

Implementation amid Constraint: What 26,238 Teachers Reveal about the Philippines' Early Language, Literacy and Numeracy Program

Nemia B. Cedo^{1*}, Merly D. Quiao¹, Jonathan C. Diola¹, Armando S. Vinoya¹, Jonathan B. Caracas¹,
Jose Emmanuel C. Mandapat¹

¹*Virgen Milagrosa University Foundation*

*nbcedo@gmail.com

Date Submitted:
August 17, 2026

Date Accepted:
September 12, 2026

Date Published:
September 28, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.23006516

ABSTRACT

This study looked at how well the Early Language, Literacy and Numeracy (ELLN) Program is actually being carried out in public elementary schools across the Philippines. Using a survey of Kindergarten to Grade 3 teachers from all 17 regional offices and 224 schools division offices, the researchers found that implementation is going fairly well overall — especially in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, which teachers rated as highly evident. Materials and teacher training, however, were only rated as evident, suggesting there's room for improvement there. The teachers themselves were mostly experienced, female, married educators with bachelor's degrees who had completed their ELLN training sessions. Interestingly, age was the only background factor

that seemed to matter, showing a positive link to how well assessment was implemented, while other characteristics made no real difference. Despite the generally positive picture, teachers still face real struggles — limited learning resources, overcrowded and overlapping competencies, not enough time or support for preparing materials, heavy workloads, and difficulty writing good assessment questions. In the end, the study suggests that making ELLN truly sustainable takes more than just training teachers; it needs proper resources, protected time for professional learning, and support that's sensitive to teachers' workloads.

Keywords: *Early Language Literacy and Numeracy, Intervention, Implementation*

INTRODUCTION

Foundational learning—the ability to read, write, understand language, and work with numbers—is the essential foundation upon which children build subsequent learning, participation, and lifelong development. Literacy and numeracy enable learners not only to comprehend information and communicate ideas but also to think critically, make sense of their environment, and respond appropriately to everyday situations. When these foundational competencies are not adequately developed in the early grades, learners are more likely to experience persistent difficulties as academic demands increase. The importance of ensuring that children acquire these skills early is therefore not simply an educational concern; it is a critical condition for achieving meaningful and equitable learning outcomes.

In the Philippines, the challenge of strengthening foundational learning has long been recognized in national education policy and reform efforts. In response to the Education for All agenda and the national goal of developing a functionally literate population, the Department of Education (DepEd) implemented the Early Language, Literacy and Numeracy (ELLN) Program in 2015 through Department Order No. 12,

s. 2015. The program was designed to help ensure that Filipino learners become literate and numerate by the end of Grade III by strengthening teachers' capacity to teach and assess early language, literacy, and numeracy skills. Its professional development component emphasized five interconnected areas—curriculum, materials, teacher training and development, assessment, and instruction—reflecting the recognition that improved foundational learning requires more than classroom instruction alone.

The ELLN Program was conceived as a response to the country's continuing need to improve early-grade learning and was linked to Every Child a Reader Policy and the broader commitment that every child should become a reader. For learners, the program focused on strengthening literacy and numeracy from Kindergarten to Grade III; for teachers, it sought to establish a sustainable and cost-effective professional development system through Learning Action Cells (LACs). The program was implemented through a cascading professional development structure involving national, regional, division, school, and teacher-level activities. LACs subsequently provided a mechanism for continuing professional development, collaborative problem solving, and improvement of classroom instruction.

Despite these sustained efforts, evidence from early-grade assessments suggests that foundational learning challenges have persisted. The Early Language, Literacy and Numeracy Assessment (ELLNA), administered to Grade III learners beginning in School Year 2016–2017, showed that many learners continued to struggle to meet expected standards in early language, literacy, and numeracy. The reported results showed an overall Mean Percentage Score of 64.45%, while subsequent results indicated declining or persistently low proficiency in several areas. Numeracy was particularly concerning, with the reported MPS declining from 46.40 in 2017 to 38.59 in 2018, remaining within the low-proficient level. Literacy results in the Mother Tongue, Filipino, and English were generally at the nearly proficient level but also showed declines across the two assessment years.

These outcomes raise an important question: If substantial policy, professional development, and program-support mechanisms have been provided, why do significant foundational-learning difficulties persist? Assessment results can demonstrate what learners know and can do, but they do not, by themselves, explain how consistently and effectively a national program intended to address those difficulties is being implemented at the school and classroom levels. The available evidence therefore points to an important implementation question—one that moves beyond measuring learner outcomes toward examining the conditions, practices, constraints, and support systems that shape program delivery.

This constitutes a significant knowledge gap in the implementation of the ELLN Program. While the program established mechanisms for teacher development, instructional improvement, assessment, and school-based professional collaboration, there remains a need for large-scale empirical evidence describing how teachers experience and implement the program, particularly across diverse Philippine educational contexts. The original program documentation itself identified the need for additional research data on ELLN implementation considering the assessment outcomes. Such evidence is especially important because implementation fidelity cannot be assumed from the existence of policies, training activities, or allocated resources. The effectiveness of a national education program ultimately depends on how these provisions are translated into sustained practices by teachers and supported by school and system-level structures.

Against this backdrop, the present study examines the implementation of the Early Language, Literacy and Numeracy (ELLN) Program from the perspective of 26,238 teachers across the Philippines. By drawing on the experiences of a large and geographically diverse group of teacher-implementers, the study provides an opportunity to examine implementation at a scale that can reveal patterns that may remain invisible in localized studies. More importantly, it brings teachers' voices to the center of the implementation discussion—documenting not only the extent to which key program components are carried out but also the constraints and difficulties encountered in translating program expectations into practice.

The study therefore contributes evidence at the critical intersection of policy and practice. Its findings can help illuminate where implementation is working, where constraints remain, and what forms

of support teachers need to strengthen the delivery of foundational language, literacy, and numeracy instruction. In doing so, the study moves beyond the question of whether the ELLN Program exists to ask a more consequential question: how effectively is it being implemented, under what conditions, and what can be done to make implementation more responsive, sustainable, and effective? The evidence generated may inform the refinement of implementation guidelines, teacher professional development, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, and targeted interventions designed to strengthen foundational learning outcomes across Philippine schools.

ELLN and implementing literacy reform at scale

The implementation of foundational literacy and numeracy reforms depends not only on the design of national policies but also on the capacity of teachers and schools to translate those policies into sustained classroom practice. In the Philippine context, the Early Language, Literacy and Numeracy (ELLN) Program, established through Department Order No. 12, s. 2015, represents a national effort to strengthen early-grade learning by building the capacity of Kindergarten to Grade III teachers and instructional leaders in literacy and numeracy instruction. The program integrates five critical components—curriculum, materials, teacher training and development, assessment, and instruction—and seeks to establish school-based mentoring and professional learning through Learning Action Cells (LACs).

ELLN therefore illustrates an important principle in large-scale education reform: policy intent must be accompanied by implementation capacity. The program's theory of change places teachers at the center of reform, if strengthened knowledge, pedagogical skills, assessment practices, instructional resources, and collaborative professional learning will contribute to improved literacy and numeracy outcomes. Its implementation through LACs further recognizes that professional development is most useful when it is continuous, collaborative, and connected to teachers' actual classroom challenges. LACs were established as a school-based continuing professional development mechanism through which teachers collaboratively address instructional problems and improve their professional knowledge and practice.

This perspective is consistent with international evidence emphasizing that effective professional development is not simply a matter of providing training. Teacher learning is more likely to influence classroom practice when professional development is content-focused, active, coherent, sustained, and supported by opportunities for collaboration and follow-through. The experiences of education systems such as Finland, Australia, and Singapore similarly highlight the importance of treating teacher development as a continuing process supported by school leadership, institutional structures, and alignment with system priorities. The implication for literacy reform is clear: large-scale programs require more than initial training; they require mechanisms that enable teachers to continuously apply, adapt, reflect on, and strengthen what they have learned.

The ELLN experience also highlights the complexity of implementing reform across a geographically and educationally diverse system. National guidelines may establish common expectations, yet implementation occurs within schools with different levels of resources, teacher experience, leadership support, professional learning opportunities, and learner needs. Thus, variation in implementation should not automatically be interpreted as a failure of policy. Rather, it can reveal the conditions and constraints that shape how reform is translated into practice. This is particularly important for foundational learning, where teachers must simultaneously respond to differences in learners' language backgrounds, literacy and numeracy abilities, instructional needs, and available learning resources.

The broader global commitment to foundational learning reinforces the urgency of this implementation perspective. Sustainable Development Goal 4 calls for inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning opportunities, including the achievement of literacy and numeracy. Yet international evidence continues to demonstrate substantial gaps in foundational competencies, particularly in low- and middle-income contexts. The challenge, therefore, is not simply to establish programs that are theoretically sound, but to ensure that they can be implemented effectively and consistently on a scale.

Within this framework, the present study conceptualizes ELLN implementation as a system-level reform enacted through teachers and supported by schools and education authorities. It examines implementation across the program's five core components—curriculum, materials, teacher training and development, assessment, and instruction—while considering teachers' characteristics, professional development experiences, and implementation challenges. The study's Input–Process–Output framework consequently links teacher and program inputs to the actual processes of implementation and ultimately to evidence that can inform program improvement and policy refinement.

This approach addresses an important gap in literature. Much of the emphasis surrounding foundational learning focuses on learner achievement and assessment results, while comparatively less attention is given to what happens between policy design and classroom delivery. By examining implementation through the experiences of 26,238 teachers, this study provides large-scale empirical evidence on how a national foundational-learning reform is being enacted in Philippine public elementary schools. It thus shifts the inquiry from *whether ELLN exists* to how it is implemented, what constrains its implementation, and what system supports are needed to sustain literacy and numeracy reform at scale.

METHODS

Study Design and Setting

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational design to examine the implementation of the Early Language, Literacy and Numeracy (ELLN) Program in Philippine public elementary schools. The descriptive component characterized the respondents and assessed the implementation of the program across its five core components: curriculum, materials, teacher training and development, assessment, and instruction. The correlational component examined the association between selected teacher characteristics and the reported level of ELLN implementation.

The study covered the Department of Education (DepEd) system across the Philippines, focusing on teachers in Kindergarten to Grade III (Key Stage 1), the primary target group of the ELLN Program. ELLN has served as a key professional development initiative for Key Stage 1 since 2015, with Learning Action Cells (LACs) providing a mechanism for continuing teacher development.

Participants and Sampling

Participants were 26,238 Kindergarten to Grade III teachers from DepEd regions across the country. The study used total population sampling, a purposive approach in which the identified population meeting the study criteria was invited to participate. The respondents were teachers who were recipients of the ELLN professional development program and directly involved in Learning Action Cells.

The online questionnaire was disseminated over a two-week period. Responses were received from all participating regions, although the number of respondents varied substantially across regions, with particularly low participation reported in CAR and Region X because of delays in disseminating the request to conduct the survey.

Measures and Instrument

Data was collected using a customized online survey questionnaire consisting of three sections. The first collected demographic information, including age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, years teaching Kindergarten to Grade III, and participation in ELLN training through LACs.

The second section assessed the implementation of ELLN practices across the five program components: curriculum, materials, teacher training, assessment, and instruction. Items used a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Not Evident) to 5 (Highly Evident). The instrument was adapted from professional development self-assessment and planning tools and contextualized for ELLN implementation.

The third section identified challenges and difficulties encountered during implementation across the five components. Respondents selected all applicable challenges and could provide additional concerns not included in the checklist. Challenges were subsequently ranked according to reported frequency.

The questionnaire underwent expert validation by five specialists with experience in ELLN implementation and professional development. Their recommendations were incorporated into the instrument, which obtained an overall validation rating of 4.72, interpreted in the source study as highly valid.

Data Collection and Ethics

An online survey was used to facilitate data collection across the geographically dispersed Philippine public-school system. The questionnaire was distributed electronically to respondents, and responses were captured through an online survey platform that allowed real-time monitoring and reporting.

The study followed principles of voluntary participation, respect for persons, confidentiality, integrity, non-maleficence, honesty, and fairness. Appropriate authorization was sought from relevant DepEd authorities before survey administration. Respondents' anonymity and confidentiality were protected, and participation was conducted without coercion or undue influence.

Analytical Strategy

Descriptive statistics, including frequencies and percentages, were used to summarize respondent characteristics. The reported level of ELLN implementation was summarized using the weighted mean for the five program components. Pearson's r correlation was used to examine relationships between respondent demographic characteristics and reported implementation levels. For reported implementation challenges, frequencies were tabulated and challenges were ranked to identify the most encountered concerns. Statistical decisions were evaluated at a 0.05 level of significance, with results considered statistically significant when $p \leq .05$.

Limitations

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings. First, the study relied on self-reported online survey data, which may be affected by recall, response, or social-desirability biases. Second, although the study obtained a large national sample, participation varied considerably across regions, with lower representation in CAR and Region X because of delayed survey dissemination. Third, the descriptive-correlational design identifies patterns of association but does not establish causal relationships between teacher characteristics and ELLN implementation. Finally, the study captures teachers' reported implementation rather than independently verifying classroom practices through observation or documentary evidence.

RESULTS

The study involved 26,238 Kindergarten to Grade III teachers, most of whom were female (95.9%), aged 30–39 years (33.4%), married (77.0%), and bachelor's degree holders (68.3%). A large majority had been teaching Kindergarten to Grade III for at least five years (78.1%), while 74.3% reported completing the ELLN Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions.

Overall, the ELLN Program was highly evident in practice, with an average weighted mean of 4.25 across its five components. Assessment received the highest rating (4.36), followed by Instruction (4.33) and Curriculum (4.30), all interpreted as highly evident. Teacher Training (4.15) and Materials (4.10) were rated evident, making these the comparatively weaker dimensions. The findings suggest that teachers generally demonstrated strong implementation of ELLN in classroom assessment, instructional practices, and curriculum delivery, while material provision and sustained professional development presented greater implementation needs.

The most frequently reported challenges differed across the five components. For Curriculum, the leading concern was the limited availability of learning resources supporting the curriculum (59.0%), followed by congested learning competencies (35.1%) and overlapping skills across competencies (34.3%). For Materials, the major difficulties were lack of time to prepare instructional materials (61.1%), insufficient appropriate learning materials (56.6%), and inadequate support for material production (39.6%). For Teacher Training, the most prominent barrier was paperwork and extended working hours that hindered participation in training or LAC activities (73.3%), followed by insufficient funds for training (44.5%) and limited access to online training (42.5%). For Assessment, teachers most frequently reported difficulty in constructing higher-order thinking questions (59.2%), followed by assessments that were inappropriate to learners' skills and abilities (28.4%) and lack of congruence between objectives and assessment (21.9%). For Instruction, the leading challenges were insufficient time for lesson planning and preparation (65.1%), learner behavior affecting planned instruction (38.5%), and lack of appropriate visual aids (34.6%).

The correlational analysis identified one statistically significant relationship supported by the reported data: age was positively associated with the assessment component of ELLN ($r = 0.9453$, $p = .015355$). The other demographic variables did not show statistically significant relationships with the five ELLN implementation components based on the reported p -values. Thus, the available results do not support reliable subgroup differences across gender, civil status, educational attainment, years of teaching, or training attendance.

Overall, the results portray an ELLN Program that is strongly implemented but constrained by practical conditions. Assessment and instruction emerged as the strongest areas, whereas materials and teacher training require greater support. Across components, the recurring barriers were lack of time, limited resources, workload demands, insufficient training support, and difficulties in developing appropriate assessment and instructional materials.

DISCUSSION

Implementation Versus Implementation Conditions

The findings indicate that the Early Language, Literacy and Numeracy (ELLN) Program is generally well implemented across public elementary schools, with curriculum, assessment, and instruction rated as highly evident. The overall pattern suggests that teachers are applying the core elements of ELLN in their classroom practices. Assessment received the highest implementation rating (4.36), followed by instruction (4.33) and curriculum (4.30). These results demonstrate that teachers can translate major ELLN expectations into classroom-level practices, particularly in monitoring learners' literacy and numeracy development, using formative assessment, and employing active and differentiated instructional strategies.

However, the results also reveal an important distinction between what is implemented and the conditions under which implementation occurs. Materials (4.10) and teacher training (4.15) were only rated evident, compared with the highly evident ratings for curriculum, assessment, and instruction. This pattern suggests that strong classroom implementation does not necessarily mean that all enabling conditions are equally strong. Teachers appear capable of sustaining key instructional and assessment practices despite limitations in resources, professional learning opportunities, and organizational support.

The findings therefore point to an implementation environment in which teachers demonstrate considerable commitment and capacity, while some structural conditions remain less supportive. The ELLN Program may consequently be viewed not simply in terms of whether its components are being implemented, but also in terms of whether teachers are provided with sufficient time, materials, professional learning, and institutional support to sustain implementation effectively.

Time and Workload

Time and workload emerged as significant practical constraints across several ELLN components. The most frequently reported challenge in teacher training was endless paperwork and extended working hours, identified by 73.3% of respondents as a factor affecting their ability to attend training programs or Learning Action Cells (LACs). Similarly, 65.0% reported a lack of time for lesson planning and preparation, while 61.1% indicated insufficient time to prepare instructional materials.

These findings highlight a recurring implementation tension: teachers are expected to engage in professional development, prepare appropriate learning materials, plan differentiated instruction, conduct assessment, and respond to learners' diverse needs while simultaneously managing other school responsibilities. Although the program's instructional and assessment components were highly evident, the workload associated with sustaining these practices may place considerable demands on teachers.

The results suggest that strengthening ELLN implementation should therefore involve more than additional training or reminders about program expectations. Time must be treated as an implementation resource. Professional development, lesson preparation, materials development, and assessment activities require protected and manageable time within teachers' work schedules. Without attention to workload, even well-designed interventions may increase the demands placed on teachers rather than improve the conditions necessary for quality implementation.

Materials and Resources

Resource availability represents another important condition influencing ELLN implementation. Although teachers generally reported using varied and developmentally appropriate learning materials, the materials component obtained the lowest overall implementation rating among the five domains (4.10). This finding corresponds closely with the reported challenges: 61.1% cited lack of time to prepare instructional materials, 56.6% reported a lack of appropriate learning materials, and 39.6% identified inadequate support for materials production.

The findings indicate that teachers are actively compensating for resource limitations through their own preparation and adaptation of materials. While such teacher initiative can support classroom implementation, it may also create additional workload and result in uneven access to appropriate resources across schools. The curriculum findings reinforce this concern, as 59.0% of respondents identified the limited availability of learning resources supporting the curriculum as a major challenge.

This suggests that resource provision should be considered a core implementation strategy rather than a supplementary concern. Large-scale foundational-learning programs require accessible, developmentally appropriate, and curriculum-aligned materials that teachers can readily use and adapt. Strengthening mechanisms for production, distribution, sharing, and local adaptation of ELLN materials could reduce teachers' preparation burden while improving consistency in program implementation.

Professional Learning and Learning Action Cells

Professional learning through LACs represents a relative strength of the ELLN implementation system, but the findings also reveal areas requiring further attention. Three-fourths of the respondents (74.3%) reported that they had completed the ELLN LAC, and active participation in school-based LACs received a high implementation rating (4.39). These findings suggest that school-based professional learning mechanisms have provided an important avenue for teachers to develop and share knowledge related to ELLN.

Nevertheless, the overall teacher-training component was rated only evident (4.15). The completion of the full 28 ELLN sessions received a comparatively lower rating (3.95), while 73.3% of teachers identified paperwork and extended working hours as barriers to attending training and LAC activities. Limited access to online training (42.5%) and insufficient funds for teacher training (44.5%) further demonstrate that participation is influenced by organizational and logistical conditions.

The findings therefore suggest that professional learning should be viewed not only in terms of whether training is available, but also in terms of whether teachers can realistically participate in and apply it. LACs appear to provide a useful platform for professional development, peer learning, and sharing of experiences. However, their effectiveness may be strengthened by ensuring protected time, sustained follow-through, adequate resources, and opportunities for teachers to apply newly acquired knowledge to actual classroom challenges.

The recommendation to map teachers who are newly hired, transferred, or non-completers is particularly relevant in this context. Such mapping can help identify gaps in training coverage and provide a basis for targeted capacity-building rather than relying on a uniform training approach for all teachers.

Implications for Large-Scale Foundational-Learning Reform

Taken together, the findings have important implications for implementing foundational-learning reforms at scale. The ELLN Program demonstrates that high levels of implementation are possible even within a complex public-school system. Teachers reported highly evident practices in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, indicating that program expectations can be translated into classroom practice across a large population of K to III teachers.

At the same time, the findings show that implementation strength and implementation conditions are not synonymous. Strong classroom practices coexist with substantial challenges involving time, workload, learning resources, materials production, training access, and professional development. This distinction is particularly important for large-scale reform because expansion of program requirements without corresponding investment in implementation conditions may place additional pressure on teachers.

The findings therefore support a more system-oriented approach to foundational-learning reform. Program implementation should be accompanied by adequate instructional resources, manageable teacher workloads, sustained professional learning, and responsive monitoring and support. Rather than measuring success solely through compliance with program components, implementation monitoring should also examine whether schools possess the conditions necessary for teachers to carry out those components effectively.

The finding that age was significantly related to the assessment component, while the other demographic variables were not significantly related to overall ELLN implementation, further suggests that implementation is not broadly determined by teachers' demographic characteristics. The reported relationship should be interpreted cautiously and within the limits of the study's correlational design; it does not establish causation. More importantly, the broad pattern of results directs attention toward system-level implementation conditions rather than individual teacher characteristics.

Overall, the study presents a nuanced picture of ELLN implementation: the program is highly evident in core classroom practices, but its sustainability is challenged by the conditions surrounding implementation. For large-scale foundational-learning reform, strengthening these conditions may be as important as strengthening the program itself. Policies and interventions that reduce unnecessary workload, improve access to appropriate materials, protect time for professional learning, and ensure continuous teacher support can help transform high implementation from an individual teacher effort into a more sustainable system-level practice.

CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The findings indicate that the Early Language, Literacy and Numeracy (ELLN) Program is generally well implemented across public elementary schools, particularly in the areas of curriculum, assessment, and instruction. Teachers reported high levels of implementation in these dimensions, suggesting that the program's core pedagogical directions have been substantially integrated into classroom practice. The relatively lower ratings for learning materials and teacher professional development, however,

points to an important implementation gap: strong classroom practices may not always be matched by equally strong institutional support.

A central insight of the study is therefore the distinction between implementation of program practices and the conditions that enable sustained implementation. Although teachers demonstrate considerable capacity to deliver ELLN-related curriculum, assessment, and instruction, their experiences reveal persistent structural constraints involving limited learning resources, preparation time, paperwork, funding for professional development, access to training, and the demands of lesson planning. These findings suggest that improving ELLN implementation cannot depend solely on increasing teachers' knowledge and skills. It also requires strengthening the organizational and resource conditions within which teachers work.

The findings further demonstrate that assessment is a relatively strong component of ELLN implementation, with teachers reporting frequent use of classroom-based and formative assessment and the use of assessment results to inform teaching. The significant relationship between age and assessment implementation may suggest that accumulated classroom experience contributes to teachers' confidence and consistency in assessment practices. However, the finding should not be interpreted as evidence that age itself causes stronger implementation. Rather, it highlights the potential contribution of professional experience to the development of assessment-related practice and warrants further investigation.

The challenges reported by teachers reinforce the importance of examining implementation beyond compliance with program requirements. Difficulties in preparing instructional materials, limited availability of appropriate resources, extended working hours, paperwork, insufficient training support, and limited time for lesson preparation indicate that teacher workload and resource adequacy are critical implementation conditions. When these conditions are weak, even well-designed program policies may be difficult to translate consistently into classroom practice.

From a policy perspective, the findings support a shift from a primarily training-centered approach toward a systems-oriented approach to foundational learning reform. Professional development remains important, but training should be accompanied by adequate learning resources, protected time for planning and professional learning, streamlined administrative requirements, and sustained school- and division-level support. Learning Action Cells and other professional learning mechanisms may be strengthened as continuing communities of practice where teachers can collaboratively examine assessment evidence, develop instructional materials, address classroom challenges, and share effective literacy and numeracy practices.

The findings also imply that resource provision should be treated as an integral component of program implementation rather than as a supplementary concern. The reported limitations in learning materials suggest the need for more systematic mechanisms for developing, distributing, adapting, and monitoring the use of developmentally appropriate literacy and numeracy resources. Resource allocation should likewise consider differences in school contexts and teacher needs rather than relying solely on uniform provision.

The study further suggests that policy implementation should be accompanied by mechanisms for monitoring not only whether program activities are conducted, but also whether teachers have the time, resources, competencies, and institutional support necessary to implement them effectively. This distinction is particularly important for large-scale foundational-learning reforms, where national policy expectations must ultimately be translated into everyday classroom practices across highly diverse school contexts.

Accordingly, the proposed intervention plan should be viewed as a practical response to the implementation conditions identified in the study, rather than as the principal contribution of the research. Instead of presenting a detailed five-day training matrix as the major output, the study may recommend a flexible, needs-responsive professional support framework addressing the major barriers identified by teachers. Such support may include targeted professional learning, resource development, collaborative planning, assessment support, and workload-sensitive implementation arrangements. The specific activities

and training schedules may subsequently be developed by implementing offices according to local needs and available resources.

Overall, the study contributes empirical evidence that the sustainability of ELLN implementation depends not only on teachers' capacity to understand and apply the program but also on the institutional conditions that enable them to do so. For large-scale foundational-learning reform, policy success should therefore be understood not simply in terms of program adoption or reported implementation, but in terms of the alignment among teacher capability, professional learning, instructional resources, assessment practices, time, and organizational support. Strengthening these conditions may provide a more sustainable pathway for translating national foundational-learning policies into consistent and effective classroom practice.

REFERENCES

- Adriano, J. (2023). *Evaluation of the implementation and effectiveness of Every Child a Reader Program (ECARP) in a Bulacan public elementary school*. Baliwag Polytechnic College.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/366876468>
- Ashman, G. (2021). *The power of explicit teaching and direct instruction*. Corwin.
- Ayade, C., et al. (2019). Early language literacy and numeracy implementation. *SMCC Higher Education Research Journal (Teacher Education Journal)*, 1(1).
- Bautista, A., & Ortega-Ruiz, R. (2015). Teacher professional development: International perspectives and approaches. *Psychology, Society & Education*, 7(3), 240–251.
- Bautista, A., Wong, J., & Gopinathan, S. (2015). Teacher professional development in Singapore: Depicting the landscape. *Psychology, Society & Education*, 7(3), 311–326.
- Caliwag, L. (2024). Every Child a Reader. *SunStar Pampanga*.
- Department of Education. (2015, April 15). *Guidelines on the Early Language Literacy and Numeracy Program: Professional development component* (DepEd Order No. 12, s. 2015).
- Department of Education. (2016). *Conduct of Learning Action Cell (LAC)* (DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016).
- Department of Education. (2016, May 30). *Guidelines on the utilization of the 2016 Every Child a Reader Program funds for the Early Language Literacy and Numeracy Program: Professional development funds* (DepEd Order No. 33, s. 2016).
- Department of Education. (2016, June 30). *Policy guidelines on the national assessment of student learning for the K to 12 Basic Education Program* (DepEd Order No. 55, s. 2016).
- Department of Education. (2017, April 19). *Guidelines on the utilization of the 2017 Every Child a Reader Program funds for the Early Language Literacy and Numeracy Program: Professional development component* (DepEd Order No. 18, s. 2017).
- Department of Education. (2018, May 17). *Guidelines on the utilization of Early Language Literacy and Numeracy Program funds: Professional development* (DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2018).
- Department of Education. (2019, March 2). *Revised implementation on the direct release, use, monitoring and reporting on maintenance and other operating expenses allocation of schools, including other funds managed by schools* (DepEd Order No. 008, s. 2019).
- Department of Education. (2019, September 5). *FY 2019 program support funds to regional offices on the Early Language Literacy and Numeracy (ELLN) professional development component* (DepEd Memorandum DM-CI 2019-00286).
- Department of Education. (2021, February 1). *Early Language Literacy and Numeracy (ELLN) program support funds for FY 2021* (DepEd Memorandum OUCI-2021-00096).
- Department of Education. (2022, January 4). *Early Language Literacy and Numeracy (ELLN) program support funds for FY 2022* (DepEd Memorandum DM-CI-2022-024).
- Department of Education. (2022, May 30). *Adoption of the Basic Education Development Plan 2030* (DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2022).
- Desimone, L. M., & Garet, M. S. (2015). Best practices in teachers' professional development in the United States. *Psychology, Society & Education*, 7(3), 252–263.

- Elopre, M., & Baggay, C. T. (2022). *Numeracy through literacy: Basis for an enhancement program for the Grade 7 learners of Barasoain Memorial Integrated School*. Schools Division Office of Malolos.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/364327834>
- Gaviño, I. B., et al. (2022). Early language, literacy, and numeracy (ELLN) program in promoting salient teaching learning outcomes in a distance learning realm. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 110(1), 350–358.
- Kay, D., & Kibble, J. (2016). Learning theories 101: Application to everyday teaching and scholarship. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 40(2), 228–234.
- Ling, L. M., & Mackenzie, N. M. (2015). An Australian perspective on teacher professional development in super complex times. *Psychology, Society & Education*, 7(3), 264–278.
- Macqueen, S., et al. (2019). The impact of national standardized literacy and numeracy testing on children and teaching staff in remote Australian Indigenous communities. *Language Testing*, 36(2), 265–287.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532218775758>
- McCombes, S. (2022, October 10). *Descriptive research | Definition, types, methods & examples*. Scribbr.
<https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/descriptive-research/>
- Mores, J. (2019). Early language, literacy and numeracy: An assessment. *Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Abstracts*, 3(2B).
<https://ojs.aaresearchindex.com/index.php/AJMJRA/article/view/7928>
- Niemi, H. (2015). Teacher professional development in Finland: Towards a more holistic approach. *Psychology, Society & Education*, 7(3), 279–294.
- Oakley, G., Scarparolo, G., & King, R. (2018). *An evaluation of ELLN Digital: Technology-supported teacher professional development on early language, literacy, and numeracy for K–3 teachers*. Digital Learning for Development. <http://dl4d.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/ELLN-Digital-Evaluation.pdf>
- Pagbilao, J., et al. (2019). The implementation of ELLN program in SDO Quirino: An evaluation. *Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Abstracts*, 3(2J).
- Philip, N. (2017, May 12). Join me, fellow King Canutes, in pushing against the tide of illiteracy. *Daily Mail*, p. 16.
- Piper, B., Zuilkowski, S. S., Dubeck, M., Jepkemei, E., & King, S. J. (2018). Scaling up successfully: Lessons from Kenya's Tusome National Literacy Program. *Journal of Educational Change*, 19(3), 293–321.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-018-9325-4>
- Salisu, A. (2014). The role of modeling towards impacting quality education. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 32, 54–61. <https://doi.org/10.18052/www.scipress.com/ILSHS.32.54>
- Schwab, K. (2015). *The global competitiveness report 2014–2015*. World Economic Forum.
<http://reports.weforum.org/global-competitiveness-report-2014-2015/>
- Sheridan, S. M., Edwards, C. P., Marvin, C. A., & Knoche, L. L. (2009). Professional development in early childhood programs: Process issues and research needs. *Early Education and Development*, 20(3), 377–401. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10409280802582795>
- Sumarno, S., et al. (2022). Integrative teaching material with project-based learning approach to improve elementary school students' bilingual literacy and numeracy skills. *International Journal of Elementary Education*, 6(3), 600–611. <https://doi.org/10.23887/ijee.v6i4.52392>
- Tan, C. Y., & Dimmock, C. (2014). How a top-performing Asian school system formulates and implements policy: The case of Singapore. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(4), 570–585.
- Tasan, R. (2022). *Teaching competencies and pupils' performance in the implementation of modular distance learning modality* [Unpublished manuscript].
- UNESCO. (2014). *EFA global monitoring report 2013/4: Teaching and learning—Achieving quality for all*. UNESCO Publishing.
- Villamor, H., & Arante, C. D. (2022). K–3 teachers' competencies addressing learners' literacy and numeracy gaps in the Global South. *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 1(3), 110–119.
<https://doi.org/10.54536/ajmri.v1i3.406>
- Villaneza, J. (2019, August 1). *Scaling education programs in the Philippines: A policymaker's perspective* [Video]. YouTube.
- World Bank. (2018). *World development report 2018: Learning to realize education's promise*. World Bank.
- Ziesemer, T. (2016). *Gini coefficients of education for 146 countries, 1950–2010* (UNU-MERIT Working Paper No. 2016-044). United Nations University.