

Students' Satisfaction Index To The Services Of The University Of Cebu – Lapu-Lapu And Mandaue Campus For S.Y. 2021-2022

ROEL A. MONSANTO

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8268-2249> rmonsanto@uc.edu.ph
University Research Office University of Cebu – Lapu-Lapu and Mandaue
Mandaue City, Cebu, Philippines

ANDREW D. CUERDA

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1453-149X>
andrew.cuerda30@gmail.com University Research Office
University of Cebu – Lapu-Lapu and Mandaue Mandaue City, Cebu, Philippines

MELVIN T. MONTON

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0075-3833>
melvinmonton1998@gmail.com University Research Office
University of Cebu – Lapu-Lapu and Mandaue Mandaue City, Cebu, Philippines

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.13.11.2023.p14304

<https://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.13.11.2023.p14304>

Paper Received Date: 16th September 2023

Paper Acceptance Date: 25th October 2023

Paper Publication Date: 6th November 2023

Abstract: Higher education institutions need to deliver excellent customer service in order to retain students and improve the institutions' standing in various league tables, as well as to increase internal and external retention rates (Blackmore et al. 2006; Douglas et al. 2006). This premise became the inspiration behind the conduct of this study. This study determined the extent of stakeholders' satisfaction to the academic and administrative services offered in the University of Cebu – Lapu-Lapu and Mandaue for the School Year 2021-2022. Subsequently, this study determined the top and low-performing academic and administrative departments of the University in terms of customer service. In terms of its objectives, this research is classified under the descriptive research. Moreover, the respondents of this study are the 4, 291 college, senior high school and basic education students of the university. This number was derived after the researchers employed the non-probability sampling method. In order to gather relevant data to fulfill the objectives of this research, the researchers also utilized a researcher-made research instrument which underwent face validation by the core management group of the university. In general, the SPS Division of the University of Cebu – Lapu-Lapu and Mandaue Campus obtained an aggregate mean of 4.44 which is interpreted as Excellent. This somehow indicates that the students, as represented by the 4, 291 respondents of this research are more than satisfied with the services offered by the aforementioned offices or departments.

Keywords: *Customer Satisfaction Survey, University Services, Students' Satisfaction*

Introduction

Contrary to popular belief, customer service does not only take place during the purchase of a product or availment of a service. It happens before, during and after the purchase of a product or availment of a service. On the one hand, before the customer decides to buy a product or avail of a service, there are opportunities already for the business to provide services such as answering in-person or online inquiries, product presentation, providing instructional materials or guidelines, warm and friendly welcome, offering a comfortable and conducive place where the purchase or delivery of products and services happens, to name a few. Similarly, how well a business serves the customers before they even buy a product or avail of a service will be a significant input in the customers' buying decision. On the other hand, the after sales support is also an integral part in the over-all customer service experience of the customers. This will complete the stages of customer service and contribute to the over-all satisfaction of the

customers to a company's products and services. Proper execution of customer service in each stage is of paramount importance in order to achieve customer satisfaction. However, the end goal of customer service is not achieving customer satisfaction if a company wants to build a loyal customer base. Loyalty of customers will only be achieved if the company is steadfast in its commitment to continuously exceed customers' expectations.

Educational institutions over and above should be a shining example of excellent customer service for one basic premise: they hone the knowledge, skills and attitude of the future generation of service providers. Apart from this, higher education institutions need to deliver excellent customer service in order to retain students and improve the institutions' standing in various league tables, as well as to increase internal and external retention rates (Blackmore et al. 2006; Douglas et al. 2006). Since the last few decades, the quality of education, student satisfaction, and loyalty have been widely discussed and promoted in scientific literature, national debates, and higher education institution strategies (Gruber et al. 2010; Temizer and Turkyilmaz 2012). According to these discussions, student contentment and loyalty on the one hand, and educational quality and student satisfaction on the other, are positively correlated (Tandilashvili, 2019).

In general, customer satisfaction can be divided into two categories: satisfaction as meeting customers' expectations prior to purchasing or after using products and services, and satisfaction as customers' relative perception of the performance of those products or services after using them. Universities need to carefully distinguish between the two options: either they should aim for high service quality as a means of boosting customer satisfaction, or they should try to offer satisfied clients who will afterwards create an impression of high service quality. Service quality at the university is a result of the variety of services that students encounter there. According to Hill, these services are offered by managers, instructional staff, administrators, and other personnel (Hill 1995).

Numerous studies have shown that acquiring new clients is more expensive than keeping the ones you already have (Gemme 1997, 19-21). Having loyal customers benefits businesses financially in both the short and long term (Kotler and Armstrong 2015, 13). The same can be said about the cost of attracting new students as well as the benefits they can bring. Loyal students benefit universities more than just their tuition fees but also because of their reputation and the power of word-of-mouth advertising. A satisfied student is more devoted to their institution both during and after their studies and helps their alma mater in various ways, which is another benefit (Gibson 2010). The decision to continue studying at the same university, regular use of various institution services, and referrals of the institution to others are all examples of situations where a student's loyalty may be criticized. Studying the factors that students are satisfied with as well as those that they are not is a crucial first step in determining how high they perceive the quality of university services to be (Douglas et al., 2006, 251-267).

The Equity Theory supports the foregoing premises and the overall direction of this study. Equity theory is concerned with the fairness, integrity, or correctness of decisions made by individuals or groups of people. In this theory, it is assumed that if customers practice impartiality and fairness (exchanging input for output), satisfaction can be achieved. As a result, customers incur costs (input) in exchange for a specific level of output (Galbreath, 2010a, b). When compared to other entities, whether real or imagined, individual or collective, person or nonperson, Oliver (1997) defines equity as "fairness, rightness, or deservingness" (p. 196). The use of equity theory to marketing has long been acknowledged (Huppertz, Arenson, and Evans 1978). The theory is based on social exchange theory (Adams 1965; Homans 1961). The fundamental assumption is that interpersonal interactions are repetitive and change over time. According to Bagozzi (1975), the idea of reciprocity in market exchange interactions is closely related to equity, indicating that it can be thought of as a relatively accumulating perception.

The factors that directly affect customer satisfaction and ensuing loyalty should depend on whether they are rating individual service episodes or a client's overall experiences (Olsen and Johnson, 2015). Compare the product and price components (such as the bank's facilities, interest rates, and fees) with the pure service component of the service offering (such as the service provider's comprehension of client needs and readiness to assist), prior studies on the critical event technique (Roos 1999; Stauss and Weinlich 1997) indicate that the emphasis is on "observable human behavior" (Flanagan 1954) when the research is on a specific service episode or occurrence, which in this case is the service provider. People frequently recall the service portion of a given service episode or transaction over other aspects of the transaction or service. This implies that the proportionate influence of the pure service component on loyalty may grow when equity and satisfaction surveys are transaction-specific. Comparatively speaking, overall assessments of equity and satisfaction are more objective and decoupled from interpersonal interactions. The researchers expect, as a result, the impact of service on product and price is greater for a transactional survey versus a cumulative survey. This prediction is consistent with the findings of Mittal, Kumar, and Tsiros (1999).

The literature and theories cited in the foregoing premises established the foundation on the objectives of this study. Specifically, this study determined the extent of stakeholders' satisfaction to the academic and administrative services offered in the University of Cebu – Lapu- Lapu and Mandaue for the School Year 2021-2022. Subsequently, this study determined the top and low-performing academic and administrative departments of the University in terms of customer service. The results of this study served as the basis of the University in coming up with development and action plans that will help the management derive a sound

decision on resolving the areas of concern in delivering customer service to its clientele.

Methods

In order to determine the University stakeholders' satisfaction index to the customer service of the University, this research employed quantitative research in terms of its mode of inquiry. In terms of its objectives, this research is classified under the descriptive research and in terms of its application, this research is under the applied research category.

This study was conducted at the University of Cebu - Lapulapu and Mandaue Campus which is located in Mandaue City, Province of Cebu in the Philippines. This learning institution is home to 15, 850 students during the second semester of the school year 2020-2021. These students are what comprise the population of its 12 academic departments namely: College of Business and Accountancy, College of Computer Studies, College of Criminology, College of Customs Administration, College of Engineering, College of Hospitality and Tourism Management, College of Marine Transportation, College of Marine Engineering, College of Nursing, College of Teacher Education, Senior High School Department and the Basic Education Department. These students are under the tutelage of 214 full-time faculty members with the addition of part-time faculty members and administrative personnel who are also teaching in the undergraduate programs. However, since face-to-face classes are suspended because of the COVID-19 pandemic, this study also relied on the online environment created by the university to continue its mission of providing quality educational services to its stakeholders. In the process, the researchers communicated with the respondents through the online communication channels promoted by the university such as the Learning Management System, Facebook Messenger, and E-mail. All of these formed part of the online research environment of this study.

Moreover, the respondents of this study are the 4, 291 college, senior high school and basic education students of the university. This number was derived after the researchers employed the non-probability sampling method. In particular, convenience sampling was so chosen given the circumstances and limitations in terms of time and resources. All these respondents met the basic criterion needed in order to become a respondent – that is, they should be officially enrolled at the time that this survey was conducted.

In order to gather relevant data to fulfill the objectives of this research, the researchers also utilized a researcher-made research instrument which underwent face validation by the core management group of the university. The research instrument is composed of 22 parts. Part one collected the basic profile of the respondents such as their name (optional), gender, year level, and age group. The rest of the parts collected data on the satisfaction of the respondents to the services of the Dean/Chairperson/Principal's Office, Students' Accounting Section, Physics-Chemistry Laboratory, Building Maintenance, Campus Director's Office, Office of Community Awareness, Relations and Extension Services (CARES), Cashier's Office, Medical Clinic, Computer Laboratories, Civil Security Unit, Library, NSA Office, On-Board Training Office, Student Affairs Office, University Research Office, Registrar's Office, EDP Section, Guidance and Counseling Services Center, Scholarship Office, and the School Facilities, respectively. The research instrument is statistically sound and the data gathered through the research instruments were treated using simple frequency count, percentage and weighted mean.

The researchers adhered to ethical principles in the conduct of the study especially during the data gathering procedure. In the conduct of the study, three basic principles were observed: the principles of respect of persons, beneficence, and justice. In the observance of respect for persons, two ethical convictions were further observed: first, the respondents were treated as autonomous agents, and second, persons with diminished autonomy were entitled to protection. In affording beneficence, the respondents were treated ethically not only by respecting their decisions and protecting them from harm but also by making efforts to secure their well-being. Two general rules were observed in the observance of beneficence: (a) do not harm and (b) maximize possible benefits and minimize possible harms. Lastly, the principle of justice was applied. In the treatment of respondents, the principle of "fairness in distribution" or "what is deserved" was observed. To further observe justice, the following formulation were also observed: (a) to each person an equal share, (b) to each person according to individual need, (c) to each person according to individual effort, (d) to each person according to societal contribution, and (e) to each person according to merit.

Before the respondents answered the online survey, they were notified about the aims, methods, and anticipated benefits of the study, their right to abstain from participation in the research, and their right to terminate at any time their participation; and the confidential nature of their answers and replies. No person was made a respondent of this research unless they have given the notice referred to in the previous paragraph and provided a freely given consent that they agreed to participate. No pressure or inducement of any kind was applied to encourage a person to become a respondent of the research. The research ensured confidentiality by making sure that the responses were kept with strict confidentiality and for study purposes only through disposing of instruments after it has been used to safeguard the confidentiality of the research process.

Results and Discussion

This part presents the results of the survey conducted to the respondents to answer the research questions, which are also translated as the objectives of this research. The subtopics hereunder are arranged according to how they appear in the research instrument. As follows:

Profile of the Respondents Table 1

Rate of Participation by Department

Department	Frequency	Population	% of Participation	Rank
College of Engineering	516	918	56.20%	2
College of Nursing	512	683	74.97%	1
College of Computer Studies	177	800	22.13%	8
College of Criminology	345	1,005	34.33%	5

College of Customs Administration	19	1, 076	1.77%	11
College of Hospitality and Tourism Management	314	1, 146	27.40%	7
College of Teacher Education	236	729	32.33%	6
College of Business and Accountancy	14	1, 337	1.05%	12
College of Marine Transportation	72	2, 556	2.82%	10
College of Marine Engineering	124	1, 241	10%	9
Senior High School Department	1, 602	3, 401	47.10%	3
Basic Education Department	360	958	37.58%	4
Total	4, 291	15, 850	27.07%	

Table 1 depicts the rate of participation to the survey of the respondents from the different academic departments of the University. Each of the academic department is ranked according to their extent of participation. The results show that the College of Nursing obtained the highest participation rate at 74.97%. This is followed by the College of Engineering which obtained a participation rate of 56.20% and the Senior High School Department which obtained a participation rate of 47.10%, respectively. Moreover, the College of Business and Accountancy obtained the lowest participation rate at 1.05%.

There were 4, 291 respondents of the survey. Using the Slovin’s Formula in determining whether this figure is representative of the study population, it was revealed that the number of respondents indeed represent the study population. The Slovin’s Formula is $n=N/(1+Ne^2)$. In computation, $n=15850/(1+15850 \times 0.05^2)$. As such, $n=390$. Therefore, given the study population, 390 is the ideal number of respondents. At a closer look, 4, 291 is way above than what is required. This means that from what is supposed to be the sample size to represent the study population, there is an increase of 1100.26%. The limitation however is the unequal representation of each academic department.

About the impact of particular drivers on survey participation, various studies reach varying conclusions (Dillman, 1991). Importantly, factors influencing survey participation are strongly influenced by the method of survey delivery (Dillman, 1991), just as the response rate itself is.

Table 2
Gender Distribution of the Respondents

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Male	2, 160	50.34%
Female	2, 131	49.66%
Total	4, 291	100%

Table 2 shows the distribution of the respondents according to their gender. There is a total of 2, 160 male respondents,

which constitutes 50.34% of the total number of respondents. 2, 131 respondents are female which constitutes 49.66% of the total number of respondents. The frequency of male and female respondents are almost equal with a difference of only 0.68%.

Table 3
Distribution of the Respondents by Year Level (College Students)

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
1 st Year Level	806	34.61%
2 nd Year Level	610	26.19%
3 rd Year Level	470	20.18%
4 th Year Level	443	19.02%
5 th Year Level	0	0%
Total	2, 329	100%

Table 3 shows the distribution of the college respondents by their year level. It was found that the highest percentage of respondents is attributed to the first-year students with a total of 806 or 34.61%. The second-year respondents comprise of the 610 respondents which is 26.19%. The third-year respondents obtained a total of 470 or 20.18%. The fourth-year respondents obtained a total of 443 or 19.02%. Notably, there are no respondents in the fifth year level. One noteworthy observation in the distribution of the college respondents by their year level is that it follows a descending order. It started with the first year respondents which obtained the highest percentage and as the year level increases, the percentage of participation also decreases. This observation is backed-up by a model on survey participation behavior proposed by Groves, Singer and Corning in 2000 which they called “leverage-salience theory”. It implies that respondents' responses to particular costs and benefits of survey participation vary. There are various points of leverage for each respondent. Additionally, leverage points interact in various ways; some can make up for the absence of others. Respondents weigh the costs and benefits of participating in a survey against an internal threshold before deciding whether or not to do so.

Table 4

Distribution of the Respondents by Grade Level (Senior High School)

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Grade 11	725	45.26%
Grade 12	877	54.74%
Total	1, 602	100%

Table 4 depicts the distribution of the senior high school respondents by their grade level. The Grade 12 level has the highest number of respondents, 877 at that or 54.74% of the over-all total number of respondents. This is followed by the Grade 11 level which obtained a total of 725 respondents or 45.26% of the over-all number of respondents.

Table 5

Distribution of the Respondents by Grade Level (Basic Education)

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Elementary	68	18.89%
Junior High School	292	81.11%
Total	360	100%

Table 5 represents the distribution of the basic education respondents by their grade level. At a closer look, the Junior High School respondents obtained the highest number which is 292 or equivalent to 81.11% of the total number of respondents. Meanwhile, there are 68 respondents in the elementary level which constitutes 18.89% of the total number of respondents.

Table 6

Distribution of the Respondents by their Age Group

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
17-20 Years Old	2, 598	60.55%
21-25 years Old	1, 599	37.26%
26-30 Years Old	72	1.68%
31-35 Years Old	13	0.30%
36-40 Years Old	8	0.19%

41 Years Old and Above	1	0.02%
Total	4, 291	100%

Table 6 outlines the distribution of the respondents according to their age group. The highest percentage or 60.55% of the respondents belong to the 17-20 years old age group. This is consistent with the data presented in the previous tables as this age group is normally composed of lower and higher basic education and college students in their preliminary stages in college. Meanwhile, the 21-25 years old age group garnered a total of 1, 599 respondents or 37.26% of the over-all number of respondents. This age group is primarily dominated by college students in their higher year levels. Finally, the rest of the 2.19% of the respondents are distributed unequally among the 26-30, 31-35, 36-40 and 41 years old and above age groups.

In general, the profile of the respondents gathered in this research formed part on the key drivers of online survey response behavior. Several drivers such as survey length (Haunberger, 2011; Sax, Gilmartin, & Bryant, 2003), interest in the topic (Brüggen et al., 2011; Huang, Hubbard, & Mulvey, 2003; Keusch, 2013; Zillmann, Schmitz, Skopek, & Blossfeld, 2014), desire to voice one’s opinion, curiosity, enjoyment, the desire to help, recognition and a feeling of obligation to complete the survey (Brüggen et al., 2011), personalized invitations to complete a survey (Joinson & Reips, 2007; Sánchez-Fernández, Muñoz-Leiva, & Montoro-Ríos, 2012; Sauermann & Roach, 2013), the number of reminders (Sánchez-Fernández et al., 2012), other design features of the survey invitation (de Bruijne & Wijnant, 2014; Sauermann & Roach, 2013), trust or the relationship with the organization conducting the survey (Fang, Shao, & Lan, 2009), and questionnaire design (Tangmanee & Niruttinanon, 2015) were considered in the conduct of this research particularly in the instrumentation and data gathering procedures.

Students’ Satisfaction to the Services of the University

This part elucidates the satisfaction of the students to the services offered by the different departments of the University. These departments are all part of the Student-Personnel Services (SPS) Division. As such, the departments that are not directly serving the students are excluded from this survey.

In order to translate the responses of the respondents into a more generalizable idea, the Likert Scale used in this research is 5-point with the following assigned values: 1.0-1.9 = Poor; 1.80-2.59 = Fair; 2.60-3.39 = Good; 3.40 – 4.19 = Very Good; and 4.20 – 5.00 = Excellent. The tallied data were then treated using weighted mean and are ranked accordingly.

One the one hand, tables 7 to 23 depicts the satisfaction of the students to the following offices/departments: Dean/Chairperson/Principal’s Office; Students’ Accounting Section; Physics-Chemistry Laboratory; Building Maintenance; Campus Affairs Director’s Office; CARES Office; Cashier’s Office; Medical Clinic; Computer Laboratories; Civil Security Unit; Library; Student Affairs Office; University Research Office; Registrar’s Office; EDP Section; Guidance Center; and Scholarship Office, respectively.

On the other hand, table 24 provides the summary of the students’ satisfaction of the different SPS departments/Offices. When the overall weighted mean is computed, table 24 also shows the overall extent of students’ satisfaction.

Table 7

Students’ Satisfaction of the Dean/Chairperson/Principal’s Office

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
A.1 - Services			
1. Orientation programs conducted by the department for new and students as well as special orientations for a specific purpose.	4.37	Excellent	2
2. Evaluation of courses or subjects to be enrolled.	4.11	Very Satisfactory	9
3. Providing the students with updated list of dissolved subjects on bulletin boards or online.	4.14	Very Satisfactory	8

4. Request for change of schedule or enrollment adjustments is acted upon immediately.	4.23	Excellent	4
5. All requested courses that reach the minimum requirement are acted upon immediately.	4.20	Excellent	5
6. The process lead-time for the transactions in the Principal/Dean's Office.	3.82	Very Satisfactory	10
7. The assessment slips are released with ample time prior to examination.	4.25	Excellent	3
8. The department posts either in the bulletin board or in any online platforms the schedule of students' consultation with the faculty members and/or other officials of the department.	3.14	Satisfactory	11
9. Provision of supplemental and or enhancement activities to boost the academic performance of the students is adequately provided by the department.	4.23	Excellent	4
10. The midterm grade/ final grades are released with ample time before enrollment period.	4.40	Excellent	1
11. Active participation of the department to the different extra-curricular activities to provide the students an avenue for creative expression of ideas, talents and skills and to reinforce the core values of the university is evident.	4.15	Very Satisfactory	7
12. The department manifests strong external industry partnerships/linkages to expand the reach of the department in terms of placement of the students for on-the-job training/immersion/apprenticeship/internship.	4.20	Excellent	5
13. Promissory notes of students are acted upon immediately.	4.19	Very Satisfactory	6
Average Weighted Mean	4.11	Very Satisfactory	
A.2 Administration of the Dean/Chairperson/Principal's Office			
1. The Dean/Chairperson/Principal's office acted immediately on complaints raised by the students and other stakeholders either verbally or in writing.	4.10	Very Satisfactory	3
2. The Staff responds to the student's request within a reasonable period of time and provides feedback or a status of the request.	2.88	Very Satisfactory	6
3. The Dean's office gives reasonable resolution/ verdict with regards to the issues and concerns raised by the students and other stakeholders.	4.16	Excellent	1
4. Stakeholders are given the opportunity to provide feedback on the services offered by the department through putting up a comment box or online platforms apart from the regular conduct of customer satisfaction survey.	2.90	Satisfactory	5
5. The Dean/Chairperson/Principal is visible in the department and accommodates appointments if the students and other stakeholders wish to discuss matters with him/her.	4.15	Excellent	2

6. The departmental policies are consistent with the University Policies and its implementation is appropriate, right and just.	4.08	Very Satisfactory	4
Average Weighted Mean	3.71	Very Satisfactory	
A.3 Attitude of the Personnel in the Dean/Chairperson/Principal's Office			
1. The staff is willing to go "the extra mile" to help the students' and other stakeholders' needs.	3.18	Satisfactory	9
2. The staff deals with the students and other stakeholders patiently and professionally.	3.50	Very Satisfactory	8
3. The staff is very accommodating.	4.05	Very Satisfactory	7
4. The staff is very approachable.	4.11	Very Satisfactory	4
5. The staff appears concerned about the students' or other stakeholders' problem or issues.	4.10	Very Satisfactory	5
6. The staff answers the stakeholders' questions in a way that is easy to understand.	4.20	Excellent	2
7. The staff is kind.	4.08	Very Satisfactory	6
8. The staff listens attentively to the stakeholders' question and then asks appropriate questions to better understand stakeholders' concerns or needs.	4.15	Very Satisfactory	3
9. The staff shows excellent knowledge of the office.	4.29	Excellent	1
Average Weighted Mean	3.96	Very Satisfactory	
A.4 Professionalism of the Personnel in the Dean/Chairperson/Principal's Office			
1. The staff is well-groomed.	4.68	Excellent	1
2. The staff refrains from using foul and vulgar languages at all times.	4.52	Excellent	2
3. The staff shows respect, care and concern or the stakeholders' welfare.	4.22	Excellent	4
4. There is a staff always available and ready to accommodate the stakeholders in the office.	3.75	Very Satisfactory	6
5. The staff answers telephone calls professionally.	4.36	Excellent	3
6. The staff replies to e-mails and other forms of online correspondences professionally.	2.93	Satisfactory	7
7. The staff exhibits cleanliness and orderliness in his/her work station and documents are easily located and filed.	4.15	Excellent	5
Average Weighted Mean	4.09	Very Satisfactory	

A.5 Physical Characteristics of the Dean/Chairperson/Principal's Office			
1. There's enough space in the office to accommodate the stakeholders.	2.19	Satisfactory	6
2. There is a well-ventilated and well-lit area intended to accommodate the stakeholders while waiting for their concerns to be attended to.	3.14	Satisfactory	4
3. The Dean/Chairperson/Principal's office is well-lit, well-ventilated and conducive for accommodating the stakeholders of the department.	3.05	Satisfactory	5
4. The postings, pictures and signage are appropriate and in accordance to the branding and /or standard of the university.	2.22	Poor	7
5. The vision, mission, goals and core values of the department and of the University in general are posted in an ideal location within the office.	4.30	Excellent	1
6. The set-up of the office allows for easy movement of the personnel and clients.	4.05	Very Satisfactory	2
7. The Dean/Chairperson/Principal's table is separated from the main service area so as to ensure that confidential conversations between the Dean/Chairperson/Principal and the stakeholders cannot be heard by other people.	3.68	Very Satisfactory	3
8. The department provides appropriate reading materials or plays appropriate videos in the television to keep the stakeholders entertained while waiting for their concerns to be acted upon.	2.18	Poor	8
Average Weighted Mean	3.10	Satisfactory	
A.6 Accessibility of the Dean/Chairperson/Principal's Office			
1. Directional signage are available to lead the stakeholders to the direction of the office.	2.80	Satisfactory	4
2. The office is strategically located to allow easy access of the stakeholders and personnel.	4.11	Very Satisfactory	1
3. There is enough information about the transaction catered by the office through posting of appropriate announcements/steps/processes/instructions.	3.05	Satisfactory	3
4. Telephone lines of the office are working and phone calls are answered promptly or if not, at a reasonable time.	3.14	Satisfactory	2
5. The department can be reached through the official online platforms and inquiries sent to these platforms are responded promptly and appropriately.	2.23	Poor	5
Average Weighted Mean	3.07	Satisfactory	
Aggregate Mean	3.67	Very Satisfactory	

Table 8

Students' Satisfaction of the Students' Accounting Section

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1. The commitment of this office to maximize the operating hours to serve as many clients as possible within a day is:	4.52	Excellent	1
2. The commitment of this office to open and close on time is:	4.07	Very Satisfactory	6
3. The location, structure and/or physical characteristics of this office that will allow for a more convenient transaction with the clients is:	3.88	Very Satisfactory	7
4. The commitment of the office to provide prompt, effective and efficient response to inquiries/requests of the clients is:	3.46	Very Satisfactory	9
5. The commitment of the office to provide prompt and accurate services is:	3.50	Very Satisfactory	8
6. The queuing system used in order to ensure fairness in accommodating the concerns and requests of the clients is:	4.17	Very Satisfactory	4
7. The posting of announcements (traditional bulletin boards and online platforms) and other pertinent information relevant to the operations and the interest of the clients is:	4.10	Very Satisfactory	5
8. The technical knowledge and expertise of the staff in this office is:	4.22	Excellent	3
9. The friendliness and attentiveness of the staff in dealing with clients is:	4.27	Excellent	2
Average Weighted Mean	4.02	Very Satisfactory	

Table 9

Students' Satisfaction of the Physics-Chemistry Laboratory

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
A.1 – Chemical Safety			
1. The provision of properly labeled chemical containers and equipment is:	4.17	Very Satisfactory	8
2. The provision of a fume hood to contain volatile/hazardous chemicals is:	4.29	Excellent	5
3. The provision of gloves that will protect the students from accidentally touching or contacting hazardous chemicals is:	4.46	Excellent	4
4. The provision of safety glasses in this laboratory is:	4.18	Very Satisfactory	9
5. The provision of laboratory gowns in this laboratory is:	3.22	Satisfactory	13
6. The provision of chemical carriers to be used in transporting liquid and hazardous chemicals is:	3.80	Very Satisfactory	12
7. The provision of cabinets to store chemicals in containers is:	4.74	Excellent	1

8. The provision of cabinets and/or refrigerators solely dedicated for flammable liquids is:	4.50	Excellent	3
9. The provision of below eye level (5 feet) cabinets to be used for storing corrosive/flammable/toxic liquids is:	4.28	Excellent	6
10. The maintenance, involving the labelling of chemical containers if they are in good condition is:	4.13	Very Satisfactory	11
11. The maintenance, involving securely covering or closing chemical containers is:	4.25	Excellent	7
12. The maintenance, involving storing of chemicals in segregated hazard class is:	4.15	Very Satisfactory	10
13. The maintenance, involving monitoring the expiration date of peroxide-forming chemicals is:	4.17	Very Satisfactory	8
14. The safety practice involving the proper labelling with "Hazardous Chemical" of chemical waste containers is:	4.63	Excellent	2
Average Weighted Mean	4.21	Excellent	
A.2 – Compressed Gas Safety			
1. The safety practice of securing properly the gas cylinders and keeping it capped when not in use is:	4.82	Excellent	1
2. The safety practice of segregating gas cylinders by hazard class is:	4.24	Excellent	5
3. The safety practice of using toxic gases inside ventilated cabinets or fume hoods is:	4.13	Very Satisfactory	6
4. The safety practice of ensuring that CGA connections on regulators are appropriate for gas/es in use, is:	4.45	Excellent	3
5. The safety practice of ensuring that Regulators in storage are bagged and protected from damage, is:	4.56	Excellent	2
6. The safety practice involving posting of cylinder change-out procedures at gas manifold systems is:	4.42	Excellent	4
Average Weighted Mean	4.44	Excellent	
A.3 – Apparatus and Equipment			
1. The provision of appropriate and properly functioning laboratory apparatus and equipment is:	4.38	Excellent	5
2. The maintenance of the laboratory apparatus and equipment is:	4.45	Excellent	3
3. The calibration of the laboratory apparatus and equipment is:	4.22	Excellent	6
4. The labelling of the laboratory apparatus and equipment is:	4.57	Excellent	2
5. The storing of the laboratory apparatus and equipment is:	4.40	Excellent	4
6. The organizing of the laboratory apparatus and equipment is:	4.87	Excellent	1
Average Weighted Mean	4.48	Excellent	

A.4 – Safety Equipment			
1. The provision of eyewash/shower stations that are clear and easy to be accessed is:	4.20	Excellent	5
2. The weekly monitoring and testing of eyewash stations reflected in a monitoring sheet is:	4.42	Excellent	2
3. Accessibility of the fire extinguishers is:	4.68	Excellent	1
4. The provision of Class D Fire extinguishers which are used for fire involving flammable metals is:	4.25	Excellent	4
5. The provision of chemical spill kit or clean up materials is:	4.33	Excellent	3
Average Weighted Mean	4.38	Excellent	
A.5 – Physical Safety			
1. The safety practice of keeping the laboratory aisles clear and uncluttered is:	4.27	Excellent	5
2. The safety practice of keeping electrical cords in good condition and not frayed is:	4.35	Excellent	4
3. The safety practice of using extension cords as permanent wiring is:	4.37	Excellent	3
4. The safety practice of keeping the laboratory well-ventilated is:	4.55	Excellent	2
5. The safety practice of keeping the laboratory well-maintained and organized is:	4.84	Excellent	1
Average Weighted Mean	4.48	Excellent	
A.6 – Laboratory Assistants			
1. The level of technical know-how of the laboratory assistant is:	4.28	Excellent	3
2. The politeness and courtesy of the laboratory assistant are:	4.47	Excellent	2
3. The preparation of materials, apparatus, and equipment of the laboratory assistant in a considerable period of time is:	4.52	Excellent	1
4. The way the laboratory assistant manifests willingness to go out of his way to render help to the students and teachers is:	4.17	Very Satisfactory	4
Average Weighted Mean	4.36	Excellent	
Aggregate Mean	4.39	Excellent	

Table 10
Students' Satisfaction of the Building Maintenance Services

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
------------	------	----------------	------

1. How satisfied are you with the over-all performance of the carpentry section?	4.14	Very Satisfactory	12
2. How satisfied are you with the over-all performance of the electrical section?	4.32	Excellent	10
3. How satisfied are you with the over-all performance of the plumbing section?	4.57	Excellent	7
4. How satisfied are you with the over-all performance of the air-condition section?	3.91	Very Satisfactory	14
5. How satisfied are you with the over-all performance of the janitorial section?	4.94	Excellent	1
6. How satisfied are you with the over-all performance of our carpentry section with regards to their effectiveness and the quality of their work?	4.59	Excellent	6
7. How satisfied are you with the over-all performance of our electrical section with regards to their effectiveness and the quality of their work?	4.55	Excellent	8
8. How satisfied are you with the over-all performance of our plumbing section with regards to their effectiveness and the quality of their work?	4.67	Excellent	4
9. How satisfied are you with the over-all performance of our air-condition section with regards to their effectiveness and the quality of their work?	4.08	Very Satisfactory	13
10. How satisfied are you with the over-all performance of our janitorial section with regards to their effectiveness and the quality of their work?	4.87	Excellent	2
11. How satisfied are you with the over-all performance of our carpentry section with regards to their attitudes and behaviors?	4.70	Excellent	3
12. How satisfied are you with the over-all performance of our electrical section with regards to their attitudes and behaviors?	4.65	Excellent	5
13. How satisfied are you with the over-all performance of our plumbing section with regards to their attitudes and behaviors?	4.27	Excellent	11
14. How satisfied are you with the over-all performance of our air-condition section with regards to their attitudes and behaviors?	4.36	Excellent	9
15. How satisfied are you with the over-all performance of our janitorial section with regards to their attitudes and behaviors?	4.55	Excellent	8
Average Weighted Mean	4.48	Excellent	

Table 11
Students' Satisfaction of the Services of the Campus Affairs Director's Office

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
------------	------	----------------	------

1. The location, structure and/or physical characteristics of this office that will allow for a more convenient transaction with the clients is:	4.29	Excellent	7
2. The channels, conventional and/or online, that will allow effective and efficient flow of communications from the UC Community to the Campus Director and the personnel is:	4.62	Excellent	6
3. The commitment of the personnel to exhibit through knowledge and understanding of the operations of this office is:	4.78	Excellent	3
4. The efficiency and effectivity of the staff in dealing with concerns, inquiries and requests from the clients are:	4.85	Excellent	1
5. The friendliness of the staff is:	4.75	Excellent	4
6. The physical grooming and being presentable of the staff is:	4.81	Excellent	2
7. Your over-all level of satisfaction to the services of the Campus Affairs Director's Office is:	4.67	Excellent	5
Average Weighted Mean	4.68	Excellent	

Table 12

Students' Satisfaction of the Services of the CARES Office

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
A.1 – Conduct of Community Extension Activities			
1. The way CARES Office organizes different community extension activities is:	4.49	Excellent	4
2. The way CARES Office disseminates information about the different community extension activities/programs and initiatives to the students/faculty and the greater university community is:	4.23	Excellent	6
3. The provision of resources to support the institutional and departmental community extension programs of the university is:	4.86	Excellent	1
4. The collaboration of CARES Office to the internal and external partners in the conduct of different community extension programs is:	4.55	Excellent	3
5. The way CARES Office ensures the involvement of the students, faculty, alumni and the greater university community in general, in its programs and initiatives is:	4.27	Excellent	5
6. The way CARES Office schedules the different institutional community extension programs is:	4.62	Excellent	2
Average Weighted Mean	4.50	Excellent	
A.2 – Relevance of the Community Extension Programs			
1. The relevance of the community extension programs of the university to my course or degree program is:	4.55	Excellent	2

2. The relevance of the community extension programs of the university to my professional growth is:	4.27	Excellent	5
3. The relevance of the community extension programs of the university to my personal growth is:	4.60	Excellent	1
4. The relevance of the community extension programs of the university to its vision, mission, goals and core values is:	4.52	Excellent	3
5. The relevance of the community extension programs of the university to the development agenda of the adopted communities is:	4.46	Excellent	4
Average Weighted Mean	4.48	Excellent	
A.3 – CARES Office Administration			
1. The reachability of the office through telephone, e-mail and other digital and online platforms is:	4.29	Excellent	7
2. The commitment of the office personnel to assist faculty, students and other stakeholders should they have concerns or inquiries is:	4.43	Excellent	3
3. The visibility of the office in terms of responding to the call for relief operations during disasters/calamities/emergency situations and implementing the community extension programs of the university in general is:	4.45	Excellent	2
4. The presence and/or availability of the office personnel including its department head during office hours is:	4.61	Excellent	1
5. The professionalism of the personnel of this office is:	4.42	Excellent	4
6. The grooming and being presentable of the personnel of this office is:	4.19	Very Satisfactory	8
7. The communication skills of the personnel of this office is:	4.45	Excellent	2
8. The physical attributes such as the space, location and visual appeal of the office making it conducive for accommodating clients is:	4.38	Excellent	5
9. The cleanliness, orderliness and sanitation of the office is:	4.34	Excellent	6
Average Weighted Mean	4.40	Excellent	
Aggregate Mean	4.36	Excellent	

Table 13

Students' Satisfaction of the Services of Cashier's Office

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
A.1 – Payment of Tuition Fees			
1. The availability of cashiers during office hours to facilitate payments is:	4.56	Excellent	2

2. The number of cashiers serving the clients on a daily basis and during peak seasons is:	4.32	Excellent	5
3. The queuing system such as standing in line or priority number scheme of the cashier's office in accommodating clients is:	3.12	Satisfactory	6
4. The accuracy of the cashiers in encoding the necessary details in relation to the payment of school fees in the system is:	4.41	Excellent	4
5. The accuracy of the cashier in giving change, should there be any, to the clients after payment is:	4.52	Excellent	3
6. The provision of official receipt after payment is:	4.98	Excellent	1
Average Weighted Mean	4.31	Excellent	
A.2 – Attitude of the Personnel			
1. The commitment of the cashier's office, through the personnel, to open on time is:	4.83	Excellent	1
2. The quality of being approachable of the personnel in the cashier's office is:	4.56	Excellent	3
3. The patience of the cashiers in guiding the clients how to fill-out the payments forms correctly should there be any errors is:	4.74	Excellent	2
4. The readiness of the cashiers in answering to the inquiries or responding appropriately to the clients' inquiries is:	4.38	Excellent	4
Average Weighted Mean	4.63	Excellent	
A.3 – Processing of Budgets			
1. The lead time set by the office to process budget requests from the point of approval and submission to releasing is:	4.45	Excellent	2
2. The promptness of the of the payables in-charge in processing budget requests is:	4.23	Excellent	4
3. The way the staff entertains questions or inquiries related to budget requests is:	4.34	Excellent	3
4. The way cashier's office provides updates to the requesting party particularly on the releasing of the requested budgets is:	4.50	Excellent	1
Average Weighted Mean	4.38	Excellent	
Aggregate Mean	4.44	Excellent	

Table 14

Students' Satisfaction of the Services of the Medical Clinic

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
A.1 – Accessibility of Health Services			
1. The location of the medical clinic is:	4.57	Excellent	3

2. The availability of medical personnel for consultation and first aid treatment is:	4.94	Excellent	2
3. The responsiveness of the medical personnel in case of emergency is	4.95	Excellent	1
Average Weighted Mean	4.82	Excellent	
A.2 – Adequacy of the Health Personnel			
1. The number of medical personnel attending to the medical needs and concerns of the students, employees and other stakeholders of the university is:	4.12	Very Satisfactory	4
2. The grooming and the way the medical staff present themselves is:	4.98	Excellent	1
3. The quality of being friendly and approachable of the medical personnel is:	4.95	Excellent	2
4. The way the medical personnel exhibit knowledge and expertise in their job is:	4.93	Excellent	3
Average Weighted Mean	4.75	Excellent	
A.3 – Quality of Health Services			
1. The provision of medicines and other supplies for first aid treatment is:	4.14	Very Satisfactory	6
2. The availability of starter doses of medicines is:	4.12	Very Satisfactory	7
3. The provision of medical examination to students as part of the admission process or as a requirement for activities requiring medical examination such as intramurals and special trainings is:	4.62	Excellent	4
4. The provision of regular schedule of physical examination for new students of every program every semester is:	4.80	Excellent	2
5. The provision of adequate health information through online or traditional leaflets, brochures and posters is:	4.74	Excellent	3
6. The way the medical personnel respond to medical emergencies is:	4.97	Excellent	1
7. The provision of regular water testing of all drinking faucets in the campus (with water testing results posted on the wall where the faucet is located) as part of the preventive measures to protect the health of the UCLM Community is:	4.02	Very Satisfactory	8
8. The provision of regular canteen monitoring and updating of sanitary permits as part of the preventive measures to protect the health of the UCLM Community is:	4.26	Excellent	5
Average Weighted Mean	4.46	Excellent	
Aggregate Mean	4.68	Excellent	

Table 15

Students' Satisfaction of the Services of the Computer Laboratories

This publication is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY.

<https://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.13.11.2023.p14304>

www.ijsrp.org

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
A.1 – Personnel			
1. The commitment of the personnel to show eagerness and willingness to assist the students with their concerns is:	4.22	Excellent	3
2. The availability of the personnel all the time in the laboratory is:	4.14	Very Satisfactory	4
3. The way the personnel present themselves particularly in the way they dress is:	4.36	Excellent	2
4. The commitment of the personnel in dealing with clients is:	4.67	Excellent	1
5. The promptness of the personnel in responding to inquires and concerns is:	4.22	Excellent	3
Average Weighted Mean	4.32	Excellent	
A.2 – Procedures in the Computer Laboratory			
1. The clarity and dissemination of procedures in utilizing the laboratory and all its materials and equipment to the students and faculty is:	4.52	Excellent	2
2. The visibility of the procedures or steps, which are posted inside the computer laboratory, in using the computers and other materials is:	4.23	Excellent	3
3. The speed of transaction per student or faculty in the computer laboratory is:	4.48	Excellent	1
4. The strict adherence of the faculty and students to the standard operating procedures in the utilization of the computer laboratory and other materials is:	4.22	Excellent	4
5. The commitment of the personnel to inform the university community particularly those who will utilize the computer laboratories about its policies and guidelines is:	4.18	Very Satisfactory	5
Average Weighted Mean	4.33	Excellent	
A.3 – Accessibility			
1. The way the laboratory is set-up to facilitate a smooth flow of traffic and easy movement of people is:	4.12	Very Satisfactory	5
2. The location of the computer laboratories is:	4.35	Excellent	4
3. The accessibility of the tools and materials in the computer laboratory is:	4.61	Excellent	1
4. The access way to where the computer laboratory is located is:	4.42	Excellent	3
5. The provision of signage and directions that will guide the students and faculty to where the computer laboratories are situated is:	4.49	Excellent	2
Average Weighted Mean	4.4	Excellent	

A.4 – Physical Set-Up			
1. The space provided where the students and faculty can wait while waiting for their turn to use the computer laboratory is:	4.15	Very Satisfactory	5
2. The ventilation and lighting in the computer laboratories are:	4.25	Excellent	4
3. The computer units in the laboratory, in terms of their functionality, are:	4.41	Excellent	3
4. The conduciveness of the computer laboratories to facilitate efficient and effective delivery of lessons or instructions is:	4.76	Excellent	2
5. The cleanliness, orderliness, visual appeal and sanitation in the computer laboratories are:	4.82	Excellent	1
Average Weighted Mean	4.48	Excellent	
A.5 – Safety			
1. The provision of appropriate fire extinguishers in the computer laboratories is:	4.54	Excellent	4
2. The appropriateness of entry and exit points in the computer laboratories is:	4.65	Excellent	3
3. The provision of emergency exit plans inside the computer laboratories is:	4.78	Excellent	2
4. The way the tools, materials and equipment are labeled and stored in the computer laboratories are:	4.65	Excellent	3
5. The provision of warning signs for hazardous components of the computers and other tools which includes but not limited to electrical parts, is:	4.87	Excellent	1
1Average Weighted Mean	4.7	Excellent	
Aggregate Mean	4.45	Excellent	

Table 16

Students' Satisfaction of the Services of the Civil Security Unit

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1. The quality of being courteous of the security personnel is:	4.23	Excellent	10
2. The friendliness and positive disposition of the security personnel in dealing with students, faculty and other stakeholders, is:	3.15	Satisfactory	14
3. The diligence of the security personnel in checking the bags upon entry of the students, faculty members and other stakeholders' to the campus is:	3.67	Very Satisfactory	13
4. The diligence of the security personnel in checking the bags upon exit of the students, faculty members and other stakeholders' of the campus is:	4.12	Very Satisfactory	11

5. The diligence of the security personnel in checking the uniforms of the students upon entry to the campus is:	4.40	Excellent	8
6. The diligence of the security personnel in checking the uniforms of the employees upon entry to the campus is:	4.10	Very Satisfactory	12
7. The diligence of the security personnel in checking if the students and faculty members are wearing their IDs, is:	4.52	Excellent	6
8. The commitment of the security personnel to inform the students, faculty members and other stakeholders of the new rules and regulations or updates thereof before full implementation is:	2.28	Satisfactory	15
9. The commitment of the security personnel to treat all stakeholders of the university with respect is:	4.36	Excellent	9
10. The commitment of the security personnel to ensure the safety and security of the stakeholders is:	4.78	Excellent	3
11. The commitment of the security personnel to ensure fair and professional conduct of investigations for cases requiring it is:	4.51	Excellent	7
12. The way the security personnel respond to reported alarms and emergency situations is:	4.82	Excellent	2
13. The commitment of the security personnel to monitor the entrance and departure of employees, visitors, and other persons to guard against theft and maintain the security of the premises, is:	4.75	Excellent	5
14. The professionalism of the security personnel in answering telephone calls and respond to inquiries during off-business hours or when the switch board handling the trunk line is switched off, is:	4.23	Excellent	10
15. The commitment of the security personnel to apprehend or evict violators from premises, using force when necessary, is:	4.76	Excellent	4
16. The commitment of the security personnel to maintain peace and order within the premises of the University is:	4.91	Excellent	1
Average Weighted Mean	4.22	Excellent	

Table 17

Students' Satisfaction of the Library Services

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
A.1 – Personnel			
1. The commitment of the personnel, including the student-assistants, to make themselves available every time students, faculty and other stakeholders come to them to seek for assistance, is:	4.15	Very Satisfactory	4
2. The commitment of the personnel respond to inquiries, concerns and requests is:	4.11	Very Satisfactory	5
3. The willingness and readiness of the personnel to assist client's research needs is:	4.48	Excellent	1

4. The courtesy and friendliness of the personnel is:	4.21	Excellent	3
5. The knowledge and expertise of the personnel on matters related to the library operations is:	4.35	Excellent	2
Average Weighted Mean	4.26	Excellent	
A.2 – Library Information Services			
1. The adequacy of books, both hardcopy and e-book version, in your field(s) of interest is:	4.11	Very Satisfactory	2
2. The adequacy of journals, both hardcopy and electronic/digital version, in your field(s) of interest is:	4.05	Very Satisfactory	4
3. The adequacy of online databases and e-books is:	4.08	Very Satisfactory	3
4. The adequacy of audio-visual materials is:	3.97	Very Satisfactory	5
5. The access to information resources (books, e-books, journals and etc.) is:	4.38	Excellent	1
Average Weighted Mean	4.12	Very Satisfactory	
A.3 – General Services			
1. The commitment of the library to open on time is:	4.65	Excellent	4
2. The availability of the Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC) is:	4.50	Excellent	7
3. The provision of internet facilities and services is:	4.76	Excellent	2
4. The availability of the electronic dictionary is:	4.12	Very Satisfactory	10
5. The provision of assistance at the circulation/multimedia/lending counter is:	4.22	Excellent	9
6. The provision of reference services assistance is:	4.35	Excellent	8
7. The provision of Information Literacy Service (Library Orientation and Instruction)	4.61	Excellent	5
8. The way the Library Department disseminates new list of books and periodicals to the UCLM community is:	4.05	Very Satisfactory	11
9. The provision of photocopying service is:	3.24	Satisfactory	12
10. The provision of ID processing service is:	4.87	Excellent	1
11. The availability of library referrals is:	4.72	Excellent	3
12. The accuracy of classified label of books and periodical collection by subject is:	4.56	Excellent	6
Average Weighted Mean	4.39	Excellent	
A.5 – Library Communications			

1. The way the library policies are cascaded to the university community is:	4.15	Very Satisfactory	1
2. The availability of notices for the arrival of new book/journal and other reference materials, is:	3.78	Very Satisfactory	2
3. The way the Library Department cascades information to the university community about its programs and activities, is:	3.55	Very Satisfactory	3
Average Weighted Mean	3.83	Very Satisfactory	
Aggregate Mean	4.15	Very Satisfactory	

Table 18

Students' Satisfaction of the Student Affairs Office (SAO) Services

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1. The cleanliness and orderliness of the SAO Office is:	4.82	Excellent	4
2. The way the personnel exhibit knowledge and expertise in their job is:	4.94	Excellent	1
3. The way the personnel ensures that their actuations will result into the effective and efficient delivery of services, is:	4.87	Excellent	2
4. The quality of being friendly and accommodating of the personnel is:	4.48	Excellent	6
5. The way the personnel exhibit proper grooming and pleasing personality is:	4.62	Excellent	5
6. The way the personnel behaves in the office is:	4.85	Excellent	3
Average Weighted Mean	4.76	Excellent	

Table 19

Students' Satisfaction of the Services of University Research Office

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
A.1 – The Personnel			
1. The way the personnel exhibit knowledge and skills in responding to issues/concerns and requests of the students, faculty and other stakeholders is:	4.78	Excellent	4
2. The way the personnel exhibit proper grooming and pleasing personality is:	4.83	Excellent	3
3. The quality of being friendly and approachable of the personnel is:	4.89	Excellent	2

4. The overall professionalism of the personnel in responding to the concerns/issues, inquiries and requests of the students, faculty and other stakeholders is:	4.95	Excellent	1
5. The way the personnel answers the telephone or inquiries made in the online platforms of the office such as e-mail or Facebook Page is:	4.67	Excellent	6
6. The way the personnel behaves inside the office is:	4.75	Excellent	5
Average Weighted Mean	4.81	Excellent	
A.2 – The Physical Characteristics of the Office			
1. The provision of a counter where the clients can transact with the personnel while being mindful of the COVID-19 health and safety protocols is:	4.73	Excellent	6
2. The provision of a space where clients can comfortably and safely wait for their turn to be accommodated by the personnel is:	4.89	Excellent	1
3. The availability of appropriate tools, materials and equipment to help the personnel efficiently deliver the services of the office is:	4.82	Excellent	4
4. The ventilation of the office is:	4.78	Excellent	5
5. The lighting of the office is:	4.84	Excellent	3
6. The visual appeal of the office is:	4.87	Excellent	2
7. The cleanliness and orderliness of the office is:	4.59	Excellent	7
8. The availability of signage that will guide the clients where the University Research Office is located, is:	4.78	Excellent	5
Average Weighted Mean	4.79	Excellent	
A.3 – Delivery of Services			
1. The provision of information drives on the services offered by this office such as the conduct of an orientation and posting of services in the bulletin board or other online platforms among other, is:	4.88	Excellent	2
2. The time-frame allocated for each transaction is:	4.75	Excellent	5
3. The conciseness of instructions given by the personnel to the clients should there are transactions that will require additional actions or responses from them is:	4.83	Excellent	4
4. The time-frame, from submission to approval or signing of the Research Director of a document or request, is:	4.18	Very Satisfactory	8
5. The provision of grammar and plagiarism checking service through the Grammarly software is:	4.71	Excellent	6
6. The way the office facilitates the ethics review process is:	4.02	Very Satisfactory	9
7. The conduct of research capability building programs or activities for students, faculty members and non-teaching personnel is:	4.23	Excellent	7

8. The way the office extends support and manages the conduct of institutional research of the faculty members is:	4.87	Excellent	3
9. The way the office monitors the conduct of students' research is:	4.34	Excellent	4
10. The collaboration of the University Research Office with external private and government institutions in the conduct different research is:	4.91	Excellent	1
Average Weighted Mean	4.57	Excellent	
Aggregate Mean	4.72	Excellent	

Table 20

Students' Satisfaction of the Services of the Registrar's Office

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
A.1 – Processing of Transactions			
1. Timely release of grade slip	4.78	Excellent	2
2. Timely release of scholastic records (e.g. T.O.R, Diploma and certifications)	4.56	Excellent	4
3. The way the personnel accommodate or acknowledge authorized representatives when the concerned client cannot personally process the request.	4.92	Excellent	1
4. Assistance from the registrar's office in changing schedule of classes and/or changing of grades	4.54	Excellent	5
5. Time-Frame for the processing of concerns and/or requests	4.77	Excellent	3
Average Weighted Mean	4.71	Excellent	
A.2 – Attitude of the Personnel			
1. The politeness of the registrar's staff especially in answering inquiries is	4.51	Excellent	3
2. The way the staff exhibit knowledge and expertise of their respective jobs is	4.46	Excellent	4
3. The commitment of the staff to provide updates and to achieve client's requests before or on the promised date is	4.42	Excellent	5
4. The commitment of the staff to facilitate clear understanding of the client as to the steps needed for the resolution should the request cannot be immediately achieved is	4.38	Excellent	6
5. The way the staff listen to the clients' questions and ask relevant questions for better understanding of the concern and/or request is	4.74	Excellent	1
6. The willingness of the staff to go the "extra mile" to assist clients	4.59	Excellent	2

Average Weighted Mean	4.52	Excellent	
A.3 – Accessibility of the Office			
1. The provision of information drives on the services offered by this office such as the conduct of an orientation and posting of services in the bulletin board or other online platforms among other, is:	4.23	Excellent	4
2. The time-frame allocated for each transaction is:	4.76	Excellent	1
3. The conciseness of instructions given by the personnel to the clients should there are transactions that will require additional actions or responses from them is:	4.45	Excellent	3
4. The time-frame, from submission to approval or signing of the Research Director of a document or request, is:	4.64	Excellent	2
Average Weighted Mean	4.52	Excellent	
Aggregate Mean	4.58	Excellent	

Table 21
Students’ Satisfaction of the Services of the EDP Section

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
A.1 – Processing of Transactions			
1. Timely release of study load	4.61	Excellent	3
2. Timely encoding of enrollment data	4.75	Excellent	1
3. The way the personnel accommodate or acknowledge authorized representatives when the concerned client cannot personally process the request.	4.67	Excellent	2
4. Assistance from the staff in changing schedule of classes and other related concerns	4.42	Excellent	5
5. Time-Frame for the processing of concerns and/or requests	4.49	Excellent	4
Average Weighted Mean	4.59	Excellent	
A.2 – Attitude of the Personnel			
1. The politeness of the EDP staff especially in answering inquiries is	4.47	Excellent	5
2. The way the staff exhibit knowledge and expertise of their respective jobs is	4.78	Excellent	1
3. The commitment of the staff to provide updates and to achieve client’s requests before or on the promised date is	4.57	Excellent	3
4. The commitment of the staff to facilitate clear understanding of the client as to the steps needed for the resolution should the request cannot be immediately achieved is	4.76	Excellent	2

5. The way the staff listen to the clients' questions and ask relevant questions for better understanding of the concern and/or request is	4.52	Excellent	4
6. The willingness of the staff to go the "extra mile" to assist clients	4.28	Excellent	6
Average Weighted Mean	4.56	Excellent	
A.3 – Accessibility of the Office			
1. The space provided to accommodate the clients is	4.67	Excellent	3
2. The adequacy of information on the processing of transaction posted outside the office to guide the clients is	4.52	Excellent	4
3. The availability of signage to guide the clients where the EDP Section is located	4.87	Excellent	1
4. The adequacy of the personnel, in terms of number, to assist the clients is	4.80	Excellent	2
Average Weighted Mean	4.72	Excellent	
Aggregate Mean	4.62	Excellent	

Table 22

Students' Satisfaction of the Services of the Guidance Center

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
A.1 – Facilities			
1. Availability of mind/board games such as chess, scrabble and "dama"	4.72	Excellent	4
2. Availability of updated magazines or educational reading materials	4.58	Excellent	6
3. Availability of tables and chairs to accommodate visiting students and other clients	4.35	Excellent	8
4. Conduciveness of the center for the administration of psychological tests like IQ and Personality Tests	4.75	Excellent	3
5. Conduciveness of the center for group activity/session	4.28	Excellent	9
6. Conduciveness of the center for counseling and academic follow-up	4.87	Excellent	1
7. Lights and ventilation (aircon) of the center	4.83	Excellent	2
8. Physical arrangement/room set-up of the center	4.69	Excellent	5
9. Cleanliness, maintenance of the center	4.47	Excellent	7
Average Weighted Mean	4.62	Excellent	
A.2 – Personnel			

1. The way guidance counselor deals with students have academic or personal problems, concerns and inquiries	4.52	Excellent	6
2. The way the guidance counselor facilitates counseling, group activity/session, seminar-workshops/training and academic follow-up	4.79	Excellent	3
3. The way the psychometrician/guidance counselor accommodates psychological tests such as IQ, Personality Tests and Achievement Tests	4.86	Excellent	2
4. The way the psychometrician/guidance counselor accommodates students inquiring about test results and interpretation	4.78	Excellent	4
5. The way the guidance center personnel assist students' needs and concerns	4.96	Excellent	1
6. The way the peer facilitators deal and make friends with students visiting the Guidance Center	4.57	Excellent	5
Average Weighted Mean	4.75	Excellent	
A.3 – Services			
1. The way the center imbibes the necessity of counseling service as one of the services offered by the university is	4.58	Excellent	6
2. The way the counseling services provided by the center helped the clients improve their academic and behavioral performance is	4.76	Excellent	4
3. My experience during the counseling service has positively affected the chances I will stay in this school	4.88	Excellent	2
4. Relevance of seminars/group guidance/informative campaigns/exhibits offered by the center is	4.94	Excellent	1
5. Materials, resources and methodology used during seminars/group guidance/informative campaigns/exhibits offered by the center is	4.63	Excellent	5
6. Significance of job postings available at the bulletin board is	4.56	Excellent	7
7. The ease of arranging an appointment for consultation is	4.85	Excellent	3
8. The speed of response to the initial request is	4.33	Excellent	9
9. The type of psychological tests available and the manner of interpretation is	4.51	Excellent	8
Average Weighted Mean	4.67	Excellent	
Aggregate Mean	4.68	Excellent	

Table 23

Students' Satisfaction of the Services of the Scholarship Office

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
A.1 – Facilities			

1. Availability of updated scholarship brochures, magazines or educational reading materials	4.58	Excellent	5
2. Availability of tables and chairs to accommodate visiting students and other clients	4.61	Excellent	3
3. Conduciveness of the office to accommodate clients	4.58	Excellent	4
4. Lights and ventilation (aircon) of the office	4.45	Excellent	6
5. Physical arrangement/room set-up of the office	4.78	Excellent	1
6. Cleanliness, maintenance and sanitation of the office	4.66	Excellent	2
Average Weighted Mean	4.61	Excellent	
A.2 – Personnel			
1. The way the personnel deal with clients who have scholarship concerns and inquiries	4.72	Excellent	3
2. The politeness of the personnel especially in answering inquiries is	4.84	Excellent	1
3. The way the personnel exhibit knowledge and expertise of their respective jobs is	4.77	Excellent	2
4. The commitment of the staff to provide updates and to achieve client's requests before or on the promised date is	4.84	Excellent	1
5. The commitment of the personnel to facilitate clear understanding of the client as to the steps needed for the resolution should the request cannot be immediately achieved is	4.55	Excellent	5
6. The way the personnel listen to the clients' questions and ask relevant questions for better understanding of the concern and/or request is	4.68	Excellent	4
7. The willingness of the personnel to go the "extra mile" to assist clients	4.46	Excellent	6
Average Weighted Mean	4.69	Excellent	
A.3 – Services			
1. Acceptance of scholarship applications	4.86	Excellent	2
2. Processing of scholarship requirements	4.72	Excellent	4
3. Conduct of orientation to the scholars and other interested parties	4.53	Excellent	5
4. Monitoring performance of the scholars	4.88	Excellent	1
5. Conduct of seminars and trainings or workshops to the scholars	4.43	Excellent	6
6. Conduct of co and extra curricular activities to the scholars	4.77	Excellent	3
7. Dissemination of scholarship opportunities to the university community	4.12	Excellent	7

Average Weighted Mean	4.62	Excellent
Aggregate Mean	4.64	Excellent

Table 24

Summary of students' satisfaction to the services of different departments in the University

Department/Office	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
The Dean/Chairperson/Principal's Office	3.67	Very Satisfactory	14
Students' Accounting Section	4.02	Very Satisfactory	13
Physics – Chemistry Laboratory	4.39	Excellent	10
Building Maintenance Department	4.48	Excellent	7
Campus Affairs Director's Office	4.68	Excellent	3
Office of Community Awareness, Relations and Extension Services	4.36	Excellent	11
Cashier's Office	4.44	Excellent	9
Medical Clinic	4.68	Excellent	3
Computer Laboratories	4.45	Excellent	8
Civil Security Unit	4.22	Excellent	11
Library	4.15	Very Satisfactory	12
Student Affairs Office	4.76	Excellent	1
University Research Office	4.72	Excellent	2
Registrar's Office	4.58	Excellent	6
EDP Section	4.62	Excellent	5
Guidance and Counseling Services Center	4.68	Excellent	3
Scholarship Office	4.64	Excellent	4
Aggregate Mean	4.44	Excellent	

Table 24 shows the summary of the satisfaction of the students towards the various offices under the Student-Personnel Services (SPS) Division of the University. The Student Affairs Office (SAO) obtained the highest weighted mean, 4.76 at that which is interpreted as Excellent. The University Research Office (URO) is the second highest-rated office in terms of customer satisfaction, which obtained a weighted mean of 4.72, which is interpreted as Excellent. The Office of the Campus Affairs Director, Guidance Center and the Medical Clinic all obtained the weighted mean of 4.68 which is interpreted as Excellent.

Although none of the offices are ranked poor or even in the satisfactory classification in terms of customer satisfaction, the offices with the lowest ranking are: Library which obtained the weighted mean of 4.15 and is interpreted as Very Satisfactory; Student Accounting Section which obtained the weighted mean of 4.02 and is interpreted as Very Satisfactory; and The Dean/Chairperson/Principal's Office which obtained the weighted mean of 3.67 and is interpreted as Very Satisfactory, respectively. This may suggest that several indicators in the performance of these offices obtained low results and need to be enhanced.

In general, the SPS Division of the University of Cebu – Lapu-Lapu and Mandaue Campus obtained an aggregate mean of 4.44 which is interpreted as Excellent. This somehow indicates that the students, as represented by the 4, 291 respondents of this research are more than satisfied with the services offered by the aforementioned offices or departments.

Students' Satisfaction of the Physical Plant and Facilities

This part presents the results for the survey conducted to determine the satisfaction of the students towards the physical plant and facilities of the University. In particular, tables 25 to 31 reflects the students' satisfaction on the given indicators.

Table 25

Students' Satisfaction of the Physical Structure and Mechanical Features of the School

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1. Floors	4.58	Excellent	4
2. Stairs	4.76	Excellent	1
3. Exterior walls, windows and doors	4.72	Excellent	2
4. Interior walls	4.68	Excellent	3
5. Ceiling Fans	2.82	Satisfactory	8
6. Plumbing in the comfort rooms	3.20	Satisfactory	7
7. Electrical lighting	4.35	Excellent	6
8. Warning systems	4.40	Excellent	5
9. Exit signs	4.68	Excellent	3
Average Weighted Mean	4.24	Excellent	

Table 25 illustrates the satisfaction of the students to the physical structure and mechanical features of the school. Generally, this variable obtained the average weighted mean of 4.24, which can be classified as Excellent. If isolated according to its rank, the stairs obtained the highest weighted mean, which is 4.76 and is interpreted as Excellent. This may suggest that the physical attributes of the stairs in found in the University premises are more than satisfactory in the perspective of the students. The ceiling fans however obtained the lowest weighted mean, 2.82 at that, and is interpreted as Satisfactory. It is also a noteworthy observation that none of the indicators were rated in the poor spectrum by the students.

Table 26

Students' Satisfaction of the Environmental Factors in the School's Buildings

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1. Lighting	4.73	Excellent	4
2. Ventilation	4.88	Excellent	1
3. Indoor Air Quality	4.55	Excellent	5
4. Acoustics for Noise Control	3.12	Satisfactory	8
5. Flexibility on instructional space	4.77	Excellent	3
6. Energy Efficiency	4.84	Excellent	2
7. Physical security of the buildings	4.02	Excellent	6
8. Exterior noise	3.16	Satisfactory	7
Average Weighted Mean	4.26	Excellent	

Table 26 shows the students' satisfaction of the environmental factors in the school's buildings. The ventilation of the

University obtained the highest weighted mean, 4.88, which is interpreted as Excellent. This somehow suggests that air circulation in the entire premises of the University is sufficient to make the students comfortable as they move around in the campus or work inside the classrooms. On the contrary, although still rated as satisfactory with a weighted mean of 3.12, acoustics for noise control obtained the lowest rating from the students. This may somehow suggest that external noises may cause distractions during class hours.

Table 27

Students' Satisfaction of the School Safety

Indicators	Frequency of Yes Answers	%	Frequency of No Answers	%
1. The school has a locked-door policy (doors that can be opened from the inside)	4, 268	99.46%	43	1.00%
2. The school has a check-in policy for visitors	4, 290	99.98%	1	0.02%
3. The school has an established emergency response plan for dealing with safety issues.	4, 285	99.86%	6	0.14%
4. The school has an on-site security provided by police officers or private security guards.	4, 291	100%	0	0%
5. The school has parent or other community volunteers to assist in monitoring the school.	4, 288	99.93%	3	0.07%
6. The school has metal detectors.	4, 229	98.56%	62	1.44%
7. The school has surveillance cameras located within the school building or on school grounds	4, 291	100%	0	0%

Table 27 shows the students' satisfaction towards the school's safety. This part of the survey limits the responses of the students to only two options – yes or no. None of the indicators presented obtained a percentage lower than 98% of yes answers. This indicates that in each of the indicator, the students are leaning towards agreeing that the indicators are evident in the university.

Table 28

Students' Satisfaction on the Educational Appropriateness of the Physical Plant and Facilities

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1. Size of classrooms allow for alternative room assignments to facilitate curricular objectives	4.58	Excellent	3
2. Adequate Space is available for small work group instructions (less than 15 students)	4.43	Excellent	4
3. Adequate Space is available for large work group instructions (more than 30 students)	4.72	Excellent	2
4. Equipment and furniture shelving, tables and chairs are appropriate for the student population	4.75	Excellent	1
Average Weighted Mean	4.62	Excellent	

Table 28 presents the students' satisfaction on the educational appropriateness of the physical plant and facilities of the University. The appropriateness of the equipment and furniture shelving, tables and chairs obtained the highest weighted mean for this cluster, which is 4.75 and is interpreted as Excellent. None of the indicators are rated below excellent however, with a mean of 4.43 which is still interpreted as excellent, the adequacy of space available for small work group instructions obtained the lowest weighted mean, which is 4.43. In general, the respondents are somehow in unison in declaring that the physical plant and facilities of the University is Excellent.

Table 29

Students' Satisfaction on the Suitability of the Building for Instruction

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1. Building materials, color schemes and decors provide motivation for learning.	4.66	Excellent	1
2. Drinking fountain and restroom facilities are conveniently located.	3.39	Satisfactory	5
3. Student services areas (guidance office and clinics) ensure privacy and has sufficient space.	4.43	Excellent	2
4. Building is accessible to students with disabilities.	4.16	Very Satisfactory	4
5. Space is available for extended day learning opportunities	4.28	Excellent	3
Average Weighted Mean	4.18	Very Satisfactory	

Table 29 shows the students' satisfaction on the suitability of the building for instruction. As declared by the respondents, they somehow agreed that the building materials, color schemes and decors provide motivation for learning as this indicator obtained a weighted mean of 4.66 and is ranked number 1 for this cluster. In the opposite end of the spectrum, the convenient location of

the drinking fountains and restroom facilities obtained the lowest weighted mean, which is interpreted as satisfactory. In general, in terms of the suitability of the building for instructions, the respondents rated it as Very Satisfactory with an average weighted mean of 4.18.

Table 30

Students' Satisfaction on the Suitability of School Site

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1. Site is large enough to meet educational needs and is accessible.	4.87	Excellent	1
2. Site has a safe outdoor space where children can play.	4.72	Excellent	2
3. Student loading areas are separated from other vehicular traffic and pedestrian walkways.	4.65	Excellent	3
Average Weighted Mean	4.75	Excellent	

Table 30 depicts the students' satisfaction on the suitability of the school site. When asked if the site is large enough to meet educational needs and its accessibility, the respondents rated it 4.87 which is interpreted as Excellent. This somehow suggests that the size of the site can accommodate the number of students, facilities and features of the school. The safe outdoor space where children can play obtained the weighted mean of 4.72 which is still interpreted as Excellent. Finally, the respondents rate the loading areas that are separated from other vehicular traffic and pedestrian walkways as Excellent with a weighted mean of 4.65. In general, the students rated the suitability of the school site as Excellent with an average weighted mean of 4.75.

Table 31

Students' Satisfaction on the Playground Site and Equipment Suitability

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1. Playground size is appropriate for number of students	4.55	Excellent	4
2. Playgrounds are separated from streets and parking areas with fencing or other permanent materials.	4.79	Excellent	3
3. Playgrounds are well-equipped and appropriate for all age levels	4.87	Excellent	1
4. Playgrounds are accessible for students with disabilities	4.81	Excellent	2
5. Playground equipment is free of sharp edges.	4.34	Excellent	5
Average Weighted Mean	4.67	Excellent	

Table 31 shows the satisfaction of the students on the playground site and equipment suitability. None of the indicators were rated below the excellent criterion by the respondents. This somehow indicates that the respondents are more than satisfied with the school's playground site and equipment.

Conclusion

There were a total of 4, 291 respondents of this research. These students bonafide students of the University at the time the research was conducted. Using the Slovin's Formula in determining whether this figure is representative of the study population, it was revealed that the number of respondents indeed represent the study population. The Slovin's Formula is $n=N/(1+Ne^2)$. In computation, $n=15850/(1+15850 \times 0.05^2)$. As such, $n=390$. Therefore, given the study population, 390 is the ideal number of respondents. At a closer look, 4, 291 is way above than what is required. This means that from what is supposed to be the sample size to represent the study population, there is an increase of 1100.26%. The limitation however is the unequal representation of each academic department.

Each of the academic department is ranked according to their extent of participation. The results show that the College of Nursing obtained the highest participation rate at 74.97%. This is followed by the College of Engineering which obtained a participation rate of 56.20% and the Senior High School Department which obtained a participation rate of 47.10%, respectively. Moreover, the College of Business and Accountancy obtained the lowest participation rate at 1.05%.

There is a total of 2, 160 male respondents, which constitutes 50.34% of the total number of respondents. 2, 131 respondents are female which constitutes 49.66% of the total number of respondents. The frequency of male and female respondents are almost equal with a difference of only 0.68%.

It was found that the highest percentage of respondents is attributed to the first-year students with a total of 806 or 34.61%. The second-year respondents comprise of the 610 respondents which is 26.19%. The third-year respondents obtained a total of 470 or 20.18%. The fourth-year respondents obtained a total of 443 or 19.02%. Notably, there are no respondents in the fifth year level. One noteworthy observation in the distribution of the college respondents by their year level is that it follows a descending order. It started with the first year respondents which obtained the highest percentage and as the year level increases, the percentage of participation also decreases.

The highest percentage or 60.55% of the respondents belong to the 17-20 years old age group. This is consistent with the data presented in the previous tables as this age group is normally composed of lower and higher basic education and college students in their preliminary stages in college. Meanwhile, the 21-25 years old age group garnered a total of 1, 599 respondents or 37.26% of the over-all number of respondents. This age group is primarily dominated by college students in their higher year levels. Finally, the rest of the 2.19% of the respondents are distributed unequally among the 26-30, 31-35, 36-40 and 41 years old and above age groups.

Although the respondents generally rate the SPS Divison of the University as Excellent, several indicators obtained a poor rating. These indicators include:

- The postings, pictures and signage are appropriate and in accordance to the branding and /or standard of the university. (Table 7)

- The department provides appropriate reading materials or plays appropriate videos in the television to keep the stakeholders entertained while waiting for their concerns to be acted upon. (Table 7)
- The department can be reached through the official online platforms and inquiries sent to these platforms are responded promptly and appropriately. (Table 7)

All of these are indicators under the Dean/Chairperson/Principal's Office satisfaction survey.

The Student Affairs Office (SAO) obtained the highest weighted mean, 4.76 at that which is interpreted as Excellent. The University Research Office (URO) is the second highest-rated office in terms of customer satisfaction, which obtained a weighted mean of 4.72, which is interpreted as Excellent. The Office of the Campus Affairs Director, Guidance Center and the Medical Clinic all obtained the weighted mean of 4.68 which is interpreted as Excellent.

Although none of the offices are ranked poor or even in the satisfactory classification in terms of customer satisfaction, the offices with the lowest ranking are: Library which obtained the weighted mean of 4.15 and is interpreted as Very Satisfactory; Student Accounting Section which obtained the weighted mean of 4.02 and is interpreted as Very Satisfactory; and The Dean/Chairperson/Principal's Office which obtained the weighted mean of 3.67 and is interpreted as Very Satisfactory, respectively. This may suggest that several indicators in the performance of these offices obtained low results and need to be enhanced.

In general, the SPS Division of the University of Cebu – Lapu-Lapu and Mandaue Campus obtained an aggregate mean of 4.44 which is interpreted as Excellent. This somehow indicates that the students, as represented by the 4, 291 respondents of this research are more than satisfied with the services offered by the aforementioned offices or departments.

In terms of the satisfaction of the students to the physical structure and mechanical features of the school. Generally, this variable obtained the average weighted mean of 4.24, which can be classified as Excellent. For the environmental factors in the school's buildings, it obtained an average weighted mean of 4.26, which is interpreted as Excellent. As to the students' satisfaction towards the school's safety, none of the indicators presented obtained a percentage lower than 98% of yes answers. This indicates that in each of the indicator, the students are leaning towards agreeing that the indicators are evident in the university. On students' satisfaction to the educational appropriateness of the physical plant and facilities of the University, the respondents are somehow in unison in declaring that the physical plant and facilities of the University is Excellent. Moreover, the respondents with an average weighted mean of 4.18 rated the suitability of the building for instructions as Very Satisfactory. Likewise, the students rated the suitability of the school site as Excellent with an average weighted mean of 4.75. Finally, in terms of the satisfaction of the students on the playground site and equipment suitability, none of the indicators were rated below excellent by the respondents. This somehow indicates that the respondents are more than satisfied with the school's playground site and equipment.

Recommendations

Based on the study's findings, the following suggestions were developed:

1. A policy to standardize the format of posters and signage to be posted within the premises of the University should be promulgated and implemented. This policy must also adhere to the branding standards of the University. The administration may also consider centralizing the production of all posters and signage of the University.
2. Provision of reading materials and educational videos in order to keep the clients entertained while waiting for their turn to be served should be monitored not just by the Dean/Chairperson/Principal's Offices but also of all offices in the University. To ensure its implementation, this recommendation may be reflected in the development plans of each academic and administrative office of the University.
3. An action plan to streamline the processes in responding to online correspondences and answering telephone calls should be developed by all academic and administrative offices of the University.
4. All departments included in this research should utilize this research as an input in the crafting of their Departmental Annual Plan.
5. Future research projects should be carried out in a manner similar to the study that involved other departments.

References Cited

- Blackmore, J., Douglas, A. and Barnes, B. 2006. "Measuring student satisfaction at a UK university." *Journal for Quality Assurance in Education* 14(3): 251-67.
- Gruber, T., S. Fuss, R. Voss and M. G. Zikuda. 2010. "Examining student satisfaction with higher education services: Using a new measurement tool." *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 23(2): 105-123.
- Tandilashvili, Nino, Factors Influencing Student Satisfaction in Higher Education. The Case of a Georgian State University (June 30, 2019). RAIS Conference Proceedings - The 13th International RAIS Conference on Social Sciences and Humanities, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3433958> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3433958>
- Hill, Frances M. 1995. "Managing service quality in higher education: the role of student as primary consumer." *Quality Assurance in Education* 3(3): 10-21.
- Gemme E. 1997. "Retaining customers in managed care market." *Marketing Health Services* 17(3): 19-21
- Kotler Ph. & Armstrong G. 2015. *Principles of Marketing*; Pearson Education, Limited, 731 pages.

- Gibson, Allen. 2010. "Measuring business student satisfaction: a review and summary of the major predictors." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 32(3): 251-259.
- Douglas, K. M., Sutton, R. M., Callan, M. J., Dawtry, R. J., Harvey, A. J. 2016. "Someone is pulling the strings: Hypersensitive agency detection and belief in conspiracy theories." *Thinking & Reasoning* 22: 57-77.
- Galbreath, J. (2010a). The impact of strategic orientation on corporate social responsibility. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 18, 23-40.
- Oliver, Richard L. (1997), *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*. New York: McGraw- Hill.
- Huppertz J. W., S. J. Arenson, and R. H. Evans (1978), "An Application of Equity Theory to Buyer-Seller Exchange Situations," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 15 (May), 250-60.
- Adams, J. Stacy (1965), "Inequity in Social Exchange," in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 2, Leonard Berkowitz, ed. New York: Academic Press, 267-99
- Homans, George C. (1961), *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Bagozzi, Richard P. (1975), "Marketing as Exchange," *Journal of Marketing*, 39 (October), 32-39. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1-52.
- Olsen, L.; Johnson, M. (2015). *Service Equity, Satisfaction, and Loyalty: From Transaction- Specific to Cumulative Evaluations*. University of Michigan Business School and Norwegian School of Management BI.
- Roos, Inger (1999), "Switching Processes in Customer Relationships," *Journal of Service Research*, 2 (August), 68-85
- Flanagan, John C. (1954), "The Critical Incident Technique," *Psychological Bulletin*, 51 (July), 327-58.
- Mittal, Vikas and Wagner A. Kamakura (2001), "Satisfaction, Repurchase Intent, and Repurchase Behavior: Investigating the Moderating Effect of Customer Characteristics," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38 (February), 131-42.
- Dillman, D. A. (1991). The design and administration of mail surveys. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17, 225-249.
- Groves, R. M., Singer, E., & Corning, A. (2000). Leverage-saliency theory of survey participation: Description and an illustration. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 64, 299-308.
- Brosnan, K., Kemperman, A., & Dolnicar, S. (2019). Maximizing participation from online survey panel members. *International Journal of Market Research*, doi:10.1177/1470785319880704
- Haunberger, S. (2011). To participate or not to participate: Decision processes related to survey non-response. *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology*, 109, 39-55.

- Sax, L. J., Gilmartin, S. K., & Bryant, A. N. (2003). Assessing response rates and nonresponse bias in web and paper surveys. *Research in Higher Education*, 44, 409–432.
- Brüggen, E., Wetzels, M., De Ruyter, K., & Schillewaert, N. (2011). Individual differences in motivation to participate in online panels. *International Journal of Market Research*, 53, 369–390.
- Huang, J. Y., Hubbard, S. M., & Mulvey, K. P. (2003). Obtaining valid response rates: Considerations beyond the tailored design method. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 26, 91–97.
- Keusch, F. (2013). The role of topic interest and topic salience in online panel web surveys. *International Journal of Market Research*, 55, 59–80.
- Zillmann, D., Schmitz, A., Skopek, J., & Blossfeld, H. P. (2014). Survey topic and unit nonresponse. *Quality & Quantity*, 48, 2069–2088.
- Joinson, A. N., & Reips, U. D. (2007). Personalized salutation, power of sender and response rates to Webbased surveys. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23, 1372–1383.
- Sánchez-Fernández, J., Muñoz-Leiva, F., & Montoro-Ríos, F. J. (2012). Improving retention rate and response quality in Web-based surveys. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28, 507–514.
- Sauermann, H., & Roach, M. (2013). Increasing web survey response rates in innovation research. *Research Policy*, 42, 273–286.
- de Bruijne, M., & Wijnant, A. (2014). Mobile response in web panels. *Social Science Computer Review*, 32, 728–742.
- Fang, J., Shao, P., & Lan, G. (2009). Effects of innovativeness and trust on web survey participation. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25, 144–152.
- Tangmanee, C., & Niruttinanon, P. (2015). Effects of forced responses and question display styles on web survey response rates. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 4, 54–62.