# Satisfaction with academic experience: Basis for crafting an action plan

Jeron B. Mina*[1], Joylene Faith M. Gumpal[2], Dishelle Anne T. Hufana[3]
[1, 2, 3] University of Perpetual Help System Laguna – Isabela Campus, Cauayan City, Isabela
*Corresponding Author email: *mina.jeron@isabela.uphsl.edu.ph*

**Abstract**

**Aim:** This study assessed students' levels of satisfaction with their academic experience in terms of the academic head's office, university instruction, and university faculty as a basis for crafting an institutional action plan to enhance academic experiences.

**Methodology:** A convergent parallel mixed-method research design was employed. The quantitative component utilized a descriptive-comparative approach, while the qualitative component applied a descriptive thematic approach. A total of 206 students from the College of Arts and Education of the University of Perpetual Help System Laguna – Isabela Campus participated in the study. Data were collected using an adapted Student Survey Satisfaction instrument from the University's Student Personnel Services. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, inferential tests, and thematic analysis.

**Results:** Findings revealed that students were generally very satisfied with their academic experiences in the academic head's office, university instruction, and university faculty. No significant differences were found in students' satisfaction with the academic head's office and university faculty when grouped according to academic program and year level. However, a significant difference was observed in students' satisfaction with university instruction when grouped according to academic program. Qualitative findings indicated that students perceived the academic head's office as responsive and approachable, valued instructional clarity and supportive teaching, and recognized faculty members' competence, approachability, and commitment to student empowerment, while also expressing the need for improved learning resources and learning management system support.

**Conclusion:** The findings underscore the importance of responsive academic leadership, effective instructional practices, and strong faculty–student engagement in enhancing students' academic experiences. Based on the results, an action plan titled Project ELEVATE was developed to further strengthen academic support systems and sustain high levels of student satisfaction.

**Keywords:** *academic head's office, academic experience, student satisfaction, university faculty, university instruction*

## INTRODUCTION

Higher education has an indispensable role to play in developing educated, competent, and skilled individuals who can make valuable contributions to sustainable development in the global pursuit of quality education, as supported by Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4). Student satisfaction is one of the important factors of the quality of higher education since it indicates learners' perceptions of curriculum, faculty interaction, learning delivery methods, and services offered by institutions. Student satisfaction is an important measure for universities that helps them gain valuable insights into their strengths and areas for improvement, enabling them to enhance their overall academic experience.

Research findings have shown that the essential factors in student satisfaction are the quality of academic staff, instructional practices, and administrative services. The competence of academic staff, quality of teaching, assessment methods, and student support have all been indicated as prime predictors of the undergraduate satisfaction and loyalty (Wisenthige et al., 2025; Supriyanto et al., 2024). Concurrently, the study found that the

657

experiences of the students with academic administration and instructional quality, especially in digital and hybrid learning environments, directly affects students' engagement, commitment, and retention (Cinkir et al., 2022; Jiménez-Bucarey et al., 2021). These underscore an arisen global concern, though institutions spend on curricula and technology, the outcome of academic leadership offices and teaching modalities is underexamined.

In the Philippine higher education, research also puts the emphasis on the service quality and academic engagement as the central attributes for the development of student satisfaction. General et al. (2025) have discovered that the perceived service quality had a strong influence on program satisfaction among Tertiary Education Subsidy (TES) grantees in private colleges, with the findings of Magboo-Campo (2024) claiming that student involvement in institutional activities was associated with lower academic stress and improved satisfaction levels in a public tertiary institution. While beneficial, these studies primarily examine the issue of student satisfaction at an institutional level or on program-specific issues and often aggregate administrative, instructional, and faculty-related contacts as constructs.

This research is essential because it supports the attainment of SDG 4 through enhancing the responsiveness of institutions to student needs through evidence-informed quality assurance. By measuring satisfaction with the academic head's office, university instruction, and university faculty, this research offers implementable recommendations that can potentially improve the academic experience of students. In addition, the interdisciplinarity of this research, which intersects educational leadership, instruction quality, and student services, reinforces institutional initiatives in aligning academic provision with international education standards.

Despite the growing body of literature, there exists a considerable contextual gap. Few studies have disaggregated student satisfaction across the academic dimensions specifically dealing with academic head's office, university instruction, and university faculty in a single college or academic unit. This is specifically highlighted in the College of Arts and Education (CAE) which plays an important role in preparing future educators and professionals who are expected to have and to promote the highest standards of educational quality, leadership, and service aligned with SDG 4. The CAE is pedagogically and administratively different since it stresses teacher training, curriculum delivery, and academic leadership development, thus, quality beyond general satisfaction surveys demands to be investigated.

Furthermore, this research goes beyond mere assessment in developing an action-oriented output which is an evidence-based action plan aimed at improving academic experiences through more responsive academic leadership, quality of instruction, and faculty support systems. In doing so, the study contributes new empirical and practical knowledge by demonstrating how disaggregated satisfaction analysis, when paired with qualitative insights, can directly inform quality assurance initiatives and institutional decision-making in higher education.

This research therefore affirms a gap by using a convergent parallel mixed-methods design, a combination of quantitative measures of student satisfaction and student-oriented qualitative feedback. Contrary to past studies mainly reporting satisfaction levels, this study cuts across three interrelated yet different domains of satisfaction, academic leadership, instructional delivery, and faculty engagement within the CAE. By using numerical data on satisfaction with students' experiences and perceptions, the research produces context-based evidence that will serve as a basis for institutional improvement.

Hence, the purpose of this study is to assess students' levels of satisfaction with their academic experiences in the College of Arts and Education. Specifically, it aims to describe the students' profile in terms of academic program and year level, determine their levels of satisfaction with the academic head's office, university instruction, and university faculty, examine significant differences in satisfaction levels when grouped according to profile variables, analyze students' qualitative feedback regarding their academic experiences, and develop an action plan to enhance academic experiences and support evidence-informed quality assurance aligned with SDG 4.

**Theoretical Framework**

This study is based on the Expectancy-Disconfirmation Theory (EDT) postulated by Oliver (1980). Expectancy-Disconfirmation Theory views satisfaction as a cognitive process in which individuals compare their prior expectations with their actual experiences of a service or system. Satisfaction arises when perceived performance matches expectations or exceeds them, while dissatisfaction occurs when perceived performance falls short. The theory has been widely utilized in service quality and higher education research to explain how students assess their academic experiences and form judgments of satisfaction.

In the higher education context, students enter institutions with expectations about leadership responsiveness, instructional quality, and faculty competence. Drawing on EDT, this research maintains that students' satisfaction with their academic experience is a function of the level of consistency between their expectations and

perceived experiences for key academic components: (a) the academic head's office - leadership supportiveness, communication about academic issues, and administrative responsiveness; (b) university instruction - clarity, organization, relevance, and delivery; and (c) university faculty - competence, approachability, feedback, and concern for student learning. To the extent that these components perform at or above expectations, positive disconfirmation occurs, leading to greater levels of satisfaction, whereas unmet expectations lead to negative disconfirmation and dissatisfaction (Oliver, 1980).

Situating this study within the Expectancy-Disconfirmation Theory allows for a formalized exploration into student satisfaction as an outcome from perceived academic performance related to administrative and instructional domains. The measured levels of student satisfaction in this study represent the disconfirmation outcomes of students' academic experiences within the College of Arts and Education. Additionally, qualitative responses from students offer explanatory richness to the disconfirmation process by highlighting factors that contribute to satisfaction or dissatisfaction. These empirical results from the conceptual and practical foundation needed for developing an evidence-informed course of action to improve academic leadership, instructional quality, and faculty engagement. Through the use of EDT within a college-specific context, the study provides further underpinning to quality assurance procedures related to Sustainable Development Goal 4 by systematically improving academic experiences based upon student-centered evidence.

## Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of the study is a systematic Input–Process–Output (IPO) model showing how satisfaction with students' academic experiences provides the basis for action plan development.

The Input includes three interrelated areas in which students have experienced satisfaction: the academic head's office, university instruction, and university faculty. Satisfaction with the academic head's office reflects students' perceptions of leadership responsiveness, communication, and administrative support, which are identified as having significant effects on student satisfaction and loyalty in higher education institutions (Wisenthige et al., 2025; Supriyanto et al., 2024). Satisfaction with university instruction refers to instructional delivery, clarity of learning objectives, assessment practices, and adaptability to different learning environments, which have been found critical to sustaining satisfaction among students, particularly in digitally and blendedly enriched learning settings (Jiménez-Bucarey et al., 2021). Satisfaction with university faculty refers to faculty competence, approachability, feedback practices, and commitment to student learning, which have been found consistently to predict positive academic experiences among students (Wisenthige et al., 2025; Supriyanto et al., 2024).

The Process component refers to a systematic analysis of both the quantitative and qualitative data based on a convergent parallel mixed-methods approach. The quantitative data first undergo descriptive analysis to summarize the students' profiles, determining levels of satisfaction from the office of the academic head, university instruction, and university faculty; and then inferential analysis, in order to examine the differences in satisfaction levels when students are segmented by profile variables. Qualitative data from students' feedback are analyzed by thematic analysis to identify recurring patterns that explain reasons for satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their academic experience. The integration of such analytical approaches yields a comprehensive understanding of student satisfaction by connecting numerical trends with the lived experiences of students.

The framework yields an evidence-based action plan, known as Project ELEVATE, intended to drive improvements in the students' academic experiences through targeted enhancements in academic head's office, university instruction, and university faculty. The project is designed to link into institutional quality assurance processes and aligns with SDG 4, emphasizing inclusive, equitable, and high-quality education.

The framework also involves a feedback mechanism whereby the implementation of the project informs continuous reassessment from an academic practice perspective, through which institutions can make iterative refinements in policy and interventions with evidence centered around the students. In this way, the framework describes a logical flow from input to process to output, showing how measures of student satisfaction can be systematically translated into actionable improvements that make the institution more responsive and enhance the quality of education.

*Thank you for embracing the culture of research with us!*

[**INPUT:** *Students' Satisfaction and Qualitative Feedback with Academic Experience*]
├── Academic Head's Office
├── University Instruction
└── University Faculty

│
▼

[**PROCESS:** *Data Analysis*]
├── Descriptive Analysis
├── Inferential Analysis
└── Thematic Analysis

│
▼

[**OUTPUT:** *Project ELEVATE*]
(Action Plan for Enhancing Academic Experiences)

│
└──────▶ *Feedback* (for continuous improvement)

## Statement of the Problem

Despite continuous efforts by higher education institutions to improve academic services, levels of student satisfaction continue to vary across academic head's office, university instruction, and university faculty. These variations suggest that existing institutional mechanisms may not consistently address students' academic needs and expectations. Variations in satisfaction may indicate inequities in academic services, potential weaknesses in instructional delivery, or gaps in administrative responsiveness that can affect student engagement and learning outcomes. In particular, there remains limited empirical evidence that examines student satisfaction by disaggregating key academic dimensions such as the academic head's office, university instruction, and university faculty within the College of Arts and Education. Assessing these areas is essential for quality assurance and for aligning the college's practices with SDG 4 targets for equitable, student-centered higher education.

In many higher education settings, student satisfaction studies are conducted at a general institutional level, which may obscure issues unique to specific academic units and limit the development of targeted, evidence-based interventions. Without a clear understanding of how students perceive academic leadership, instructional delivery, and faculty engagement, institutions may struggle to design responsive strategies that enhance the overall academic experience. Therefore, there is a need to systematically assess students' satisfaction with these academic components in order to inform institutional planning, quality assurance initiatives, and the development of an action plan aimed at improving students' academic experiences.

## Research Objectives

The study aimed to assess the students' level of satisfaction with their academic experiences as a basis for an action plan. Specifically, it sought:

1. To identify the profile of the students in terms of:
   1.1  academic program, and
   1.2  year level.
2. To determine the level of students' satisfaction with their academic experience in terms of:
   2.1 academic head's office,
   2.2 university instruction, and
   2.3 university faculty.
3. To analyze the qualitative feedback of students regarding their academic experiences in terms of:
   3.1 academic head's office,
   3.2 university instruction, and
   3.3 university faculty.
4. To examine significant differences in students' level of satisfaction with their academic experience when grouped according to their profile variables.
5. To develop an action plan based on the findings to proposed to improve students' satisfaction and overall academic experience.

**Research Questions**

This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the students in terms of:
   1.3  academic program, and
   1.4  year level?
2. What is the level of students' satisfaction with their academic experience in terms of:
   2.1 academic head's office,
   2.2 university instruction, and
   2.3 university faculty?
3. What specific feedback does students provide regarding their academic experiences in terms of:
   3.1 academic head's office,
   3.2 university instruction, and
   3.3 university faculty?
4. Is there a significant difference in students' level of satisfaction with their academic experience when grouped according to their profile variables?
5. Based on the study's findings, what actionable strategies can be developed to improve students' satisfaction and overall academic experience?

**METHODOLOGY**

**Research Design**

This study utilized a convergent parallel mixed-method research design, in which quantitative and qualitative data were collected concurrently. This was appropriate because it allows the researchers to simultaneously gather quantitative and qualitative data which captured the breadth and depth of the study, obtaining a comprehensive understanding of students' academic experiences. This have been widely applied in educational research on student satisfaction and related outcomes. (Zuniga et al., 2025; Tibog & Generalao, 2025).

The quantitative approach employed a descriptive-comparative research design. A descriptive research design was applied to identify the profile of the students and to determine students' level of satisfaction with their academic experience, while a comparative research design was employed to examine significant differences in students' levels of satisfaction with their academic experience when grouped according to profile variables. On the other hand, a qualitative approach was utilized for the feedback of students regarding their satisfaction with their academic experiences. Integration occurred at interpretation, where quantitative results were compared to qualitative themes for convergence, divergence, and complementarity. These integrated findings underpinned the development of the proposed action plan.

**Population and Sampling**

The study was comprised of 206 students. The inclusion criteria included students who were officially enrolled in the College of Arts and Education for the First Semester of Academic Year 2024–2025. In both the quantitative and qualitative phases of the research, a total population sampling approach is applied, ensuring that the findings reflect the experiences and perspectives of the entire group, increasing the accuracy and generalizability of the results. This is appropriate because the population is manageable, where including all participants is feasible and desirable.

**Instruments**

The instrument used in the study was adopted from the "Student Survey Satisfaction (SSS)" of the University's Student Personnel Services (SPS). The instrument is an institutional survey used for internal quality assurance and evaluation of student services. The questionnaire was divided into three parts. The first part consisted of the students' profiles, including their program and year level. The second part was the satisfaction with academic experience among students, which includes the dean's office, university instruction, and university faculty. The third part was the students' feedback regarding their satisfaction with the academic experience.

The SSS survey tool was content validated and reliability tested by the SPS before it was utilized within the institution. In this research, the researchers relied on the validity and reliability of the survey tool substantiated by the SPS. There have been no modifications made in the structured questions in order to preserve the Survey Tool's

*Thank you for embracing the culture of research with us!*

integrity within the institution. The open-ended questions allow the participants to express their personal experiences, perceptions, and ideas which will benefit the qualitative component of the research.

## Data Collection

Data collection was conducted during the First Semester of Academic Year 2024–2025 at the College of Arts and Education, University of Perpetual Help System Laguna – Isabela Campus. Permissions were first secured from the Dean of the CAE and the Office of the School Director to access the required data.

Both quantitative and qualitative data were obtained from official institutional records of the SSS administered by the SPS. Quantitative data were obtained from the SSS instrument, an internal survey administered by the Office of SPS. The survey responses were collected via online forms, ensuring all 206 enrolled students participated in the quantitative component.

Qualitative data were gathered from the open-ended items of the SSS instrument, designed to capture students' feedback and personal experiences regarding their satisfaction with the academic head's office, university instruction, and faculty. The responses were collected simultaneously with the quantitative data, following the convergent parallel mixed-methods approach.

## Treatment of Data

Quantitative data were analyzed using JAMOVI statistical software. Frequency counts and percentage distributions were used to describe students' profiles in terms of academic program and year level. Mean scores were computed to determine students' level of satisfaction with the academic head's office, university instruction, and university faculty. To examine significant differences in students' level of satisfaction when grouped according to profile variables, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied.

Thematic analysis was the method employed for analyzing qualitative data. The analysis was done through following a methodical procedure which involved getting intimately acquainted with the data by reading it multiple times, first coding to single out meaningful information units, related code grouping, and finally theme creation that showed the areas in students' academic experiences with academic success. Themes were critically reviewed and then slightly adjusted according to the consistency and conformity with the raw data.

Integration of quantitative and qualitative findings occurred at the interpretation stage, where quantitative results were cross-checked with qualitative themes to explain the reasons behind observed satisfaction, explanation for inconsistencies, and provide a comprehensive interpretation.

## Ethical Considerations

The study was performed following ethical standards that aimed at the protection of participants' rights, privacy, and well-being. Participants were informed of the objectives and purposes of the study by requiring their informed consent. Personal identifiers were omitted to maintain confidentiality and anonymity, and all documents were kept in a safe place after the research. Participation was strictly voluntary, with assurance of minimal risk to the participants. Data collection, analysis, and reporting were done without any breach of honesty and integrity to avoid bias and misrepresentation. Ethical considerations had been approved by Institutional Ethics Review Board (IERB) at the University of Perpetual Help System Laguna – Isabela Campus with Reference No. 2025-000165.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

## Students' Profile

As indicated in the table, in terms of academic program, the majority belonged to the Bachelor of Arts major in Psychology, while only a few were enrolled in the Bachelor of Arts in Communication. Regarding year level, the majority were second-year students, followed closely by third-year students, with a smaller frequency from the first year and fourth year levels.

**Table 1.** Students' Profile

| Variables | f (n = 206) | % (100.00) |
|---|---|---|
| Academic Program | | |
| Bachelor of Arts (BA) major in Communication | 5 | 2.40 |
| Bachelor of Arts (BA) major in Political Science | 15 | 7.30 |

662

ETCOR's Website : https://etcor.org
Facebook Page : https://www.facebook.com/EmbracingTheCultureOfResearch
Twitter Account : https://twitter.com/ETCOR_research
YouTube Channel : https://tinyurl.com/YouTubeETCOR
E-mail Address : embracingthecultureofresearch@etcor.org
Mobile Number : 0939-202-9035

*Thank you for embracing the culture of research with us!*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bachelor of Arts (BA) major in Psychology | 81 | 39.30 |
| Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) | 49 | 23.80 |
| Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) major in Biological Science | 13 | 6.30 |
| Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) major in English | 32 | 15.50 |
| Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) major in Mathematics | 11 | 5.30 |
| | | |
| Year Level | | |
| First Year | 40 | 19.40 |
| Second Year | 72 | 35.00 |
| Third Year | 66 | 32.00 |
| Fourth Year | 28 | 13.60 |

**Students' Level of Satisfaction with their Academic Experience**

**Table 2.** Students' Level of Satisfaction with their Academic Experience

| Dimensions | Mean | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---|---|
| Academic Head's Office | 8.88 | Very Satisfied |
| University Instruction | 8.72 | Very Satisfied |
| University Faculty | 8.84 | Very Satisfied |

Student satisfaction is an important indication of quality in higher education as it reflects students' perceptions of the curriculum, faculty engagement, instructional methods, and institutional services. The findings have implications for creating inclusive, equitable, and quality learning environments, focusing on student engagement, the integration of technology, and responsive academic services related to the SDGs, particularly SDG 4 (Quality Education).

In terms of academic head's office, quantitative results revealed that students had a consistent high satisfaction with the academic head's office. Students rated their experiences as "Very Satisfied", highlighting the prompt response of the office to inquiries, comprehensive support for both academic and stating that the office responded quickly to inquiries, supported them fully with academic and personal problems, allowed them to participate in discussions, and contributed much to their growth and development. These findings suggest that the office meets student expectations. The office of the academic head is very instrumental in creating an appropriate academic environment, which will most likely serve to increase motivation, academic performance, and institutional satisfaction. High levels of satisfaction also mean a great match between the students' needs and service provision, hence further cementing the office's position within the academic setup. Students become more satisfied over time when responsiveness and feedback are regular and prompt (Yuen et al., 2019). The significance of facilitative online learning environments in supporting academic achievement and individual growth supports the high level of satisfaction with offering a favorable learning environment and overall support to students (Arulkadacham, 2024). Additionally, Setiawan and Rodgers (2023) established that the quality of instructional content, accessibility, and interaction are fundamental elements that affect student satisfaction. Intuitive and interactive learning components substantially increase student engagement and satisfaction (Ismail et al., 2021). Karaoğlan Yılmaz (2022) further established that course satisfaction plays a substantial role in affecting student motivation and involvement.

As to university instruction, students also rated their experiences as "Very Satisfied". This reinforced the capability of faculty members to deliver quality education to students through active learning and professionalism. The results obtained clearly indicated the capability of academic faculty members at the university to serve students. The high levels of satisfaction regarding university instruction indicate that universities are successful in helping students through appropriate services, fair assessments, and instructive services. This underlines the observations that strategies for instructions, facilities for assessments, and activities for learning at universities are highly accepted. The appropriate application of technology and learning facilities is reinforced through evidence from Teng and Wang (2021), which proved that there is a direct relationship between educational technology instruments and engagement and satisfaction of students. Additionally, the integration of university instructions and program and course learning goals relates to the study by Martin and Bolliger (2022), which underlines the importance of course display and quality of a program in terms of improving learner satisfaction of online courses. The need to research

663

ETCOR's Website : https://etcor.org
Facebook Page : https://www.facebook.com/EmbracingTheCultureOfResearch
Twitter Account : https://twitter.com/ETCOR_research
YouTube Channel : https://tinyurl.com/YouTubeETCOR
E-mail Address : embracingthecultureofresearch@etcor.org
Mobile Number : 0939-202-9035

*Thank you for embracing the culture of research with us!*

approaches to support scientific problem-solving is further amplified through the study by Nkomo et al. (2021), which underlines the role of digital technologies to encourage student motivation and critical thinking skills.

Regarding the university faculty, it was rated by the students as "Very Satisfied." This highlights the effectiveness and capability of the university faculty to deliver quality education and professionalism. From the results, it's clear that the academic staff of the university are effective in taking care of the students. The university faculty members are extremely important and play a vital part in enhancing the academic experience of the students due to their professional skills and personal engagement and thereby the academic excellence of the university. As stated by Al-Mwzaiji et al. (2022), instructor speech behavior directly influences the academic achievements and satisfaction of the students. Effective teaching practices in the modern academy are contingent on the effective formation of adaptive pedagogies to cater to the changing demands of the learners (Devlin & Samarawickrema, 2010). Also, Baber (2020) identified that instructor behavior related to the subject content taught and how it's taught and how faculty members engage the students has a profound influence on the experience of the learners' achievements and satisfaction related to the experience, especially in online education.

Educational institutions need to enhance their pedagogy, develop their academic staff, and adopt technology that is adaptable to suit different needs in their students in their quest to ensure that they meet targets in SDG 4. Coming up with a policy, which seeks to enhance quality and accessibility in higher education, particularly in online and hybrid learning, can in some way be affected by these activities. It is, therefore, critical that administrative departments, such as the office of the academic head, continue with this endeavor to create an academic environment that aims for motivation, satisfaction, and critical thinking.

## Students' Qualitative Feedback with their Academic Experience

### Academic Head's Office

*Theme 1: Approachability and Professionalism*
This emerged as the dominant theme. Students characterized the office as accommodating, understanding, professional, and supportive; this reflects leadership that is student-centered and responsive to concerns about academics.

*Theme 2: Assistance and Responsiveness*
Students highlighted that the office was able to provide timely and effective support, stating that their queries were promptly addressed. This fostered a perception of the office as being efficient, reliable, and attentive to student needs.

### University Instruction

*Theme 1: Instructional Clarity and Effectiveness*
Students appreciated clear, well-structured instructions and effective teaching approaches that enabled learning and interactive participation. This has been interpreted to show a positive perception about instructional delivery and pedagogical competence.

*Theme 2: Accessibility of Learning Resources*
Students raised concerns about accessing learning resources, mentioning the need for more relevant and supportive learning contexts. These concerns, if acted upon, would help in better aligning instructional delivery with expectations of students.

### University Faculty

*Theme 1: Faculty Performance and Approachability*
Students valued qualified, accessible, and communicative instructors, and the learning experiences were improved along with the positive rapport between faculty and students.

*Theme 2: Quality of Education and Student Empowerment*

Students recognized the faculty commitment to quality instruction and their role in building student confidence, which contributed to academic success and personal growth.

**Integrated Discussion**

Analysis of quantitative and qualitative data indicated that, overall, satisfaction of the academic head's office, university instruction, and faculty collectively contributed to a positive student experience within the College of Arts and Education (CAE).

In regard to the academic head's office, quantitative data and qualitative responses indicated that the office was not just an administrative structure for students. Students felt that they were respected, valued, and supported, and such high satisfaction was linked to personalized attention and care. What this suggests is that attempts by the office to relate to students individually made a strong positive difference.

Regarding university instruction, while a majority of students expressed satisfaction with teaching quality, a notable concern emerged regarding the availability of learning resources. Students particularly identified this as an area that needed improvement, emphasizing that support materials were desired to supplement teaching. This disparity suggests that if more attention or emphasis is put on making instructional quality and adequate resource provision concurrent, the academic environment would be even stronger.

The interactions that students had with university faculty received very strong marks, with descriptions of professors being approachable, supportive, and committed to academic and personal development. Student narratives, as well as survey results, reinforce the notion of faculty being both accessible and professional, contributing to increased confidence and growth on the part of students.

The evidence showed that the CAE provides a student-centered and supportive environment. However, the identified deficiency in learning resources presented an avenue for further development, which arguably will help in improving the academic experience of the students.

**Difference between Students' Level of Satisfaction with Academic Experience when Grouped according to Profile**

**Academic Program**

As shown in the table, the academic head's office showed no significant difference in students' levels of satisfaction with academic experience when grouped according to academic program. This resulted in the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This implied that students from all academic programs, in general, found the services of the academic head's office similarly satisfactory. It suggested that students from all programs perceived the office's services consistently positively, indicating that administrative support, responsiveness, and student-centered practices were uniformly effective across programs. Practically, this demonstrated that the academic head's office maintained a high standard of service delivery that equally met the needs of diverse student groups, reinforcing its role in promoting a cohesive and supportive academic environment.

For University Instruction, the analysis revealed a significant difference in students' levels of satisfaction with academic experience when grouped according to academic program, which resulted in the rejection of the null hypothesis. In pairwise comparisons, BA Communication, BSEd – Biological Science, and BSEd-English were found to have significant differences. BSEd – Biological Science and BSEd-English were more satisfied with university instruction than BA Communication. The findings could be attributed to variations in instructional quality, teaching strategies, or alignment between instructional methods and program-specific learning objectives. Practically, this finding highlighted the need for program-specific instructional improvements, such as enhancing curriculum delivery, diversifying teaching approaches, or providing additional learning resources tailored to students' expectations in less satisfied programs.

Regarding University Faculty, findings showed that there was no significant difference in students' levels of satisfaction with academic experience when grouped according to academic program, resulting in the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Therefore, students were similarly satisfied with the university faculty across programs. This indicated that faculty performance, approachability, and teaching effectiveness were perceived consistently across programs, suggesting uniformity in faculty quality and student support. The practical implication was that existing faculty development practices were effective, yet continuous professional development and program-specific pedagogical strategies could further strengthen instructional impact.

While the academic head's office and faculty maintained consistently high satisfaction levels across programs, the variation in instructional satisfaction pointed to the need for targeted program-level interventions.

**Table 3.** Difference between Students' Level of Satisfaction with Academic Experience when Grouped according to Academic Program

| Dimensions | Academic Program | Mean | F-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Academic Head's Office | BA Communication | 8.80 | 1.079 | 0.376 |
| | BA Political Science | 8.69 | | |
| | BA Psychology | 8.82 | | |
| | BEEd | 8.80 | | |
| | BSEd – Biological Science | 8.80 | | |
| | BSEd - English | 9.41 | | |
| | BSEd - Mathematics | 8.47 | | |
| University Instruction | BA Communication | 7.52[ab] | 2.166 | 0.048 |
| | BA Political Science | 8.85 | | |
| | BA Psychology | 8.47 | | |
| | BEEd | 8.73 | | |
| | BSEd – Biological Science | 9.25[a] | | |
| | BSEd - English | 9.23[b] | | |
| | BSEd - Mathematics | 8.76 | | |
| University Faculty | BA Communication | 8.80 | 1.246 | 0.285 |
| | BA Political Science | 8.93 | | |
| | BA Psychology | 8.62 | | |
| | BEEd | 8.82 | | |
| | BSEd – Biological Science | 9.15 | | |
| | BSEd - English | 9.27 | | |
| | BSEd - Mathematics | 8.89 | | |

**Year Level**

As presented in the table, findings revealed no significant difference in students' levels of satisfaction with the academic head's office when grouped according to year level, resulting in the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This indicated that students across all year levels experienced similar satisfaction with the office, suggesting that administrative support and responsiveness were consistently effective throughout their academic progression.

In terms of university instruction, the differences were also not statistically significant, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This suggested that students' satisfaction with instructional delivery was uniform across year levels, reflecting consistency in teaching quality, clarity of instruction, and engagement strategies throughout the program.

Regarding university faculty, findings similarly showed no significant differences across year levels, resulting in the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This implied that students perceived faculty performance, approachability, and overall support similarly regardless of year level, demonstrating that faculty consistently maintained high-quality interactions and instructional effectiveness.

Implications of these non-significant findings indicated that the College has successfully implemented equitable and uniform academic support and instruction across all year levels. Such consistency reinforces a stable and student-centered learning environment.

**Table 4.** Difference between Students' Level of Satisfaction with Academic Experience when Grouped according to Year Level

| Dimensions | Year Level | Mean | F-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Academic Head's Office | First Year | 9.09 | 0.497 | 0.685 |

*Thank you for embracing the culture of research with us!*

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Second Year | 8.89 | | |
| | Third Year | 8.82 | | |
| | Fourth Year | 8.87 | | |
| University Instruction | First Year | 9.11 | | |
| | Second Year | 8.78 | | |
| | Third Year | 8.56 | 1.971 | 0.120 |
| | Fourth Year | 8.38 | | |
| University Faculty | First Year | 8.99 | | |
| | Second Year | 8.80 | | |
| | Third Year | 8.75 | 0.311 | 0.817 |
| | Fourth Year | 8.94 | | |

**Proposed Action Plan to Enhance Students' Academic Experience**

**Project ELEVATE**
**(Enhancing Learning, Engagement, and Value through Academic Transformation and Excellence)**

**General Objectives**
1. To make academic leadership more accessible and responsive to students through more interaction and prompt communication.
2. To enhance instructional quality and consistency among programs by encouraging effective teaching practices, innovative learning technologies, and meaningful learning experiences.
3. To create a more supportive, effective, and professional learning environment through improving faculty-student interaction, faculty performance, and ongoing professional development.

| Focus Area | Objectives | Strategies/ Activities | Persons Involved | Resources | Timeframe | Success Indicator |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Academic Head's Office | Enhance accessibility of the Academic Head's Office | Schedule regular student consultations<br><br>Conduct outreach programs and student forums | Academic Head, Students | Consultation schedules, venue, feedback forms | Semestral | Increased student awareness and satisfaction with academic services |
| | Promote consistent and equitable service delivery | Develop a service charter<br><br>Provide a feedback rating scale | Academic Head, Students | Service charter, feedback mechanisms | Semestral | Enhanced service consistency and equitable student support |
| University Instruction | Minimize disparity in instructional satisfaction across programs | Conduct a peer-classroom observation<br><br>Implement regular teaching effectiveness workshops | Faculty, Academic Head | Workshop modules, observation rubrics | Semestral | More uniform and engaging teaching practices across programs |
| | Increase integration of LMS and digital learning tools | Upgrade LMS platform<br><br>Conduct LMS usage training for both students and faculty | ITS staff, faculty, students | LMS, training manuals, tech support | Semestral | Improved access and satisfaction with technology-aided instruction |

667

| University Faculty | Enhance faculty-student communication and support | Provide training in student-centered communication<br><br>Develop a feedback loop system | Faculty, Academic Head | Training modules, digital feedback tools | Semestral | More responsive, empathetic, and student-friendly faculty-student relationships |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Encourage continuous faculty development | Support attendance in seminars/conferences<br><br>Facilitate professional development plans | HR, Academic Head, Faculty | Training funds, professional development plans | Semestral | Increased faculty competence, motivation, and instructional innovation |

Overall, these findings showed that the College has established inclusive, equitable, and high-quality learning environments, supporting SDG 4 (Quality Education) by prioritizing student engagement, responsive academic services, and technological integration. The integration of quantitative and qualitative evidence also revealed both strengths and potential areas for improvement, particularly in enhancing instructional resources and continued responsiveness. These results directly informed the design of Project ELEVATE, which aims to enhance the academic experience by strengthening administrative responsiveness and student support through the academic head's office, improving instructional resources and delivery strategies to align with student expectations, and supporting faculty development initiatives to maintain high-quality teaching, professional engagement, and student empowerment.

**Conclusion**

Students were generally very satisfied with the services of the academic head's office, the quality of university instruction, and the professionalism of university faculty. Satisfaction levels were consistently high across year levels, suggesting that administrative support, instructional delivery, and faculty engagement were uniformly experienced throughout students' academic progression. A significant difference emerged in university instruction, where BA Communication students reported comparatively lower satisfaction than BSEd–Biological Science and BSEd–English students. This finding suggested that instructional practices, learning activities, or alignment with program-specific expectations may vary across programs.

Qualitative results further clarified these patterns. While students widely valued instructional clarity and faculty approachability, concerns were noted regarding the availability and accessibility of learning resources, particularly in relation to instructional support. This specific gap highlighted an area for targeted improvement rather than a general shortcoming in instructional quality.

These emphasized that the institution demonstrated strong alignment with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education) through consistent academic support, responsive leadership, and professional faculty engagement. At the same time, the findings pointed to program-specific instructional enhancements and resource provision as priority areas. These evidence-based insights provided a clear basis for Project ELEVATE, which aimed to sustain existing strengths while addressing identified gaps to further enhance students' academic experiences in a focused and actionable manner.

**Recommendations**

From the findings, the university are encouraged to continue and enhance its existing practices that yield high student satisfaction, especially in responsiveness, quality of instruction, and faculty ability. In order to deal with areas for improvement, the institution may consider increasing the use of interactive and interest-based learning activities to further enrich instructional experiences. Additionally, the institution may also provide consistent access to and utilization of learning technologies, such as the Learning Management System (LMS), across all programs may help address concerns related to instructional resource availability and accessibility. Moreover, additional support for programs with relatively lower satisfaction levels, such as BA Communication, may be investigated through faculty development, curriculum revision, and student feedback incorporation. Continuous monitoring and evaluation of academic services and increased accessibility of academic heads can also further improve the student learning experience and sustain academic excellence. These recommendations support the institution's commitment to

*Thank you for embracing the culture of research with us!*

continuous quality improvement and inclusive, equitable education, reinforcing its alignment with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education) and the ongoing enhancement of student satisfaction.

## REFERENCES

Al-Mwzaiji, A., Aldhafiri, M., & Alotaibi, K. (2022). The role of instructor communication behaviors in students' learning outcomes and satisfaction in higher education. *International Journal of Instruction*, *15*(1), 375–392. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2022.15122a

Arulkadacham, L. (2024, March 21). Making study more human: How online education is creating powerful spaces for learning. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/monash-online-impact-today-for-tomorrow/2024/mar/22/making-study-more-human-how-online-education-is-creating-powerful-spaces-for-learning

Baber, H. (2020). Determinants of students' perceived learning outcome and satisfaction in online learning during the pandemic. *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research*, *7*(3), 285–292. https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.509.2020.73.285.292

Cinkir, S., Yildiz, S., & Kurum, G. (2022). The effect of undergraduate students' perceived service quality on student commitment. *SAGE Open*, *12*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221096134

Devlin, M., & Samarawickrema, G. (2010). The criteria of effective teaching in a changing higher education context. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *29*(2), 111–124. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360903244398

General, M. A., Galilea, J., Cinco, A. H., Esmundo, N., Valdez, L. R., & Parcon, B. S. (2025). Perceived program satisfaction and service quality among Tertiary Education Subsidy (TES) grantees in Midsayap, Cotabato Private Schools. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies in Higher Education*, *2*(1), 41–55. https://doi.org/10.70847/590780

Ismail, S. N., Hamid, S., Ahmad, M., Alaboudi, A., & Jhanjhi, N. (2021). Exploring students' engagement towards the learning management system (LMS) using learning analytics. *Computer Systems Science and Engineering*, *37*(1), 73–87. https://doi.org/10.32604/csse.2021.01526

Jiménez-Bucarey, C., Acevedo-Duque, Á., Müller-Pérez, S., Aguilar-Gallardo, L., Mora-Moscoso, M., & Vargas, E. C. (2021). Student's satisfaction of the quality of online learning in higher education: An empirical study. *Sustainability*, *13*(21), 11960. https://doi.org/10.3390/su132111960

Karaoğlan Yılmaz, F. G. (2022). An investigation into the role of course satisfaction on students' engagement and motivation in a mobile-assisted learning management system flipped classroom. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, *31*(1), 15–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2021.1940257

Magboo-Campo, C. (2024). Tourism student satisfaction with extra-curricular activities in a public higher education institution in the Philippines. *Journal of Tertiary Education and Learning*, *2*(3), 38–45. https://doi.org/10.54536/jtel.v2i3.3333

Martin, F., & Bolliger, D. U. (2022). Developing an online learner satisfaction framework in higher education through a systematic review of research. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *19*(1), 50. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-022-00355-5

Nkomo, L. M., Daniel, B. K., & Butson, R. J. (2021). Synthesis of student engagement with digital technologies: A systematic review of the literature. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *18*(1), 34. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00270-1

Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research, 17*(4), 460–469. https://doi.org/10.2307/3150499

Setiawan, B., & Rodgers, A. (2023). Determinants affecting students' satisfaction in the use of learning management systems on instructional content, interaction, and accessibility. *International Journal of Pedagogy and Teacher Education*, *7*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.20961/ijpte.v8i2.89853

Supriyanto, A., Burhanuddin, B., Sunarni, S., Rochmawati, R., Ratri, D.K. and Bhayangkara, A.N. (2025). Academic service quality, student satisfaction and loyalty: a study at higher education legal entities in Indonesia. *The TQM Journal*, *37*(5), 1364-1384. https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-10-2023-0334

Teng, Y., & Wang, X. (2021). The effect of two educational technology tools on student engagement in Chinese EFL courses. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *18*(1), 27. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00263-0

Tibog, K., & Generalao, R. (2025). An assessment on the teaching style and student satisfaction among teacher education students: A convergent parallel study. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 34*(8), 1015–1055. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.340810

Wisenthige, K., Pathirana, U., Perera, B., Wijesinghe, K., & Wijethunga, A. (2025). Determinants of student satisfaction in private universities: examining the impact of academic staff quality. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-12-2023-0562

Yuen, A. H. K., Cheng, M., & Chan, F. H. F. (2019). Student satisfaction with learning management systems: A growth model of belief and use. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *50*(5), 2520–2535. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12830

Zuniga, S. C. O., Poliquit, T. M. L., Policarpio, K. Q., & Napil, J. S. C. (2024). Learning roadblock: A convergent parallel study of inclusive education perceptions. *Journal of Tertiary Education and Learning, 3*(3), 116–127. https://doi.org/10.54536/jtel.v3i3.5352.

*Thank you for embracing the culture of research with us!*