RESEARCH ARTICLE

JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research
Volume 2, Issue 5, Page 168-179 | Article No. 17
DOI: 10.4898/jener.v2i5.a17
ISSN: 7895-9216
Journal homepage: https://jenerjournal.com
Journal email: editor@jenerjournal.com

JENER Journal
JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research

The Monitoring Practices of the Implementation of the Intervention Activities in the Public Elementary School in Labo East and West District, Division of Camarines Norte

Shiela G. Ragelis[1]

[1]University of Northeastern Philippines, School of Graduate Studies and Research

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:
Published: May 2026

Keywords:
Monitoring Practices
Intervention Activities
Literacy Intervention

ABSTRACT

Literacy intervention remains a central concern in public elementary education because basic reading competence shapes later academic participation, classroom confidence, and access to the wider curriculum. This study examined the monitoring practices used in the implementation of intervention activities in public elementary schools in Labo East and West Districts, Division of Camarines Norte, during School Year 2023-2024. The investigation focused on the implementation of Brigada Pagbasa, Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment, and Remedial Instruction. It also assessed how monitoring practices were employed across program goals and objectives, monitoring strategy design, targeted activities, availability of materials and resources, and processing of obtained information. The manuscript was developed from a graduate thesis that used a descriptive-correlational research design. Forty-six teachers from Labo East and West Districts served as respondents, representing public elementary schools directly involved in intervention implementation and monitoring. The study used a researcher-made questionnaire that measured both intervention implementation and monitoring practices. The resulting data were summarized through weighted means, ranks, verbal interpretations, and Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney U-test outputs. Findings revealed that intervention activities were generally much implemented, with a weighted average of 3.82. Among the three intervention components, Remedial Instruction obtained the highest average mean of 4.00, followed by Brigada Pagbasa with 3.79 and Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment with 3.67. This ordering shows that targeted teacher-led remediation was perceived as the most established intervention activity. The results also indicate that community-supported reading activities and rapid literacy assessment practices were present but still required deeper institutional support. Detailed results for Brigada Pagbasa showed that regular reading assessment received the highest rating, with an average of 4.22. Reading buddy programs and personalized reading plans both obtained average ratings of 4.00, suggesting that peer support and individualized planning were recognizable strengths. However, literacy-rich environments and technology-based reading programs received lower averages of 3.22 and 3.40, respectively. These findings suggest that the intervention already uses assessment and human support mechanisms but still needs stronger material and digital enrichment. For Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment, the strongest item was the utilization of CRLA materials and resources to supplement classroom instruction, with an average of 4.08. Differentiated instruction in CRLA sessions also ranked highly at 3.82, showing attention to learners' varied reading levels. The lowest-rated item was collaboration with reading specialists and support staff, with an average of 3.07. This suggests that CRLA implementation may be more teacher-managed than specialist-supported, creating a need for stronger technical assistance structures. For Remedial Instruction, the use of scaffolding strategies obtained the highest rating at 4.40. Targeted remedial instruction for individual learning gaps followed with an average of 4.29, and differentiated instruction obtained 4.19. These findings show that teachers recognize remediation as a responsive and learner-sensitive practice. Lower ratings for research-based instructional strategies and small-group remedial sessions imply that remediation can be made more systematic through stronger instructional design, training, and monitoring. The monitoring practices of the implementation of intervention activities were also rated as much practiced, with a weighted average of 3.60. Program Goals and Objectives received the highest domain rating at 3.79, followed by Availability of Materials and Resources at 3.62, Processing of Obtained Information at 3.56, Targeted Activities at 3.53, and Designing the Monitoring Strategy at 3.50. These results indicate

that monitoring is more strongly associated with alignment and materials checking than with strategy design and fidelity review. The findings point to the need to shift from compliance-oriented monitoring to improvement-oriented monitoring. The Mann-Whitney U-test results revealed no significant differences between Labo East and Labo West in the implementation of Brigada Pagbasa, CRLA, and Remedial Instruction. The same pattern was observed across the monitoring practice domains, where all p-values exceeded the 0.05 level of significance. This means that respondents from the two districts tended to share similar perceptions of how intervention activities were implemented and monitored. Such statistical consistency supports the feasibility of district-wide policy recommendations rather than district-specific corrective measures. The study concludes that intervention activities in the Labo District are substantively present and operational, but their monitoring systems require strengthening in stakeholder feedback, technology integration, specialist collaboration, resource management, and data processing. The results also suggest that remedial instruction is the most mature intervention component, while CRLA and Brigada Pagbasa need deeper support systems. Monitoring practices appear functional, yet they must become more explicit, evidence-driven, and participatory. The findings therefore have implications for school heads, teachers, reading coordinators, district supervisors, curriculum implementers, and education policymakers.The manuscript argues for a monitoring framework that integrates regular learner assessment, clearly defined indicators, collaborative data analysis, resource adequacy checks, and feedback from learners, parents, teachers, and community partners. Schools should institutionalize mechanisms that use monitoring results to refine interventions instead of merely documenting implementation. District offices should support professional development in data use, differentiated instruction, CRLA interpretation, remedial design, and technology-assisted monitoring. Keywords: Monitoring Practices; Intervention Activities; Literacy Intervention.

1. Introduction

Literacy remains one of the most decisive foundations of basic education because it influences how learners access every other learning area. In the early and intermediate grades, reading ability determines whether learners can follow instructions, interpret texts, solve problems, and participate in classroom discourse. When literacy gaps persist, they tend to produce cumulative disadvantages that affect achievement, motivation, and learner confidence. For this reason, schools are expected not only to conduct literacy interventions but also to monitor them with sufficient rigor and continuity.

The contemporary understanding of literacy has expanded beyond the ability to decode printed words. Literacy now includes comprehension, interpretation, critical thinking, communication, and the ability to use information in meaningful contexts. In the public elementary school setting, this broader view requires interventions that are responsive to learners' actual reading profiles. It also requires systematic monitoring so that intervention activities are adjusted when learner progress is slow, uneven, or inconsistent.

Public education systems across the world increasingly use intervention models to respond to learners who are at risk of falling below expected proficiency levels. These interventions may include targeted reading sessions, structured assessment, peer support, remediation, diagnostic testing, and individualized learning plans. However, the mere presence of intervention activities does not guarantee effectiveness. Without monitoring, interventions may become routine activities that are implemented on schedule but not necessarily adjusted based on evidence of learner growth.

Monitoring practices function as the accountability and improvement mechanism of intervention programs. They help schools determine whether program goals are understood, whether activities are implemented as designed, whether resources are adequate, and whether learners are responding positively. Monitoring also makes it possible to identify gaps in implementation before those gaps become entrenched. In literacy intervention, timely monitoring is especially important because reading difficulties are best addressed through early and continuous support.

In the Philippine educational context, literacy intervention has long been connected to the constitutional commitment to quality and accessible education. National frameworks such as the K to 12 curriculum, DepEd strategic directions, and school-level learning recovery initiatives have emphasized foundational competencies. These frameworks require schools to identify struggling learners and provide corrective, remedial, and enrichment mechanisms. The effectiveness of these mechanisms depends greatly on the quality of monitoring practices at the classroom, school, and district levels.

One important example of community-supported literacy intervention is Brigada Pagbasa. As a reading-focused initiative, it encourages schools and stakeholders to provide learners with additional reading opportunities, mentoring, and reading support. Its strength lies in mobilizing teachers, volunteers, parents, and community members around the common goal of improving learners' literacy. However, its sustainability depends on regular assessment, appropriate reading materials, learner matching, and feedback-based adjustment of activities.

Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment, or CRLA, also plays an important role in the identification and monitoring of learners' reading needs. As an assessment-related intervention, CRLA can guide teachers in grouping learners, selecting materials, and determining the level of instructional support required. When properly used, CRLA can help shift literacy intervention from

generalized remediation to data-informed instruction. Its effectiveness, however, depends on teachers' ability to interpret results and translate them into specific instructional actions.

Remedial Instruction is another key component of literacy intervention in elementary schools. It provides targeted teaching support for learners who need additional opportunities to master reading competencies. Remediation can take the form of scaffolding, diagnostic assessment, differentiated instruction, small-group work, and formative progress checks. In practice, remedial instruction becomes effective when teachers use learner data to determine what support is needed, how support should be delivered, and when learners are ready to progress.

Intervention activities must be examined alongside the monitoring systems that support them. Monitoring practices related to program goals and objectives ensure that daily intervention activities are connected to institutional priorities. Monitoring strategy design clarifies how data are collected, who collects them, when they are reviewed, and how results are used. Targeted activity monitoring helps determine whether intervention tasks are aligned with learner needs and whether implementation remains faithful to the intended design.

The availability of materials and resources also affects intervention quality. Reading interventions require appropriate texts, assessment tools, activity guides, learning materials, digital resources, and teacher support materials. If resources are insufficient, outdated, or poorly matched to learner needs, even well-intentioned intervention activities may produce limited results. Thus, monitoring must include resource adequacy, resource utilization, and the continuing relevance of materials used in literacy support.

Processing of obtained information is another essential monitoring practice. Data gathered from reading assessments, formative checks, classroom observations, learner outputs, and teacher reports must be processed in a manner that informs action. Monitoring becomes weak when data are collected but not analyzed, shared, or used in decision-making. Strong monitoring requires a cycle of evidence gathering, interpretation, planning, implementation, and review.

The Labo East and West Districts of Camarines Norte provide a meaningful setting for examining intervention monitoring. The districts have implemented intervention activities aimed at addressing learner needs in public elementary schools. The presence of multiple schools, varied contexts, and teacher involvement offers an opportunity to examine whether intervention implementation and monitoring are perceived consistently across districts. Such evidence can inform district-wide improvement planning and policy formulation.

The research problem addressed in this manuscript arises from the recognition that literacy interventions need more than implementation. They require structured monitoring systems that determine whether activities are aligned with goals, responsive to learner needs, supported by materials, and adjusted based on evidence. This emphasis is important because schools often face the challenge of implementing interventions while managing time limitations, resource constraints, and diverse learner profiles. Monitoring helps convert intervention activities into deliberate instructional improvement mechanisms.

The study therefore examined two major dimensions: the extent of implementation of intervention activities and the extent of monitoring practices employed in those activities. The intervention dimension covered Brigada Pagbasa, CRLA, and Remedial Instruction. The monitoring dimension covered program goals and objectives, designing the monitoring strategy, targeted activities, availability of materials and resources, and processing of obtained information. Differences between Labo East and West were also tested to determine whether district-level perceptions varied significantly.

This article is significant because it reframes intervention activities as systems that require evidence-based monitoring. It contributes to the local educational discourse by presenting empirical data from teachers who directly participate in the implementation and monitoring of literacy-related interventions. It also offers a basis for practical recommendations that can guide school heads, reading coordinators, and district supervisors. More broadly, it affirms that intervention quality depends not only on what schools do but also on how consistently and intelligently schools monitor what they do.

The manuscript is organized according to the IMRAD format to make the thesis findings more suitable for scholarly publication. The methodology section presents the design, respondents, instrument, procedure, and statistical treatment. The results and discussion section presents tabular findings and analytical interpretation of intervention implementation and monitoring practices. The concluding section synthesizes the implications for policy, practice, and future improvement of school-based literacy intervention monitoring.

2. Methodology

The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive component was appropriate because the study aimed to describe the extent to which intervention activities were implemented and the extent to which monitoring practices were employed in public elementary schools. The correlational and comparative aspect was reflected in the testing of significant differences between the rank orders of responses from Labo East and Labo West. This design was suitable for generating empirical descriptions of existing practices and determining whether perceptions differed across respondent groups.

The locale of the study was the Labo District in the Division of Camarines Norte, specifically Labo East and Labo West. These districts were selected because they were implementing intervention activities and were therefore appropriate sites for examining monitoring practices. The school setting provided a practical field context where literacy intervention activities such as Brigada Pagbasa, CRLA, and Remedial Instruction were present. The district context also enabled the researcher to compare perceptions across two administrative areas.

The respondents consisted of public elementary school teachers from Labo East and Labo West who were involved in the implementation and monitoring of intervention activities. The study used total population sampling, a purposive approach in which all accessible teachers meeting the criteria were included. This approach was appropriate because the respondent population

was manageable and directly connected to the phenomenon under investigation. A total of 46 respondents participated in the study, including teachers from both districts.

The research instrument was a researcher-made questionnaire designed to gather data on two main constructs. The first part measured the extent of intervention activities implemented along Brigada Pagbasa, Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment, and Remedial Instruction. The second part measured the monitoring practices employed along Program Goals and Objectives, Designing the Monitoring Strategy, Targeted Activities, Availability of Materials and Resources, and Processing of Obtained Information. The questionnaire used rating scales that allowed the researcher to compute weighted means and verbal interpretations.

The instrument underwent validation to ensure clarity, relevance, and content coverage. Experts, including graduate school faculty, supervisors, and the research adviser, reviewed the questionnaire items. Their comments were incorporated to improve item wording and alignment with the study objectives. Reliability was also addressed through the use of Kuder-Richardson Formula 21 as indicated in the source thesis, supporting the suitability of the instrument for actual data gathering.

Data gathering followed a systematic procedure. The researcher first presented the proposal, reflected the suggestions of the panel, prepared and validated the questionnaire, and secured permission from relevant school authorities. After permission was obtained, the instrument was administered to the respondents and later retrieved. The responses were then tallied, tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted according to the research problems.

The study observed standard ethical expectations for school-based research. The questionnaire was administered for academic purposes, and respondent answers were treated as data for aggregate analysis rather than individual evaluation. Since the study examined institutional practices rather than personal performance, the interpretation focused on patterns across districts and domains. The manuscript therefore presents findings in a manner that protects individual respondents while preserving the educational value of the results.

Weighted mean and ranking were used to determine the extent of intervention implementation and the extent of monitoring practices. Verbal interpretations were applied to describe the meaning of numerical ratings, such as Much Implemented and Much Practiced. These descriptive statistics allowed the researcher to determine which domains and indicators were strongest and which required further improvement. The ranking of items also helped identify priority areas for policy and professional development.

The Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney U-Test was used to test whether significant differences existed between the rank orders of responses from Labo East and Labo West. This non-parametric test was appropriate because the data were ordinal in nature and derived from rating-scale responses. A 0.05 level of significance was used as the decision criterion. When p-values exceeded 0.05, the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating no significant difference between the districts.

3. Results and Discussion

This section presents the results of the study based on the intervention activity domains and monitoring practice domains reported in the source thesis. The analysis begins with the implementation of Brigada Pagbasa, CRLA, and Remedial Instruction, followed by tests of significant difference between Labo East and Labo West. It then proceeds to monitoring practices in terms of program goals and objectives, monitoring strategy design, targeted activities, availability of materials and resources, and processing of obtained information. Each table is followed by analytical discussion that interprets the results for literacy intervention governance, classroom implementation, and district-level policy action.

Table 1. Extent of Intervention Activities Implemented in Terms of Brigada Pagbasa

Indicator	Labo East Wx	Labo West Wx	Average Wx	Int.	Rank
Conducting regular reading assessments to identify students' reading levels and areas for improvement	4.16	4.27	4.22	MI	1
Organizing small-group reading sessions to provide targeted instruction and support for struggling readers	4.03	3.92	3.98	MI	4
Facilitating reading buddy programs to pair students with reading mentors and foster peer support	3.97	4.03	4.00	MI	2.5
Developing and implementing personalized reading plans to address individual students' literacy needs	3.93	4.07	4.00	MI	2.5
Establishing literacy-rich environments with access to a variety of reading materials and resources	3.21	3.23	3.22	I	8
Offering reading workshops and training sessions for teachers to enhance their literacy instruction skills	3.81	3.94	3.88	MI	5
Integrating technology-based reading programs to supplement classroom instruction and engage students	3.33	3.47	3.40	I	7
Creating reading incentives and recognition programs to motivate and celebrate students' reading achievements	3.59	3.61	3.60	MI	6
Weighted Average	3.75	3.82	3.79	MI	

Legend: VMI = Very Much Implemented; MI = Much Implemented; I = Implemented; FI = Fairly Implemented; NA = Not at All.

The Brigada Pagbasa results show that assessment-driven implementation was the strongest element of the intervention. Conducting regular reading assessments obtained the highest average rating of 4.22, indicating that teachers recognize assessment

as the entry point for identifying learner needs. This is an important strength because intervention activities become more responsive when they begin with evidence of learners' reading levels. It also suggests that teachers are not merely conducting reading activities but are attempting to connect those activities to observed learner performance.

The ratings for reading buddy programs and personalized reading plans, both at 4.00, reveal the importance of human support and individualized planning in the intervention. These practices position Brigada Pagbasa as both a community-based and learner-centered initiative. Reading mentors can provide encouragement, while personalized plans can help ensure that learners receive assistance that matches their specific literacy profiles. The combination of peer or mentor support and individualized planning strengthens the social and instructional dimensions of the program.

The lower ratings for establishing literacy-rich environments and integrating technology-based reading programs reveal a structural limitation. A literacy intervention cannot be sustained by assessment and mentoring alone if learners do not have consistent access to varied, appropriate, and engaging reading materials. The rating of 3.22 for literacy-rich environments suggests that the physical and material conditions for reading may not yet be sufficient. Similarly, technology-based support at 3.40 indicates that digital resources remain underdeveloped within the intervention system.

Overall, Brigada Pagbasa was much implemented, but the pattern of results points to uneven implementation. The strongest practices are those that depend on teacher action and learner assessment, while weaker areas are those that require resources, digital access, and environmental enrichment. This means that improvement efforts should not only train teachers but also invest in classroom libraries, community book access, and technology-supported reading platforms. The program can become more robust if its community spirit is matched with stronger resource infrastructure.

Table 2. Extent of Intervention Activities Implemented in Terms of Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment

Indicator	Labo East Wx	Labo West Wx	Average Wx	Int.	Rank
Organizing regular CRLA sessions to provide targeted support for students with reading difficulties	3.81	3.66	3.74	MI	4
Developing individualized CRLA plans tailored to each learner's specific reading needs	3.41	3.56	3.49	I	6
Implementing CRLA strategies such as repeated readings and word recognition exercises	3.76	3.81	3.79	MI	3
Conducting ongoing assessments to monitor students' progress and adjust CRLA interventions	3.66	3.74	3.70	MI	5
Providing differentiated instruction in CRLA sessions to address students' varying reading levels	3.86	3.77	3.82	MI	2
Collaborating with reading specialists and support staff to deliver effective CRLA interventions	3.12	3.01	3.07	I	7
Utilizing CRLA materials and resources to supplement classroom instruction and reinforce reading skills	4.06	4.09	4.08	MI	1
Weighted Average	3.67	3.66	3.67	MI	

Legend: VMI = Very Much Implemented; MI = Much Implemented; I = Implemented; FI = Fairly Implemented; NA = Not at All.

The CRLA results indicate that the strongest feature of implementation was the use of CRLA materials and resources, which obtained an average of 4.08. This suggests that teachers recognize the value of standardized or structured materials in reinforcing classroom instruction. The presence of such materials helps make intervention more systematic because teachers have tools to guide learner support. Materials also provide consistency across classrooms when used properly.

Differentiated instruction in CRLA sessions obtained the second-highest average at 3.82, indicating that teachers attempt to respond to varied reading levels. This is pedagogically significant because literacy difficulties are rarely uniform among learners. Some learners require support in decoding, others in fluency, and others in comprehension. Differentiated CRLA sessions can therefore help teachers move beyond one-size-fits-all remediation.

The lowest-rated CRLA practice was collaboration with reading specialists and support staff, with an average of 3.07. This finding is important because assessment interpretation and intervention design often require technical expertise. If classroom teachers are left to manage CRLA implementation without specialist collaboration, the quality of interpretation and follow-through may vary. The result points to a need for stronger reading coordination, coaching, and school-based technical support.

The overall CRLA mean of 3.67 indicates that the activity was much implemented but still less established than Remedial Instruction and Brigada Pagbasa. The result suggests that CRLA is functioning as a support mechanism, but its full value depends on stronger collaboration, individualized planning, and progress monitoring. Schools should therefore institutionalize post-assessment conferences where teachers, reading coordinators, and school heads examine CRLA results. This would strengthen the link between assessment data and instructional decisions.

Table 3. Extent of Intervention Activities Implemented in Terms of Remedial Instruction

Indicator	Labo East Wx	Labo West Wx	Average Wx	Int.	Rank
Administering diagnostic assessments to identify students' specific areas of need	4.07	4.12	4.10	MI	4
Providing targeted remedial instruction to address individual students' learning gaps	4.26	4.32	4.29	MI	2

Utilizing differentiated instruction to accommodate students' diverse learning styles and needs	4.16	4.21	4.19	MI	3
Utilizing scaffolding strategies provides support as students navigate challenging texts independently	4.33	4.46	4.40	MI	1
Monitoring students' progress through ongoing formative assessments	3.86	3.94	3.90	MI	7
Offering small-group remedial sessions to provide personalized support and guidance	3.55	3.61	3.58	MI	8
Implementing research-based instructional strategies to enhance student learning outcomes	3.41	3.59	3.50	MI	9
Collaborating with colleagues and specialists to develop effective remedial plans	4.02	4.05	4.04	I	5
Providing additional resources and materials to supplement remedial instruction	4.00	3.98	3.99	MI	6
Weighted Average	3.96	4.03	4.00	MI	

Legend: VMI = Very Much Implemented; MI = Much Implemented; I = Implemented; FI = Fairly Implemented; NA = Not at All.

Remedial Instruction obtained the highest overall rating among the three intervention activities, with an average of 4.00. The strongest indicator was the use of scaffolding strategies, rated 4.40. This result shows that teachers perceive guided support as central to helping learners navigate challenging texts. Scaffolding is especially important for struggling readers because it gives them structured assistance while gradually building independence.

Targeted remedial instruction for individual learning gaps was also strongly rated at 4.29. This suggests that teachers recognize remediation as a focused response to specific learner difficulties rather than a general repetition of lessons. When remediation is targeted, it becomes more likely to address the root causes of poor reading performance. This finding supports the need for diagnostic and formative assessment data to guide remedial sessions.

The lower-rated indicators reveal possible areas for improvement in the remedial system. Implementing research-based instructional strategies received 3.50, while small-group remedial sessions received 3.58. These results do not indicate weakness in implementation, but they suggest that remedial work may still rely more on teacher experience than on formally structured evidence-based models. Schools may need to provide more training on specific remedial methods, especially for phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension intervention.

The findings show that Remedial Instruction is the most mature component of the intervention framework in the district. Its strength lies in direct teacher support, scaffolding, targeted instruction, and differentiation. However, its sustainability depends on stronger monitoring of learner progress, more structured small-group approaches, and access to supplementary materials. If these elements are improved, remedial instruction can serve as the anchor intervention for learners with persistent literacy gaps.

Table 4. Summary of the Extent of Intervention Activities Implemented

Indicator	Labo East Wx	Labo West Wx	Average Wx	Int.	Rank
Brigada Pagbasa	3.75	3.82	3.79	MI	2
Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment	3.67	3.66	3.67	MI	3
Remedial Instruction	3.96	4.03	4.00	MI	1
Weighted Average	3.79	3.84	3.82	MI	

Legend: VMI = Very Much Implemented; MI = Much Implemented; I = Implemented; FI = Fairly Implemented; NA = Not at All.

The summary table confirms that intervention activities were generally much implemented, with a weighted average of 3.82. Remedial Instruction ranked first with a mean of 4.00, showing that schools rely heavily on teacher-led corrective support. Brigada Pagbasa ranked second with 3.79, reflecting the value of reading-focused community and school initiatives. CRLA ranked third with 3.67, indicating that assessment-based intervention is present but still requires strengthening.

The ranking of Remedial Instruction as the strongest domain suggests that teachers are most confident in interventions that they can directly control within the classroom. Remediation is familiar, adaptable, and immediately connected to learner performance. This may explain why it obtained the highest rating compared with CRLA, which may require more structured interpretation and technical support. The implication is that district policy should build on teachers' remedial strengths while deepening the evidence base of these practices.

The lower summary rating for CRLA should not be interpreted as lack of value. Rather, it suggests that assessment systems require stronger support mechanisms to become fully effective. CRLA can provide valuable diagnostic information, but teachers must be trained to interpret results, group learners, plan interventions, and monitor progress. Without these processes, assessment risks becoming a compliance task instead of a driver of instruction.

Taken together, the intervention findings indicate that the district has an operational intervention structure. However, implementation must move toward better integration among Brigada Pagbasa, CRLA, and Remedial Instruction. Regular reading assessment should feed into CRLA-informed learner profiling, which should then guide remedial grouping and instructional support. Such integration would make intervention activities more coherent, efficient, and responsive to learner needs.

Table 5. Test of Significant Difference on the Rank Orders of Intervention Activities Implemented

Measure	Brigada Pagbasa	CRLA	Remedial Instruction
Summation of rank of Labo East	63.5	54	81
Summation of rank of Labo West	72.5	45	90

Total Number of Cases	16	14	18
Computed Z	-0.42	-0.89	-0.047
Probability Associated with Z	.4403	.4920	.4246
Decision	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted
Significance Difference	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant

Decision rule: $p > 0.05$ indicates no significant difference; null hypothesis accepted.

The test of significant difference showed that all p-values exceeded the 0.05 level of significance. Brigada Pagbasa produced p = .4403, CRLA produced p = .4920, and Remedial Instruction produced p = .4246. These results led to the acceptance of the null hypothesis across all three intervention activities. Therefore, Labo East and Labo West did not significantly differ in their rank-order perceptions of intervention implementation.

The absence of significant differences suggests that the two districts share broadly similar implementation conditions. This may indicate common district expectations, similar school practices, or parallel implementation experiences among teachers. From a policy perspective, this is useful because improvements can be designed at the district level rather than fragmented into separate district-specific programs. It supports the idea of a unified intervention monitoring framework.

Statistical similarity does not mean that all schools are equally strong in practice. Rather, it means that respondent perceptions across the two districts do not differ enough to be considered statistically significant. Individual schools may still differ in resources, leadership, teacher capacity, and learner profiles. Thus, while district-wide policy is justified, school-level monitoring should still identify local variation.

The findings strengthen the argument for coordinated improvement planning. Since Labo East and Labo West show comparable perceptions, joint training, shared templates, common monitoring tools, and district-wide reporting systems may be effective. The district can develop a single intervention monitoring protocol that schools can contextualize. This approach would promote consistency while allowing flexibility for school-specific needs.

Table 6. Monitoring Practices Along Program Goals and Objectives

Indicator	Labo East Wx	Labo West Wx	Average Wx	Int.	Rank
Assessing learners' progress regularly to track their achievement of program objectives	3.67	3.72	3.70	MP	5
Monitoring the alignment of classroom activities with the stated goals and objectives of the program	4.26	4.18	4.22	MP	1
Evaluating the effectiveness of instructional materials and resources in meeting program objectives	3.88	3.92	3.90	MP	4
Observing classroom practices to ensure adherence to the goals and objectives of the program	3.98	4.12	4.05	MP	3
Reviewing learners' work and assignments to gauge their mastery of program objectives	3.52	3.46	3.49	MP	7
Analyzing assessment data to identify areas where program objectives may need adjustment	3.61	3.77	3.69	MP	6
Providing ongoing feedback and support to teachers to facilitate the implementation of program objectives	4.18	4.18	4.18	MP	2
Soliciting feedback from students and parents regarding their perceptions of the program's effectiveness	3.12	3.02	3.07	P	8
Weighted Average	3.78	3.80	3.79	MP	

Legend: VMP = Very Much Practiced; MP = Much Practiced; P = Practiced; FP = Fairly Practiced; NA = Not at All.

Monitoring practices related to Program Goals and Objectives obtained an overall average of 3.79, interpreted as much practiced. The strongest indicator was monitoring the alignment of classroom activities with stated program goals and objectives, rated 4.22. This finding shows that teachers and implementers pay attention to whether intervention activities are connected to program intentions. Such alignment is important because interventions become less effective when classroom practices drift away from intended outcomes.

Providing ongoing feedback and support to teachers was also highly rated at 4.18. This suggests that monitoring is not limited to checking documents but includes some form of instructional support. Feedback to teachers is a critical element because it helps implementers refine their practices while the program is still ongoing. It also positions monitoring as a developmental process rather than a punitive or purely administrative requirement.

The lowest-rated indicator was soliciting feedback from students and parents, with an average of 3.07. This reveals a participation gap in the monitoring process. Learners and parents are direct stakeholders in literacy intervention, yet their perspectives appear less systematically gathered. Without their feedback, schools may miss important information about motivation, home support, access to reading materials, and learner experience.

The results suggest that the district has a functional goal-alignment monitoring practice but needs to broaden its feedback channels. Monitoring must include not only teachers and school heads but also learners, parents, and community partners. This is

particularly important for Brigada Pagbasa, which relies on community participation. A stronger feedback loop can improve relevance, accountability, and responsiveness in intervention implementation.

Table 7. Monitoring Practices Along Designing the Monitoring Strategy

Indicator	Labo East Wx	Labo West Wx	Average Wx	Int.	Rank
Designing clear objectives and indicators to guide the monitoring process effectively	4.16	4.22	4.19	MP	1
Establishing comprehensive monitoring tools and protocols	3.66	3.52	3.59	MP	3
Engaging stakeholders in the development of the monitoring strategy to ensure inclusivity	3.21	3.14	3.18	P	7
Utilizing technology to streamline data collection and analysis for efficient monitoring	3.37	3.28	3.33	P	5
Providing training and support to staff involved in implementing the monitoring strategy	3.31	3.48	3.40	P	4
Establishing a culture of continuous improvement by using monitoring data to inform decision-making and program refinement	3.60	3.61	3.61	MP	2
Integrating feedback mechanisms to solicit input from stakeholders on the monitoring strategy's effectiveness	3.17	3.24	3.21	P	6
Weighted Average	3.50	3.50	3.50	MP	

Legend: VMP = Very Much Practiced; MP = Much Practiced; P = Practiced; FP = Fairly Practiced; NA = Not at All.

Designing the Monitoring Strategy obtained an average of 3.50, which is interpreted as much practiced but ranked lowest among the monitoring domains. The strongest indicator was designing clear objectives and indicators, with an average of 4.19. This shows that teachers and implementers recognize the importance of defining what the monitoring process is supposed to track. Clear indicators help prevent monitoring from becoming vague or dependent on personal judgment alone.

Establishing a culture of continuous improvement through monitoring data ranked second at 3.61. This suggests that some schools already see monitoring results as a basis for decision-making and program refinement. This is a positive sign because the ultimate purpose of monitoring is not only to report completion but to improve intervention quality. Data-informed refinement is essential when learner needs change over time.

The lower ratings for stakeholder engagement, technology use, staff training, and feedback mechanisms reveal a design limitation. A monitoring strategy that lacks stakeholder input may not fully capture the realities of implementation. A strategy that uses limited technology may also make data consolidation slow and less efficient. Similarly, insufficient training may affect the consistency and accuracy of monitoring practices.

The results indicate that monitoring strategy design is the most important area for structural improvement. Schools may already have objectives, but they need stronger tools, protocols, training, and feedback mechanisms. District offices can address this by developing standard monitoring templates, digital tracking tools, and periodic reflection sessions. Such improvements would help transform monitoring into a more systematic and participatory process.

Table 8. Monitoring Practices Along Targeted Activities

Indicator	Average Wx	Int.	Rank
Tracking the progress of individual students participating in targeted intervention activities	3.96	MP	1
Adjusting and refining targeted intervention activities based on monitoring data and feedback	3.83	MP	2
Collaborating with colleagues to share best practices and strategies	3.60	MP	3
Providing ongoing support and guidance to teachers implementing targeted intervention activities	3.59	MP	4
Monitoring the allocation of resources to support the implementation	3.39	P	5
Analyzing assessment data to gauge the effectiveness of targeted intervention activities	3.23	P	6
Reviewing the fidelity of implementation of intervention activities to ensure adherence to established protocols	3.22	P	7
Weighted Average	3.53	MP	

Domain average: 3.53, interpreted as Much Practiced.

Targeted Activities obtained an overall average of 3.53, interpreted as much practiced. The highest-rated practice was tracking the progress of individual students participating in targeted intervention activities, with an average of 3.96. This shows that monitoring is most visible when it directly concerns learner progress. Individual progress tracking is essential because literacy intervention should respond to learner-specific gaps rather than broad assumptions.

Adjusting and refining targeted intervention activities based on monitoring data and feedback ranked second at 3.83. This result suggests that teachers recognize the value of using monitoring evidence to modify interventions. Adjustment is a key feature of responsive intervention because learners progress at different rates. When data are used to revise activities, intervention becomes more adaptive and learner-centered.

The lower-rated indicators were analyzing assessment data and reviewing fidelity of implementation. These are critical technical aspects of monitoring because they determine whether interventions are both effective and implemented as intended. If fidelity

review is weak, schools may not know whether poor results are caused by weak intervention design or inconsistent implementation. If assessment data are not analyzed deeply, the school may collect data without using it to improve instruction.

The findings imply that targeted activity monitoring is present but must become more technically rigorous. Teachers need support in interpreting data, checking fidelity, and linking learner progress to specific instructional decisions. School heads and reading coordinators should conduct regular intervention review meetings where learner data, activity logs, and intervention adjustments are examined together. This would strengthen the link between targeted activities and measurable learner improvement.

Table 9. Monitoring Practices Along Availability of Materials and Resources

Indicator	Labo East Wx	Labo West Wx	Average Wx	Int.	Rank
Ensuring the adequacy of materials and resources to support the implementation of intervention activities	3.91	4.08	3.91	MP	3
Regularly assessing the availability and accessibility of materials needed	3.84	3.97	3.84	MP	4
Monitoring the utilization of materials and resources to prevent shortages or overstocking	3.31	3.26	3.31	P	5
Implementing word study techniques to explore word roots, prefixes, and suffixes for vocabulary enrichment	4.16	4.28	4.16	MP	2
Evaluating the effectiveness of materials and resources in meeting the diverse needs of students	4.18	4.29	4.18	MP	1
Collaborating with colleagues to share information about available materials and resources for intervention activities	3.16	3.11	3.16	P	7
Seeking feedback from students and staff regarding the quality and usefulness of materials and resources	3.28	3.17	3.28	P	6
Updating and replenishing materials and resources as needed to maintain their relevance and effectiveness	3.13	3.26	3.13	P	8
Weighted Average	3.62	3.62	3.62	MP	

Legend: VMP = Very Much Practiced; MP = Much Practiced; P = Practiced; FP = Fairly Practiced; NA = Not at All.

Availability of Materials and Resources obtained an average of 3.62, interpreted as much practiced. The highest-rated indicator was evaluating the effectiveness of materials and resources in meeting diverse student needs, with an average of 4.18. This shows that implementers are aware that materials must not only be available but also appropriate for learner diversity. The result highlights the importance of matching resources to learners' reading levels, interests, and intervention needs.

Word study techniques for vocabulary enrichment also received a high average of 4.16. This suggests that some materials and instructional practices are directed toward vocabulary development, which is an essential component of reading intervention. Vocabulary support can strengthen comprehension, oral language, and confidence in reading tasks. The inclusion of word study indicates that intervention materials are not limited to decoding but also address meaning-making.

Lower ratings were recorded for collaboration on available materials, seeking feedback from users, and updating or replenishing resources. These results show that materials may be evaluated by teachers, but resource management may not yet be sufficiently collaborative or systematic. If materials are not regularly replenished, they may become outdated or insufficient for changing learner needs. If user feedback is not gathered, schools may not know whether materials are engaging, accessible, or effective.

The findings suggest that resource monitoring should be strengthened as part of intervention governance. Schools need inventories of reading materials, schedules for replenishment, mechanisms for teacher sharing, and feedback forms for learners and staff. District-level support can also help by pooling resources and developing localized reading materials. Stronger resource management would directly support the quality and sustainability of intervention activities.

Table 10. Summary of Monitoring Practices of the Implementation of Intervention Activities

Indicator	Labo East Wx	Labo West Wx	Average Wx	Int.	Rank
Program Goals and Objectives	3.78	3.80	3.79	MP	1
Designing the Monitoring Strategy	3.50	3.50	3.50	MP	5
Targeted Activities	3.55	3.50	3.53	MP	4
Availability of Materials and Resources	3.62	3.62	3.62	MP	2
Processing of Obtained Information	4.07	3.58	3.56	MP	3
Weighted Average	3.60	3.60	3.60	MP	

Legend: VMP = Very Much Practiced; MP = Much Practiced; P = Practiced; FP = Fairly Practiced; NA = Not at All.

The summary of monitoring practices shows an overall weighted average of 3.60, interpreted as much practiced. Program Goals and Objectives ranked first at 3.79, showing that alignment monitoring is the strongest domain. Availability of Materials and Resources ranked second at 3.62, while Processing of Obtained Information ranked third at 3.56. Targeted Activities and Designing the Monitoring Strategy ranked lower, with averages of 3.53 and 3.50 respectively.

The ordering of domains suggests that monitoring is stronger in areas that are visible and documentable. Program alignment and resource availability are easier to check through activity plans, reports, and inventories. In contrast, monitoring strategy design and targeted activity review require deeper technical systems, including data analysis, fidelity checks, and stakeholder feedback. This pattern indicates a need to develop monitoring capacity beyond surface-level implementation checks.

Processing of Obtained Information received a moderate rating, suggesting that data use is present but not yet maximized. In intervention programs, information processing is crucial because assessment results, teacher observations, and learner outputs must be converted into instructional decisions. If data are not interpreted collectively and promptly, they cannot fully guide intervention adjustment. The result therefore points to the need for structured data conferences and intervention review cycles.

Overall, monitoring practices are functional but still developing. Schools appear to have the basic elements of monitoring, but these elements need stronger integration into a coherent improvement cycle. The cycle should include goal setting, data collection, data interpretation, activity adjustment, resource review, stakeholder feedback, and follow-up assessment. Such a cycle can help schools move from activity compliance to evidence-based literacy intervention management.

Table 11. Test of Significant Difference on the Rank Orders of Monitoring Practices

Measure	Program Goals and Objectives	Designing the Monitoring Strategy	Targeted Activities	Availability of Materials and Resources	Processing of Obtained Information
Summation of rank of Labo East	61	53	61.5	66	58
Summation of rank of Labo West	63	52	61.5	70	77
Total Number of Cases	16	14	16	16	16
Computed Z	-0.68	0	-0.63	-0.16	-0.9978
Probability Associated with Z	.48006	.50000	.4562	.4364	.1867
Decision	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted
Significance Difference	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant

Decision rule: $p > 0.05$ indicates no significant difference; null hypothesis accepted.

The test of significant difference for monitoring practices showed that all p-values were greater than 0.05. Program Goals and Objectives had $p = .48006$, Designing the Monitoring Strategy had $p = .50000$, Targeted Activities had $p = .4562$, Availability of Materials and Resources had $p = .4364$, and Processing of Obtained Information had $p = .1867$. These results led to the acceptance of the null hypothesis across all monitoring domains. Thus, no significant difference was found between Labo East and Labo West.

The findings indicate that teachers in both districts perceived monitoring practices in statistically similar ways. This similarity may reflect common implementation guidelines, shared district expectations, or comparable school realities. It also suggests that issues in monitoring are not isolated to one district. Instead, they likely represent system-wide patterns that should be addressed through district-level interventions.

The absence of significant differences strengthens the basis for unified policy recommendations. If one district had shown significantly weaker monitoring, targeted district-specific support would have been necessary. Since both districts show similar perceptions, a common monitoring framework can be adopted across Labo East and West. This framework can still allow school-level contextualization, but its core indicators and procedures should be consistent.

The results also indicate that improvement should focus less on comparing districts and more on strengthening the monitoring system as a whole. Both districts can benefit from common training on data processing, digital monitoring tools, stakeholder feedback, and fidelity checks. Joint learning action cells, district reading conferences, and shared dashboards may promote consistency. The statistical findings therefore support collaborative rather than competitive district improvement planning.

4. Conclusions and Implications

4.1 Conclusions

The study concludes that the intervention activities in the public elementary schools of Labo East and West were generally much implemented. Remedial Instruction emerged as the strongest intervention component, followed by Brigada Pagbasa and CRLA. This indicates that teachers are most confident in direct instructional support for learners with identified reading difficulties. The intervention structure is therefore present and operational, but the three components must be integrated more deliberately.

Brigada Pagbasa was found to be a meaningful intervention mechanism, especially through regular reading assessment, reading buddy programs, and personalized reading plans. These practices show that schools recognize the value of assessment, peer support, and individualized intervention. However, the lower ratings for literacy-rich environments and technology-based reading support indicate that material and digital resources remain areas for improvement. Brigada Pagbasa can therefore be strengthened by pairing human support with richer reading environments and technology-enabled tools.

CRLA was also much implemented, particularly through the use of materials and differentiated instruction. The results indicate that teachers recognize CRLA as a useful assessment and instructional support process. However, collaboration with reading specialists and support staff was the lowest-rated CRLA indicator. This suggests that CRLA implementation needs more technical support, coaching, and collaborative data interpretation.

Remedial Instruction was the highest-rated intervention activity, demonstrating the importance of scaffolding, targeted remediation, and differentiated instruction. Teachers appear to value strategies that directly address learners' reading difficulties. However, lower ratings for research-based instructional strategies and small-group remedial sessions reveal areas that require

further capacity-building. Remedial Instruction should therefore be refined through more evidence-based models and stronger progress monitoring.

The study also concludes that monitoring practices were generally much practiced. Program Goals and Objectives was the strongest monitoring domain, indicating that schools pay attention to alignment between intervention activities and program aims. Availability of Materials and Resources and Processing of Obtained Information were also practiced, but with room for improvement. Designing the Monitoring Strategy and Targeted Activities require deeper technical strengthening.

The monitoring system appears to be stronger in checking alignment and resources than in designing inclusive, data-driven, and stakeholder-informed strategies. This means that monitoring may still be partly compliance-oriented. Schools may be able to report that interventions are being implemented, but they need stronger mechanisms to determine whether interventions are producing the intended learner outcomes. Monitoring must therefore evolve into a continuous improvement process.

The tests of significant difference showed no statistically significant differences between Labo East and Labo West in both intervention implementation and monitoring practices. This means that teachers across the two districts share similar perceptions of the implementation and monitoring systems. The finding supports the development of district-wide recommendations and common monitoring tools. It also suggests that improvement efforts should be coordinated across both districts.

Overall, the study concludes that intervention activities and monitoring practices are substantively present but require greater integration, technical rigor, and stakeholder participation. The findings show that the district has a functional foundation for literacy intervention, yet further improvement is necessary in data use, collaboration, technology integration, resource management, and feedback systems. The study therefore provides a basis for a more systematic monitoring framework. Such a framework should help schools ensure that intervention activities are not only implemented but also continuously improved.

4.2 Implications

The findings imply that school heads should treat monitoring as an instructional leadership function rather than a documentation requirement. School leaders must ensure that intervention activities are aligned with goals, supported by materials, and adjusted based on learner progress. They should establish regular intervention review meetings where teachers examine assessment data and discuss instructional responses. This leadership role is essential for sustaining effective literacy support.

For teachers, the findings imply the need to deepen competence in data-informed literacy intervention. Teachers already conduct assessment and remediation, but they need stronger skills in interpreting CRLA data, designing small-group interventions, and applying research-based strategies. Professional development should therefore focus on practical classroom applications rather than general orientation. Training should help teachers convert assessment findings into specific intervention plans.

For reading coordinators and support staff, the results imply the need for stronger collaboration with classroom teachers. The low rating for specialist collaboration in CRLA indicates that teachers may need more coaching in assessment interpretation and intervention planning. Reading coordinators can facilitate data conferences, model strategies, and help teachers identify appropriate materials. Their role should be embedded in the intervention cycle, not limited to reporting or coordination.

For district supervisors, the results imply the feasibility of adopting a common district monitoring framework. Since no significant differences were found between Labo East and West, a unified system can be implemented across both districts. Such a system may include common indicators, reporting templates, learner progress dashboards, and quarterly review mechanisms. Standardization can promote comparability while still allowing schools to contextualize interventions.

For curriculum implementers, the findings imply the need to align intervention activities with curriculum competencies and learner profiles. Remedial Instruction, Brigada Pagbasa, and CRLA should not operate as separate activities. Instead, assessment results should identify learner needs, intervention activities should respond to those needs, and monitoring should determine whether learning gaps are closing. This alignment will make intervention more purposeful and efficient.

For resource planning, the study implies that literacy-rich environments and technology-based support must be prioritized. Schools should invest in reading corners, leveled reading materials, digital reading tools, and localized resources. Resource monitoring must also include feedback from teachers and learners regarding the usefulness of materials. Without sufficient and appropriate resources, intervention activities may remain limited in reach and impact.

For parents and community stakeholders, the findings imply the need for greater participation in monitoring and feedback. The low rating for soliciting feedback from students and parents suggests that stakeholder voices are not yet fully integrated. Parents can provide information about reading habits at home, learner motivation, and barriers to practice. Community participation can also strengthen Brigada Pagbasa by expanding reading support beyond the classroom.

For policy makers, the study implies the need for policies that institutionalize data-driven monitoring of intervention programs. Policies should require clear indicators, regular progress checks, resource audits, and action planning based on monitoring results. They should also provide support for teacher training, digital tools, and reading materials. Ultimately, policy must ensure that intervention monitoring leads to instructional decisions, not merely compliance reports.

References

[1] Department of Education Philippines. (2021). Brigada Pagbasa manual.
[2] Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. (2020). Response to intervention.
[3] Slavin, R. E. (2020). Evidence-based reform in education.
[4] Hattie, J. (2020). Visible learning.
[5] Fullan, M. (2020). Educational change.
[6] Guskey, T. R. (2020). Evaluating professional development.
[7] Earl, L. (2021). Assessment as learning.

[8] Datnow, A., & Park, V. (2020). Data-driven decision making.
[9] OECD. (2021). Monitoring education systems.
[10] UNESCO. (2020). Literacy intervention strategies.