**Satisfaction with the Quality of Educational Services in the BS Mathematics Graduates, College of Science, University of Eastern Philippines**

**ABSTRACT**

This study investigates the level of satisfaction among BS Mathematics graduates from the College of Science, University of Eastern Philippines-Main Campus, from the school years 2000 to 2022. Employing the Higher Educational Service Quality (HESQUAL) model, the research examines satisfaction across five dimensions: Administrative Quality, Physical Environment Quality, Core Educational Quality, Support Facilities Quality, and Transformative Quality. The study reveals a generally high level of satisfaction among graduates, with an overall weighted mean indicating positive evaluations across all dimensions. The administrative staff received the highest satisfaction scores, reflecting effective and supportive services. While rated fairly satisfactory, the physical environment quality indicated areas for improvement, particularly in the library and cafeteria infrastructure. Core educational and transformative quality were rated very satisfied, highlighting the institution's success in providing a conducive learning environment and fostering critical skills. Support facilities were rated fairly satisfied, suggesting room for enhancement to meet student needs better. These findings indicate that while the University of Eastern Philippines is performing well in delivering educational services, there are specific areas where targeted improvements could further enhance graduate satisfaction.
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**Introduction**

“Various groups can be categorized as customers of a university, namely students, employees, families, and society. In spite of this diversity, U.K.'s higher education has considered students to be the ‘primary customers’ of a university due to the commercialization of scholarship” (Crawford, 1991). The acknowledgment of the student’s experience of an institution is regarded as an essential perspective to adopt in the students’ satisfaction surveys. According to (Douglas et al., 2006), “students’ opinions in the form of satisfaction feedback are recognized in educational institutions worldwide. Higher educational institutions are increasingly recognizing that higher education is a service industry. As service organizations, higher education institutions are dealing with the same situation, placing greater emphasis on meeting the expectations and needs of their customers. However, in the university environment, the concept of customer is not clearly defined” (Navarro et al., 2005).

“Student satisfaction metrics enable universities to define their strengths and areas for improvement” (O'Neill & Palmer, 2004). “This goes beyond simply examining teaching that has a limited emphasis on considering wider facets of the learning experience of students in and out of the classroom setting. To understand the complexity of satisfaction toward student learning experience, it is not enough to know the factors that lead to student satisfaction to recognize the dynamics of satisfaction with the student learning experience, but it is critical to note the degree to which students are satisfied” (LeBlanc & Nguyen, 1997, 1999).

“Satisfaction, as Webster defines it, is anything that brings gratification, pleasure, or contentment. The challenge from a student’s standpoint is that satisfaction is subjective, and because of that, it is hard to measure satisfaction. The value of goods or services we grasp varies with each of us. Also, student satisfaction is a subjective evaluation of students’ experiences associated with their education that continuously being shaped by repeated experiences in tenure inside the campus” (Oliver & DeSarbo (1989); Elliot & Shin (2002).

Some studies have revealed that students’ satisfaction has a positive impact on students’ motivation, retention, recruiting efforts, and fundraising. Cheng and Tam (1997), as cited by Arpilleda (2017), specifically disclosed that “universities can best attract and retain students by identifying and meeting students’ needs and expectations. To this end, universities need to identify and deliver what is important to students. Hence, Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) should acknowledge the fact that since they are part of the service industry, they must place greater emphasis on meeting the expectations and needs of students”.

From the foregoing, feedback from graduating students on their satisfaction and experience with the quality of educational services from HEIs is legitimate and strategic for institutional improvement. This study was conducted in line with this thinking (Alhassan *et.al*., 2018).

The study sought to determine the level of satisfaction among BS Mathematics graduates of the College of Science, University of Eastern Philippines-Main Campus from the school year 2000-2022. This endeavor sought to gauge how well the school is providing services to university graduates. The areas or services covered in this study include: 1. Administrative quality, Physical Environmental Quality, Core Educational Quality, Support Facilities Quality, and Transformative Quality.

**Objectives**

This study aimed to determine the level of satisfaction among College of Science BS Mathematics graduates of the University of Eastern Philippines from the school year 2000-2022.  Specifically, it sought to

1. determine the demographic profile of the respondents as to their gender, age, and year graduated;

 2. determine the respondents’ level of satisfaction in terms of:

      2.1 Administrative quality;

      2.2 Physical Environmental Quality;

      2.3 Core Educational Quality;

      2.4 Support Facilities Quality; and

           2.5 Transformative Quality

**Review of Literature**

Service quality has drawn much interest in the context of higher education institutions (Petruzzellis, L., D’Uggento, A. & Romanazzi; S., 2006). In fact, “customer satisfaction evaluation has raised a key factor in universities’ service quality improvement efforts. In general, companies need to systematically monitor and measure how they can meet customer needs. As service providers, universities are no exception. In order to maintain or enhance student satisfaction and reduce student dissatisfaction, services that contribute to “academic life” must be delivered to a suitable standard” (Douglas, J., Douglas, A. & Barnes, B., 2006).

“Higher Education (HE) service quality is getting more and more attention from researchers in China. However, fewer Chinese researchers conduct this kind of service quality research in the Chinese atmosphere” (Hong, 2018). (Mortari & Ubbiali, 2021) put that “there are some instruments to assess the service quality in higher education.” The purpose of the paper is to assess the quality of service for Higher Public Education Institutions using the HESQUAL model developed by (Teeroovengadum et al., 2016). “Service quality in the higher education sector is increasingly recognized as a research field, and this puts a greater emphasis on meeting the expectations and needs of its participating customers, who are the students” (Chen & Chen, 2010).

“Student satisfaction metrics enable universities to define their strengths and areas for improvement”” (O'Neill & Palmer, 2004). “This goes beyond simply examining teaching that has a limited emphasis on considering wider facets of the learning experience of students in and out of the classroom setting. To understand the complexity of satisfaction toward student learning experience, it is not enough to know the factors that lead to student satisfaction to recognize the dynamics of satisfaction with the student learning experience, but it is critical to note the degree to which students are satisfied” (LeBlanc and Nguyen 1997, 1999).

Douglas *et al.* (2008) said that students are considered “primary customers” of a university under a non-compulsory higher education system, and therefore, universities need to compete in identifying students' levels of satisfaction.

According to Salinda Weerasinghe, R. Lalitha, and S. Fernando in their journal, the American Journal of Educational Research (2017), Students’ satisfaction can be defined as a short-term attitude resulting from an evaluation of students’ educational experience, services, and facilities. Earlier, it was measured by common satisfaction frameworks, but later, higher education-specific satisfaction models were developed. The objective of this review is to render all available constructive literature about students’ satisfaction with a sound theoretical and empirical background.

The level of student satisfaction is focused on the educational experience, programs, and facilities enjoyed by students during the learning process (Elliott & Shin, 2002; Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2017). The student satisfaction level is a function of the relative level of experiences and perceived performance of educational services provided by higher educational institutions (Mukhtar *et al*., 2015).

In the study proposed by Wiers-Jenssen (2002), he found that the quality of teaching is an important dimension of student satisfaction while emphasizing the need for a good physical environment and the quality of services from the school’s administrative staff; these factors should not be overlooked when an institution is considering the impacts of student’s satisfaction in their academic performance.

Elliot and Healy (2001) examined some dimensions of university student satisfaction; based on their study, the consistent factors that tend to emerge are the performance of the academic personnel that affect their learning experiences and complete access to facilities and resources of the campus.

**Methodology**

In this study, the researcher adopted the Higher Educational Service Quality (HESQUAL) model of Teeroovengadum, V., Kamalanabhan, T.J., and Seebaluck, A.K. (2006), which was specifically developed for the Mauritian higher education sector with a few revisions to fit the respondents. The model consists of 48 higher education service quality attributes grouped into five major themes (Administrative Quality, Support Facilities Quality, Core Educational Quality, Transformative Quality, and Physical Environment Quality).

**Study protocol:**

The College of Science is preparing the data needed to supply the requirements for a level IV accreditation. This project utilized a descriptive study to look into the level of satisfaction of our graduates in order to come up with recommendations on how to improve the quality of services of the college and the university. The respondents of the study are the graduates from 2000-2022. The researchers utilized the stratified random sampling method in the selection of respondents. The survey questionnaire was sent via Google Forms, Facebook Messenger, and emails. The list of graduates was asked through the University Registrar. 

**Statistical Tools and Treatment of Data**

The data was gathered, tabulated, and quantified using the Weighted Mean and Simple Average. The Likert scale was used in the analysis, particularly to identify the respondents' overall level of satisfaction (refer to Table 1).

Table 1. The Scale, Range of Weighted Mean and Interpretation to be Used in this Study.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Value | Range | Interpretation |
| 5 | 4.21-5.00 | Very Satisfied |
| 4 | 3.41-4.20 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 3 | 2.61-3.40 | Satisfied |
| 2 | 1.81-2.60 | Rarely Satisfied |
| 1 | 1.00-1.80 | Not Satisfied |

Ethical Consideration

The researchers considered ethical factors when the study was conducted. It includes informed consent and disclosure of information. To disclose the discussion, name or personal identification was intended to be blank and there was no video or audio to maintain confidentiality of the respondents who answered the questionnaire.

.

**Results and Discussion**

An online survey was conducted using Google Forms. Following the initial collection of responses, a gentle reminder was issued to the non-respondents. Awareness of the survey was also heightened through student group chats and the Facebook page to improve response rates. Participants, who were CS graduates, contributed anonymously. This chapter analyzes the response rates, demographic information, and the study's research objectives. The quantitative data obtained from the survey responses were thoroughly evaluated.

# Demographic Information of the Respondents

The following figures display demographic information of the respondents, such as sex, age, and year of graduation. The majority of the graduates are aged between 28–31-year-old. Thirty-nine (39) of the study respondents were male, fifty-nine (59) were female. This emphasizes that the female contributed more than the male in the study. Out of 232 BS Math graduates from the school year 2000-2022, there were 98 respondents. There is a diversity of respondents from the year 2000 to 2022 graduates who have responded to the survey.

**Figure 1. Age of the Respondents**

**Figure 2. Sex of the Respondents**

**Figure 3. Year Graduated of the Respondents**

**Students Satisfaction in terms of Administrative Quality**

Table 2 shows the domain of administrative quality. All attributes measured received a "Very Satisfied" interpretation, with Weighted Means (WM) ranging from 4.35 to 4.50. This suggests that the administrative staff is performing well across all assessed dimensions. The highest-rated attribute is the politeness of administrative staff, with a WM of 4.50. This indicates that students feel particularly well-treated and respected by the administrative personnel. The scores for the different attributes are very close to each other, all hovering around the mid-4 range. This consistency suggests no significant weaknesses in the administrative services, and the quality is uniformly high. Attributes such as willingness to help (4.45) and behavior imparting confidence (4.45) also received high marks. These aspects are crucial as they directly affect students' trust and reliance on administrative services. While all areas received high marks, the attributes related to standardized processes, clarity of procedures, and transparency (all at 4.35) are slightly lower than others. This could be a subtle indicator that there's room for further streamlining administrative processes and improving communication about procedures and regulations. The overall WM of 4.40 reinforces those students are very satisfied with the administrative quality. This commendable result is reflected well in the administrative staff and their practices.

**Table 2. Responses of the graduate-respondents on Administrative Quality**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BS MATHEMATICS** | | | |
| **Service Quality Dimensions and Attributes** | | | |
| **Administrative Quality** | | **WM** | **Interpretation** |
| 1 | Willingness of administrative staff members to help students. | 4.45 | Very Satisfied |
| 2 | Ability of administrative staff members to solve students’ problems | 4.35 | Very Satisfied |
| 3 | Politeness of administrative staffs | 4.50 | Very Satisfied |
| 4 | Behavior of administrative staff members imparting confidence in students | 4.45 | Very Satisfied |
| 5 | Well standardized administrative processes so that there is not much bureaucracy and useless difficulties | 4.35 | Very Satisfied |
| 6 | Administrative procedures are clear and well structured so that service delivery times are minimum | 4.35 | Very Satisfied |
| 7 | Transparency of official procedures and regulations | 4.35 | Very Satisfied |
|  | **Overall Mean** | **4.40** | **Very Satisfied** |

# Students Satisfaction in terms of Physical Environment Quality

The overall WM of 4.01 indicates that students are generally fairly satisfied with the quality of the physical environment. This is a good sign, but there is room for improvement. The BS Math graduates gave the highest ratings to having quiet places to study (4.2), safety on campus (4.2), and the appearance of buildings and grounds (4.2). These are crucial aspects of the physical environment, suggesting that the campus provides a conducive and safe learning atmosphere. Both having adequate lecture rooms (4.05) and favorable ambient conditions (4.05) were also rated positively, indicating that basic academic infrastructure is up to standard. The lowest ratings were for the availability of adequate library infrastructure (3.7) and cafeteria infrastructure (3.8). Enhancing these areas could significantly improve overall student satisfaction. The availability of adequate recreational infrastructure (3.95) and teaching tools/equipment (3.95) also received relatively lower ratings, suggesting these areas could benefit from enhancements. Overall, while the graduates are fairly satisfied with the quality of the physical environment, targeted improvements in specific areas like library infrastructure, cafeteria services, and recreational facilities could significantly enhance their overall experience.

**Table 3. Responses of the graduate-respondents on Physical Environment Quality**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Physical Environment Quality** | **WM** | **Interpretation** |
| 8 | Availability of adequate cafeteria infrastructure | 3.8 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 9 | Availability of adequate library infrastructure | 3.7 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 10 | Availability of adequate recreational infrastructure | 3.95 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 11 | Availability of adequate sports infrastructure | 4 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 12 | Having adequate lecture rooms | 4.05 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 13 | Having quiet places to study within campus | 4.2 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 14 | Availability of adequate teaching tools and equipment (e.g., Projector, White boards) | 3.95 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 15 | Favorable ambient conditions (ventilation, noise, odor, etc.) prevailing within the campus | 4.05 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 16 | Safety on campus | 4.2 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 17 | Appearance of buildings and grounds | 4.2 | Fairly Satisfied |
|  | **Overall Mean** | **4.01** | **Fairly Satisfied** |

# Students Satisfaction in terms of Core Education Quality

The students are very satisfied with aspects such as the availability of lecturers to guide and advise, the prevalence of a collaborative culture, lecturers' behavior instilling confidence, clearly defined course content, relevance to future jobs, well-designed examinations, and lecturers' theoretical knowledge. There is a fair level of satisfaction regarding the lecturers' understanding of students' needs, personal attention given, the usefulness of module content, challenging academic standards, use of multimedia, active participation of students, regular feedback provision, communication skills of lecturers, and their up-to-date expertise in their field. This analysis shows that while students are generally very satisfied with many core aspects of educational quality, there are still areas with room for improvement, particularly in personalized attention, use of multimedia, and challenging academic standards.

**Table 4. Responses of the graduate-respondents on Core Educational Quality**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Core Educational Quality** | | **WM** | **Interpretation** |
| 18 | Lecturers understanding students’ needs | 4.15 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 19 | Lectures giving personal attention to students | 4.15 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 20 | Availability of lecturers to guide and advise students | 4.25 | Very Satisfied |
| 21 | Prevalence of a culture of sharing and collaboration among lecturers | 4.25 | Very Satisfied |
| 22 | Behavior of lecturers instilling confidence in students | 4.3 | Very Satisfied |
| 23 | Lecturers appearing to have students’ best interest at heart | 4.3 | Very Satisfied |
| 24 | Clearly defined course content and course objectives | 4.4 | Very Satisfied |
| 25 | Usefulness of module content and design to cater for the personal needs of students | 4.05 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 26 | Challenging academic standards of programs to ensure students’ overall development | 4.2 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 27 | Relevance of course content to the future/current job of students | 4.25 | Very Satisfied |
| 28 | Use of multimedia in teaching (e.g. use of overhead projector, power-point presentations) | 4.1 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 29 | Active participation of students in their learning process | 4.2 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 30 | Provision of regular feedback to students with respect to their academic performance | 4.2 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 31 | Well-designed examinations and continuous assignment to promote the enhancement of knowledge skills | 4.25 | Very Satisfied |
| 32 | Theoretical knowledge, qualifications and practical knowledge of lecturers | 4.3 | Very Satisfied |
| 33 | Communication skills of lecturers | 4.2 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 34 | Lecturers are up-to-date in their area of expertise | 4.15 | Fairly Satisfied |
|  | **Overall Mean** | **4.22** | **Very Satisfied** |

Table 5 shows the responses on support facilities. Students are very satisfied with the availability and adequacy of extracurricular activities, including those provided through clubs and societies, indicating a solid approval of these opportunities for personal growth and engagement. Overall satisfaction with support facilities is fair. Specific aspects such as the pricing and quality of food and refreshments, availability of IT, photocopying and printing, transport, and sports and recreational facilities are rated as fairly satisfying. This suggests that while these facilities generally meet student needs, improvement opportunities exist to increase satisfaction levels. The data indicates that support facilities function adequately but could benefit from enhancements to satisfy student needs and expectations.

**Table 5. Responses of the graduate-respondents on the Support Facilities**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Support Facilities** | **WM** | **Interpretation** |
| 35 | Reasonable pricing and quality of food and refreshments on campus | 3.9 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 36 | Availability of adequate IT facilities | 3.9 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 37 | Availability and adequacy of photocopy and printing facilities | 3.95 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 38 | Availability of transport facilities | 4.05 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 39 | Amount of opportunity for sports and recreational facilities | 4.15 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 40 | Availability and adequacy of extracurricular activities including those through clubs and societies | 4.35 | Very Satisfied |
|  | **Overall Mean** | **4.05** | **Fairly Satisfied** |

# Students Satisfaction in terms of Transformative Quality

Harvey and Green (1993) as cited by Arpilleda (2017) opined that education is not about presenting a service to a customer but rather a continuous process of transformation of the student. Students are very satisfied with the availability and adequacy of extracurricular activities, including those provided through clubs and societies, indicating a solid approval of these opportunities for personal growth and engagement. Overall satisfaction with support facilities is fair. Specific aspects such as the pricing and quality of food and refreshments, availability of IT, photocopying and printing, transport, and sports and recreational facilities are rated as fairly satisfying. This suggests that while these facilities generally meet student needs, improvement opportunities exist to increase satisfaction levels.

**Table 6. Responses of the graduate-respondents on Transformative Quality**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Transformative Quality** | | **WM** | **Interpretation** |
| 41 | Enabling students to be emotionally stable | 4.1 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 42 | Increase in self-confidence of students | 4.1 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 43 | Development in students’ critical thinking | 4.35 | Very Satisfied |
| 44 | Increase in self-awareness of students | 4.2 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 45 | Development of problem-solving skills with respect to their field of study | 4.3 | Very Satisfied |
| 46 | Enabling students to transcend their prejudices | 4.15 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 47 | Acquiring adequate knowledge and skills to perform future job | 4.3 | Very Satisfied |
| 48 | Increase in knowledge, abilities and skills of students | 4.35 | Very Satisfied |
|  | **Overall Mean** | **4.23** | **Very Satisfied** |

**Summary Responses of the graduate-respondents on the satisfaction on service quality dimensions and attributes**

The students are delighted with the administrative quality, indicating efficient management, supportive administrative staff, and effective academic services. Satisfaction with the physical environment is moderate. While the facilities are generally adequate, classroom conditions, campus amenities, and overall infrastructure could be improved.

The BS Mathematics graduates express their satisfaction with the core educational quality, emphasizing the effectiveness of teaching methods, the relevance of course content, and the overall academic rigor of the program.

The respondents also greatly appreciate the support facilities, including IT services, extracurricular activities, and campus resources, which enhance their educational experience.

Overall satisfaction is fair, with students recognizing the program's strengths in administrative quality, core education, and support facilities. However, improvements in the physical environment could enhance the overall student experience.

The evaluation of the BS Mathematics program indicates a generally positive student experience, with high satisfaction in administrative quality, core educational aspects, and support facilities. The primary area for improvement is the quality of the physical environment, where enhancements could elevate the overall satisfaction level of the program.

**Table 7. Summary Responses of the graduate-respondents on the satisfaction on service quality dimensions and attributes**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **BS MATHEMATICS** | | |
| **Attributes** | **Mean** | **Interpretation** |
|  |
| Administrative Quality | 4.40 | Very Satisfied |
| Physical Environment Quality | 4.01 | Fairly Satisfied |
| Core Educational Quality | 4.22 | Very Satisfied |
| Support Facilities | 4.05 | Fairly Satisfied |
| Transformative Quality | 4.23 | Very Satisfied |
| **Overall Mean** | **4.18** | **Fairly Satisfied** |

**Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation**

**Summary**

The majority of the graduates are between 28 and 31 years old. Thirty-nine (39) of the study respondents were male, and fifty-nine (59) were female. This emphasizes that the female contributed more than the male to the study. Out of 232 BS Math graduates from the school year 2000-2022, there were 98 respondents. There is a diversity of respondents from the 2000 to 2022 graduates who have responded to the survey.

All attributes in administrative quality measured received a "Very Satisfied" interpretation, with Weighted Means (WM) ranging from 4.35 to 4.50. The results suggest that the administrative staff performs well across all assessed dimensions, maintaining a uniformly high quality. The highest-rated attribute is the politeness of administrative staff, with a WM of 4.50. It indicates that students feel particularly well-treated and respected by the administrative personnel.

The scores for the different attributes are very close to each other, all hovering around the mid-4 range. This consistency further strengthens the confidence in the university system, suggesting no significant weaknesses in the administrative services. Since the graduates are fairly satisfied with the quality of the physical environment, the university may make some improvements in specific areas like library infrastructure, cafeteria services, and recreational facilities that significantly enhance their overall experience.

The students are very satisfied with aspects such as the availability of lecturers to guide and advise, the prevalence of a collaborative culture, lecturers' behavior instilling confidence, clearly defined course content, relevance to future jobs, well-designed examinations, and lecturers' theoretical knowledge.

There is a fair level of satisfaction regarding the lecturers' understanding of students' needs, personal attention given, the usefulness of module content, challenging academic standards, use of multimedia, active participation of students, regular feedback provision, communication skills of lecturers, and their up-to-date expertise in their field.

Overall satisfaction with support facilities is fair. Specific aspects such as the pricing and quality of food and refreshments, availability of IT, photocopying and printing, transport, and sports and recreational facilities are rated fairly satisfying. This suggests that while these facilities generally meet student needs, there is a hopeful potential for improvement to increase satisfaction.

**Conclusion**

The study concludes that the BS Mathematics graduates from the College of Science, University of Eastern Philippines-Main Campus, generally express fairly satisfaction with the educational services received.

The administrative quality, core educational quality, and transformative quality dimensions scored the highest, indicating strong performance in these attributes.

Graduates felt well-supported by administrative staff and were satisfied with the clarity and efficiency of administrative processes. Although the physical environment quality was satisfactory, specific areas for improvement were identified, particularly in the availability and quality of library and cafeteria facilities.

The Support facilities also received fairly satisfied ratings, suggesting that the university still needs to enhance IT, sports, and recreational facilities that could significantly improve overall satisfaction. The consistency of high ratings across most dimensions reflects the institution's success in meeting the needs and expectations of its graduates.

### **Recommendations**

Based on this study's findings, several initiatives can be undertaken to enhance graduate satisfaction at the University of Eastern Philippines.

The University must invest in improving the infrastructure and resources of the library and cafeteria to meet student needs and preferences better. It is crucial to create a more student-friendly environment that meets diverse academic and personal needs. A library with updated resources and comfortable study areas aligns with international benchmarks for higher education service quality (Teeroovengadum et al., 2016), fostering a conducive learning space for students.

The University is encouraged to strengthen the availability and quality of IT resources, sports, and recreational facilities to provide a more enriching campus experience. As digital learning and technology-based education become increasingly common around the world, it is really important to invest in solid IT infrastructure. This ensures that students can easily access academic resources and online learning platforms, making their educational experience much smoother and more effective (Douglas, Douglas, & Barnes, 2006).

Likewise, improved sports and recreational amenities promote student well-being and holistic development, which are essential components of a well-rounded higher education experience.

Administrative processes also play an important role in student satisfaction as the University is currently ISO Certified. The University should continue improving administrative procedures to ensure efficiency in service delivery. Cutting down on red tape and simplifying procedures improve how well an institution responds to the issues of the faculty and students (Elliott & Shin, 2002).

Furthermore, a stronger faculty-student engagement is essential. Encouraging faculty members to provide more personalized attention to students can significantly impact academic success and satisfaction. Research suggests that student-centered teaching approaches, mentorship programs, and academic support systems contribute to positive educational experiences (LeBlanc & Nguyen, 1997).

The extracurricular activities through clubs and societies, facilitated by the Office of Student Affairs and the University Student Council, can enhance student engagement and personal growth. Universities worldwide recognize the importance of co-curricular involvement in building leadership skills, fostering social connections, and improving overall student well-being (O’Neill & Palmer, 2004).

. Lastly, the university may implement regular feedback mechanisms to continuously gather student input and make data-driven improvements to educational services and facilities.

The researcher's recommendations aim to build on the institution's strengths and address identified areas for improvement, ultimately improving the overall quality of educational services and graduate satisfaction.

.

**Consent**

As per international standards or university standards, respondents’ written consent has been collected and preserved by the author(s).

**Disclaimer (Artificial intelligence)**

Author(s) hereby declare that generative AI technologies such as Grammarly Premium have been used only for grammar when editing manuscripts.
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