a need for consistency in their replication and institutional implementation.

Taken together, the results indicated that both capacity building and policy integrity functioned effectively as mechanisms for sustaining reading improvement initiatives. The integration of professional development, coaching, and policy alignment reflected a systemic approach to school improvement, where practices were continuously reinforced and institutionalized. Systems Theory, which emphasized that sustainable improvement occurred when all components of the system—people, processes, and policies—worked cohesively. Additionally, the findings affirmed the Theory of Change underlying the study, which posited that continuous capacity development and policy support were necessary to achieve long-term improvements in reading outcomes.

In summary, the extremely effective rating of Institutionalization, with a mean of 3.710 (SD = .4022), suggested that schools had established structures that supported the sustainability and scalability of evidence-based reading interventions.

It is perceived to have not only been implemented but also embedded in the school's culture and operations, increasing the likelihood of sustained literacy gains. As supported by global evidence, school improvement efforts that were institutionalized through continuous professional development and policy alignment were more likely to produce lasting impacts on student achievement (OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2022). Therefore, the results affirmed that the SIP framework and its institutionalization should be adapted and refined to support long-term, sustainable improvements in reading performance across the entire school in Batangas province.

Overall, the respondents' assessment of the Institutionalization component is presented, with a focus on capacity building, policy integrity, and replication mechanisms. The overall mean of 3.710 (SD = 0.4022) indicated that institutionalization was extremely effective, suggesting that reading-related initiatives were not only implemented but also sustained and embedded in school systems.

These findings reflected the study's conceptual framework, in which institutionalization represented the final stage of the SIP cycle—ensuring that effective practices were sustained, scaled, and integrated into long-term school operations.

The government recently established the Aral Program in compliance with DepEd requirements. Schools, especially in Batangas District 3, followed. What was best about this program was that it was conducted year-round and constantly monitored. Although the program still needs to be polished to meet each reader's needs.

Part III. Reading Outcomes

Table 23

Summary of the Perceived Level of Reading Outcomes

Reading Outcomes	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
Reading Motivation	3.393	.6610	Excellent
Reading Habit	3.327	.6977	Excellent
Reading Engagement	3.457	.5967	Excellent
Overall	3.392	.614	Excellent

Legend: 1.0-1.80 (Strongly Disagree/Poor), 1.81-2.60 (Disagree/Average), 2.61-3.20 (Moderately Agree/Good), 3.21-4.00 (Agree/Excellent)

Table 23 presents a summary of perceived reading outcomes. The reading engagement had the highest mean, 3.457 (SD = .5967), rated as excellent, as it falls within the 3.21-4.00 range. This indicates that students demonstrate a high level of active involvement in reading activities, reflecting increased interest, confidence, and participation. The relatively moderate standard deviation suggests that while most learners exhibit positive engagement, there are still slight variations in how students experience and respond to reading activities. The result suggests that reading programs and interventions are effective in fostering learner engagement, a key factor in improving reading performance.

In contrast, the reading habit has the lowest mean, 3.327 (SD = .6977), which is interpreted as excellent. It also has the highest standard deviation, indicating greater variability in students' responses. This suggests that while some learners have developed consistent reading habits, others may still struggle to maintain regular reading practices. The findings imply that reading behaviors are generally positive; there is less consistency in establishing sustained reading routines among students, highlighting an area that may benefit from further reinforcement and support.

In summary, the overall mean for reading outcomes is 3.392 (SD = .614). These findings indicated that students demonstrated excellent reading outcomes, particularly in engagement and motivation, with slightly lower but still strong development of reading habits. These results suggested that the Evidence-Based SIP strategies were effective in influencing learners' reading behaviors, supporting the study's assumption that well-implemented school improvement plans could lead to measurable improvements in literacy outcomes. From a theoretical perspective, active engagement, meaningful experiences, and continuous support contributed to improved learning outcomes. Moreover, global evidence indicates that comprehensive literacy interventions that integrate motivation, engagement, and habit formation are more likely to produce sustained improvements in reading performance (UNESCO, 2022; OECD, 2019). Thus, the results validated the SIP framework's effectiveness in addressing the reading challenges identified in this study.

This finding suggested that the interventions embedded in the SIP contributed meaningfully to learners' literacy development, particularly by fostering interest, participation, and persistence in reading activities. The relatively moderate standard deviation, however, suggested some variation in student experiences that may have been influenced by contextual and individual factors.

Test of Correlations between Variables

The next table presents the correlations between SIP implementations' inputs and reading outcomes, followed by the correlations between SIP implementations' plans and reading outcomes, SIP implementations and

reading outcomes, SIP implementations' monitoring and evaluation and reading outcomes, and SIP implementations' institutionalization and reading outcomes.

Table 24***Relationship between Evidence-Based SIP Strategies and Reading Outcomes***

Evidence-Based SIP Implementation	Reading Outcomes			
	Reading Motivation	Habit	Reading Engagement	Overall Reading Outcomes
Evidence gathering	.302**	.222**	.287**	.285**
Context Mapping	.430**	.342**	.420**	.420**
Stakeholder Engagement	.404**	.368**	.404**	.415**
Overall Input	.423**	.347**	.414**	.417**

Table 24 presents the relationship between evidence-based SIP strategies and reading outcomes. The input component showed that evidence gathering has a weak positive relationship with overall reading outcomes ($r = .285$) and with motivation ($r = .302$), habit ($r = .222$), and engagement ($r = .287$). This indicates that while data collection is crucial, its impact on reading outcomes is largely determined by how the collected data is utilized in practice. Furthermore, it suggests that data-driven approaches can guide the development of contextualized, meaningful reading interventions to address the reading gaps identified by the assessment results.

In contrast, context mapping ($r = .420$) and stakeholder engagement ($r = .415$) both exhibited moderate positive relationships with overall reading outcomes, indicating a stronger influence. This suggests that creating contextualized interventions not only for students but also for implementers like teachers and stakeholders like parents is integrated in conducting these initiative changes. Teachers who are engaged in creating change for students' development will seek training to better carry out their role as educational implementers.

The overall Input component ($r = .417$) also fell within the moderate range, suggesting that when data are interpreted in the learners' context and supported by stakeholder participation, their impact becomes more evident. This pattern supported the argument that data alone is insufficient unless it is contextualized and translated into responsive interventions (Schildkamp, 2019; OECD, 2019).

Table 25
Relationship between Evidence-Based SIP Strategies and Reading Outcomes

Evidence-Based SIP Implementation	Reading Outcomes			
	Motivation	Habit	Engagement	Overall Reading Outcomes
Goal Alignment	.413**	.353**	.390**	.408**
Strategic Design	.399**	.336**	.412**	.404**
Resource Planning	.436**	.402**	.418**	.444**
Overall Plan	.452**	.395**	.442**	.455**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 25 shows the relationship between evidence-based strategies and reading outcomes. Goal alignment and students' reading outcomes showed a moderate positive correlation ($r = .353$ to $.413$, $p < .01$).

This suggests that when school reading goals align with classroom objectives and student needs, there are noticeable improvements in reading motivation, habits, engagement, and overall outcomes. The findings highlight the coherence between school planning and classroom instruction for enhancing learner performance. The clear goals provide direction and consistency, allowing teachers to focus on specific literacy outcomes, which supports previous research indicating that well-aligned goals improve instructional clarity and student achievement (Liu & Yun, 2023; Meyer et al., 2021).

In strategic design, the results show a moderate statistically significant positive relationship with reading outcomes ($r = .336$ to $.412$, $p < .01$). This suggests that the importance of planning, particularly the use of research-based strategies, differentiated instruction, and stakeholder-informed approaches, had a meaningful influence on students' reading development. Schools that used evidence-based strategic planning demonstrated instructional freedom to support diverse learners and sustain students' reading engagement. However, the slightly lower correlation with reading habits ($r = .336$) implied that while strategic design contributed to structured interventions, its effect on habitual reading behaviors required longer-term reinforcement. This finding aligned with the idea that effective planning needed to be coupled with daily reading time to show observable reading improvements among students. (Smith & Johnson, 2021; Fullan, 2019).

In resource planning, the strongest correlations among the plan components, with r values ranging from $.402$ to $.444$ ($p < .01$), indicate a moderately strong positive relationship with reading outcomes. It reveals the importance of allocating adequate resources—such as instructional materials, teacher training, and external support—to facilitate effective literacy programs. The findings suggest that when schools invest in reading-related resources, learners are more likely to exhibit improved motivation, engagement, and reading performance. Teachers with well-crafted materials and professional support enhance the quality of their instruction and create more opportunities for meaningful reading experiences for students. The research cited indicates that resource allocation is a tool for school improvement and development when it aligns with identified learning needs and instructional priorities (Henry, 2019; Ramos et al., 2024).

In summary, the plan was determined to be moderate and positive, and it had a statistically significant relationship with reading outcomes ($r = .395$ to $.455$, $p < .01$), indicating that well-structured planning contributed to literacy development. The higher correlation with overall reading outcomes ($r = .455$) suggested that planning processes, if effectively designed and implemented, provided a strong foundation for improving student performance. Hence, the findings showed that planning alone was not enough; its effectiveness was maximized when carried out through consistent, sustained practices within the school. Research indicated that planning was a critical starting point, but its effectiveness depended on how well it was implemented and integrated into instructional systems (Bryk et al., 2015; Pont et al., 2020).

Table 26
Relationship between Evidence-Based SIP Strategies and Reading Outcomes

Evidence-Based SIP Implementation	Reading Outcomes			
	Reading Motivation	Reading Habit	Reading Engagement	Overall Reading Outcomes
Instructional Leadership	.421**	.357**	.422**	.422**
Teacher Engagement	.370**	.338**	.392**	.388**
Stakeholder Support	.482**	.469**	.472**	.503**
Overall Implementation	.473**	.433**	.477**	.488**

***Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2 tailed).*

In Table 26, the Implementation results reveal consistently moderate positive relationships, with the overall component obtaining $r = .488$, approaching the upper end of the moderate range.

Stakeholder support ($r = .503$) showed the perfect positive association. This was followed by instructional leadership ($r = .422$) and teacher engagement ($r = .388$). These findings suggested that School Improvement Plan implementation was positively associated with stakeholders, particularly parents and the community, having an active involvement in their child's education, and together with innovative leadership, along with teachers working collaboratively in school reading initiatives. The results highlighted that implementation was not merely a process to do but a shared responsibility that extended beyond the classroom.

To enhance the effectiveness of their support, parents felt more engaged when they were actively shown ways to assist and were encouraged to ask how they could help. This was supported by studies showing that family engagement, collaborative teaching practices, and strong leadership significantly improved literacy outcomes (Epstein, 2018; Hargreaves & O'Connor, 2018).

Reading habits are widely recognized as an important factor in students' academic performance and literacy development. Abid et al. (2023) found that students who read regularly tend to achieve higher academically and have better comprehension. The study also showed that reading habits are closely connected to study skills and learning engagement, highlighting their importance for academic success.

Table 27
Relationship between Evidence-Based SIP Strategies and Reading Outcomes

Evidence-Based SIP Implementation	Reading Outcomes			
	Reading Motivation	Reading Habit	Reading Engagement	Overall Reading Outcomes
Program Tracking	.438**	.385**	.447**	.448**
Data Reflected Sessions	.445**	.390**	.444**	.451**
Overall Monitoring & Evaluation	.459**	.403**	.463**	.467**

***Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Table 27 shows the relationship between evidence-based SIP strategies and reading outcomes. The Monitoring and Evaluation component and data-reflection sessions show a relatively strong correlation ($r = .451$), indicating that data reflection and analysis play an active role in improving reading outcomes. This difference indicates that monitoring is more effective when it goes beyond recording information and actively involves making instructional adjustments.

On the other hand, program tracking shows the lowest correlation, particularly with reading habit ($r = .385$, $p < .01$), which falls within the weak-to-moderate positive range. While still statistically significant, this comparatively lower value suggests that tracking alone—such as documenting progress or ensuring program continuity—may not be sufficient to influence students' consistent reading behaviors directly.

Overall, the Monitoring and Evaluation component, encompassing both program tracking and data-informed sessions, shows a consistent, moderate, positive relationship with reading outcomes ($r = .403$ to $.467$, $p < .01$). The results suggest that data reflection strengthens its impact more than routine tracking alone. Taken together, the findings imply that Monitoring and Evaluation is most effective when program tracking is complemented by reflective practices that guide teaching and learning. It helps track interventions and reflect on revisions on these teaching reading initiatives.

Both the screening assessment and the post-assessment administered to students played a crucial role in tracking changes and advancements in their reading abilities. This supported the view that monitoring and evaluation served as dynamic mechanisms that bridged planning and instructional improvement (Datnow & Park, 2018; Schildkamp, 2019).

Table 28

Relationship between Institutionalization and Reading Outcomes

Institutionalization	Reading Outcomes			
	Reading Motivation	Reading Habit	Reading Engagement	Overall Reading Outcomes
Capacity Building	.480**	.418**	.451**	.477**
Policy & Replication	.475**	.437**	.469**	.487**
Overall	.502**	.450**	.484**	.507**

Table 28 shows the relationship between institutionalization and reading outcomes. Policy and Replication have strong correlations with reading outcomes and reading motivation, with coefficients $r = .475$ ($p < .01$) and $r = .487$ ($p < .01$), respectively. This indicates a moderately strong, positive, and statistically significant relationship. It means that when reading interventions are institutionalized as part of the daily classroom routine, aligned with national and district school policies, and systematically implemented, learners are more likely to show improved reading performance, motivation, and engagement. This shows that policy-driven implementation, when coupled with effective practice, ensures consistency in literacy programs.

In contrast, Capacity Building shows slightly lower correlation in policy and replication, with coefficients of $r = .418$ to $.480$ ($p < .01$). The results indicate a moderate positive and statistically significant relationship, particularly in relation to reading habit ($r = .418$), which shows that training and professional development alone do not immediately influence students' reading behaviors if not put into action. This implies that although enhancing teachers' competencies is essential, its impact becomes more evident when teachers apply this training in their daily lessons, for it ensures consistent application in classroom practice.

Overall, the Institutionalization demonstrates a stronger relationship with reading outcomes ($r = .450$ to $.507$, $p < .01$) than its individual sub-variables. This indicates that the combined components of capacity building and policy replication are stronger when these elements are sustained and embedded within the school system. The findings suggest that while capacity building develops teachers' capabilities and policy replication ensures sustainability, it is their institutionalization, through routine practice, alignment, and system support, from data gathering and assessments to the creation of an intervention plan, including stakeholder participation, that ultimately strengthens reading outcomes among learners.

Supporting this, global studies have emphasized that school improvement initiatives yield stronger and more sustained outcomes when they are institutionalized through continuous professional development, policy alignment, and organizational learning systems (OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2022).

Table 29***Summary of the Relationship between Evidence-Based SIP Implementation and Reading Outcomes***

Evidence-Based Implementation	SIP	Reading Outcomes			
		Reading Motivation	Reading Habit	Reading Engagement	Overall Reading Outcomes
INPUT		.423**	.347**	.414**	.417**
PLAN		.452**	.395**	.442**	.455**
IMPLEMENTATION		.473**	.433**	.477**	.488**
MONITORING & EVALAUTION		.459**	.403**	.463**	.467**
INSTITUTIONALIZATION		.502**	.450**	.484**	.507**
Overall	Evidence-Based SIP	.498**	.437**	.491**	.503**

Table 29 summarizes the relationship with the Evidence-Based SIP implementation. The mediation of institutionalization demonstrates the strongest correlation with reading outcomes, with coefficients of $r = .507$ ($p < .01$) for overall reading outcomes and $r = .502$ ($p < .01$) for reading motivation. This is closely followed by Implementation ($r = .488$) and Monitoring and Evaluation ($r = .467$), both reflecting moderate-to-strong positive and statistically significant relationships. These findings suggest that when SIP strategies are not only implemented but also sustained through institutionalized practices. Chen et al. (2022) emphasized that embedding policies within school operations strengthens their effectiveness, as aligned governance structures support consistent instructional practices. These studies suggest that policy integrity plays a vital role in sustaining reading programs by ensuring that initiatives are consistently supported and aligned with school goals.

In contrast, the lowest correlation is observed in the input component, with coefficients as low as $r = .417$ ($p < .01$) for reading habit, which is statistically significant, with a weak to low-moderate positive relationship, suggesting that initial processes such as data collection and identification of reading needs have a more indirect influence on student reading outcomes.

Overall, the relationship between the Evidence-Based School Improvement Plan (SIP) strategies and students' reading outcomes in terms of motivation, habit, and engagement has shown a correlation with a coefficient

of 0.01 (2-tailed), indicating that the relationships were statistically significant at the this meant the probability that these relationships occurred by chance was very low, thereby confirming that the observed associations were meaningful and reliable. Using the adopted verbal interpretation of correlation coefficients, values of 0.20 to 0.39 indicated a weak relationship. In contrast, values between 0.40 and 0.59 indicated a moderate relationship, corresponding to a weak-to-moderate positive correlation, suggesting that as SIP implementation increased, students' reading outcomes tended to improve.

Additionally, the results demonstrated that all components of the Evidence-Based SIP were significantly associated with reading outcomes, with stronger associations observed in the later stages of the SIP cycle. This indicated that while input and planning were important, the most substantial impact on learners occurred when strategies were fully implemented, continuously monitored, and institutionalized.

By applying the theory of change, wherein a desired change in the reading skills of students occurs when reading initiative is purposeful.

Table 30

ANOVA in the perceptions of respondents (school heads, teachers, parents) on Evidence-based SIP Strategies

ANOVA									
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F		Sig.	
INPUT: Evidence gathering	<i>Between Groups</i>	6	1.56	2	0.783	5.754		0.004	
	<i>Within Groups</i>	94	29.7	19	0.136				
	<i>Total</i>	59	31.3	21					
PLAN: Goal Alignment	<i>Between Groups</i>	8	0.85	2	0.429	3.345		0.037	
	<i>Within Groups</i>	101	28.1	19	0.128				
	<i>Total</i>	59	28.9	21					
PLAN: Strategic Design	<i>Between Groups</i>	1	1.48	2	0.740	5.023		0.007	
	<i>Within Groups</i>	78	32.2	19	0.147				
	<i>Total</i>	59	33.7	21					
PLAN: Overall	<i>Between Groups</i>	2	1.05	2	0.526	4.271		0.015	

MONITORING & EVALUATION: Program Tracking	Within Groups	65	26.9	19	2	23	0.1		
	Total	16	28.0	21	2				
	Between Groups	9	0.92		2	65	0.4	02	3.1
Overall Monitoring and Evaluation	Within Groups	10	32.8	19	2	50	0.1		
	Total	40	33.7	21	2				
	Between Groups	8	0.89		2	49	0.4	52	3.1
	Within Groups	96	31.1	19	2	42	0.1		
	Total	94	32.0	21	2				
	Between Groups								

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine whether there are significant differences in the perceptions of school heads, teachers, and parents regarding the implementation of evidence-based strategies in the School Improvement Plan (SIP).

Table 30 shows that several components—evidence gathering, goal alignment, strategic design, and overall planning, including monitoring and evaluation—yield statistically significant differences, as all corresponding p-values are less than 0.05. This suggests that the three groups lack a consistent understanding of how SIP strategies are designed and implemented, reflecting differences in their roles, level of participation, and access to information within the school system.

Specifically, evidence gathering shows a significant difference ($F(2,219) = 5.754, p = .004$), suggesting that stakeholders have varying views on the processes involved in collecting, analyzing, and using data for school improvement. The nature of stakeholder involvement can explain this variation. School heads are directly involved in system-level data analysis and decision-making, whereas teachers primarily interact with data at the classroom level. At the same time, parents may have limited exposure to formal data processes. Rather than indicating disagreement, this difference reflects unequal access to parents' participation in evidence-based practices. This observation is consistent with research suggesting that data-driven decision-making is often unevenly distributed across stakeholder groups, depending on their roles and levels of data literacy (Schildkamp, 2019; Mandinach & Gummer, 2016).

In goal alignment, the results ($F(2,219) = 3.345, p = .037$) also indicate a significant difference in perceptions. Principals tend to view SIP goals as integrated with institutional mandates and broader educational targets, whereas teachers evaluate goal alignment in terms of instructional practicality and classroom realities. Parents, on the other hand, may perceive goals as less directly connected to learner outcomes if these are not clearly communicated. This divergence highlights that alignment is interpreted differently across stakeholder groups—not as a contradiction, but as a reflection of principals, teachers, and parents on how to achieve school goals. Existing studies affirm that goal alignment becomes more effective when it is clearly communicated and translated into actionable classroom practices that stakeholders can readily understand (Leithwood et al., 2020; OECD, 2019).

Similarly, strategic design reveals significant differences ($F(2,219) = 5.023, p = .007$), suggesting that stakeholders evaluate SIP strategies using different criteria. School heads often emphasize coherence, structure, and alignment with policy directions, whereas teachers are more concerned with practicality, workload, and available resources. Parents may have limited familiarity with how strategies are developed and how these contribute to long-

term improvement. Thus, the variation in perception reflects differences in evaluative lenses rather than opposition to the strategies themselves. This finding is supported by which indicates that effective school improvement requires not only technically sound strategies but also a shared understanding among stakeholders of their purpose and implementation (Fullan & Quinn, 2017; Harris & Jones, 2020).

The plan also shows a statistically significant difference, $F(2.219) = 4.271$, $p = .015$, reinforcing the idea that stakeholders perceive the SIP differently when viewed as a whole. This suggests that while the SIP may be structurally sound, its interpretation and perceived relevance vary across groups. School heads may view it as a comprehensive and integrated framework, while teachers and parents may focus more on its observable outcomes and day-to-day implications. Similarly, in the Monitoring and Evaluation component, both program tracking ($F = 3.102$, $p = .047$) and overall monitoring and evaluation ($F = 3.152$, $p = .045$) show significant differences, further underscoring that stakeholders' experiences and interpretations of evaluation processes vary by level of involvement. These findings suggest that, while monitoring systems are present, they may not be equally visible or fully understood across all groups.

Taken together, the ANOVA results highlight that differences in stakeholder roles significantly shape how SIP strategies are perceived and interpreted. School heads tend to adopt a systems-level perspective, teachers emphasize implementation realities, and parents focus on relevance and visibility of outcomes. These differences in perceptions do not necessarily indicate conflict but rather point to gaps in communication, participation, and shared understanding. If left unaddressed, such gaps may undermine collaboration and weaken collective ownership of school improvement efforts.

Overall, the findings underscore the importance of improving stakeholder engagement and transparency, and of fostering shared responsibility in SIP implementation. Research consistently shows that school improvement initiatives are more effective when stakeholders develop a common understanding of goals, processes, and outcomes, supported by clear communication and inclusive participation (Epstein, 2018; Bryk et al., 2015; UNESCO, 2022). Therefore, addressing these perceptual differences is essential to ensuring that the SIP functions not only as a planning document but also as a collaborative, living framework that actively supports sustained improvements in reading outcomes.

Also, the Department of Education's School-Based Management (SBM) Manual (DepEd, 2019) identifies stakeholder participation as a core of Philippine education governance, emphasizing its contribution to learners' performance and program sustainability.

Table 31

Regression of Evidence-based SIP strategies on Students' Reading Outcomes

Model Fit Measures
Overall Model Test

Model	Mo	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	df1	df2	df3	p
1	521	0.271	0.05	0.25096	16.5	16	2	001	<.

Note: Models estimated using sample size of N=222

Model Coefficients-Reading Outcomes

Predictor	Predictor Name	Estimate	Standard Error	t	p	Standard Estimate	95% Confidence Interval			Lower	Upper
Intercept	Intercept	0.207	0.394	0.527	0.599	.					
T	INPU	0.071	0.193	0.368	0.713	0.042	0.265		0.182		0.
N	PLA	0.035	0.239	0.148	0.882	0.021	0.253		0.294		0.
EME	IMPL	0.048	0.237	0.470	1.143	0.207	0.070		0.484		0.
EVAL	MON	0.055	0.233	0.238	0.812	0.034	0.250		0.319		0.
PS	EBSI	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN		NaN		N
ITU	INST	0.45	0.182	0.687	2.008	0.321	0.143		0.321		N

Note: Linear model contains aliased coefficients (singular fit)

The regression results indicate that the overall model is statistically significant (adjusted $R^2 = 0.255$, $F = 16.096$, $df = 5, 216$, $p < .001$), suggesting that approximately 25.5% of the variance in students' reading outcomes is explained by the combined Evidence-Based School Improvement Plan (EB SIP) components. This suggests a moderate degree of implementation power, indicating that while the model effectively captures important system-level influences, a significant portion of the variation in reading outcomes may still be attributable to other factors. These include differences in learners' reading habits, motivation, and engagement, as well as teachers' involvement in reading instruction and students' perceptions of their teaching methods. Additionally, contextual factors such as the availability of reading materials and health-related issues may influence reading outcomes. From a systems perspective, this result confirms that reading outcomes are multi-determined and cannot be fully explained by planning variables alone.

However, a closer examination of the individual predictors reveals that input ($p = .713$), plan ($p = .882$), implementation ($p = .143$), and monitoring and evaluation ($p = .812$) do not exhibit statistically significant direct effects on reading outcomes. This suggests that, when analyzed simultaneously with other variables, these components do not independently predict improvements in reading performance. Rather than indicating that these components are unimportant, the findings suggest a more nuanced interpretation: their influence may be indirect, cumulative, or mediated by other processes. This pattern reflects what has been widely described in educational research as the policy–practice gap, where well-designed reforms do not automatically translate into improved learner outcomes unless they are effectively enacted within classroom and school routines (Fullan & Quinn, 2017; Datnow & Park, 2018).

In contrast, Institutionalization is the only statistically significant predictor ($est = 0.490$, $t = 2.687$, $p = .008$), indicating that it plays a central role in shaping reading outcomes. It further emphasizes that before implementing intervention strategies, the school should institutionalize a well-embedded plan grounded in thorough evidence-gathering. Additionally, it is important to engage stakeholders by informing them about the actionable steps in this plan and by establishing a system for ongoing monitoring and evaluation. These findings highlight that capacity building, policy integration, and the replication of effective practices are the mechanisms by which EB SIP strategies have their actual impact. While earlier stages, such as planning and implementation, establish direction, embedding these practices in organizational routines leads to measurable improvements in student learning. This is consistent with research demonstrating that sustained professional development, instructional coaching, and system-level alignment are stronger predictors of literacy gains than isolated or short-term interventions (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Kraft et al., 2018). Ultimately, the findings indicate that true effectiveness comes not from merely having a plan, but from the quality of actions and the continuity of its institutional implementation.

The non-significant intercept ($p = .599$) further supports this interpretation, indicating that, in the absence of strong institutional mechanisms, baseline reading outcomes do not differ significantly after controlling for the predictors. This suggests that improvements in reading performance are not driven by initial conditions alone but are shaped by the extent to which systems can sustain and operationalize reform efforts over time. From the lens of Systems Theory, this underscores that educational change is not linear; rather, it emerges from the interaction of structures, processes, and capacities within the school environment.

Taken together, these findings carry important implications for educational management and policy implementation. While evidence-based planning remains a necessary foundation, its significant effect on implementation lies in its institutionalization to improve reading outcomes. Instead, schools must shift toward strengthening the institutional processes that support daily implementation, including continuous teacher development, structured instructional support, and the integration of SIP priorities into everyday school practices. This aligns with system improvement literature, which emphasizes that durable learning gains are achieved not through compliance-driven planning, but through capacity-building and sustained organizational learning (OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2022).

Overall, the results suggest that a critical reframing of school improvement efforts is needed: success is not determined by how well a plan is written, but by how deeply it is embedded, practiced, and sustained within the school system. For school leaders and policymakers, this underscores the need to move beyond planning as an endpoint and focus instead on building systems that can continuously implement, adapt, and institutionalize evidence-based practices to improve reading outcomes.

Table 32

The Mediating Effect of Institutionalization in the Relationship between Evidence-Based SIP and Reading Outcomes.

Mediation Estimates

<u>95% Confidence Interval</u>											
Mediation Effect	Label	Estimate	Lower	Upper	Z	p	% Mediation				
Indirect	a × b	0.533	0.181	0.884	2.971	.003	61.252				
Direct	c	0.337	0.066	0.740	1.639	.001	38.748				
Combined Total	a + b	0.870	0.664	1.075	8.295	<.001	100.000				

Path Estimates

<u>95% Confidence Interval</u>									
	Label	Estimate	Lower	Upper	Z	p			
EB-SIP → Institutionalization	a	1.014	0.039	0.937	25.814	<.001			
Institutionalization → Reading Outcomes	b	0.525	0.176	0.817	2.991	.003			
EB-SIP → Reading Outcomes	c	0.337	0.206	0.066	1.639	.101			

The findings demonstrated that institutionalization—operationalized through capacity building and policy replication—mediates the relationship between the evidence-based school improvement plan (EB SIP) and reading outcomes. The indirect effect ($\beta = 0.533$, 95% CI [0.181, 0.884], $z = 2.971$, $p < .003$) is statistically significant, and the confidence interval does not include zero, providing strong evidence that institutionalization functions as a meaningful transmission mechanism between planning and student reading performance. This indicates that EB-SIPs influence reading outcomes primarily by being embedded into school structures, routines, and professional capacities rather than by planning alone.

Importantly, 61.252% of the total effect is explained through this indirect pathway, underscoring that most of the improvement in reading outcomes occurs when evidence-based plans are translated into organizational practice via sustained capacity development and systematic policy enactment. This aligns with system-strengthening literature,

which emphasizes that improvement initiatives yield durable gains only when they are institutionalized within the organization rather than implemented as short-term projects.

In contrast, the direct effect of the EB-SIP on reading outcomes ($\beta = 0.337$, 95% CI [-0.066, 0.740], $z = 1.639$, $p = .101$) is statistically not significant. This suggests that planning alone is not sufficient to improve reading outcomes directly. The presence of a nonsignificant direct path, along with a robust and significant indirect effect, suggests a functional or full mediation pattern. In this context, institutionalization significantly contributes to the majority of EB-SIP's capacity on reading outcomes.

This pattern reinforces the notion that evidence used must move beyond compliance-driven planning documents toward routinized practice, professional learning, and policy coherence. Similar mediation patterns had been documented in education research, where intermediate organizational or motivational mechanisms explain how upstream inputs translate into learning outcomes.

The total effect of the EB-SIP on reading outcomes was substantial ($\beta = 0.870$, $p < .001$), confirming that the overall implementation of intervention, input, plan, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation was effective.

Path estimates further revealed strong and significant relationships among the constructs EB-SIP $\rightarrow$ Institutionalization ($\beta = 1.014$, $p < .001$), Institutionalization $\rightarrow$ Reading Outcomes ($\beta = 0.525$, $p < .001$), and then EB-SIP $\rightarrow$ Reading Outcomes ($\beta = 0.337$, $p < .001$). Together, these paths provide evidence that planning initiates change, institutionalization sustains it, and sustained practice drives literacy gains.

This configuration reflected evidence-based SIP implementation practices observed at scale, where professional development, leadership capacity, and policy alignment consistently predict stronger reading instruction and outcomes than policy mandates alone.

From a management and leadership perspective, the results clearly indicate that school leaders and system managers should focus on systematically institutionalizing capacity-building to develop a range of interventions. These efforts should encompass not only the schools themselves but the entire community. This includes enhancing principals' leadership practices in implementing these interventions and strengthening teacher training in reading. Additionally, engaging stakeholders and parents through active involvement and support is essential to achieving improved reading outcomes and should be at the core of our intervention strategy. Management actions should focus on (1) building instructional and leadership capacity through sustained professional learning, coaching, and data-use routines, and (2) replicating evidence-based policies into standard operating procedures, school improvement cycles, and accountability mechanisms. Investments limited to plan development or compliance reporting are unlikely to yield significant gains in reading without these institutional supports.

Furthermore, the high proportion of mediated effects suggested that monitoring institutional indicators—such as teacher practice consistency, policy uptake, and leadership routines—may be more actionable for decision-makers than monitoring plans alone. Embedding EB-SIPs into the “way schools work” enhances implementation fidelity, reduces initiative fatigue, and supports equitable literacy improvement across classrooms and cohorts, consistent with system-level reform research.

Based on these findings, the study concludes that the strategies and efforts associated with Evidence-Based School Improvement Plans are being implemented effectively; their impact on enhancing reading outcomes is neither immediate nor linear. Instead, improvements in students' reading performance depend heavily on the extent to which these strategies are incorporated into the school routine and institutionalized within the school's organizational structures, policies, and professional practices. Do not exclude the power of parents in shaping their child's reading ability. If properly guided by the school, the impact of changes in reading will be surprising. This reinforces the notion that school improvement cannot be realized merely through well-laid plans but hinges on the sustained, system-wide application of evidence-based practices.

Moreover, the study points out that institutionalization was the most crucial factor in achieving significant gains in literacy. Empowering teachers through training and seminars about reading outcomes will boost their confidence. Such as capacity building, policy alignment, and ongoing professional development support, which were essential mechanisms through which SIP strategies can exert transformative influence on teaching practices and, consequently, learner outcomes. Without these supports, even the most thoughtfully designed improvement plans will fall short of delivering noteworthy results, leading to a persistent gap between policy intentions and practical classroom implementation.

Finally, the findings emphasized that improving reading outcomes requires a holistic, systems-based approach. Routine should start with leadership involvement and commitment, teachers working on collaboration, open communication, and shared responsibility with stakeholders, and ongoing monitoring integrated into the school's everyday functioning. Sustainable improvements in literacy occur when these elements are viewed and treated as interconnected components of efforts.

2. Recommendations

Current interventions in many schools are fragmented and short-term, with limited alignment to broader school goals. Effective reading programs require sustained commitment and coordination across grade levels, curriculum areas, and support services. Integrating these programs into the SIP ensures that reading improvement is prioritized and systematically monitored, promoting accountability and continuous improvement.

The existing literature highlights the importance of data use, stakeholder collaboration, and context-specific planning in improving school outcomes. However, gaps remain in how these components are systematically aligned and sustained in practice. This study addresses this gap by examining how evidence-based SIP strategies influence reading outcomes and how institutionalization mediates this relationship.

Furthermore, the institutionalization of SIP processes is critical for long-term success. Consistent leadership, policy support, and capacity building are necessary to embed effective reading interventions within the school culture. Without sustained institutional commitment, even well-designed SIPs risk becoming superficial exercises rather than engines of real change.

This research proposes a contextualized framework that links planning, implementation, and sustainability to improve reading outcomes. It connects SIP processes to measurable literacy gains and offers practical steps for school leaders and policymakers.

In summary, strengthening the SIP as a tool for reading improvement requires a comprehensive approach that bridges policy and practice, fosters collaboration, and ensures that interventions are responsive to local needs. By doing so, schools can make meaningful progress toward addressing literacy challenges and enhancing academic achievement for all learners.

References

- [1] N. Abid, S. Aslam, A. A. Alghamdi, and T. Kumar, "Relationships among students' reading habits, study skills, and academic achievement in English," *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 14, 2023, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1020269.
- [2] B. Avalos, "Teacher professional development in teaching and teacher education for over ten years," *Teach. Teach. Educ.*, vol. 27, pp. 10–20, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.007.
- [3] I. L. Beck, "The data literacy continuum: Building teachers' capacity for data-informed decision making," *Educ. Res.*, vol. 49, no. 5, pp. 310–323, 2020.
- [4] N. Beltrán-Sierra, "Parental engagement in early literacy: Effects and facilitators," 2024.
- [5] M. Benavides, G. Pérez, and B. Pont, *Adaptive implementation: From policy to practice in education reform*. UNESCO, 2025.
- [6] E. Brakema, M. van Geel, and K. Schildkamp, "Context-mapping tools for school-level adaptation and improvement," *Educ. Res. Rev.*, vol. 34, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100414.

- [7] Y. Brel-Fournier, Policy issues in public education: A literature review. University of Delaware Press, 2022.
- [8] Brookings Institution, “Data-driven learning dashboards for developing countries,” 2016.
- [9] A. S. Bryk, L. M. Gomez, A. Grunow, and P. G. LeMahieu, Learning to improve: How America’s schools can get better at getting better, 2nd ed. Harvard Education Press, 2015.
- [10] M. M. Buckman, “Data-informed professional learning and instruction in integrated tiered systems,” J. Spec. Educ., 2024.
- [11] L. Chen, A. Smith, and R. Gomez, “Embedding reading policy in secondary schools: Roles, systems, and outcomes,” Educ. Manag. Adm. Leadersh., vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 617–634, 2022, doi: 10.1177/17411432211067213.
- [12] J. Coore-Hall et al., “Using lessons learned from key stakeholders to increase support for scaling programs,” Front. Public Health, vol. 11, 2023, doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2023.1151826.
- [13] K. C. Cosico and R. Malonze, “Reading habits and silent reading comprehension,” Int. J. Res. Stud. Educ., vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 33–42, 2025, doi: 10.5861/ijrse.2025.25833.
- [14] F. Crowther et al., “Institutionalizing literacy improvement,” Sch. Eff. Sch. Improv., vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 195–215, 2023.
- [15] A. J. Daly, K. Finnigan, N. Moolenaar, and J. Che, “The power of networked data use in school improvement,” Educ. Eval. Policy Anal., vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 205–228, 2021, doi: 10.3102/0162373721993234.
- [16] L. Darling-Hammond et al., “Science of learning and development,” Appl. Dev. Sci., vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 97–140, 2017.
- [17] A. Datnow and L. Hubbard, Teacher data use for school improvement. Teachers College Press, 2016.
- [18] Department of Education (DepEd), School-Based Management (SBM) Manual (Revised Edition), 2019.
- [19] M. Ehlert and E. Souvignier, “Effective professional development,” Teach. Teach. Educ., vol. 134, 2023.
- [20] J. L. Epstein, School, family, and community partnerships, 4th ed. Corwin Press, 2018.
- [21] D. Ferguson and P. Mathew, “Scaling literacy interventions,” Int. J. Educ. Dev., vol. 95, 2024.
- [22] M. Fullan, Nuance: Why some leaders succeed and others fail. Corwin Press, 2019.
- [23] M. Fullan and J. Quinn, Deep learning. Corwin Press, 2017.
- [24] R. Garcia and M. Cerado, “Evidence-based evaluation tool,” Philipp. J. Educ. Dev., vol. 94, no. 2, pp. 25–41, 2020.
- [25] G. Gillon, “Early literacy monitoring,” Front. Educ., vol. 9, 2024.
- [26] J. Goodall, “Parental engagement,” Educ. Rev., vol. 69, no. 4, pp. 475–489, 2017.

- [27] A. Hargreaves and M. T. O'Connor, Collaborative professionalism. Corwin Press, 2018.
- [28] A. Harris and M. Jones, "School improvement networks," *Sch. Leadersh. Manag.*, vol. 40, pp. 111–126, 2020.
- [29] W. Henry, "Resource allocation in schools," *Theory Pract. Rural Educ.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 61–73, 2019.
- [30] C. R. Kingsbery et al., "The impact of multilevel coaching on pre-service teachers' fidelity of implementation," *Educ. Sci.*, vol. 15, no. 2, p. 244, 2025, doi: 10.3390/educsci15020244.
- [31] J. S. Kim and D. M. Quinn, "The effects of summer reading on literacy achievement," *Read. Res. Q.*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 129–158, 2013, doi: 10.1002/trq.39.
- [32] M. A. Kraft, D. Blazar, and D. Hogan, "The effect of teacher coaching," *Rev. Educ. Res.*, vol. 88, no. 4, pp. 547–588, 2018.
- [33] J. Liu and S. Yun, "Goal alignment," *Front. Educ.*, vol. 8, 2023.
- [34] M. C. Mandap, Data-informed leadership. Globus Publication, 2024.
- [35] S. McGeown and K. C. Smith, "Reading engagement matters," *Read. Teach.*, vol. 77, no. 4, pp. 462–472, 2024, doi: 10.1002/trtr.2267.
- [36] K. L. McMaster, "Reading intervention PD," *Remedial Spec. Educ.*, 2021.
- [37] S. Ni, "Parental involvement effects," *Early Child. Res. Q.*, 2021.
- [38] L. O. Nabong, "Reading habit practices," 2025.
- [39] W. E. Nwagwu, "Sociocultural factors on reading habits," 2025.
- [40] OECD, PISA 2018 results (Volume I): What students know and can do. OECD Publishing, 2019, doi: 10.1787/5f07c754-en.
- [41] OECD, Curriculum reform: A literature review to support effective implementation. OECD Publishing, 2020.
- [42] C. F. Ojetunde, "Reading habits and students' academic performance," *Eksu J. Educ.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 167–174, 2023.
- [43] S. Patel, "Policy-practice coherence," *Educ. Policy Anal. Arch.*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2023.
- [44] B. Pont, D. Nusche, and H. Moorman, School leadership for learning. OECD Publishing, 2020.
- [45] R. B. Ramos et al., "Resource management," *Asian J. Educ. Soc. Stud.*, vol. 50, no. 8, 2024.
- [46] D. Salavacion et al., "Teacher engagement and collaboration," *Int. J. Educ. Res.*, vol. 102, 2025.
- [47] K. Schildkamp, "Data-based decision-making for school improvement," *Educ. Res.*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 257–273, 2019.
- [48] J. Smith and K. Johnson, "Reading goal embedding," *Int. J. Educ. Res.*, vol. 109, 2021.
- [49] J. P. Spillane, Distributed leadership in practice, 2nd ed. Teachers College Press, 2019.

- [50] J. P. Torres, “Reading challenges in the Philippines,” *Philipp. J. Educ.*, vol. 97, no. 1, pp. 45–61, 2020.
- [51] UNESCO, Global education monitoring report 2022. UNESCO Publishing, 2022.
- [52] H. Wang, “Parental involvement and learning outcomes,” *Front. Psychol.*, 2022.
- [53] J. Willis et al., “Resource allocation strategies,” WestEd, 2019.
- [54] Y. Zhao, *Learners without borders*. Teachers College Press, 2022.