

Academic Probe on School-Community Partnership and Reading Skills of Students: Basis for a Proposed Program

Eunice R. Combalicer

University of Perpetual Help System- DALTA PHILIPPINES

Email address: julierosemendoza002@gmail.com

Abstract—This study explored the relationship between school-community partnerships and students' reading skills. The research aimed to assess how demographic factors, such as age, sex, education, and length of service, influence the effectiveness of these partnerships. A descriptive research approach was employed, involving surveys with teachers and parents to gather both quantitative and qualitative data. Total enumeration sampling was utilized for the teacher respondents, while simple random sampling determined the sample size for parent respondents. Respondents of this study were 70 teachers and 100 parents in 4 Junior High Schools in Burdeos District, Division of Quezon, during the school year 2023-2024. The findings indicated a significant difference in the strength of school-community partnerships when grouped according to age, sex, education, and length of service for both teachers and parents. This highlighted those various demographic factors play a role in the degree of partnership engagement. Moreover, the study found a significant positive relationship between students' reading skills and the level of school-community partnership across multiple dimensions. Stronger collaboration between schools and communities was associated with better reading outcomes for students. Based on these findings, the study proposed a comprehensive program designed to enhance school-community partnerships, focusing on fostering stronger collaboration to support students' literacy development. This program aimed to improve reading skills by engaging teachers, parents, and the broader community in the academic growth of students.

Keywords— School-community partnership, reading skills, students, demographic factors, educational program.

I. INTRODUCTION

School-community partnerships were widely acknowledged as pivotal elements in improving academic performance and overall student achievement. While some schools had just begun to forge these alliances, others had made considerable strides in this endeavor. Each community's engagement with schools varied based on its unique needs, but the overarching objective remained constant: student success (Spark Generation, 2024).

Educational institutions that excelled understood the significance of fostering positive and collaborative relationships with their local communities, as highlighted by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, cited in Daly, 2022). This emphasis on community involvement led to expanded learning opportunities, heightened student retention, increased teacher morale, and enhanced attendance rates (Daly, 2022).

Education was aptly described as a 'social activity' wherein society, alongside schools, assumed the role of facilitator and partner (Sujatha, 2011, cited in UNESCO 2022).

Family-school-community partnerships embodied a shared responsibility and reciprocal process, wherein schools and community entities engaged families in meaningful and culturally sensitive ways. Families, in turn, proactively supported their children's development and learning. Additionally, schools and community organizations prioritized listening to parents, provided them with the necessary support and resources to actively participate in their children's educational journey (National Learning Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environment, 2024).

School-community partnerships often facilitated the implementation of academic support programs, such as tutoring, mentoring, after-school programs, and enrichment activities. These programs provided students with additional resources, personalized instruction, and opportunities for academic growth beyond the regular school day.

Research showed that participation in academic support and enrichment programs through school-community partnerships was associated with improvements in students' academic performance, including higher grades, test scores, and graduation rates (Vanourek, 2018). Similarly, schools with strong community partnerships that provided access to resources and opportunities outside the classroom tended to have higher student engagement, motivation, and academic achievement (Blankenship & Kelleher, 2019).

In the Philippines, various partnership agreements entered into by DepEd have contributed greatly to the success of educational programs. These partnerships have addressed critical needs, such as classrooms, training of teachers, provision of equipment and construction of other facilities required for the efficient and effective implementation of the different programs, projects and activities. It was indeed important for DepEd to explore diverse ways of financing and providing educational services, and one of the possible solutions was through partnership.

As DepEd continuously found ways to solve the challenges faced by Philippine education, partnership became an important paradigm in delivering and achieving the country's development goals and services. Through partnership, the school communities worked together to provide additional resources to address the immediate needs of the learners. The

collaboration of all education stakeholders was the key to ensuring that our dream of having quality education for all would be achieved (Department of Education, n.d).

Through the combined initiatives of parents, the community, and other stakeholders, the DepEd programs were successfully implemented and found to be beneficial for the students. The significant contributions identified from the implementation of the DepEd programs with the support of the volunteers, assisted learners in terms of food security, physical facilities, learning resources, a conducive learning environment, and reading skills (Tan, 2024).

Mandolado and Ancho's (2023) study on Brigada Eskwela of the DepEd program brought together teachers, parents, and community members to work together in preparation for the school opening. Highlights of findings revealed that the school-community partnership was able to improve physical facilities and generate sufficient funds that the school could use to support practices to achieve organizational success.

In light of the literature discussed, the researcher conducted this study to determine the extent to which school-community partnership affected the academic performance of the students, as well as the strategies and challenges faced in affecting the partnership for students.

There was an increasing acknowledgement in recent years of the significance of cultivating robust collaborations between schools and their neighboring communities. The shift in focus arose from the recognition that education was not exclusively the obligation of schools, but rather a cooperative endeavor that encompassed several stakeholders, such as families, community organizations, and local governments.

School-community partnerships were established based on the principle that by actively involving schools with their communities, they could effectively cater to the varied needs of their students and foster more conducive learning environments. These relationships involved various activities such as parent engagement initiatives, community service projects, cooperation with local businesses, and shared decision-making procedures (RA 9155).

The school's implementation of various programs had garnered support from both internal and external stakeholders. Ensuring that the community and other stakeholders were aware of the school's programs, projects, and activities was a priority for the school. Despite concerted efforts to enhance school-community partnerships, challenges persisted in areas such as school facilities, instructional resources, and parental support and engagement, which in turn reflected on the academic performance of the students. Hence, the researcher conducted this study to craft a program that would enhance academic performance through a school-community partnership.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Specifically, it sought to answer the following:

- 1. What was the demographic profile of teachers and parents in terms of:*
 - 1.1 age;*
 - 1.2 sex;*
 - 1.3 education; and*

- 1.4 Length of years in service?*
- 2. What was the level of school-community partnerships in terms of?*
 - 2.1 Project Implementation;*
 - 2.2 diversity of school-community collaboration; and*
 - 2.3 monitoring and evaluation?*
- 3. What was the level of reading skills of students in English as per the PHIL-IRI Evaluation?*
- 4. What challenges did the respondents encounter in implementing school-community partnerships?*
- 5. Was there a significant difference on the level of school-community partnership when grouped according to profile?*
- 6. Was there a significant relationship between students' reading skills and the school-community partnership?*
- 7. Based on the results of the study, what program could be proposed?*

II. METHODOLOGY

For this study, the descriptive research approach was utilized. This approach to research placed a greater emphasis on the "what" of the studied problem than it does on the "why." One of the key goals of this research methodology is to characterize the characteristics of the group that is being investigated, rather than to gain an understanding of "why" (The Descriptive Research Project, 2021).

Considering this, the researcher concluded that this method was the most appropriate for the investigation. In addition to providing the researcher with a comprehensive view of the situation, this research method would be of great use to the researcher in gathering measurable information regarding the issues.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter provides the presentation, analysis and interpretation of gathered data, which were tabulated and given meaningful implications.

Statement of Problem 1. What is the demographic profile of teachers and parents?

Table 1.1. *Demographic profile of Teachers in Terms of Age*

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
21-25 years old	8	11
26-30 years old	16	23
31-35 years old	24	34
36-40 years old	12	17
41-45 years old	0	0
46-50 years old	0	0
51-55 years old	9	13
56 years old and above	1	1
TOTAL	70	100

Table 1.1 showed the demographic profile of teachers in terms of age. Most of the respondents' ages were 31-35 years old, comprising about 34 percent, indicating a comparatively youthful group of educators, most likely in the early to middle stages of their professional careers, who worked at the school. Teachers aged 36-40 and 26-30 years comprised 17% and 23% of the workforce, respectively, indicated a substantial

percentage of teachers were in their early to mid-career stages. Conversely, a lower percentage of the teaching staff was in the older age groups. Only 1% of responders were 56 years of age or older, while 13% were between the ages of 51 and 55. This implied that a small percentage of educators had advanced to the latter phases of their professions, whether because of retirement, changes in career paths, or institutional hiring practices that prioritized younger candidates.

The study's findings showed that a thorough mentorship program to support teachers with less experience might have been required to improve participation in school-community-related activities. This could have been accomplished by creating rules that promoted career advancement and job satisfaction, which contributed to retaining mid-career teachers while minimizing turnover. Instituting rules that promoted professional progression and job satisfaction, such as recognition systems, opportunities for leadership roles, and ongoing training, encouraged teachers to stay involved. These strategies not only helped to retain mid-career teachers but also promoted continuity and stability when developing long-term school-community activities.

Table 1.2. Demographic profile of Teachers in Terms of Sex

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	24	34
Female	46	66
TOTAL	70	100

Analyzing the demographic profile of instructors by gender showed that 34% were male (24 teachers) and 66% were female (46 teachers), for a total of 70 teachers. This distribution was consistent with global trends, with women occupying the majority of teaching positions, particularly at both elementary and secondary schools. The prevalence of female teachers in the field of education had complex ramifications for student reading abilities. Female teachers could have been great role models, particularly for female students; the absence of male teachers had an impact on male students' reading interest and accomplishment, who might have struggled to identify with reading as a valued skill. The gender representation gap might have had an impact on male students' motivation, involvement, and performance in literacy-related tasks. To address this, fostering school-community partnerships that involve a diverse group of mentors—including male educators and volunteers—can help balance representation and enhanced reading engagement for all students.

Table 1.3. Demographic profile of Teachers in Terms Highest Educational Attainment

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
College Graduate	59	84
Master's Graduate	8	11
Doctorate Graduate	3	5
TOTAL	70	100

A large proportion of teachers (84%) had a college degree, which showed that a bachelor's degree was the minimum requirement for teaching professions. This emphasized how higher education served as a prerequisite for teachers,

guaranteeing that they had the scholarly background and pedagogical abilities required for successful teaching. Meanwhile, a total of 16% of instructors had pursued postgraduate study, with 11% holding master's degrees and 5% earned doctorates. This demonstrated that these teachers went above and beyond the call of duty, pursued additional coursework to broaden their understanding of the subject matter, improved their methods of instruction, and kept up with changing research and practices in education.

Teachers with higher education levels frequently offered deeper subject matter understanding and advanced instructional abilities in the classroom. Their academic background often equipped them with the ability to design more effective lesson plans and differentiated instruction to meet diverse learner needs. Advanced-degree teachers, on the other hand, were better prepared to lead and participate in school-community partnerships. Their training often included exposure to research-based practices, program development, and educational policy, enabling them to take a more active role in decision-making processes. These educators were well-positioned to collaborate with stakeholders in planning and implementing programs aimed at enhancing student performance, particularly in critical areas like literacy. As a result, schools with highly educated teachers experienced more success in both academic instruction and community engagement efforts that targeted improved reading outcomes.

Table 1.4. Demographic profile of Teachers in Terms Years in Service

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
5 years and below	15	21
6 – 10 years	10	14
11-15 years	26	37
16-20 years	9	13
21-25 years	7	10
26 years and above	3	4
TOTAL	70	100

Table 1.4 showed that most of the teacher respondents had 11-15 years of teaching in the field, which constituted 37% of the total respondents. This indicated that teachers usually demonstrated improved teaching methods, effective classroom management tactics, and a thorough comprehension of the curriculum and the requirements of their students. They were able to adapt to different teaching environments and made a significant contribution to school development activities thanks to their broad experience. While 3% of the teachers had teaching experience of 26 years and above, they suggested that despite being fewer in number, these seasoned educators were invaluable to the school. They played important roles in developing educational policies, mentoring colleagues, and cultivating successful school-community relationships because of their in-depth understanding of pedagogical trends, policy changes, and community dynamics.

Findings of the study suggested that using these experienced teachers in dealing with school-community partnership activities could provide significant results in implementing school programs and attracting support from the stakeholders. These experienced educators frequently had a thorough awareness of community dynamics and used their

reputation to build trust and collaboration between the school and its external partners. Their knowledge of school operations and stakeholder expectations qualified them to lead programs that required strategic communication and ongoing engagement.

Furthermore, experienced teachers were great mentors, guiding less experienced colleagues through the difficulties of school-community connections. Schools utilized their knowledge to improve both instructional quality and community support networks, thereby increasing the overall impact of educational programs.

Demographic profile of Parents

Table 1.5. Demographic profile of Parents in Terms of Age

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
36-40 years old	62	62
41-45 years old	16	16
46-50 years old	13	13
51-55 years old	9	9
TOTAL	100	100

A high majority (62%) of parents fell between the ages of 36 and 40, according to Table 1.5. This showed that many parents were young, which could have indicated that their children were in the early stages of education, such as elementary or middle school. Furthermore, parental representation declined as people aged, with only 9% of parents aged 51 to 55. This could have indicated that older parents were less involved in school-related activities, or that their children had completed elementary and secondary schooling.

The study's findings showed that younger parents had more energy and passion, which could have led to more participation in school-community relationships. Their active participation enhanced their children's academic achievement and social development. On the other side, older parents faced difficulties such as busy work schedules or health conditions, which limited their capacity to participate in school events. Schools needed to understand these hurdles and create flexible involvement options to accommodate varied parental demographics.

Table 1.6. Demographic profile of Parents in Terms of Sex

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	34	34
Female	66	66
TOTAL	100	100

The table showed that 66% of engaging parents were female and 34% were male, indicating that moms were more engaged in school-community collaborations in this setting. This indicated that mothers were more actively involved in supporting educational initiatives and participating in school programs. Female parents' higher engagement rates were attributed to conventional caregiving duties and cultural expectations that placed women at the forefront of their children's academic development. However, this gender disparity emphasized the need for methods that encouraged more fathers to join in school-community events, thereby promoting more balanced and inclusive parental engagement.

Data indicated that the larger prevalence of female parents in school-community partnerships reflected a broader trend of increased maternal involvement in education. This engagement increased school achievements while also reinforcing established gender norms in parental participation, such as higher academic performance and stronger links between the home and school environments.

However, this development reinforced established gender stereotypes that placed women in major caregiving and educational support roles. While this was desirable, it also implied that fathers were underrepresented in school-community events, limiting the diversity of parental involvement. Schools needed to actively develop inclusive initiatives that encouraged both mothers and fathers to participate, understanding that various parental contributions promoted school-community collaborations and improved the overall educational experience for students.

Table 1.7. Demographic profile of Parents in Terms of Highest Educational Attainment

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Elementary	23	23
High School	65	65
College	12	12
TOTAL	100	100

A sizable percentage of parents (65%) finished their high school education. This showed that most parents had basic intellectual skills, which could have impacted their involvement in the education of their children. This educational background enabled these parents to provide basic academic support, such as assisting with homework, attending parent-teacher meetings, and providing advice on school-related issues. However, the fact that just 12% of parents held a college degree showed that a smaller fraction may have had the advanced knowledge or resources to help their children with more specialized academic areas, such as higher-level math, science, or advanced reading abilities.

Parents with higher education were frequently better able to navigate educational systems, acquire academic resources, and provide advice on long-term academic and career aspirations. The restricted proportion of college-educated parents presented obstacles in providing full support for students aspiring to better academic achievements, thus affecting the students' long-term educational goals.

The study's findings implied that parents with higher degrees of education were more likely to have had the ability and assets necessary to promote their children's academic goals. Garcia et al. (2021) found a considerable correlation between parents' educational achievement and their level of school involvement. Furthermore, recognizing parents' educational backgrounds enabled schools to build programs that addressed their requirements. For example, workshops on effective study habits helped parents assist their children's education. On the other hand, schools could have given tools and training to help students with homework and school projects, establishing a more inclusive educational atmosphere.

Statement of Problem 2. What is the level of school-community partnerships?

The respondents' level of school-community partnerships in terms of project implementation revealed that instructors were aware of the current projects being implemented at the school, which received the highest rating (WM = 3.50) and was assessed as very high. This meant that instructors were

deeply devoted and active in school-community interactions. Taking responsibility for the project being implemented scored the lowest (WM = 2.86), described as high. This suggested that teachers' involvement in project implementation did not imply that they were fully responsible for ongoing project sustainability.

Table 2.1. Level of school-community partnerships of the Respondents in Terms Project implementation

	Teacher			Parent			Overall		
	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD
Is aware of the current projects being implemented in the school	3.50	Very high	0.68	3.18	High	0.85	3.34	High	0.77
Involves in the planning of the school project	3.24	High	0.81	3.19	High	0.94	3.22	High	0.88
Participate in the implementation of the project	3.31	High	0.69	3.28	High	0.87	3.30	High	0.78
Communicates the project of the school to others	3.29	High	0.74	3.31	High	0.93	3.30	High	0.84
Share ideas in the decision-making process	3.19	High	0.71	3.03	High	0.96	3.11	High	0.84
Takes ownership of the project being implemented	2.86	High	0.91	2.33	Moderately Low	1.04	2.6	High	0.98
Average Weighted Mean	3.23	High	0.76	3.05	High	0.93	3.15	High	0.85

Note: 1.00-1.49 Very Low 1.50-2.49 Moderately Low 2.50-3.49 High 3.50-4.00 Very High

Table 2.2. Level of school-community partnerships of the Respondents in Terms Diversity of school-community collaboration

	Teacher			Parent			Overall		
	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD
Ensures adequate resources for improving reading skills.	3.34	High	0.63	3.16	High	0.85	3.25	High	0.74
Extends support for struggling readers	3.44	High	0.69	3.08	High	0.92	3.26	High	0.81
Coordinates with the barangay officials in promoting school reading initiatives aimed at improving reading skills.	2.64	High	0.92	3.02	High	0.95	3.83	High	0.94
Engages stakeholders in capacity development program in reading initiatives	2.92	High	0.81	2.86	High	0.94	2.89	High	0.88
Solicits professionals and other alumni assistance in the implementation of reading initiatives.	2.76	High	0.88	2.70	High	1.11	2.73	High	1
Average Weighted Mean	3.02	High	0.79	2.96	High	0.95	2.99	High	0.87

Note: 1.00-1.49 Very Low 1.50-2.49 Moderately Low 2.50-3.49 High 3.50-4.00 Very High

On the other hand, communicating school projects to others (WM=3.31) was rated the highest by the parents, described as High, suggesting that parents take an active role in disseminating information about the programs and activities within the community. However, parents rated their sense of ownership over projects the lowest (WM=2.33), showing a gap in deep engagement beyond participation.

Overall, the combined results (WM = 3.15) suggested that both teachers and parents actively contributed to school projects but did not always take full ownership or leadership roles in sustaining them. The highest-ranking indicators—aware of the current projects being implemented in the school, rated the highest (WM = 3.50) suggested that both groups recognized the importance of their understanding of the activities of the schools, as this created collaboration and support in decision-making and project ownership.

To promote greater ownership and address local needs, active parental and community participation in school decision-making was vital. This took more than just involvement in school events; they must have been actively involved in establishing policies, programs, and projects that directly influenced children. Active participation allowed stakeholders to express their perspectives and cultural values, linking educational activities with the actual needs of the community. When parents and community members felt heard and valued, they were more likely to make significant

contributions, which improved the school's ability to serve all students. It was essential that decisions related to student needs involved meaningful consultation and collaboration with stakeholders, supported by clear and transparent communication throughout the process.

While both teachers and parents participated in planning and implementation, lower ratings in sharing ideas in decision-making (WM=3.11) and taking ownership (WM=2.60) suggested that parents may have felt excluded from leadership roles, indicating that while participation existed, it did not extend to influential roles where stakeholders could truly lead or guide school initiatives. This perceived exclusion reduced motivation and diminished the potential benefits of community involvement. Schools deliberately fostered a culture of inclusive decision-making in which every voice is heard and respected. This necessitated school leaders cultivating mutual respect and trust, ensuring that parents, teachers, and community members believed they were co-creators of school rules and activities. Leadership teams provided established opportunities for interaction, such as forums, focus groups, or advisory councils, where stakeholders shared ideas and solutions. Finally, creating a truly inclusive environment ensures that school programs are more responsive to community needs and effective in promoting student success.

By fostering a culture of mutual respect, shared leadership, and transparent communication, schools created a collaborative environment where teachers, parents, and community members were empowered as co-creators of school initiatives. This collaborative model ultimately led to the development of programs that were more responsive to community needs, thereby enhancing student outcomes and promoting educational equity.

Extending support for struggling readers (WM = 3.44) indicated that teachers prioritized offering interventions to improve reading skills, suggesting that teachers accepted responsibility for recognizing difficult readers and implemented targeted interventions such as guided reading sessions, remedial education, and tailored learning plans. Providing such assistance not only improved students' core literacy skills but also boosted their confidence and drive to interact with reading materials. Coordination with barangay authorities for reading initiatives (WM = 2.64) suggested a lack of coordination with local government entities, which jeopardized the long-term viability of community-based reading programs. This lack of coordination had a substantial impact on the sustainability and reach of literacy programs, as barangays played an important role in mobilizing community support and resources. Without effective coordination between schools and local government agencies, reading initiatives may encounter limits in terms of outreach, volunteer support, and logistical assistance.

On the other hand, providing appropriate resources for enhancing reading abilities (WM = 3.16, High) indicated that parents recognized their role in supporting their children's literacy journey, whether by offering access to books, educational tools, or quiet reading spaces. While involving stakeholders in capacity development programs (WM = 2.86, High), it suggested that it was possible that parents were not completely aware of or participated in capacity-building efforts for reading initiatives. Engaging parents in more systematic capacity building can boost their confidence in supporting reading at home and increase their participation in school activities. Addressing hurdles such as time, communication, and access to training was critical to expanding parental participation.

Finally, coordination with barangay authorities for school reading activities (WM = 3.83) indicated that community

leaders played an important role in fostering literacy. This demonstrated the important role that community leaders played in promoting literacy by providing logistical support, organizing reading events, and endorsing literacy as a priority. Their presence not only gave school initiatives credibility but also stimulated community-wide participation, making literacy efforts more inclusive and comprehensive. Soliciting professional and alum assistance in reading initiatives (WM = 2.73) demonstrated a lack of external support for conducting long-term literacy programs. This underutilization was due to poor alum relations, a lack of communication channels, or the absence of planned volunteer activities. However, professionals and alums were helpful collaborators by providing mentorship, giving books and resources, or delivering literacy courses. Building relationships with these groups significantly improved the sustainability and diversity of reading initiatives in schools.

The data indicated that while teachers and parents understood the value of reading programs, engagement with barangay officials, professionals, and alums was limited. Similarly, participation in capacity development programs ranked among the lowest indicators, indicating a lack of training and skill-building opportunities. Furthermore, schools had maintained coordination with local leaders, which encouraged and strengthened community-based partnerships.

The results showed that extending support for struggling readers (WM = 3.44) remained a priority for teachers, highlighting their commitment to implementing targeted interventions like guided reading sessions and remedial programs. Such initiatives not only improved literacy skills but also enhanced students' confidence and motivation. However, coordination with barangay authorities for reading initiatives scored lower (WM = 2.64), suggesting a gap in partnership with local government units, which were crucial in sustaining community-wide literacy programs through resource mobilization and logistical support.

On the parents' side, providing appropriate resources for reading (WM = 3.16) reflected awareness of their role in fostering literacy at home. Yet, involvement in capacity-building activities (WM = 2.86) indicated limited parental engagement in programs designed to enhance their ability to support reading initiatives. Addressing barriers like time constraints and communication gaps has improved this.

Table 2.3. *Level of school-community partnerships of the Respondents in Terms Monitoring and Evaluation*

	Teacher			Parent			Overall		
	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD
1. Takes an active part in monitoring reading initiatives in school through weekly review of the progress.	3.19	High	0.69	2.96	High	0.96	3.08	High	0.83
2. Shares ideas on improving the reading initiatives of the school based on the results of the evaluation.	3.29	High	0.66	2.87	High	0.95	3.08	High	0.81
3. Takes part in conducting assessments before and after the initiatives to measure improvement in reading skills	3.30	High	0.62	2.85	High	1.03	3.08	High	0.83
4. Gathers regular feedback from students on their reading experiences and challenges.	3.24	High	0.67	2.95	High	0.95	3.1	High	0.81
5. Engages community members and local organizations in supporting and evaluating reading initiatives.	2.84	High	0.79	2.68	High	0.92	2.76	High	0.86
Average Weighted Mean	3.17	High	0.69	2.86	High	0.96	3.02	High	0.83

Note: 1.00-1.49 Very Low 1.50-2.49 Moderately Low 2.50-3.49 High 3.50-4.00 Very High

Interestingly, coordination with barangay officials for school reading activities was rated high (WM = 3.83), reaffirming the key role of community leaders in promoting literacy events and endorsing education as a communal priority. Meanwhile, seeking assistance from professionals and alums (WM = 2.73) remained underutilized, likely due to weak networks or lack of organized volunteer opportunities — an area with significant potential for enhancing program sustainability.

The findings showed that both teachers and parents rated the monitoring and evaluation of reading programs in the school as "High," with an overall weighted mean (WM) of 3.02. Teachers evaluated their involvement higher (WM = 3.17) than parents (WM = 2.86), indicating that teachers were more active in monitoring and evaluating reading programs. The highest-rated indicator among teachers was "Takes part in conducting assessments before and after the initiatives to measure improvement in reading skills" (WM = 3.30, SD = 0.62), whereas for parents, the highest-rated item was "Shares ideas on improving the school's reading initiatives based on the results of the evaluation" (WM = 2.87, SD = 0.95).

However, the lowest-rated indicator for both groups was "Engages community members and local organizations in supporting and evaluating reading initiatives" (Teachers: WM = 2.84, SD = 0.79; Parents: WM = 2.68, SD = 0.92), indicating a need for stronger collaboration between schools and external stakeholders in monitoring reading programs. This implied that, while schools created reading programs, local organizations and community members played a limited

role in both the support and evaluation phases of these activities. Lack of engagement was due to poor outreach, imprecise role communication, or a belief that external stakeholders were not important to the review process. Strengthening partnerships with non-governmental organizations, civic groups, and local companies provided new views, additional resources, and a shared feeling of responsibility, all of which were critical for sustaining and enhancing reading outcomes.

These findings reinforced the need for schools to deliberately expand the involvement of both parents and community partners in reading program monitoring and evaluation. Hoover-Dempsey et al. (2022) emphasized that strong parental involvement in literacy initiatives substantially contributed to improved student reading outcomes, not just through direct support at home but also by participating in program assessments and offering valuable feedback on the effectiveness of instructional strategies. Their research suggested that many parents were willing to be involved but lacked the necessary knowledge or confidence to participate meaningfully in program evaluation processes. Schools should offer training sessions, workshops, and consistent communication platforms to help parents develop the skills and understanding needed to track and support their children's reading progress effectively. Schools should have given training and regular contact to parents so they can effectively monitor their children's reading progress.

Summary of the Level of School-Community Partnership

Table 2.4. Summary of the Level of School-Community Partnership

	Teacher			Parent			Overall		
	M	VI	SD	M	VI	SD	M	VI	SD
Project Implementation	3.23	High	0.76	3.05	High	0.93	3.15	High	0.85
Diversity of School-Community Collaboration	3.02	High	0.79	2.96	High	0.95	2.99	High	0.87
Monitoring and Evaluation	3.17	High	0.69	2.86	High	0.96	3.02	High	0.83
Composite Mean	2.78	High	0.75	2.52	High	1.04	2.65	High	0.65

Note. 1.00-1.49 Very Low 1.50-2.49 Moderately Low 2.50-3.49 High 3.50-4.00 Very High

Data revealed that teachers had a high level of participation in project implementation (M = 3.23, SD = 0.76), reflecting a strong and reasonably consistent commitment to carrying out school activities and projects. This implied that teachers were actively involved in the delivery and implementation of school initiatives, demonstrating their critical role in driving educational activities and objectives. Respondents rated the diversity of school-community collaboration the least, showing that collaboration remained limited to familiar or traditional partners, thereby reducing opportunities for broader community involvement and innovative contributions from diverse groups.

On the other hand, parents had also shown their high level of participation in project implementation (M = 3.05, SD = 0.93), showing that many parents were willing to support school activities, particularly those with visible or tangible components. In terms of monitoring and evaluation, participation obtained the lowest level. This suggested a lack of ongoing commitment or impact beyond the early stages of a project. This indicated parents' limited chances or capacity to

participate in more technical or strategic areas of school programming, such as measuring progress or providing feedback.

While monitoring and evaluation received the lowest level of participation, both respondents demonstrated a high level of participation overall in project implementation (M = 3.15, SD = 0.85), confirming that stakeholders were most active when they were involved in direct and immediate actions. This imbalance implied that, even though implementation was adequately supported, the sustainability, accountability, and effectiveness of projects were jeopardized in the absence of greater participation in oversight and follow-through activities.

Both teachers and parents reported high levels of engagement in all three areas: project implementation, cooperation and diversity, and monitoring and evaluation. However, teachers regularly reported higher levels of involvement than parents in all categories. The composite mean reinforced this, with teachers evaluating the relationship somewhat higher (M = 2.78) than parents (M = 2.52). This implied that, while collaboration was usually seen positively,

there was a perception gap across stakeholders. Teachers were more aware of or participated in collaborative activities than parents, or parents felt less engaged or acknowledged in these procedures.

The findings emphasized the need for inclusive and open communication in bridging the perceived gap between teachers and parents in school-community collaborations. While teachers were active participants, parents frequently felt alienated from important procedures such as decision-making and evaluation. This gap was due to insufficient communication and a lack of relevant roles for parents. To address this issue, schools developed two-way communication, involved parents in leadership and planning, and promoted mutual trust. Strengthening collaboration in this manner improved program effectiveness and student achievement.

Statement of Problem 3. What are the reading skills of students in English as per the PHIL-IRI Evaluation?

Table 3. *Level of Reading Skills of Students in English*

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Frustration	14	20
Instructional	44	63
Independent	12	17
Total	70	100

The statistics showed that the majority of students (63%) had instructional-level reading skills, indicating that they needed guidance and support to effectively absorb texts. This level suggested that, while these children had gained basic reading skills, they required purposeful instruction to improve their comprehension and fluency. A lesser percentage (17%) were classed as independent readers, which meant they could read and comprehend texts without assistance, demonstrating strong literacy proficiency and the ability to engage with academic content confidently. However, 20% of children were frustrated, suggesting that reading was a significant issue for them; these students were likely to struggle with vocabulary, comprehension, or decoding, and without tailored treatments, they might have become disinterested or frustrated. This study emphasized the importance of diversified literacy programs that catered to different reading levels, such as remedial support for struggling readers and enrichment activities for independent readers.

The findings underlined the significance of structured literacy programs and customized education to accommodate pupils' varying reading skills. Schools were encouraged to provide remedial reading programs to strengthen core literacy abilities and prevent subsequent academic challenges, as well as give access to diverse and demanding reading materials to keep students engaged and help them enhance their comprehension skills. At the same time, kids with advanced reading skills were challenged with a diverse range of challenging and relevant books that promoted critical thinking and comprehension. Access to a diverse range of reading materials and individualized support ensured that all students, regardless of skill level, could grow and thrive in their literacy journey.

The statistics revealed that a majority of students, specifically 63%, fell under the instructional reading level category. This indicated that while these learners had acquired basic reading skills, they still required guided instruction and support to effectively comprehend and engage with texts appropriate for their grade level. Students at this stage often need scaffolded activities, explicit teaching of vocabulary and comprehension strategies, and opportunities to practice reading with support from teachers or peers. Without intentional instructional intervention, these students might have struggled to develop higher-order literacy skills necessary for independent academic success.

A smaller group, 17% of students, were categorized as independent readers, meaning they could read and comprehend grade-level texts with minimal or no assistance. These students demonstrated strong literacy proficiency and the ability to engage confidently with academic content. For these learners, the educational focus shifted toward enrichment programs and the provision of diverse, complex reading materials that challenged their critical thinking, comprehension, and analytical skills.

Conversely, 20% of students were classified as frustrated readers—those who struggled considerably with decoding, comprehension, vocabulary acquisition, and fluency. For this group, reading became a source of anxiety and discouragement, often leading to disengagement from academic activities. Without individualized, remedial interventions such as guided reading sessions, phonics-based instruction, or tailored literacy programs, these students risked falling further behind, affecting their overall academic performance and confidence.

These findings emphasized the importance of implementing differentiated literacy programs that addressed the diverse reading competencies within a classroom. Schools were advised to prioritize remedial reading programs for struggling readers to strengthen foundational literacy skills and mitigate future academic difficulties. Simultaneously, providing diverse and stimulating reading materials for students at the instructional level was crucial to enhancing comprehension, vocabulary development, and reading fluency. Independent readers, on the other hand, benefited from access to more complex, engaging, and content-rich texts that encouraged analytical reading, synthesis of ideas, and deeper comprehension.

Statement of Problem 4. What are the Challenges in implementing school-community partnerships?

The data revealed that both teachers and parents generally agreed on the existence of challenges in school-community partnerships, with an overall average weighted mean of 2.65, demonstrating a general perception that such partnerships faced obstacles. However, teachers ($M = 2.78, SD = 0.83$) tended to perceive these challenges as slightly more significant than parents ($M = 2.52, SD = 1.04$), indicating a higher awareness or concern about the difficulties that arose in school-community collaborations from a teacher's perspective.

Table 4. Challenges in implementing school-community partnerships as assessed by the respondents

	Teacher			Parent			Overall		
	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD	WM	VI	SD
1. Limited availability of time for effective collaboration between schools and communities.	2.93	Agree	0.71	2.76	Agree	1	2.76	Agree	0.86
2. Interference in daily school activities	2.19	Agree	1.1	1.79	Disagree	0.9	1.99	Disagree	1.1
3. Implementation of cooperative initiatives and schemes intended to improve student welfare and academic performance.	3.21	Agree	0.66	2.84	Agree	0.9	3.03	Agree	0.78
4. Insufficient participation and involvement from members of the community.	2.76	Agree	0.81	2.6	Agree	1.1	2.68	Agree	0.96
5. Poor channels of communication lead to ineffective exchange of information between schools and communities.	2.66	Agree	0.88	2.28	Agree	1.2	2.47	Agree	1.04
6. Difficulties or issues arising in the interactions and relationships between parents and teachers.	2.74	Agree	0.79	2.48	Disagree	1.1	2.61	Agree	0.95
7. Lack of openness and clarity in decision-making processes and resource management.	3.17	Agree	0.83	2.89	Agree	1.1	3.03	Agree	0.97
Average Weighted Mean	2.78	Agree	0.83	2.52	Agree	1.04	2.65	Agree	0.65

Note: 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree 1.50-2.49 Disagree 2.50-3.49 Agree 3.50-4.00 Strongly Agree

The highest-ranked challenge for teachers was "Implementation of cooperative initiatives and schemes intended to improve student welfare and academic performance" (M = 3.21, SD = 0.66), reflecting considerable challenges to implementing effective collaborative initiatives meant to meet students' overall requirements. Teachers felt a sense of responsibility for developing and sustaining activities that engaged both the school and the community, frequently meeting challenges in aligning resources and techniques to achieve effective outcomes.

For parents, the most significant issue was "Lack of openness and clarity in decision-making processes and resource management" (M = 2.89, SD = 1.10), showing that parents felt alienated from crucial decisions affecting their students' education and were concerned about how resources were distributed and handled, which jeopardized the viability of collaborative school-community efforts.

On the other hand, the least concerning issue for both groups was "Interference in daily school activities", which was disagreed upon by parents (M = 1.79, SD = 0.90) and was agreed upon by teachers (M = 2.19, SD = 1.10). This implied that parents often regarded any external contributions or interactions as supportive and constructive, rather than intrusive. They regarded such involvement as an opportunity to strengthen links between the school and the community, despite their belief that it had a negative impact on their students' educational environment.

The findings emphasized the need for honest decision-making, open communication, and ongoing collaboration in improving school-community ties. These components were essential for creating trust and ensuring that all stakeholders—teachers, parents, local governments, and community organizations—were on the same page and worked towards common goals. Clear communication channels helped to avoid misunderstandings, align expectations, and keep everyone informed about school projects, which led to increased community involvement and support.

Furthermore, weak communication channels (M = 2.47, SD = 1.04) presented a barrier that schools must overcome by implementing effective two-way communication systems. This suggested that both teachers and parents believed that present communication systems were insufficient, which

limited the flow of critical information and reduced stakeholder participation.

Statement of Problem 5. Is there a significant difference in the level of school perception in school-community partnership when grouped according to profile?

Table 5. Test of Difference in School Community Partnership when grouped according to Profile

Teachers	School-community partnerships	p value	Interpretation	Decision
Age		0.001	Significant	Reject Ho
Sex	Project implementation	0.001	Significant	Reject Ho
Education	School-community collaboration	0.001	Significant	Reject Ho
Service	Monitoring and Evaluation	0.001	Significant	Reject Ho
Parents				
Age	Project implementation	0.001	Significant	Reject Ho
Sex	School-community collaboration	0.001	Significant	Reject Ho
Education	Monitoring and Evaluation	0.001	Significant	Reject Ho

Note: Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). See Appendix B for the exact p value

A Kruskal-Wallis H Test was conducted to compare the school-community partnership when grouped according to profile. The results were statistically significant, $H(5) = 58.12, p = .001$, indicating that there were significant differences between the school community and demographic profile.

The statistical results showed that there was a substantial difference in school-community partnerships between teachers and parents based on age, gender, education, and duration of service (p-value = 0.001). Because all values were less than the 0.05 significance level, the null hypothesis was rejected, implying that these demographic factors influenced differences in how school-community partnerships functioned in terms of project implementation, collaboration, and monitoring and evaluation.

According to this result, teachers' and parents' levels of involvement, communication techniques, expectations, and duties varied depending on their demographic features. For example, older or more experienced teachers were suited to navigating and leading community-based projects due to their

exposure and expertise with school systems, whereas younger or less experienced persons required additional support or mentoring. Similarly, parents with higher educational attainment felt more comfortable participating in planning and decision-making processes, whereas those with lower education levels felt less prepared to contribute actively.

Schools assigned age-appropriate and experience-based roles to teachers and parents in projects and collaborations. Mentorship programs and community engagement courses helped younger teachers and parents become more involved in their communities. On the other hand, schools provided flexible participation opportunities to encourage more participation from both male and female stakeholders. Furthermore, people with higher levels of education participated in leadership roles and strategic planning, and those with less formal education contributed through practical participation and hands-on experiences.

A Kruskal-Wallis H Test was conducted to compare school-community partnerships when grouped according to respondent profiles. The analysis yielded statistically significant results, $H(5) = 58.12, p = .001$, indicating meaningful differences in the nature and strength of school-community partnerships when factors such as age, gender, educational attainment, and length of service were considered. The null hypothesis was disproved because the p-value was below the 0.05 significance threshold, demonstrating that these demographic variables had a substantial impact on how stakeholders participated in and supported school-community collaborations, with a focus on program implementation, collaboration, and program monitoring and evaluation.

A closer look at these findings revealed several important insights. For instance, age and experience played a crucial role in determining levels of involvement and leadership in school initiatives. Older or more experienced teachers and parents often brought with them institutional knowledge, familiarity with school-community dynamics, and established networks, making them more likely to take on leadership roles or serve as mentors.

Conversely, younger or less experienced individuals lacked confidence or clarity regarding their expected roles within these partnerships, requiring additional orientation, mentorship, or gradual involvement to build their capacity for community engagement.

Educational attainment also emerged as a significant factor influencing participation patterns. Parents and teachers with higher education levels typically possess greater confidence and capacity to engage in decision-making, planning, and evaluation processes. They often were more familiar with formal communication practices, data interpretation, and program planning methodologies, making them well-positioned to assume strategic and leadership functions within partnerships. Those with lower educational backgrounds, while no less invested in their children's success, preferred or were limited to more hands-on or operational roles, participating through volunteer work, event coordination, or logistical support. Gender differences also were found to influence engagement levels, with variations in communication preferences, available time, and perceived responsibilities. This underscored the importance of creating inclusive and flexible participation models that accommodated the needs of both male and female stakeholders, recognizing and valuing diverse forms of involvement.

These findings suggested that schools would benefit from assigning context-sensitive roles in school-community projects, acknowledging individual strengths, experiences, and preferences—for example, offering leadership roles or mentorship responsibilities to more experienced individuals while providing training and structured support for newer or less confident stakeholders. Schools might also develop community engagement workshops, capacity-building sessions, and mentorship programs that target less experienced parents and younger teachers to gradually build their confidence and involvement in school-community partnerships.

These results were strongly aligned with the conclusions drawn by Smith and Brown (2022), who similarly found that demographic characteristics influenced school-community partnerships to varying degrees. In their study, while demographic factors such as age, education, and experience sometimes had minimal effects on surface-level participation, such as event attendance, they had a marked influence on deeper involvement activities like decision-making, program design, and long-term project leadership.

Statement of Problem 6. Is there a significant relationship between reading skills and the level of school-community partnership?

Table 6. Test of Relationship between reading skills and the level of school-community Partnership

Teachers	School-community partnerships	r	p value	Interpretation	Decision
Reading Skills	Project implementation	0.781	0.001	Significant	Reject Ho
	School-community collaboration	0.795			
	Monitoring and Evaluation	0.847			
Parents					
Reading Skills	Project implementation	0.613	0.001	Significant	Reject Ho
	School-community collaboration	0.609			
	Monitoring and Evaluation	0.684			

Note: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). See Appendix B for the exact p value

A Spearman's rank-order correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between reading skills and the level of school-community partnership. The analysis revealed a

very weak, significant positive correlation, $p = .78, p = .001$, indicating a meaningful association between the variables.

Statistical research showed a substantial positive link between students' reading ability and the extent of school-community engagement across multiple dimensions. Because all correlation values were positive and statistically significant, the null hypothesis was rejected, implying that greater school-community ties led to improved reading skills in students. These findings clearly supported the rejection of the null hypothesis, demonstrating that variations in school-community engagement levels were significantly associated with disparities in students' reading proficiency.

Findings suggested that when schools worked closely with families, local leaders, and community organizations, students developed higher literacy abilities. Joint reading programs, community-led tutorials, and parental involvement in literacy progress tracking were all examples of partnerships that provided kids with consistent support and motivation outside of the classroom. A highly engaged school-community context fostered a learning ecosystem in which literacy was prioritized at home and in the community, reinforcing classroom instruction and fostering a culture of education.

According to data, schools provided literacy training programs to parents so that they could support their children's reading development at home. Community organizations assisted school efforts by offering reading programs, literacy courses, and access to literature. Furthermore, improved school-community partnerships helped address reading

challenges through educational interventions and early remediation initiatives.

7. Proposed program based on the results of the study.

A program is proposed to enhance the school-community partnerships and increase the reading skills of the students. Rationale: A strong partnership between schools and the wider community is essential in fostering student success, particularly in foundational skills like reading. The rationale for the proposed program lies in the growing recognition that improving students' reading abilities requires not only the efforts of teachers and school administrators but also the active engagement of families, local organizations, and stakeholders. When schools collaborate with parents, barangay leaders, NGOs, and volunteers, they create a supportive environment where learning extends beyond the classroom. This program is designed to bridge the gap between home and school by promoting shared responsibility in developing literacy skills through activities such as community reading sessions, parent workshops, and resource mobilization. With declining reading comprehension level observed among students – especially in early grade levels – this initiative aims to create a culture of reading that is inclusive, sustainable, and rooted in real-life partnerships. By leveraging community support and participation, the program not only enhances reading proficiency but also builds trust, communication and unity between the school and its surrounding community.

Table 7. *Proposed Program to Strengthen School-Community Partnerships*

Key Result Area	Objectives	Strategies/ Activities	Persons Involved	Time Frame	Resources	Expected Output
Project Implementation	To enhance stakeholder ownership of reading projects	Organize planning sessions where parents, teachers, alums, and barangay officials jointly design reading initiatives.	Teachers, Parents, Barangay Officials, Community Members	April to May	P25000: P10000 Venue preparation, P2000 Printed materials, P8000 meals, and P5000 facilitation fees.	Stakeholders showed shared responsibility; documented plans from co-design sessions
School-Community Collaboration	To expand school-community collaboration beyond barangay coordination	Implement community-based reading centers Invite alums, professionals, and local NGOs to adopt reading roles such as mentors, donors, or facilitators.	Teachers, Parents, Barangay Officials, Community Members	May to June	P5000: P2000 community-based reading centers P3000 stakeholder engagement activities feedback sessions	NGO, alumni and other professionals demonstrated a strong culture of collaboration
Monitoring and Evaluation	To enhance monitoring and evaluation with shared responsibility	Organize community teams to conduct reading progress monitoring and feedback, using rubric and performance indicators.	School Leaders, Parents, PTA, Local Government Units, NGOs	Second Quarter	P10000: P2000 performance rubrics P5000 quarterly community feedback sessions P3000 Preparation of evaluation reports	Community-led reports on student progress submitted every quarter
Students Reading Skills	To increase student reading proficiency from instructional to independent level Capacitate parents in using home-based reading materials	Implement tailored reading camps, phonics drills, and home-guided reading logs for struggling readers.	Teachers, School Administrators, Parents	Year Round	P10000: P3000 reading camps P3000 phonics drills and P4000 printing of home-based reading materials	25–50% of instructional-level students moved to independent level at the end of school year
Transparent Decision-Making	To address concerns about transparency in decision-making	Establish monthly forums where all stakeholders review budget use, project progress, and raise concerns openly	School Administrators, Parents, Teachers	Quarterly	P5000: regular stakeholder forums, budget transparency boards, publication of financial and progress reports	Published minutes and financial transparency boards

The fourth KRA addressed the urgent need to improve students' reading skills, particularly given that 63% of students were found to be at the instructional reading level, requiring additional support to achieve independence. The proposed strategies included tailored reading camps, phonics drills, and home-based reading logs, combined with parent capacity-building programs. This multi-tiered intervention ensured that struggling readers received remedial support while independent readers were challenged through enrichment activities. The target of moving 25–50% of instructional readers to independent status by the end of the school year was ambitious yet realistic, especially when literacy development was supported both in school and at home. Bendanillo (2021) similarly found that parental involvement and targeted reading interventions had a direct, positive effect on students' reading performance, validating the inclusion of family literacy initiatives within the plan.

Finally, the fifth KRA sought to improve transparency in decision-making through regular stakeholder forums, public transparency boards, and the publication of financial and progress reports. The study highlighted concerns over limited community involvement in decision-making, despite existing participation in activities. This strategy ensured that community members remained informed about project progress, budget utilization, and decisions affecting the program's direction. Transparency mechanisms not only build trust but also enhance stakeholder motivation and long-term commitment to school initiatives.

Budget allocation for the proposed program

This budget was designed to support a 1-year implementation of activities aimed at improving reading skills through strong school-community collaboration.

To support the effective implementation of the proposed school-community reading initiative, a total budget of ₱55,000 was recommended. For Project Implementation, an allocation of ₱25,000 was designated to conduct collaborative planning sessions with key stakeholders, including parents, teachers, barangay officials, and alums. This covered venue preparation, printed materials, meals, and facilitation fees. For School-Community Collaboration, ₱5,000 was allotted to establish community-based reading centers and support stakeholder engagement activities such as alum mentoring and local NGO participation. For Monitoring and Evaluation, ₱10,000 was allocated for the creation and deployment of performance rubrics, quarterly community feedback sessions, and preparation of evaluation reports. Enhancing Students' Reading Skills required ₱10,000 for reading camps, phonics drills, and the printing of home-based reading materials. Lastly, Transparent Decision-Making was supported with ₱5,000, earmarked for regular stakeholder forums, budget transparency boards, and the publication of financial and progress reports. This budget ensured inclusive participation, sustainability, and measurable improvements in student literacy through meaningful school-community partnerships.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The demographic profile of teachers and parents suggested a strong presence of experienced teachers and parents with diverse educational backgrounds. This difference in educational attainment impacted the level of involvement and understanding of school initiatives.
2. Teachers demonstrated a strong understanding of school projects, while parents play a key role in communicating these initiatives. Teachers focused on academic interventions, while parents prioritize resource availability for student improvement.
3. Most students were at the instructional level, meaning they required consistent guidance and structured support to develop their reading comprehension.
4. Teachers struggled with implementing collaborative initiatives, while parents highlighted a lack of transparency in decision-making. These issues hindered the effectiveness of school-community partnerships.
5. There was a significant difference in school-community partnerships based on age, sex, education, and length of service. This suggested that personal and professional characteristics influence how individuals engage with and contribute to collaborative efforts between schools and their surrounding communities.
6. The positive correlation between reading skills and school-community partnership suggested that greater collaboration leads to improved student reading performance.
7. By fostering collaborative efforts between teachers, parents, and the community, the program aimed to provide structured support and targeted interventions for struggling readers

Based on the conclusions drawn, the following are recommended:

1. Schools should implement parent education programs to bridge the gap in understanding school projects through training workshops for parents to enhance their involvement in school-community partnerships. By providing parents with the necessary information and skills, they may play a more active and informed role in school-community collaborations.
2. Strengthen joint initiatives between teachers and parents, aligning interventions with student needs by creating a structured feedback system where parents and teachers can exchange insights into reading interventions. This collaborative communication promotes trust and shared accountability for student learning.
3. Implement targeted reading interventions such as peer-assisted learning, guided reading sessions, and literacy workshops. Increasing school-community reading programs encourages parents and neighborhood volunteers to actively promote literacy. These efforts provide a strong support network for children outside of the classroom.

REFERENCE

- [1]. Al-Rimawi, S. & Al Masri, A. (2022). The Level of Reading Comprehension Skills of Students with Learning Disabilities in Jordan.

- Journal of Educational and Social Research. Vol 12 No 1. January 2022. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2022-0019>
- [2]. Alonzo, A., & Santos, M. (2021). Educational reforms in the Philippines: Addressing literacy challenges. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 12(5), 45-58.
 - [3]. Anderson-Butcher, D., (2024). A Case for Expanded School-Community Partnerships in Support of Positive Youth Development. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cs/28.3.155>
 - [4]. Asim, S. & Riaz, A. (2020). Community Engagement in Schools: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Pakistan. <https://www.doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-9280>
 - [5]. Aung, N. N., Arunberkfa, N., Hague, M., Luxchaigul, N., & Vadevelu, K. (2019). Community Participation In Education: A Case Study of Taungzalat School in Kalay, Myanmar. *Journal of Education in Black Sea Region*, 5(1), 98–117. <https://doi.org/10.31578/jeb.v5i1.193>
 - [6]. Bagolong, N., & Usop, A. (2021). Reading Skills of Elementary Pupils as Basis for an Intervention Plan: The Case of Don E. Sero Elementary School, Philippines. *JPAIR Institutional Research*, 16(1), 13-2.
 - [7]. Blankenship, C., & Kelleher, P. (2019). Community Schools: An Evidence-Based Strategy for Equitable School Improvement. *American Educator*, 43(2), 20-25.
 - [8]. Borrel, N. Y. (2022). School-community partnerships: Bhutanese principals' impact on community involvement in schools. <https://www.doi.org/10.5204/thesis.eprints.233666>
 - [9]. Brianna, B. (2024). Inclusive Decision-Making: A Practical Guide for Middle Managers and the C-Suite. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/inclusive-decision-making-practical-guide-middle-blackwood-mallory-r2goe>
 - [10]. Cabardo, J. R. O. (2021). Participation of Stakeholders and School-Based Management. *Journal of Inquiry & Action in Education*, 8(1), 2016
 - [11]. Chacha, M. & Tangi, F. (2023). Challenges facing stakeholders' participation in improving teaching and learning process in public secondary schools in Rorya District, Mara, Tanzania. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22161/jhed.5.6.4>
 - [12]. Daly, C. (2022). How Community Involvement in Schools Will Help Students Prosper. <https://thoughtexchange.com/blog/community-involvement-in-schools/>
 - [13]. Datingguino, M. G. R. (2019). The School-Community Relations in Batangas State University. *International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences* Volume 6, Issue 2, ISSN (Online) : 2349–5219
 - [14]. DepEd. (2021). National Assessment of Student Learning: Reading Proficiency Report. Department of Education, Philippines.
 - [15]. Đukić, T. B. M., Bogavac, B. S., Stojadinović, A. M., and Rajčević, P. D. (2022). Parental Involvement in Education and Collaboration with School. <https://doi.org/10.23947/2334-8496-2022-10-1-01-14>
 - [16]. de Bondt, M., Willenberg, I. A., & Bus, A. G. (2020). Do book giveaway programs promote the home literacy environment and children's literacy-related behavior and skills? *Review of Educational Research*, 90(3), 349-375.
 - [17]. De la Peña, C. & Loque-Rojas, M. J. (2021). Levels of Reading Comprehension in Higher Education: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Front. Psychol.*, 04 August 2021. *Educational Psychology*. Volume 12 – 2021| <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.712901>
 - [18]. DepEd. Overview of Partnership. <https://dpap.deped.gov.ph/about-overview>
 - [19]. Dowdall, N., Melendez-Torres, G. J., Murray, L., Gardner, F., Hartford, L., & Cooper, P. J. (2020). Shared picture book reading interventions for child language development: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Child Development*, 91(2), e383–e399. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13225>
 - [20]. Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools*. Westview Press.
 - [21]. Epstein, J. L. (2021). *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Your Handbook for Action*. Corwin Press.
 - [22]. Erdem, C. & Kaya, M. (2020). A Meta-Analysis of the Effect of Parental Involvement on Students' Academic Achievement. 2020 VOL. 7, No. 3. <https://j14d.org/index.php/ej14d/article/view/417/567>
 - [23]. Essuman, A. (2019). Improving Education Delivery through Community-School Partnership: Is the "Social Contract" Being Weakened? A Study of Two Rural Schools. <https://www.doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-06-2018-0175>
 - [24]. Estimada, C. R. Aquino, L. E. & Estimada-Bolleser, A. (2019). Partnership among Educational Stakeholders: Its Impact on School Management. <https://www.dpublication.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/33-ICTLE.pdf>
 - [25]. Flores, D. R and Perez, H. D. (2022). Parent-School-Community Involvement in the Academic Performance of Senior High School Students-GAS (Grade 11 and 12) in One Public High School in the New Normal: Towards Project ISLA. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajiri.v1i1.466>
 - [26]. Francisco, L. D., & Madrazo, C. A. (2019). Reading habits, reading comprehension and academic performance of grade V pupils. *Asian ESP*, 15(2), 138-165.
 - [27]. Freeland, S. F. (2020). Community Schools: Improving Academic Achievement Through Meaningful Engagement. <https://www.doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-0280-8.CH008>
 - [28]. French, G., Farrell, T., & McCormack, M., Nic, M., & Shiel, C. (2023). Enabling
 - [29]. Community Engagement to Support Literacy, Digital Literacy, and Numeracy Development for All Children A Review of Literature.
 - [30]. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370825586_Enabling_Community_Engagement_to_Support_Literacy_Digital_Literacy_and_Numeracy_Development_for_All_Children_A_Review_of_the_Literature
 - [31]. Galang, C. Q. (2020). Community Partnership In Secondary Schools: A Sequential Analysis Of Issues, Problems And Outstanding Practices. *European Journal of Research Development and Sustainability (EJRDS)*. Vol. 1 No. 1, September 2020, ISSN: 2660-5570. <https://www.scholarzest.com/>
 - [32]. Garcia, M., Rodriguez, S., & Martinez, L. (2021). Parental Demographics and Engagement in School-Community Partnerships: A Comparative Analysis. *Journal of Family and Community Engagement*, 12(4), 213-228.
 - [33]. Gipit, F. G., Benavide, N. G., & Labo, A. D. (2020). School-Community Partnerships in Bulan District. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*. ISSN: 2319-7064
 - [34]. Hakim, L. (2020). The Participation of the Community in Enhancing Education Quality. <https://www.doi.org/10.51278/AJ.V2I1.34>
 - [35]. Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2022). The impact of communication strategies on effective school governance. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 98(4), 112-129.
 - [36]. Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., Ice, C. L., & Whitaker, M. C. (2022). Parental engagement in literacy programs: Impacts and challenges. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 12(3), 45-60.
 - [37]. Hwang, N. and Fitzpatrick, B. (2021). Student-Teacher Gender Matching and Academic Achievement. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584211040058>
 - [38]. Ismanto, B. & Sanoto, H. (2023). Exploring the Role of Community-Based Partnership for Enhancing Academic Achievement: Empowering Students Through Quality Teaching. <https://www.doi.org/10.33394/jk.v9i2.7816>
 - [39]. Johnson, A., Smith, J., & Anderson, L. (2023). Demographic Factors and School Community Partnerships: Exploring the Role of Teachers. *Journal of Educational Research*, 45(3), 321-335.
 - [40]. Kamkwis, M. Z. & Zumo, M. A. (2019). Community Involvement and Impact on Public Secondary Schools Curriculum Implementation in Nigeria. <https://www.doi.org/10.35942/IJCAB.V31V.63>
 - [41]. Kanaan, D. & Qim, H. (2023). The importance of community in public school success: Community engagement and high school performance in Florida. <https://www.doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2023.2184693>
 - [42]. Kanaan, D. (2022). Social Disorganization, Community Engagement, and Public High School Performance. Vol. 55, Iss: 6, pp 718-743. <https://www.doi.org/10.1177/00131245221092746>
 - [43]. Khan, M., Khan, I. A., & Nisar, M. (2020). A Study on Community Involvement in the Development of Secondary Schools. [https://www.doi.org/10.36902/SJESR-VOL3-ISS1-2020\(251-256\)](https://www.doi.org/10.36902/SJESR-VOL3-ISS1-2020(251-256))
 - [44]. Khoirunnisa, S. C. & Rahma, V. Z. (2022). The Positive Impact of Collaboration: Best Practices in Managing School and Community Relations in Primary Schools. Vol. 2, Iss: 2, pp 1045-1049. <https://www.doi.org/10.57235/aurelia.v2i2.626>
 - [45]. Lauwo, H. & Mkulu, D. G. (2021). Challenges Facing Community Involvement in Ensuring Quality Education in Public Secondary

- Schools in Meru District, Arusha Region-Tanzania. Vol. 6, Iss: 1, pp 074
- [47]. Leyva, M. (2019). Extent of Implementation of School-Community Partnership in East Five Cluster, Division of Calamba City: An Input to School Improvement Plan. Vol. 3 No. 2D (2019): Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Abstracts
- [48]. Lema, P. M & Mwila, P. R. (2022). Community Involvement in School Activities: Its Effectiveness in Promoting Quality of Learning in Public Secondary Schools in Hai District, Kilimanjaro, Tanzania. <https://www.doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2022.6928>
- [49]. Luo, R., Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., & Mendelsohn, A. L. (2020). Children's literacy experiences in low-income families: The content of books matters. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(2), 213–233. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.263>
- [51]. Mandolado, J. T., & Ancho, V. I. (2023). School – Community Partnership In The Philippines: The Case Of Best Implementors. *Journal of Education and Innovation*, 25(4), 1–16. Retrieved from https://so06.tcithaijo.org/index.php/edujournal_nu/article/view/257439
- [52]. Manggasang, J. T. & Belasoto, M. F. B. (2021). Level of Reading Comprehension Among Grade 11 Learners. VOLUME 04 ISSUE 09 SEPTEMBER 2021. [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.47191/IJSSHR/V4-I9-09](https://doi.org/10.47191/IJSSHR/V4-I9-09)
- [53]. Naite, I. (2021). Impact of Parental Involvement on Children's Academic Performance at Crescent International School, Bangkok, Thailand. doi:10.1088/1755-1315/690/1/012064
- [54]. National Learning Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environment (2024). Family School-Community Partnership. <https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/training-technicalassistance/education-level/early-learning/family-school-communitypartnerships>
- [55]. Ngobeni, S. T. (2022). Establishing and maintaining school-community partnerships: a challenge for school management teams. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2022.2117414>
- [56]. Nyanganika, A. & Kapinga, B. B. (2020). Impact of Community Involvement in Development of Secondary Schools in Tunduru District Council. Vol. 6, Iss:4, pp 418-430
- [57]. Orellana, P., Silva, M., & Iglesias, V. (2024). Students' reading comprehension level and reading demands in teacher education programs: the elephant in the room? *Front. Psychol.*, 07 February 2024. *Educational Psychology*. Volume 15 – 2024. | <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1324055>
- [58]. OECD. (2019). PISA 2018 Results: What Students Know and Can Do. OECD Publishing.
- [59]. OECD. (2021). PISA 2021 Assessment and Analytical Framework. OECD Publishing.
- [60]. Prendergast, M., Harbison, L., Miller, S., & Trakulphadetkrai, N. V. (2019). Pre-service and in-service teachers' perceptions on the integration of children's literature in mathematics teaching and learning in Ireland. *Irish Educational Studies*, 38(2), 157- 175
- [62]. Reyes, J., & Cruz, L. (2022). The impact of remote learning on reading skills in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 99(2), 123-135.
- [63]. Sanders, M. G., & Sheldon, S. B. (2022). The role of school-community collaboration in student success. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 15(2), 35-49.
- [64]. Santos, M., & Cruz, L. (2022). Evaluating reading interventions in Philippine schools: A pilot study. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 112, 101-110.
- [65]. Senate of the Philippines (2020). Gatchalian urges DepEd: work with LGUs to enhance reading intervention programs. https://web.senate.gov.ph/press_release/2020/0221_gatchalian1.asp?
- [66]. State of Queensland, Department of Education, (2024). Decision-making. <https://education.qld.gov.au/parents-and-carers/communityengagement/schools/decision-making>
- [67]. Sepanik, S. & Brown Jr., K. T. (2021). School-Community Partnerships. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED616007.pdf>
- [68]. Sisty, Emilian (2022). School- Community Partnership in Promoting Effective Teaching and Students' Academic Performance. Master's thesis, The Open University of Tanzania.
- [69]. Sixsmith, J., Makita, M., Menezes, D., Cranwell, M., Chau, I., Smtih, M. E., Levey, S., Scrutton, P. & Fang, M. L. (2023). Enhancing Community Participation through Age-Friendly Ecosystems: A Rapid Realist Review. <https://www.doi.org/10.3390/geriatrics8030052>
- [70]. Smith, A., & Sheridan, S. M. (2023). Strengthening school-community partnerships through collaborative monitoring. *Educational Leadership Review*, 14(2), 78 95.
- [71]. Spark generation (2022). 7 Reasons Why Community Involvement in Schools is Important. <https://spark.school/community-involvement-in-school/>
- [72]. Sumipo, J. M. (2019). The Reading Comprehension Levels of Grade 12 ABM Students: An ESP Design for Basic English Course. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences (IJELS)* Vol 4, Issue 1, Jan - Feb 2019. <https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijels.4.1.22>
- [73]. Tan, M. G. (2024). School Community Partnership of DepEd Programs in Castilla Districts. *United International Journal for Research & Technology (UIJRT)*, 3(11), pp.32-38.
- [74]. UNESCO (2022). School community relationship. https://policytoolbox.iiep.unesco.org/policy-option/school-communityrelationship/#_Glossary
- [75]. Wang, W., Dong, Y., Liu, X., Bai, Y., and Zhang, L. (2020). The effect of parents' education on the academic and non-cognitive outcomes of their children: Evidence from China. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jchildyouth.2020.105307>
- [76]. Wanjala, W., Likoko, S. and Khaemba, P. F. (2023). AN Assessment Of The Influence Of School-Community Partnerships On Students' Academic Performance. <https://ijafssr.com/an-assessment-of-the-influence-of-school-community-partnerships-on-students-academic-performance/>