

# Student Satisfaction under Flexible Learning Delivery: The Influence of Student Welfare, Development, and Institutional Services in Compliance with CMO No. 8, S. 2021

Alkhaser V. Sappayani, PhD., Lourdes Angelica B. Ugpo, MAEd., Loredel A. Alicante, MAEd

College Instructor, Davao Central College

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.110400131>

Received: 19 April 2026; Accepted: 24 April 2026; Published: 13 May 2026

## ABSTRACT

Student satisfaction in higher education under flexible learning remains inadequately explained, particularly regarding the predictive role of Student Affairs and Services (SAS) in compliance with CMO No. 8, s. 2021. This study aimed to determine the relationships and influences among student welfare, student development, and institutional programs and services on student satisfaction at Davao Central College. A quantitative correlational design was employed with a stratified sample of 358 students, and data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlation, and multiple regression. Results revealed high levels of SAS implementation and student satisfaction, with significant differences across sex, department, and year level, and a strong combined influence of SAS components explaining 91.7% of the variance in satisfaction. It is recommended that institutions strengthen student development services, enhance counseling and financial assistance programs, and adopt data-driven, student-centered strategies to sustain and improve satisfaction in flexible learning environments.

**Keywords:** Student satisfaction, flexible learning delivery, student welfare, development, institutional services, compliance CMO No. 8, s. 2021

## INTRODUCTION

Significant challenges have been posed by the increased competition among higher education institutions in the current educational landscape (Diez-Busto et al., 2023). Despite the recognized importance of student satisfaction for both institutional success and student outcomes (Wong & Chapman, 2022), persistent issues indicate that many institutions struggle to effectively meet students' needs. Although student satisfaction is often treated as a priority, gaps in service quality, accessibility, and responsiveness continue to undermine its achievement. While higher enrollment can bring financial gains and opportunities for improvement (Patulin, 2025), these benefits are not always translated into better student experiences. Moreover, student satisfaction is used as an index of service quality (Duraku & Hoxha, 2020), yet underlying dissatisfaction and unmet expectations are frequently overlooked.

Globally, challenges in achieving student satisfaction remain evident. In China, key factors such as teaching quality, environment, and support services continue to shape satisfaction levels (Altinay et al., 2023), while in Pakistan, issues like ineffective teaching, limited resources, and technological constraints hinder improvements (Haris, 2024). Similarly, in Malaysia, increasing competition pressures institutions to strengthen student trust and satisfaction, yet maintaining these remains difficult (Badeggi & Muda, 2021).

In the Philippine context, the problem is more pronounced. Studies in Cagayan show only moderate awareness of Student Affairs and Services (SAS), while in Western Philippine University, only 33% of student leaders reported satisfaction, highlighting clear gaps between student needs and service delivery (Kutat et al., 2021). These findings indicate that student satisfaction is not fully achieved and remains a significant concern. If not addressed, dissatisfaction may continue to be overlooked, leading to reduced engagement and retention (Langan & Harris, 2023).

Despite its importance, there is still limited empirical research examining SAS as predictors of student satisfaction under the flexible learning framework of CMO No. 8, 2021. Existing Philippine studies are largely descriptive and fail to identify which specific services significantly influence satisfaction. Without such evidence, institutions—particularly private ones like Davao Central College—risk ineffective policy implementation, inefficient resource allocation, and declining student trust. This underscores a clear and urgent problem: the need to determine which components of SAS significantly predict student satisfaction to support data-driven and responsive institutional improvements.

### **Statement of the Problem**

This study aimed to examine the relationship between Flexible Learning Delivery Implementation (CMO No. 8, s. 2021) and Student Satisfaction with Student Affairs and Services Programs in Davao Central College. Specifically, it aims to:

#### **1. Determine the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:**

- 1.1 sex;
- 1.2 enrollment status;
- 1.3 year level; and
- 1.4 programs?

#### **2. Assess the level of student welfare services on Flexible Learning Delivery Implementation (CMO No. 8, s. 2021) Student Affairs and Services Programs in Davao Central College;**

- 2.1 information and orientation services;
- 2.2 guidance and counselling services;
- 2.3 career and job placement services;
- 2.4 economic enterprise development; and
- 2.5 student handbook.

#### **3. Assess the level of student development services on Flexible Learning Delivery Implementation (CMO No. 8, s. 2021), Student Affairs and Services Programs in Davao Central College;**

- 3.1 student organizations and student activities;
- 3.2 leadership training;
- 3.3 student council/government;
- 3.4 student discipline; and
- 3.5 student publication/yearbook.

#### **4. Assess the level of institutional student programs and services on Flexible Learning Delivery Implementation (CMO No. 8, s. 2021) Student Affairs and Services Programs in Davao Central College;**

- 4.1 admission services;
- 4.2 scholarships and financial assistance;
- 4.3 health services;

- 4.4 safety and security services;
- 4.5 multi-faith services;
- 4.6 cultural and arts programs;
- 4.7 sports development programs; and
- 4.8 social and community involvement programs.

**5. Assess the level of satisfaction in Davao Central College.**

**6. Determine the significant difference between Student Satisfaction when grouped according to sex, department, and year level.**

**7. Determine the significant relationship between Student Welfare, Student Development, and Institutional Programs and Services and Student Satisfaction.**

**8. Determine the significant influence of Student Welfare, Student Development, Institutional Programs and Services, and Student Satisfaction.**

**Theoretical Framework**

This study was anchored on the SERVQUAL Theory developed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988), which explains that satisfaction with services is determined by the gap between expected and perceived service quality. The theory outlines five key dimensions for evaluating services: reliability, referring to consistent and dependable service delivery; responsiveness, or the promptness and willingness to assist clients; assurance, which includes the competence and courtesy of service providers; empathy, referring to individualized care and attention; and tangibles, such as physical facilities, equipment, and personnel appearance. Together, these dimensions offer a comprehensive framework for assessing service quality and its influence on user satisfaction.

**Research Design**

This study utilized a quantitative correlational research design to determine the extent to which Student Welfare, Student Development, and Institutional Programs and Services under the Flexible Learning Delivery Implementation (CMO No. 8, s. 2021) predict student satisfaction. A quantitative approach was deemed appropriate as it involves the systematic collection and statistical analysis of numerical data to examine relationships among variables with objectivity and precision (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Specifically, a correlational design was employed to identify the strength and direction of associations among variables without manipulation. Supported by multiple regression analysis, this approach is suitable for determining whether the identified institutional factors significantly predict levels of student satisfaction (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2019).

**Population and Sampling**

The study utilized a sample of 358 students, determined using the Raosoft sample size calculator to ensure statistical adequacy and reliability. A stratified sampling technique was employed to achieve proportional representation from the various groups within the student population. This method involves dividing the population into distinct subgroups, or strata, and drawing samples from each to ensure that all segments of the population are sufficiently represented (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2019).

Department	Population	Sample	Percentage
<i>College of Business and Administration</i>	1354	94	26.26%
<i>College of Education and Liberal Arts</i>	1388	97	27.09%

<i>College of Justice Education</i>	1193	83	23.18%
<i>Hospitality Management Education</i>	914	64	17.88%
<i>Information Technology Education</i>	289	20	5.59%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5112</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Research Locale

One of the private higher education institutions in Davao City. The choice of Davao City as the locale is significant because its dynamic and multicultural population provides an ample representation of the broader Filipino community. This makes the findings and implications drawn from the study more relevant and reflective of the actual educational landscape of the region. The instrument that was used in this study will be an adapted survey questionnaire from CHED Memorandum Order No. 8, series of 2021.

The adapted survey questionnaires have been validated by three experts with a rating of 5.00 out of 5.00, equivalent to excellent. There are a few modifications to the adapted survey questionnaires based on the suggestions of the content expert’s validator to fit the interest of the study. After which, it underwent pilot testing to test the reliability of the said instrument. The Cronbach's alpha of the following variables: student welfare services is 0.906, student development services is 0.885, institutional student programs are 0.894, and student satisfaction is 0.929.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Demographic Profile

Profile		Frequency	Percentage
<b>Department</b>	CBA	94	26.3%
	CELA	97	27.1%
	CJE	83	23.2%
	HME	64	17.9%
	ITE	20	5.6%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Sex</b>	Male	180	50.3%
	Female	178	49.7%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Year Level</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	145	40.5%
	3 <sup>rd</sup>	174	48.6%
	4 <sup>th</sup>	39	10.9%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>100%</b>

Shown in Table 1, the distribution of respondents across departments indicates that ITE has the lowest representation at 5.6%, followed by HME at 17.9%, CJE at 23.2%, CBA at 26.3%, and CELA with the highest representation at 27.1%. Research on student demographic profiles suggests that academic programs and major choices vary significantly by demographic groups, including gender and year level, and such variation can influence educational experiences and outcomes (Saadat, 2022). In terms of sex, female respondents have a slightly lower proportion at 49.7%, while males have a marginally higher proportion at 50.3%, which aligns with literature reporting gender differences in academic contexts and participation patterns among higher education students (Eshetu, 2024). For year level, fourth-year students register the lowest proportion at 10.9%, followed by second-year students at 40.5%, with third-year students comprising the highest proportion at 48.6%. Studies that include year of study as part of the student profile indicate that academic level and demographic characteristics such as gender and year of study can have meaningful associations with student engagement and learning outcomes (Badrudin, 2024).

Table 2. The Summary Level of student welfare services on Flexible Learning Delivery Implementation (CMO No. 8, s. 2021) Student Affairs and Services Programs in Davao Central College

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Level
Information and Orientation Services	3.08	High
Guidance and Counselling Services	2.91	High
Career and Job Placement Services	3.02	High
Economic Enterprise Development	2.99	High
Student Handbook	3.09	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.02</b>	<b>High</b>

Shown in Table 2 is the Summary Level of student welfare services on Flexible Learning Delivery Implementation; the indicators reveal generally high mean ratings across all areas. The lowest mean is observed in guidance and counselling services, with a mean of 2.91, followed by economic enterprise development at 2.99. Career and job placement services rank next with a mean of 3.02, which is equal to the overall mean of 3.02, indicating a consistently high level of implementation. Information and orientation services register a higher mean of 3.08, while the student handbook records the highest mean at 3.09, reflecting strong support for students in terms of access to information and institutional guidelines.

The relatively lower mean for guidance and counselling services is consistent with the findings of Mireku (2024), who reported that counselling and psychological support services in higher education are often less utilized or perceived as less accessible compared with other student support services. On the other hand, the generally high ratings across the other indicators are supported by Albarracin et al. (2024), who found that students tend to report higher satisfaction when student affairs and welfare services, particularly information dissemination, orientation programs, and institutional support mechanisms, are accessible and responsive to their needs.

Table 3. The Summary Level of student development services on Flexible Learning Delivery Implementation (CMO No. 8, s. 2021), Student Affairs and Services Programs in Davao Central College

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Level
Student Organizations and Student Activities	3.13	High
Leadership Training	3.03	High

Student Council/Government	3.07	High
Student Discipline	3.13	High
Student Publication/Yearbook	3.05	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>High</b>

Shown in Table 3, the Summary Level of student development services on Flexible Learning Delivery Implementation, the mean scores indicate a consistently high level of implementation across all indicators. The lowest mean is recorded for leadership training at 3.03, followed by student publication or yearbook with a mean of 3.05. Student council or government ranks next with a mean of 3.07. The highest mean values are shared by student organizations and student activities, and student discipline, all with a mean of 3.13, reflecting stronger implementation in these areas. The overall mean of 3.11 further confirms the high level of student development services under flexible learning delivery, suggesting that the institution effectively supports co-curricular and developmental experiences even in flexible learning contexts. This finding is supported by literature showing that well-structured student development programs, including student organizations, leadership opportunities, governance structures, discipline frameworks, and publication platforms, contribute positively to holistic student outcomes and engagement in flexible or blended learning environments (Nguyen, 2023). Research on student affairs and services further highlights that when student development services are consistently implemented and perceived as accessible and responsive, students report higher levels of satisfaction, a greater sense of belonging, and improved personal and academic development, affirming the high descriptive levels observed in the present study (Uadiale & Okojie, 2024).

Table 4. The Summary Level of institutional student programs and services on Flexible Learning Delivery Implementation (CMO No. 8, s. 2021) Student Affairs and Services Programs in Davao Central College

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Level
Admission Services	3.10	High
Scholarships and Financial Assistance	2.80	High
Health Services	3.19	High
Safety And Security Services	3.16	High
Multi-Faith Services	3.29	High
Cultural and Arts Programs	3.03	High
Sports Development Programs	3.04	High
Social and Community Involvement Programs	3.16	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>2.63</b>	<b>High</b>

Shown in the table is the Summary Level of institutional student programs and services on Flexible Learning Delivery Implementation, the lowest mean is reflected in the overall mean at 2.63, indicating a generally high level of implementation across institutional services. Among the indicators, scholarships and financial assistance have the lowest mean at 2.80, followed by cultural and arts programs at 3.03 and sports development programs at 3.04. Admission services register a mean of 3.10, while safety and security services and social and community involvement programs share a higher mean of 3.16. Health services follow closely with a mean of 3.19. The highest mean is observed in multi-faith services at 3.29, demonstrating the strongest level of implementation among the institutional student programs and services. The relatively lower rating for scholarships and financial

assistance, although still within the high descriptive level, is consistent with the findings of Adeyemi (2023), who reported that students often perceive financial aid services as less accessible or less sufficient compared with other institutional services, which can affect their overall satisfaction. On the other hand, the generally high ratings across all indicators are supported by Alqurashi (2022), who found that comprehensive and well-implemented institutional support services, including health, safety, community involvement, and other student programs, are associated with higher student satisfaction in flexible and blended learning environments.

Table 5. The Summary Level of Satisfaction in Davao Central College

Indicators	Mean	Descriptive Level
Satisfaction	3.15	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>High</b>

Shown in Table 5, the Summary Level of satisfaction in Davao Central College, the results indicate a uniformly high level of satisfaction among respondents. The satisfaction indicator records a mean of 3.15, which also represents the lowest and highest value since only one indicator is measured in the table. Consequently, the overall mean is likewise 3.15, confirming consistency between the specific indicator and the aggregate result. This finding suggests that students generally perceive a high level of satisfaction with the services and programs provided by the institution under the flexible learning delivery implementation. This result is consistent with previous studies showing that students tend to report higher satisfaction when institutional support services are accessible and responsive in flexible and blended learning environments (Alqurashi, 2022). This finding is further supported by Albarracin et al. (2024), who reported that effective implementation of student affairs and services programs is significantly associated with higher levels of student satisfaction.

Table 6. Significant Difference Between Student Satisfaction When Grouped According to Departments

	Satisfaction				
	F	df1	df2	p	Interpretation
<i>Department</i>	3.28	4	103	.014	Significant

Shown in Table 6, the Significant difference between Student Satisfaction when grouped according to departments, the results of the analysis indicate that student satisfaction varies significantly across academic departments. The computed F-value of 3.28 with degrees of freedom of 4 and 103 yielded a p-value of .014, which is lower than the conventional significance level of 0.05. This finding implies that there is a statistically significant difference in the level of student satisfaction when respondents are grouped according to their department. Hence, students' satisfaction is not uniform across departments, suggesting that departmental contexts and practices may influence students' perceptions and experiences. This result is consistent with Alqurashi (2022), who reported that variations in institutional and program-level support services can lead to differences in student satisfaction across academic contexts. Similarly, Albarracin et al. (2024) found that student satisfaction with student affairs and services differs across groups and institutional units, indicating that variations in implementation and service delivery can influence how students evaluate their educational experiences.

Table 6.1 Significant Difference between Student Satisfaction when Grouped According to Sex

	Satisfaction				
	t	df	p	Interpretation	
<i>Sex</i>	2.21	356	.028	Significant	

Shown in Table 6.1, the Significant difference between Student Satisfaction when grouped according to sex, the results demonstrate that student satisfaction differs significantly between male and female respondents. The computed t-value of 2.21 with 356 degrees of freedom resulted in a p-value of .028, which is below the 0.05 level of significance. This indicates the presence of a statistically significant difference in student satisfaction when grouped according to sex. The finding suggests that male and female students may have differing perceptions or experiences regarding institutional services and learning conditions. This result is consistent with Alqurashi (2022), who reported that student satisfaction in blended and flexible learning environments varies across demographic groups, including sex, due to differences in access to and perceptions of institutional support services. Similarly, Eshetu (2024) found that male and female students often report different levels of satisfaction and academic experiences in higher education, indicating that gender related factors can influence how students evaluate institutional services and learning conditions.

Table 6.2 Significant Difference Between Student Satisfaction When Grouped According to Year Level

	Satisfaction				
	F	df1	df2	p	Interpretation
<i>Year Level</i>	13.0	2	118	.001	Significant

Shown in Table 6.2, the Significant difference between Student Satisfaction when grouped according to year level, the findings reveal that student satisfaction significantly varies across year levels. The computed F-value of 13.0 with degrees of freedom of 2 and 118 produced a p-value of .001, which is far below the 0.05 level of significance. This result indicates a statistically significant difference in student satisfaction when respondents are grouped according to year level. The outcome suggests that students' academic standing or level in the institution influences how they perceive and evaluate their overall satisfaction. This finding is consistent with Alqurashi (2022), who reported that students' satisfaction in blended and flexible learning environments differs across student groups and stages of study due to variations in needs, expectations, and experiences. Similarly, Burke (2024) found that students at different stages of their academic programs report differing perceptions of support and satisfaction, indicating that year level or stage of study can shape how students evaluate institutional services and learning conditions.

Table 7. Significant relationship between Student Welfare, Student Development, Institutional Programs and Services, and Student Satisfaction.

	Satisfaction			
	r	p-value	Decision on Ho @ 0.05 level of significance	Interpretation
<b>Student Welfare Services</b>	0.705	<.001	Reject the null hypothesis	Moderately high significant positive correlation
<b>Student Development Services</b>	0.655	<0.01	Reject the null hypothesis	Moderately high significant positive correlation
<b>Institutional Student Programs and Services</b>	0.741	<0.01	Reject the null hypothesis	Moderately high significant positive correlation

Shown in Table 7 is the significant relationship between student welfare services, student development services, institutional student programs and services, and student satisfaction. The r-values of 0.705 for student welfare services, 0.655 for student development services, and 0.741 for institutional student programs and services indicate moderately high positive correlations, suggesting that higher levels of these services are associated with higher levels of student satisfaction. The corresponding p-values, all of which are below the 0.05 level of

significance ( $p < .001$  and  $p < 0.01$ ), indicate that these relationships are statistically significant and unlikely to have occurred by chance. Consequently, the null hypothesis is not accepted for all variables. Overall, the results presented in Table 7 demonstrate that student satisfaction is positively and significantly associated with student welfare services, student development services, and institutional student programs and services. This finding is consistent with Alqurashi (2022), who reported that institutional support services are significantly related to student satisfaction in blended and flexible learning environments. Similarly, Albarracin et al. (2024) found that stronger implementation of student affairs and services is positively associated with higher levels of student satisfaction, supporting the present results that improvements in welfare, development, and institutional services correspond to higher student satisfaction.

Table 8. Significant Influence between Student Welfare, Student Development, and Institutional Programs and Services and Student Satisfaction

	Standard Coefficient Beta	Satisfaction			
		t	p-Value	Decision On Ho @ 0.05 Level Of Significance	Interpretation
<b>Student Welfare Services</b>	0.287	11.61	<.001	Reject the Null Hypothesis	Significant
<b>Student Development Services</b>	0.430	18.91	<0.01	Reject the Null Hypothesis	Significant
<b>Institutional Student Programs and Services</b>	0.357	15.48	<0.01	Reject the Null Hypothesis	Significant
R= 0.958; R Square=0.917 F=1299 P<.01					

Shown in Table 8 the Significant Influence between student welfare, student development, and institutional programs and services and student satisfaction, the results indicate strong statistical relationships among the variables. Student welfare services obtained a standard coefficient beta of 0.287 with a t-value of 11.61 and a p-value of less than .001, leading to the decision to fail to accept the null hypothesis, which signifies a moderately high and significant positive correlation with student satisfaction. Student development services yielded the highest beta value of 0.430, with a t-value of 18.91 and a p-value of less than 0.01, indicating a stronger positive influence on satisfaction. Institutional student programs and services recorded a beta of 0.357, a t-value of 15.48, and a p-value of less than 0.01, also resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis. The overall model shows an R value of 0.958, reflecting a very strong relationship between the independent variables and student satisfaction. The R-squared value of 0.917 indicates that 91.7% of the variance in student satisfaction is explained by the combined predictors. The F-value of 1299 with a p-value of less than .05 confirms that the regression model is statistically significant and meaningful. This finding is consistent with Alqurashi (2019), who reported that perceived institutional support and service quality are significant predictors of student satisfaction in flexible and blended learning environments, highlighting the importance of support services for positive student outcomes. Similarly, Stankovska, Ziberi, and Dimitrovski (2024) found that higher perceived service quality dimensions are significantly related to overall student satisfaction in higher education settings, indicating that improvements in responsiveness, reliability, and assurance enhance students' evaluative experiences. Additionally, studies such as Amoako (2023) and Chen et al. (2025) demonstrate that the quality of academic and administrative services positively influences student satisfaction, reinforcing the present results that improvements in welfare, development, and institutional programs and services correspond to increased student satisfaction.

## RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings, it is recommended that higher education institutions may further strengthen Student Affairs and Services by prioritizing student development initiatives, given their strong influence on student

satisfaction, while continuing to enhance student welfare and institutional support services. Since 8.3% of the variance in student satisfaction remains unexplained, future studies may explore other contributing factors. Targeted improvements should focus on areas with relatively lower mean ratings, particularly guidance and counseling services and scholarships and financial assistance, to promote more equitable and responsive service delivery. The institution may also adopt department- and year-level-responsive strategies to address variations in student satisfaction. Continuous monitoring and data-driven evaluation of SAS programs are recommended to sustain high satisfaction levels and ensure alignment with students' evolving needs in flexible learning environments.

## REFERENCES

1. Adeyemi, A. B. (2023). Students' perceptions of financial aid services and their impact on academic persistence in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Student Financial Aid*, 53(1). <https://doi.org/10.55547/JSFA53.1.4>
2. Albarracin, M. R., Caynila, R. J. L., Manzanades, G. M., & Segovia, C. K. (2024). Student satisfaction in student affairs and services: Ordinary least squares model insights. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(12), 4290–4302. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.12.28>
3. Alqurashi, E. (2019). Predicting student satisfaction and perceived learning within online learning environments. *Distance Education*, 40(1), 133–148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2018.1553562>
4. Alqurashi, E. (2022). Student perceptions of institutional support services and satisfaction in blended learning environments. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 19(1), Article 54. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-022-00354-x>
5. Arrabaca, M. S., & Tan, M. R. S. (2025). Evaluating the influence of student affairs and services program on students' holistic development. *United International Journal for Research & Technology*, 6(5). <https://uijrt.com/paper/evaluating-influence-student-affairs-services-program-students-holistic-development>
6. Badruddin, A. (2024). Impact of demographic profile on sustainability learning objectives: Academic level and demographic factors in relation to learning outcomes.
7. Badeggi, M. S., & Muda, H. (2021). The challenges of student satisfaction and student loyalty in Malaysian university. *The Journal of Management Theory and Practice*, 2(4). <https://doi.org/10.37231/jmtp.2021.2.4.125>
8. Burke, K. (2024). Student perceptions of supports for managing study in higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2024.2362843>
9. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
10. Das, S. R., & Gochhayat, L. (2025). Student satisfaction towards educational services in higher education. *HRDC E-Journal*, 15(1), 141–150. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/369550335\\_STUDENT\\_SATISFACTION\\_TOWARDS\\_EDUCATIONAL\\_SERVICES\\_IN\\_HIGHER\\_EDUCATION](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/369550335_STUDENT_SATISFACTION_TOWARDS_EDUCATIONAL_SERVICES_IN_HIGHER_EDUCATION)
11. Diez-Busto, E., Palazuelos, E., San-Martín, P., & Montoya del Corte, J. (2023). Developing accounting students' professional competencies and satisfaction through learning experiences: Validation of a self-administered questionnaire. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 21(3), 100859. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100859>
12. Duraku, Z. H., & Hoxha, L. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 on higher education: A study of interaction among Kosovar students' mental health, attitudes toward online learning, study skills, and lifestyle changes. In Z. H. Duraku (Ed.), *The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on education and wellbeing* (pp. 46–61). University of Prishtina.
13. Eshetu, A. A. (2024). Gender disparity in academic performance in higher education institutions. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, Article 1476112. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2024.1476112>
14. Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

15. Gu, Q., & Lu, G. (2023). Factors influencing the satisfaction level of college students in China: Literature analysis based on grounded theory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1023420>
16. Haris, S., Haris, M., Lajber, M., Bilal, N., & Deeba, F. (2024). Comparison of satisfaction of students in public and private sector colleges of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *Journal of Humanities and Research*, 4(1), Article 341. <https://doi.org/10.61919/jhrr.v4i1.341>
17. Kutat, R. J., Cayaon, C. J., Colis, I. D., & Jagmis, M. G. (2021). Student satisfaction survey on student affairs and services (SAS) programs of Western Philippines University. *European Journal of Research Development and Sustainability*, 2(9).
18. Mireku, D. O. (2024). A systematic review of students' support services provision in higher education institutions. *Cogent Education*, 11(1).
19. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12–40.
20. Patulin. (2025). Students' satisfaction level on the services program of Surigao del Norte State University, Philippines. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 12(3). <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v12i3.5894>
21. Saadat, Z. (2022). Review of factors affecting gender disparity in higher education: Systematic identification of demographic influences on participation and representation.
22. Sarsale, M. S., & Caday, S. G. (2020). Exploring quality of student services of a Philippine state university satellite campus using SERVQUAL and service improvement matrix. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management*, 8(2), 59–71. <https://doi.org/10.22452/mojem.vol8no2.5>
23. Seitova, M. (2024). Perceived service quality and student satisfaction: Evidence from a quantitative study in Kazakhstan. *Frontiers in Education*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/feduc.2024.1492432/full>
24. Stankovska, G., Ziberi, F., & Dimitrovski, D. (2024). Service quality and student satisfaction in higher education. *BCES Conference Books*, 22. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/381823095/Service\\_Quality\\_and\\_Student\\_Satisfaction\\_in\\_Higher\\_Education](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/381823095/Service_Quality_and_Student_Satisfaction_in_Higher_Education)
25. Wong, W. H., & Chapman, E. (2023). Student satisfaction and interaction in higher education. *Higher Education*, 85, 957–978. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00874-0>

Name (Optional): \_\_\_\_\_

I volunteer to be a respondent on this study: Yes ( ) No ( )

Program/Department:  CELA  
 CBA  
 CJE  
 ITE  
 HME

Sex:  Male  Female

Year Level:  1<sup>st</sup>  2<sup>nd</sup>  3<sup>rd</sup>  4<sup>th</sup>

Enrollment Status:  Regular  Irregular

**General Instruction:** Please check the corresponding numbers of each item in accordance with your personal observation. Use the scale below to objectively assess. Be truthful with your response.

4 - Very Satisfied

3 –Satisfied

2 - Dissatisfied

1 - Very Dissatisfied

<b>IV1-STUDENT WELFARE SERVICES</b>				
This questionnaire was adapted from CMO 21, Series of 2021				
<b>1.1 Information and Orientation Services</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...</i>				
1. send printed or digital information and orientation materials (brochures, orientation packets, guidebooks) to students				
2. creates contents and materials that can be downloaded.				
3. develop other platforms for orientation (Zoom, Google Meet, FB Live)				
4. conduct synchronous and asynchronous sessions using different media platforms				
<b>1.2 Guidance and Counseling Services</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...</i>				
1. conduct remote psychological first aid, tele-counselling, tele-mental health through mobile phone or landline				
2. conduct remote psychological first aid, tele-counselling, tele-mental health through online platforms				
3. conduct series of webinars for mental health and wellness in the campus				
4. conduct series of webinars for mental health and wellness using secured digital platforms (Zoom, Google Meet)				
<b>1.3 Career and Job Placement Services</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...</i>				
1. conduct virtual career fairs with partnership from DOLE				
2. conduct a series of webinars on personality development, resume writing, application letter, etc.				
3. conduct a series of seminars and workshops on personality development, resume writing, application letter, etc.				
4. provide and post links on the bulletin board or on the Facebook page (e.g., DOLE links) to resources on job applications, opportunities, and legal considerations (e.g., labor rights).				
<b>1.4 Economic Enterprise Development</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...</i>				
1. provide printed information materials on the different opportunities for loans and educational assistance for students				
2. offer information on financial literacy for students				
3. conduct entrepreneurial webinars and initiatives on financial literacy				
4. create online platforms for student loans and services				
5. institutionalize online processes for student loan applications and fee collection				
6. make information accessible through digital platforms (chatbots, websites, social media)				
<b>1.5 Student Handbook Development</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...</i>				
1. distribute hard copies via courier or designated pick-up points				
2. send printed FAQs and primers with important information				
3. make e-handbooks available on the institution's website				
4. provide online FAQs about services and policies				
5. offer downloadable primers for new student orientation				
6. emphasize proper online discipline, including online etiquette, e-citizenship, digital well-being, and digital safety				

<b>IV2-STUDENT DEVELOPMENT SERVICES</b>				
This questionnaire was adapted from CMO 21, Series of 2021				
<b>2.1 Student Organizations and Activities</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...</i>				
1. student organizations can conduct online activities (but must be reported to Student Affairs Services)				
2. provide online platforms or virtual meeting rooms for student activities				
3. provide meeting rooms for student activities				
4. provides information about student activities that is easily accessible (e.g., posters, social media, announcements).				
5. provides an application or membership process for organizations that is easy to follow.				
6. mandated that student organizations are inclusive and welcoming to all students.				

<b>2.2 Leadership Training</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...</i>				
1. send printed materials on leadership training modules.				
2. organize webinars on leadership training.				
3. provide online resources on or links to leadership.				
4. provide students a list of online seminars-workshops and conferences.				
5. allow students to participate as official representatives in online seminars, workshops, conferences, etc.				
<b>2.3 Student Council/Government</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...</i>				
1. provide the Student Council/Government online platforms, virtual meeting rooms, etc.				
2. supports the Student Council in organizing activities that are beneficial to students.				
3. helps the council in addressing student concerns in a timely manner.				
4. monitors the responsible use of Student Council funds.				
5. ensures that financial or budget reports are communicated clearly when necessary.				
6. oversees that the council's goals and plans are realistic and aligned with institutional policies.				
<b>2.4 Student Discipline</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...</i>				
1. send student discipline policies, which should be part of the student handbook, via courier or via pick-up.				
2. students may file their grievances or complaints through courier or drop-off.				
3. include in virtual orientations highlighting positive reinforcement of behaviors producing resilient and well-mannered individuals.				
4. provide an online student discipline process (Students Desk) managed by a committee that will handle student complaints (grievances) following standard protocols.				
<b>2.5 Student Publication/Year Book</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...</i>				
1. send student publications via courier or pick-up.				
2. conduct webinars on online campus journalism.				
3. provide software for students to convert print campus journals to e-publication.				

4. provide online platforms for student publications.				
5. provides clear information about the student publication/yearbook and its purpose.				
6. offers accessible channels for inquiries related to the student publication or yearbook.				
7. promotes awareness of how students can contribute to or engage with the publication/yearbook.				
8. school ensures the timely release and distribution of the student publication/yearbook.				
9. provides clear guidelines on how students can obtain their copies.				

**IV3-INSTITUTIONAL STUDENT PROGRAM AND SERVICES**

This questionnaire was adapted from CMO 21, Series of 2021

**3.1 Admission Services**

**4 3 2 1**

*As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...*

1. offers applicants may submit academic credentials through courier.				
2. during admission, applicants can submit scanned copies of basic admission credentials, but with undertaking the submission of not readily available documents. Once admitted they are required to submit original credentials.				
3. allows online enrollment.				
4. conduct time-bound online entrance examination for applicants.				
5. provides clear information about admission requirements.				
6. admission guidelines are easy to understand.				
7. provides accurate and updated information regarding enrollment schedules.				
8. admission procedures are organized and systematic.				
9. admission process is completed within a reasonable time.				
10. minimizes delays or issues during the admission process.				
11. admission staff are approachable and respectful.				
12. admission personnel provide helpful guidance during enrollment.				
13. provides convenient channels for admission inquiries (e.g., office, phone, online).				
14. admission forms and requirements are easy to access.				
15. ensures that facilities used for admission are comfortable and organized.				

16. addresses inquiries and concerns related to admission quickly.				
<b>3.2 Scholarship and Financial Assistance</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...</i>				
1. allows applicants may submit documents via courier.				
2. shall have an online application for submission of documents				
3. application documents shall be made available online for easy download.				
4. offer financial assistance to support technological requirements of students for flexible learning.				
<b>3.3 Health Services</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...</i>				
1. provide tele- and online medical consultations, digital format of forms and prescriptions.				
2. conduct webinars on health and wellness.				
3. provides clear information about available health services.				
4. informed where the school clinic or health office is located.				
5. ensures that health services are easily accessible to students.				
6. health staff are approachable, respectful, and supportive.				
7. ensures that health personnel respond promptly to students' health concerns.				
8. provides health education and awareness programs.				
9. promotes preventive health measures (e.g., hygiene, nutrition, mental health).				
<b>3.4 Safety and Security Services</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...</i>				
1. provide printed materials on safety and security to reduce disaster risk reduction be provided to students via courier.				
2. activate the school DRRM to be ready to respond in case of disasters.				
3. provide online materials on the safety and security during disaster.				
4. conduct seminars on safety and security during disaster.				
<b>3.5 Multi-faith Services</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...</i>				
1. host worship services for various faith.				

2. accommodates students of different religious backgrounds.				
3. procedures for availing multi-faith services are clearly communicated by the school.				
4. ensures that multi-faith services are easily accessible to all students.				
5. promotes respect for diverse religious beliefs and practices.				
6. ensures that no student feels discriminated against based on religious affiliation.				
7. encourages harmony among students from different faith traditions.				
<b>3.6 Multi-faith Services</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...</i>				
1. provision of artistic training materials (e.g. printed or email) that the student artists can learn in their own time.				
2. send information and video materials that can be used by the general student body on using the arts for general wellness (i.e. meditation, arts therapy through music, dance and theatre exercises).				
3. aid the academic sector in the creation of online instructional materials for the promotion and conservation of national culture and multi-cultural heritage.				
4. assist in staging online institutional events.				
5. host virtual cultural and artistic performances.				
6. creating virtual platforms for cultural and artistic performances and exhibitions.				
7. creation of instructional materials to promote wellness through the arts.				
8. assist in staging online institutional events, local and national cultural/historical celebrations.				
<b>3.7 Sports Development Programs</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...</i>				
1. conduct or host individualized physical fitness program through online platforms.				
2. provides clear information about its sports development programs.				
3. ensures that sports programs are accessible to interested students.				
4. provides adequate sports facilities for training and competitions.				
5. sports equipment provided by the school is safe, complete, and in good condition.				
6. provides opportunities for students to participate in inter-school competitions.				
7. encourages students to engage in physical activities and sports.				

<b>3.8 Social and Community Involvement Programs</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that the school...</i>				
1. provides clear information about social and community involvement programs.				
2. social and community involvement programs are meaningful and relevant to students' development.				
3. ensures that programs address actual community needs.				
4. programs help develop students' social responsibility and civic awareness.				
5. activities are well-organized and well-planned by the school.				
6. encourages students to actively participate in social and community programs.				
7. students are given opportunities to take leadership roles in community involvement activities.				
8. participation in these programs is recognized and valued by the school.				

<b>IV4-STUDENTS SATISFACTION</b>				
This questionnaire was adapted from CMO 21, Series of 2021	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>As a College Student, I am satisfied that...</i>				
1. The orientation conducted by the school on students' affairs and services were clearly outlined.				
2. The student handbook provided by the school contains information such as contact numbers of school personnel, how to access student services, etc.				
3. The services to ensure psychosocial and mental well-being are administered regularly.				
4. The school provided career and occupational opportunities.				
5. The school supported activities of student organizations.				
6. The school supported the student council/government.				
7. The school publication is active and accessible.				
8. The services provided are accessible to students with disabilities, students belonging to indigenous groups, students who are solo parents, etc.				
9. The school personnel in the admissions/registrar's office are helpful.				
10. The school provided accessible information to having a healthy lifestyle.				
11. The school provided accessible health services such as medical consultation among others.				

12. The school provided a safe learning environment.				
13. The school provided accessible and safe student housing or residential services.				
14. The cultural and arts program provided opportunities to develop and enhance talents, abilities, and values for appreciation, promotion and conservation of national culture and multi-cultural heritage.				
15. The sports development program provided physical fitness and wellness other than physical education subjects.				