



International Journal Research Publication Analysis

Page: 01-14

IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF A FAILURE REDUCTION PROGRAM ON STUDENT ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

*Beatrice Totanes Olio

Graduate School student, Benguet State University, Loo Campus, Buguias Benguet Philippines.

Article Received: 29 December 2025

***Corresponding Author: Beatrice Totanes Olio**

Article Revised: 18 January 2026

Graduate School student, Benguet State University, Loo Campus, Buguias Benguet

Published on: 07 February 2026

Philippines.

DOI: <https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijrpa.4407>

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the implementation and effectiveness of the Failure Reduction Program at Public elementary schools, specifically focusing on the extent of assessment, the level of performance of intervention strategies, and the seriousness of problems encountered by teachers. Utilizing a descriptive quantitative research design, data were collected from 100 respondents using structured survey questionnaires. Findings revealed that the program is much assessed and much performed, suggesting that assessment mechanisms and intervention strategies are actively implemented and teacher-driven. However, several much serious challenges were identified, particularly low student motivation, irregular attendance, and limited teacher training in differentiated instruction. Hypothesis testing negated the assumption that the program was only moderately assessed and performed. Based on these findings, the study concludes that the assessment processes are generally functional but would benefit from improved communication strategies and more comprehensive evaluation frameworks. While early identification and intervention are strengths of the program, gaps remain in leadership engagement, impact evaluation, and strategic alignment with the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Furthermore, the presence of persistent implementation issues highlights the need for targeted measures to address barriers affecting learner participation and instructional delivery. The study recommends structured interventions, continuous capacity-building, and stronger stakeholder collaboration to enhance program sustainability.

KEYWORDS: assessment mechanisms, intervention strategies, learner motivation, program evaluation, teacher capacity.

INTRODUCTION

Education is a fundamental human right, central to the personal development of individuals and the advancement of societies. The Global Education for All (EFA) framework, launched in Thailand in 1990 and reaffirmed in 2015, underscores that every child, youth, and adult has the right to benefit from education that meets their basic learning needs, including the full development of the human personality (Article 28, 1989). These learning needs are to be delivered not only through the formal school system but also via alternative learning systems. Despite global progress in educational access, millions of learners still complete basic education without acquiring essential skills such as simple arithmetic or reading comprehension. The World Bank (2019) highlighted that 56% of the world's children will grow to be less than half as productive as they could be, due to inadequate education and health services. Clearly, while access to education has improved, being in school is not the same as learning.

In many countries, including the Philippines, the learning crisis is further reflected in international assessments. The Philippines has ranked among the lowest in reading, mathematics, and science in the 2018 and 2022 cycles of the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) (OECD, 2023). This underperformance points to systemic issues in instructional delivery, curriculum relevance, and student engagement. The age or grade-level promotion model commonly used in schools worldwide, including those in the OECD—does not guarantee student promotion, and often results in retention or dropout for those who fall behind (Faubert, 2012). As a result, up to 20% of students in OECD countries fail to complete secondary education, often due to unaddressed academic and socio-emotional challenges.

In the Philippine context, the Education Act of 1982 affirms the state's duty to provide every citizen with access to quality education, regardless of background or ability. In alignment with this, the Department of Education has developed alternative learning initiatives such as the Open High School Program (OHSP), Effective Alternative Secondary Education (EASE), and School-Initiated Interventions (SII), which includes the Failure Reduction Program (FRP). These efforts seek to minimize dropout rates and promote learner retention, particularly for students at risk of academic failure or those already out of the formal school system (The Adivay Newsletter, 2017).

At the local level, Public elementary schools (BCHS) have implemented its own Failure Rate Reduction Program (FRRP) as part of its commitment to inclusive education. The school

recognizes that absenteeism, socio-emotional barriers, and academic disengagement often lead to student failure or dropout. First introduced in school year 2016–2017, the FRRP was created in response to a high failure rate of 8.53% recorded in the preceding year. The program includes intervention activities such as monthly remediation reports, grading period monitoring, and the identification of students at risk of dropping out (SARDO) (The Pinetree, 2018). As of the following year, the failure rate was reduced to 2.78%, which the school attributes to the FRRP's early success. However, stakeholders acknowledge the need for continuous monitoring and assessment of the program's implementation (Flores, 2018).

The FRRP aims to address the academic difficulties of learners by identifying and targeting the root causes of failure, such as insufficient foundational skills, lack of parental support, emotional stress, and teaching-learning mismatches (Dela Cruz & Santos, 2022). This aligns with international recommendations from the OECD to prevent and overcome difficulties of all young people, especially those in disadvantaged contexts (Faubert, 2012). Evaluating the effectiveness of such programs is critical in the light of national and global learning benchmarks, especially with the continued challenge posed by poor performance in PISA and the learning losses worsened by the COVID-19 pandemic (Navarro, 2024; Ramirez, 2023).

This study is anchored on several learning and motivation theories that explain how effective instruction and learner-centered interventions can reduce academic failure. Constructivist theory (Bruner, 1960) posits that learning is an active process in which learners construct knowledge by building on prior experiences, revisiting concepts with increasing complexity as they progress across grade levels. In this view, teachers act as facilitators who design lessons that allow learners to actively discover information and engage in meaningful learning experiences—an approach aligned with the intent of a Failure Reduction Program. Complementing this is Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligences (1983), which emphasizes that learners possess diverse intelligence and learning styles that are often underrecognized in traditional classrooms. This theory underscores the importance of differentiated instruction through varied teaching strategies, activities, and learning modalities to address learners' individual strengths and needs. Similarly, Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) highlights the critical role of motivation—both intrinsic and extrinsic—in learning and achievement, stressing that motivated learners exert greater effort, sustain engagement, and improve performance. Together, these theories support the idea that reducing school failure

requires responsive instruction, differentiated strategies, and motivational supports that foster active participation and mastery of competencies.

The conceptual framework of the study is grounded in the Department of Education's commitment to providing quality, equitable, and inclusive education, particularly through policies that aim to reduce student failure, retention, and dropout. This commitment is operationalized through intervention and remediation initiatives such as DepEd Order No. 74, s. 2010, which institutionalizes the Dropout Reduction Program (DORP), and DepEd Order No. 13, s. 2018, which provides guidelines on learner promotion, retention, and the use of remedial classes. These policies highlight the importance of school-based, teacher-led interventions such as the Failure Reduction Program, which seeks to address learners' academic difficulties through targeted support systems. Schools function as complex social environments where student performance is influenced by both internal factors (motivation, ability, adaptability) and external factors (family, social, economic, and instructional conditions). As supported by prior studies, international findings on the multifactorial causes of school failure, early identification of at-risk learners and timely intervention are essential in improving learning outcomes. In this context, the Failure Reduction Program serves as a localized response that integrates theory, policy, and practice to mitigate academic failure and promote student success.

Hence, this study seeks to assess the Failure Reduction Program at Public elementary schools, with the goal of evaluating its impact on learner performance, identifying strengths and challenges in its implementation, and formulating recommendations to enhance its contribution to educational equity and quality. By understanding how school-based interventions work at the ground level, this research supports national and global educational goals that prioritize inclusive, quality learning for all. The primary objective of this research is to assess the extent of the implementation and effectiveness of the Failure Reduction Program (FRP) at Public elementary schools in addressing student failures. Specifically, it aims to evaluate the extent of the school's performance in reducing failure rates through the FRP, to identify and analyze the performance strategies employed under the program, and to determine the degree of seriousness of the problems encountered by teachers in the implementation of the FRP. The findings of this study provided valuable insights into how the program supports academic recovery, the challenges it faces, and how it can be further improved for more effective outcomes. This study benefitted various stakeholders in the

education sector. Learners directly benefited from improved intervention strategies that address their academic challenges, thereby enhancing their chances of promotion and overall academic success. Parents gained a better understanding of the causes of student failure and the importance of their involvement in their child's education. Teachers benefited from insights that can inform more effective remediation practices and early identification of at-risk students. School administrators can use the findings to strengthen school policies and allocate resources more efficiently to support programs like the Failure Reduction Program. Lastly, other stakeholders such as policymakers, education advocates, and community members found the study useful in promoting inclusive and quality education that supports national and global goals of reducing dropout rates and improving learner outcomes.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-survey research design to assess the implementation and effectiveness of the Failure Reduction Program in a public elementary school. Respondents were 100 Junior High School teachers selected through stratified random sampling across Grade 7 to Grade 10. Data were gathered using a researcher-adapted questionnaire consisting of three parts: (1) extent of assessment of the program, (2) level of performance of implementation strategies, and (3) degree of seriousness of problems encountered. The instrument was anchored on existing DepEd School-Based Management assessment tools and aligned with program indicators. Data collection was conducted through both printed questionnaires and Google Forms after securing approval from the school authorities. Responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics, specifically frequency counts, weighted mean, and ranking, supported by a five-point Likert scale. Ethical standards were observed by obtaining informed consent, ensuring voluntary participation, and maintaining the confidentiality and anonymity of all respondents in compliance with the Data Privacy Act.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Extent of Assessment of Failure Reduction Program

Table 1 presents the results on the extent of assessment of the failure reduction program as evaluated through ten key indicators. These indicators measured how well various assessment practices are implemented within the school, particularly in identifying and supporting learners at risk of academic failure. With an Average Weighted Mean (AWM) of 3.92, which corresponds to the descriptive level "Much Assessed" (MA). This suggests that, overall, the

assessment components of the failure reduction program are consistently practiced, though there is still room for enhancement toward full institutionalization.

Among the indicators, the highest-rated item was “The school regularly monitors student academic performance as part of the failure reduction program,” which attained a weighted mean of 4.35 and was rated “Very Much Assessed” (VMA), ranking first overall. This highlights the strong emphasis placed on academic monitoring as a foundational strategy in reducing student failure. Other top-rated indicators included “Assessment tools are used to track at-risk learners” (WM = 4.31) and “Teachers are involved in the evaluation and feedback process of the failure reduction strategies” (WM = 4.25), both also falling under the “Very Much Assessed” category. These results point to a solid internal system that promotes data-driven monitoring and teacher participation in intervention efforts in Public elementary schools.

Conversely, the lowest-ranked indicator was “Evaluation results are communicated with stakeholders,” which received a weighted mean of 3.31 and was rated “Moderately Assessed” (MoA). This reveals a noticeable gap in stakeholder engagement, suggesting that while assessment practices are implemented within the school, there is limited dissemination of outcomes beyond the institution. Other lower-ranked indicators—such as those involving the evaluation of program

Table 1 Extent of Assessment of Failure Reduction Program.

Indicators	TWP	WM	DE	R
1. The school regularly monitors student academic performance as part of the failure reduction program.	435	4.35	VMA	1
2. Teachers are involved in the evaluation and feedback process of the failure reduction strategies.	425	4.25	VMA	3
3. Assessment tools are used to track at-risk learners.	431	4.31	VMA	2
4. Stakeholders are consulted in assessing the program.	390	3.90	MA	6
5. Documentation of interventions for learners at risk of failure exists.	405	4.05	MA	5
6. Assessment data is used to revise/improve the program.	415	4.15	MA	4
7. Success indicators are used to evaluate program impact.	370	3.70	MA	7
8. Assessment includes academic and behavioral outcomes.	350	3.50	MA	8
9. Evaluation results are communicated with stakeholders.	331	3.31	MoA	10
10. Leadership initiates regular review meetings.	368	3.68	MA	9
		3.92	MA	

Legends:

Numerical Values	Statistical Limit	Descriptive Equivalent	Symbol
5	4.21-5.00	Very Much Assessed	VMA
4	3.41-4.20	Much Assessed	MA
3	2.61-3.40	Moderately Assessed	MoA
2	1.81-2.60	Slightly Assessed	SA
1	1.00-1.80	Least Assessed	LA

Impact and inclusion of behavioral outcomes—were also assessed less frequently, indicating that a more holistic approach to evaluation is still developing.

These findings are consistent with trends in educational reform which emphasized the importance of data-informed decision-making, teacher empowerment, and post-pandemic recovery planning. The Department of Education (DepEd, 2022) has advocated strengthening continuous assessment and using real-time learner data to inform teaching and interventions. Similarly, UNESCO (2021) emphasized the need for tracking student learning outcomes and tailoring support based on performance metrics, especially in the wake of COVID-19-related disruptions. The high ratings of internal assessment mechanisms reflect these recommendations. Moreover, teacher involvement in program evaluation corresponds with the findings of Tan et al. (2023), who noted that empowering teachers in assessment and intervention efforts leads to more responsive and effective remediation.

However, the low assessment of stakeholder communication is aligned with critiques from both local and international educational bodies. For instance, SEAMEO INNOTECH (2021) noted that many school-based programs lack systematic communication strategies that involve parents and community stakeholders, which limit shared accountability. This finding is further supported by the World Bank (2020), which reported that the sustainability of educational reforms relies heavily on transparent reporting and stakeholder involvement. The underassessment of behavioral and holistic indicators also reflects the still-emerging shift from purely academic benchmarks toward whole-child approaches in education, as advocated by UNICEF (2021). The hypothesis stating that "the extent of assessment of the failure reduction program at Public elementary schools is moderately assessed" is negated. This suggests that the school has established and consistently applied various assessment mechanisms to monitor and support learners at risk of academic failure.

Level of Performance Strategies in Failure Reduction Program

Table 2 presents the level of performance of strategies implemented under the failure reduction program at Public elementary schools, as evaluated through ten indicators. With an overall Average Weighted Mean (AWM) of 3.92, the data falls under the descriptive equivalent of "Much Performed" (MP). This indicates that most performance strategies in the program are implemented consistently and effectively, though some may require refinement for optimal results.

Table 2

Level of Performance Strategies in Failure Reduction Program in Public elementary schools.

Indicators	TWP	WM	DE	R
1. Early warning systems are effectively implemented.	444	4.44	VMP	1
2. Remedial and intervention classes are consistently conducted.	430	4.30	VMP	2
3. LAC sessions enhance teacher strategies.	405	4.05	MP	4
4. Teachers adjust instruction based on needs.	409	4.09	MP	3
5. Guidance and counseling services are accessible and used.	385	3.85	MP	6
6. Home-school partnerships support at-risk students.	381	3.81	MP	7
7. Learners receive timely feedback.	386	3.86	MP	5
8. School leadership supports implementation.	378	3.78	MP	8
9. Strategies align with SIP and learning recovery.	360	3.60	MP	9
10. Strategies lead to measurable improvement.	346	3.46	MP	10
		3.92	MP	

Legends:

Numerical Values	Statistical Limit	Descriptive Equivalent	Symbol
5	4.21-5.00	Very Much Performed	VMP
4	3.41-4.20	Much Performed	MP
3	2.61-3.40	Moderately Performed	MoP
2	1.81-2.60	Slightly Performed	SP
1	1.00-1.80	Least Performed	LP

Among all indicators, the highest-rated strategy was "Early warning systems are effectively implemented" with a weighted mean of 4.44, falling within the "Very Much Performed" (VMP) category and ranking first overall. This suggests a strong system for identifying at-risk learners before academic issues escalate, aligning with national efforts to institutionalize early warning mechanisms in basic education (DepEd, 2021). Closely following was the consistent implementation of remedial and intervention classes (WM = 4.30), also rated as "Very Much Performed," indicating schools' responsiveness in providing timely academic support.

In contrast, the lowest-ranked indicator was “Strategies lead to measurable improvement,” which received a weighted mean of 3.46, just above the minimum threshold for the “Much Performed” category. This suggests that while strategies are in place and being executed, their actual impact on measurable academic outcomes may not yet be strongly evident or systematically documented. Other indicators that were rated lower include alignment of strategies with the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and learning recovery efforts (WM = 3.60), and the extent of school leadership support (WM = 3.78). These findings point to potential gaps in strategic coherence and institutional leadership backing. These results echo observations from previous studies between 2020 and 2025, particularly in the post-pandemic recovery phase. The World Bank (2022) highlighted that although intervention programs have increased in number, evidence of measurable learning gains remains limited due to the lack of robust monitoring frameworks. Similarly, UNICEF (2023) emphasized that school-level initiatives often fall short when not explicitly linked to broader school improvement goals or when leadership involvement is weak. Nonetheless, the strong performance in early identification and remedial efforts demonstrates that the program aligns with DepEd’s Learning Recovery and Continuity Plan (2022), which emphasizes targeted remediation, early intervention, and teacher-led instructional adjustments. The hypothesis stating that “the level of performance of the strategies of the failure reduction program at Public elementary schools is moderately performed” is negated. This reflects a proactive and sustained effort by the school to reduce failure rates through structured and data-driven strategies.

Degree of Seriousness of the Problems Encountered

Table 3 presents the extent to which problems associated with the implementation of the failure reduction program are perceived as seriously by respondents at Public elementary schools. The results reveal an Average Weighted Mean (AWM) of 4.01, which falls under the category “Much Serious” (MS). This indicates that, overall, the school community views the challenges affecting the program as significant and potentially limiting to its effectiveness. The most serious problem identified was the “lack of student motivation to participate in intervention activities,” which received the highest weighted mean of 4.48 and was rated “Very Much Serious” (VMS), ranking first among all indicators. This is followed by “irregular attendance of at-risk students during remedial or support sessions” (WM = 4.39), also rated “Very Much Serious.” These findings suggest that learner engagement remains the most critical barrier to the success of intervention efforts, echoing broader educational concerns about student participation, especially in post-pandemic contexts.

On the other hand, the least serious problem was “lack of coordination among school personnel involved in the program,” which still received a relatively high weighted mean of 3.62, indicating it is still much serious, though comparatively less critical than other challenges. Other lower-ranked issues include “inconsistent data collection or record-keeping” and “overloaded teacher workload,” both of which still fall within the “Much Serious” range, emphasizing that even the lowest-ranking problems remain nontrivial. The consistent ratings across all indicators—none falling below the “Much Serious” threshold—highlight that the failure reduction program, while structured and active, faces widespread implementation barriers. These findings align with observations from DepEd (2022) and UNICEF (2023), which reported that student disengagement, poor attendance, and resource constraints remain persistent issues in large public elementary schools. Moreover, research by Delos Santos et al. (2021) noted that while many schools have

Table 3 Degree of Seriousness of the Problems Encountered.

Indicators	TWP	WM	DE	R
1. Lack of student motivation to participate in intervention activities.	448	4.48	VMS	1
2. Irregular attendance of at-risk students during remedial or support sessions.	439	4.39	VMS	2
3. Insufficient time allocation for implementing failure reduction strategies.	419	4.19	MS	3
4. Limited teacher training on differentiated instruction and remediation.	407	4.07	MS	4
5. Inadequate monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for the program.	399	3.99	MS	5
6. Low parental involvement and support for learners at risk of failure.	390	3.90	MS	6
7. Shortage of instructional materials and resources for intervention programs.	385	3.85	MS	7
8. Overloaded teacher workload hindering consistent implementation.	386	3.86	MS	8
9. Inconsistent data collection or record-keeping on student performance.	376	3.76	MS	9
10. Lack of coordination among school personnel involved in the program.	362	3.62	MS	10
		4.01	MS	

Legends:

Numerical Values	Statistical Limit	Descriptive Equivalent	Symbol
5	4.21-5.00	Very Much Serious	VMS
4	3.41-4.20	Much Serious	MS
3	2.61-3.40	Moderately Serious	MoS

2	1.81-2.60	Slightly Serious	SS
1	1.00-1.80	Least Serious	LS

Robust intervention frameworks, their success is often undermined by logistical challenges and insufficient student buy-in. The hypothesis stating that “the degree of seriousness of the problems encountered by the teachers on the program of failure reduction at Public elementary schools is moderately serious” is negated. This underscores the need for targeted support strategies such as enhanced learner engagement, improved attendance, and strengthened teacher capacity to address these pressing concerns. Overall, the results reveal that the failure reduction program at Public elementary schools is generally well-implemented, with most strategies being actively and consistently performed by teachers and school personnel. Assessment mechanisms, early warning systems, and remedial interventions are evident, indicating a structured approach to supporting at-risk learners. However, challenges persist, particularly in learner motivation, attendance, and the alignment of strategies with measurable outcomes. Teachers also face considerable barriers such as limited training, lack of resources, and insufficient parental involvement, all of which are viewed as serious concerns. Despite these issues, the overall performance of the program reflects a strong commitment to addressing student failure, though further improvements are necessary to enhance its effectiveness and long-term impact.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

The study concludes that the Failure Reduction Program is generally well implemented and supported by teachers, with effective assessment mechanisms and strong performance in early identification and intervention of at-risk learners. However, the findings indicate that the program’s effectiveness can be further enhanced through improved communication practices, more systematic and comprehensive evaluation frameworks, and stronger alignment with school improvement goals. Despite the presence of established strategies, persistent challenges—particularly learner motivation and attendance—continue to affect program outcomes, highlighting the need for more focused and sustained support measures to ensure the long-term impact and sustainability of the program.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, it is recommended that teachers and school staff strengthen communication by utilizing simple, consistent tools to monitor and share learner progress.

School administrators should ensure that the Failure Reduction Program is clearly aligned with the School Improvement Plan and designate responsible leaders to oversee implementation and evaluation. Additionally, schools should adopt targeted strategies to improve learner motivation and attendance, such as incentive systems, mentoring programs, and enhanced parental involvement, to address key barriers to student success and maximize the program's effectiveness.

REFERENCES

1. Arao, R., et al. (2007). *Statistics*. Manila: Rex Book Store.
2. Ariola, M. M. (2006). *Principles and methods of research*. Manila: Rex Book Store.
3. Armstrong, T. (2018). Is multiple intelligences research-based? Retrieved from <http://www.institute4learning.com>
4. Baguio Central University. (2018). *BCU research manual*. Research and Development Center.
5. Baguio City National High School. (2015). *Students' manual*. Baguio City: Baguio City National High School.
6. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE Publications.
7. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78.
8. Dela Cruz, J., & Santos, L. (2022). School-based interventions for at-risk learners in urban high schools. *Southeast Asian Review of Educational Research*, 17(1), 89–102.
9. Delos Santos, A. G., Reyes, M. T., & Aquino, J. B. (2021). Barriers in the implementation of intervention programs in public elementary schoolss: A basis for action plan. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 2(3), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.53378/345728>
10. DepEd. (2010). DepEd Order No. 74, s. 2010: Institutionalizing dropout reduction program (DORP).
11. DepEd. (2015). DepEd Order No. 8, s. 2015: Policy guidelines on classroom assessment for the K to 12 basic education curriculum.
12. DepEd. (2018). DepEd Order No. 13, s. 2018: Learner promotion and
13. retention.

14. Department of Education. (2022). Brigada Pagbasa Implementation Guidelines. DepEd Philippines.
15. Department of Education. (2021). Basic education development plan 2030. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
16. Department of Education. (2022). Learning recovery and continuity plan. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
17. Education Act of 1982. Batas Pambansa Blg. 232 Section 3. Retrieved from <https://www.slideshare.net>
18. Faubert, B. (2012). A literature review of school practices to overcome school failure. *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 68. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5kgflcwvvgtk-en>
19. Faubert, B. (2012). In-school practices for overcoming school failure: A literature review. *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 70. OECD Publishing.
20. Flores, M. (2018). Failure rate reduction program (FRRP) report. *The Pinetree*.
22. Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59–109.
23. Global Education for All (EFA) of 2015. (1989). Article 28. Retrieved from <http://www.worldbank.org>
24. Hayes, A. (2024). How stratified random sampling works, with examples. Retrieved from https://www.investopedia.com/terms/s/stratified_random_sampling.asp
25. McCombes, S. (2019). Descriptive research. Retrieved from <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/descriptive-research/>
26. McLeod, S. (2019). Bruner – learning theory in education. Retrieved from <https://www.simplypsychology.org/bruner.html>
27. Navarro, R. (2024). Educational reforms and localized interventions: Lessons from Philippine public schools. *Journal of Educational Innovation and Practice*, 12(1), 45–59.
28. OECD. (2023). *PISA 2022 Results (Volume I): Student performance in reading, mathematics and science*. OECD Publishing.
29. Oman Medical Journal. (2009, July). Factors contributing to school failure among school children in a very fast developing Arabian society. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3251187/>
30. Ramirez, C. (2023). Program assessment in Philippine education: Toward
31. data-driven policy and practice. *Asia-Pacific Education Policy Review*, 15(3), 120–135.

32. Ratvitch, D. (2007). Differentiation. Retrieved from <https://www.csudh.edu>
33. Roman, M. D. (2014). Students' failure in academic environment. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 114, 10–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.679>
34. SEAMEO INNOTECH. (2021). Policy Research on Stakeholder Engagement in Philippine Schools.
35. Tan, M. R., de Vera, G., & Lopez, K. (2023). Teacher agency in intervention programs: A post-pandemic analysis. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 98(2), 45–59.
36. The Adivay. (2017, January–July). Vol. 7 No. 1. Tracking learners from previous SY urged. Retrieved from <http://www.depedbenguet.com>
37. The Adivay Newsletter. (2017). School-based interventions and dropout reduction strategies in Benguet schools.
38. The Pine Tree. (2018, June 25). Student failure rate down by almost 6%. Retrieved from <https://baguioicityhigh.wordpress.com>
39. The World Bank. (2019, January 22). The education crisis: Being in school is not the same as learning. Retrieved from <https://www.worldbank.org>
40. UNICEF. (2023). Reimagining education in the Philippines: Addressing
41. Learning loss and recovery. United Nations Children's Fund.
42. <https://www.unicef.org/philippines>
43. UNESCO. (2021). Education in a post-COVID world: Nine ideas for public action. Paris: UNESCO.
44. UNICEF. (2021). Reimagining education: Supporting holistic development in learners.
45. World Bank. (2019). *the learning crisis: The state of global education*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
46. World Bank. (2020). Philippines Education Note: Improving Learning Outcomes through Systematic Reform.
47. World Bank. (2022). Philippines: Education note on learning recovery post-COVID-19. The World Bank Group. <https://www.worldbank.org>