Assessment of the Implementation of the Student Affairs and Services: A Basis for the Intervention Program

* Rose Mae T Lumasag, PhD[1], *Rogelio L Gawahan, PhD[2]

[1]Commission on Higher Education Region X, Misamis Oriental, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

[2]Xavier University-Ateneo de Cagayan, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

*Corresponding Author

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the implementation and effectiveness of CMO 09 Series 2013 among Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in region 10-Northern Mindanao, strategically located in the Southern Philippines. It involves 252 respondents, including SAS Directors, SAS personnel, and student leaders from various types of institutions. Utilizing a descriptive design, participants were selected through Stratified Random Sampling, and data were collected via a validated questionnaire with a high reliability index of 0.93. Findings indicate that approximately 60% of SAS Directors rated CMO implementation as "very well implemented," with a mean score of 3.30. The results show a strong commitment to compliance with CHED directives, particularly in Monitoring and Evaluation, Student Development, and Student Services Funds. SAS personnel reported a moderate level of implementation (mean score of 3.09), with 22.60% noting very effective execution. Student leaders also acknowledged compliance with a mean rating of 2.96, highlighting the need for improved policy directives. Overall, HEIs received an average compliance rating of 3.12, categorizing them as 'Compliant,' though areas for improvement, particularly in Student Welfare, were identified. Additionally, student leaders found the CMO to be "very useful" (mean rating of 3.35), emphasizing its role in enhancing student services. This research underscores the importance of feedback from all stakeholders in evaluating CMO implementation and calls for targeted interventions to exceed basic compliance, ultimately improving student welfare and satisfaction within higher education institutions.

Keywords: implementation, compliance, student affairs and services, usefulness

INTRODUCTION

Quality education is a crucial component of a nation's economic success. Higher education plays an essential role in this context, increasingly recognized globally as a service industry that focuses on developing the 'holistic student.' The development of this holistic student is based on a comprehensive education, which should be prominently reflected in schools' vision and mission statements, guiding and supporting students in achieving their ultimate goals.

To this end, all institutions of higher learning must highlight the dignity and appeal of intellectual and scholarly life, taking pride in their physical and natural environments (Republic Act 7722). Consequently, colleges and universities are compelled to reflect inwardly and outwardly, remodeling and reinventing themselves to meet societal demands, with students at the heart of this transformation (International Association on Student Affairs and Services, 2020). This aligns with the fundamental principles of student rights and welfare, ensuring everyone's entitlement to high-quality and accessible education.

The enhancement of academic, social, and professional skills is closely linked to students' essential needs for a successful transition from school to lifelong learning and economic integration (Attri & Kushwana, 2018), beginning from enrollment to employment. Therefore, Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) must provide a wide range of high-quality services to meet their students' needs (Abbas, 2020). HEIs must ensure that the experiences

they provide are student-centered, featuring programs and services that support academic instruction and promote the holistic development of students (Kaput, 2018).

In this context, the concept of Student Affairs and Services (SAS) refers to the division or department within HEIs dedicated to providing support and services for students. Its purpose is to foster student growth and development throughout their academic journeys (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 2012). The services and programs offered by SAS focus on academic support for holistic development, addressing students' essential life needs by delivering a comprehensive array of out-of-classroom services and programs that empower students to concentrate more effectively on their studies (Pope, et al., 2019).

In the Philippines, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) expresses deep concern regarding the quality of programs and services offered by tertiary education institutions nationwide. This concern is articulated in CHED Memorandum Order No. 46 S. 2021, which outlines the Policy-standard to Enhance Quality Assurance (QA) in Philippine Higher Education through an Outcomes-Based and Typology-Based Quality Assurance Framework. Article II, Section 8 states: "Any Quality Assurance (QA) system begins with the HEIs identity and enters a quality cycle of planning, implementation of teaching-learning systems as well as support processes and procedures; review against performance indicators and standards defined in the assessment system; and enhance programs and systems." Moreover, through CHED Memorandum Order 09, series 2013, titled "Enhanced Policies and Guidelines on Student Affairs and Services," CHED has established policies and guidelines to govern the management of student affairs and outline the various roles within Student Affairs Services (SAS).

Numerous research studies examining the management of student affairs in the Philippines have been conducted, particularly in light of CMO No. 21, s. 2006, which provides guidelines for implementing student affairs services (Sison, 2019). For instance, Ciobanu (2013) explored the function and value of student services in enhancing students' academic experiences, referencing various international studies. Another study by Buban and Janer (2022) assessed student satisfaction with the delivery of SAS programs in private higher education institutions, identifying both online and offline services related to student welfare, development, and institutional programs and services.

Similarly, Herdlein and Zurner (2015) focused on respondents' awareness and satisfaction with the services provided by existing Student Affairs and Services Offices in European universities. Magolda and Magolda (2023) investigated the historical issues and practices of student affairs and services from a global perspective emerging in the 19th and 20th centuries, suggesting student development programs that complement traditional classroom learning experiences.

Furthermore, Chalufu and Rheeder (2022) examined the deployment of SAS programs during the COVID-19 pandemic, evaluating the level of satisfaction with these services. Akens et al. (2019) emphasized the importance of understanding the collective interpretation of the Student Affairs and Services function's role and its relationship with academic affairs and the institutional mission.

Ibarrientos (2015) assessed the implementation and effectiveness of the Camarines Sur Polytechnic College Student Affairs Services Program in the Philippines, revealing that while some services and programs were implemented with satisfactory results, further investigation into their delivery was necessary. She recommended a comprehensive approach to developing a plan for Student Affairs services.

Following the review of these literatures and studies, the researchers were inspired to conceptualize this study to thoroughly investigate the implementation of student services in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) based on the policies and guidelines established by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) in Region 10-Northern Mindanao strategically located in the Southern Philippines. This assessment aims to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the various services offered by Student Affairs Services, ultimately designing an intervention program that responds to the principles of "Quality and Excellence."

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study aimed to assess the extent of implementation and compliance of CMO 09, Series of 2013 towards Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) Students Services in Region 10, Northern Mindanao in the Philippines

covering the Academic Year 2022-2023. The result of the study was the basis for an intervention program for quality student services.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. What is the extent of the CMO 09 S. 2013 implementation of the following raters:

   a. Student Affairs Services director;

   b. personnel from Student Affairs Services;

   c. student leaders?

2. What is the extent of Higher Education Institution's compliance with CMO 09 S. 2013 based on the following indicators:

   a. management & administration of student affairs services;

   b. student services funds;

   c. student welfare;

   d. student development;

   e. institutional student programs and services;

   f. research on student affairs and services; and

   g. monitoring and evaluation?

3. What is the level of usefulness of CMO 09. S. 2013 as rated by the student leaders?

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a descriptive design to thoroughly understand the data related to the implementation of CMO 09 Series 2013. The study was conducted in region 10-Northern Mindanao which is strategically located in the Southern Philippines on the resource-rich island of Mindanao. It includes five provinces: Misamis Oriental, Misamis Occidental, Bukidnon, Lanao del Norte, and Camiguin. The region boasts a diverse economy with the PHIVIDEC Industrial Estate, efficient international seaports, and a reliable workforce, making it an ideal site for business and industrial development while offering vast agricultural lands and rich natural resources. It involved 252 respondents divided into three groups: 84 SAS Directors, 84 SAS personnel, and 84 student leaders from various higher education institutions, which included State Universities and Colleges (SUC), Local Universities and Colleges (LUCs), and Private Higher Education Institutions (PHEIs).

From a total of 107 colleges and universities of the region, the sample size was calculated using Cochran's Formula, which generated a total population of 84 colleges and or universities which include: Pangantucan Bukidnon Community College, ACLC College of Bukidnon, Inc., IBA College of Mindanao, Inc., Mindanao Arts and Technological Institute, Philippine College Foundation, Inc., Philippine Country Ville College, Inc., Quezon Institute of Technology, Inc., Roman C. Villalon Memorial Colleges Foundation, Inc. Southern Bukidnon Foundation Academy, Southern Maramag Colleges, STI College Malaybalay, STI College Valencia, Valencia Colleges (Bukidnon), Inc. Mountain View College, San Agustin Institute of Technology, San Isidro College, seven campuses of Bukidnon State University, Central Mindanao University, Northern Bukidnon State College, Tangub City Global College, Northwestern Mindanao State College of Science and Technology, Fatima College of Camiguin, Inc., Camiguin Polytechnic State College, Community College of Gingoog City, Gingoog City Colleges, Inc., Christ the King College Tubod College, Mindanao State University-Lanao del Norte Agricultural College, Christ the King College de Maranding, Inc, North Central Mindanao College, Mindanao State University-Maigo School of Arts and USTP-Oroquieta & Panaon, Stella Maris College, Dr. Solomon U.

Molina College, Inc., John Buco Colegio de Jimenez, Inc., Medina Foundation College of Sapang Dalaga, Inc, Misamis University - Oroquieta City, Misamis University - Oroquieta City, City College of El Salvador, Initao College, Magsaysay College, Opol Community College, Salay Community College, Tagoloan Community College, Colegio de Santo Niño de Jasaan, Misamis Oriental Institute of Science and Technology, St. Peter's College of Misamis Oriental, Inc., The New El Salvador Colleges, Inc., St. Rita's College of Balingasag, Mindanao State University-Naawan, Bukidnon State University-Medina, University of Science and Technology of Southern Philippines-Claveria Campus, Iligan Capitol College, Iligan Medical Center College, Lyceum of Iligan Foundation, Masters Technological Institute of Mindanao, Santa Monica Institute of Technology, STI-Iligan, St. Peter's College, St. Michael's College, Adventist Medical Center College, Blessed Mother College, Golden Heritage Polytechnic College, Liceo de Cagayan University, Southern de Oro Philippines College, University of Science and Technology of Southern Philippines-CDO, Pilgrim Christian College, STI College Cagayan de Oro, Cagayan de Oro College, Capitol University, Lourdes College, Vineyard International Polytechnic College, and Xavier University. Each of these colleges/universities have 3 types of participants (1 SAS Director, 1Personnel from SAS, and 1 Student leader). These participants were selected through Stratified Random Sampling.

A researcher-developed questionnaire, based on and modified from CHED Memorandum Order No. 9, Series of 2013, was utilized. This instrument was validated by three professionals and researchers and was pilot tested to establish a reliability index, achieving a high reliability index of 0.93 using Cronbach's Alpha. All ethical considerations in data collection were rigorously followed as approved by Xavier University Research Ethics Board. The scoring guidelines for the extent of CMO implementation were categorized as fully implemented, implemented, partially implemented, or not implemented. The level of usefulness was classified as very useful, useful, fairly useful, or not at all useful. Descriptive statistics, including frequency distribution, percentage, mean, and standard deviation, were used for data analysis**.**

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The results and findings for all problems in this paper are presented in Tables 1.1-1.3, 2, and 3.

Overall rating on the extent of CMO 09 S. 2013 implementation as rated by the SAS Directors

Table 1.1 presents the overall ratings from SAS directors regarding the implementation of CMO 09 S. 2013. Approximately 60.00% of directors reported that the schools they oversee have very well implemented the CMO, while 39.00% indicated that it is implemented, and only one director stated that it is less implemented. The mean rating for the "very well implemented" category is 3.30, reflecting that schools have thoroughly adhered to the implementation of this section.

The findings suggest that SAS directors rate the implementation as "Very Well Implemented," indicating that the policies and guidelines of CMO 09 S. 2013 are effectively applied and fully recognized by the schools. This demonstrates a high average score in relation to the directors' satisfaction with the effective strategies implemented and the overall process that facilitates alignment with organizational goals. The distribution of directors who evaluated the implementation of CMO 09 S. 2013 as "very well implemented" reflects a strong organizational capability to successfully integrate these directives within their institutions.

Table 1.1 Overall Extent of the CMO 09 S. 2013 implementation as rated by SAS director (n=84)

Interval	Description	Frequency(f)	Percentage (%)
3.25-4.00	Very Well Implemented	50	59.50
2.50-3.24	Implemented	33	39.30
1.75- 2.49	Less Implemented	1	1.20
1.00-1.74	Not Implemented	0	0.00
Total		84	100.00

Mean:3.30Sd:0.37Description: Very Well Implemented

Indicators	Mean	Description
Management & Administration of Student Affairs & Services	3.21	Implemented
Student Services Funds	3.43	Very Well Implemented
Student Welfare Services	3.12	Implemented
Student Development	3.45	Very Well Implemented
Institutional Student Programs and Services	3.17	Implemented
Research On Student Affairs and Services	3.16	Implemented
Monitoring And Evaluation	3.55	Very Well Implemented

This can be interpreted as the SAS directors ensuring that the implementation of CMO No. 9, s. 2013 is well-managed by the schools, as compliance with this directive is mandatory for all higher education institutions. Adhering to the minimum standards set by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) signifies that these institutions are dedicated to developing higher education that meets students' needs. Furthermore, the SAS directors believe they have comprehensively implemented all provisions mandated by the CMO, often exceeding the minimum requirements. It is also noteworthy that all SAS directors are aware of this CMO, placing the responsibility for implementation on them. As part of their regular reporting, they ensure that the schools they serve strictly adhere to the orders issued by CHED regarding student services.

When evaluating the indicators reflected in the CMO as sections, three out of seven were rated as very well implemented or fully observed. These include section 7 - Monitoring and Evaluation (the highest rated), followed by section 4 - Student Development, and section 2 - Student Services Funds. Conversely, four sections received a descriptive rating of implemented, with section 1 - Management & Administration of Student Affairs & Services leading, followed by section 5 - Institutional Student Programs and Services, section 6 - Research on Student Affairs and Services, and section 3 - Student Welfare Services.

According to Ibarrientos (2015), an effective student services program encourages supervisors to prioritize building effective workgroups to achieve the strategic goals of Student Development Services. Educators recognize that when student services and activities are properly managed and supervised, they significantly benefit academic performance. They believe that social growth and interpersonal relationships are enhanced through well-planned and organized co-curricular and extra-curricular activities.

Overall rating on the extent of CMO 09 S. 2013 implementation as rated by the Personnel from SAS

Table 1.2 presents the overall personnel ratings from SAS directors regarding the implementation of CMO 09 S. 2013. The data indicates that 69.00% of the directors reported that the schools they serve have implemented this section of the CMO, while 22.60% stated that it has been very well implemented. Only seven participants noted that this section is either poorly implemented or not implemented at all. The average rating of 3.09 for this CMO section suggests that schools have recognized the implementation of its provisions.

Table 1.2 Overall extent of the CMO 09 S. 2013 implementation as rated by personnel from SAS (n=84)

Interval	Description	Frequency(f)	Percentage (%)
3.25-4.00	Very Well Implemented	19	22.60
2.50-3.24	Implemented	58	69.00
1.75- 2.49	Less Implemented	4	4.80

1.00-1.74	Not Implemented	3	3.60
Total		84	100.00

Mean:3.09 Sd:0.48 Description: Implemented

Indicators	Mean	Description
Management & Administration of Student Affairs & Services	3.13	Implemented
Student Services Funds	3.25	Very Well Implemented
Student Welfare Services	3.07	Implemented
Student Development	3.21	Implemented
Institutional Student Programs and Services	3.02	Implemented
Research on Student Affairs and Services	3.12	Implemented
Monitoring and Evaluation	3.25	Very Well Implemented

This indicates that, at the level of SAS directors, the implementation of CMO No. 9, s. 2013 is being effectively managed by the schools, as compliance with this directive is mandated for all higher education institutions. Adhering to the minimum standards set by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) signifies that these institutions are dedicated to creating higher education environments responsive to student needs. Furthermore, the SAS directors believe they have implemented all provisions of the CMO and are capable of exceeding the minimum requirements specified.

It is noteworthy that all SAS directors are knowledgeable about this CMO; thus, their assessment of the quality of implementation is significant. Their evaluations are critical for enhancing the implementation of the same CMO. Consequently, the higher education institutions they represent are committed to ensuring that the schools they support strictly adhere to the directives issued by CHED regarding student services. For them, compliance with this policy is essential, which is why they provide objective assessments as required.

Among the indicators outlined in the CMO, two sections received ratings of very well implemented or fully observed. These include Section 2 - Student Services Funds as the highest-rated, followed by Section 7 - Monitoring and Evaluation. Conversely, five sections received a rating of implemented or observed by the schools they serve. These are Section 4 - Student Development; Section 1 - Management & Administration of Student Affairs & Services; Section 6 - Research on Student Affairs and Services; Section 3 - Student Welfare Services; and Section 5 - Institutional Student Programs and Services, listed in order of their rankings. Despite variations in mean ratings, all sections received implemented or observed ratings, indicating that the extent of implementation is recognized in the higher education institutions included in this study.

The study by Vetter, et al., (2019) emphasizes the importance of quality involvement experiences in enhancing student thriving in college. It finds that students engaged in organizations or leadership roles are more likely to succeed, prompting student activities professionals to create programs that promote meaningful involvement and leadership opportunities. By focusing on thriving, educators can better understand the broader impacts of their initiatives, fostering inclusive communities that support student success. Collecting evidence of co-curricular experiences' effects is crucial for informed resource allocation and improving practices in student affairs.

Overall rating on the extent of CMO 09 S. 2013 implementation as rated by the Student Leaders

Table 1.3 presents the overall ratings from student leaders regarding the implementation of CMO 09 S. 2013. Approximately 85.00% of respondents indicated that their current school has implemented this section of the CMO, while 12.00% reported it is less implemented. Less than 3.00% stated it is either very well implemented or not implemented at all.

The description of implementation is reflected in a mean rating of 2.96 for this section of the CMO, suggesting that schools have made noticeable efforts to implement it. This indicates that student leaders perceive the implementation of CMO No. 9, s. 2013 as being managed by their institutions, as compliance is mandatory for all higher education institutions. Adhering to this minimum standard set by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) signifies the institutions' commitment to creating higher education environments that effectively respond to student needs.

Furthermore, this implies that student leaders believe they have responsibly implemented all the provisions mandated by the CMO, which they are required to follow and may even exceed, as the order only sets a minimum requirement. It is also noteworthy that student leaders recognize their rights to receive comprehensive student services outlined in this CMO, making its implementation crucial for all student leaders.

When ranking the indicators outlined in the CMO, all seven sections received ratings indicating they are implemented, with Section 4-Student Development receiving the highest mean rating, followed by Section 1-Management & Administration of Student Affairs & Services. Section 6-Research on Student Affairs and Services ranked third, while Section 5-Institutional Student Programs and Services ranked fourth. Conversely, the lowest three

Table 1.3 Overall Extent of the CMO 09 S. 2013 implementation as rated by student leaders (n=84)

Interval	Description	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
3.25-4.00	Very Well Implemented	2	2.40
2.50-3.24	Implemented	71	84.50
1.75- 2.49	Less Implemented	10	11.90
1.00-1.74	Not Implemented	1	1.20
Total		84	100.00

Mean: 2.96 Sd: 0.17 Description: Implemented

Indicators	Mean	Description
Management & Administration of Student Affairs & Services	3.05	Implemented
Student Services Funds	2.63	Implemented
Student Welfare Services	2.83	Implemented
Student Development	3.13	Implemented
Institutional Student Programs and Services	2.92	Implemented
Research on Student Affairs and Services	3.04	Implemented
Monitoring and Evaluation	2.88	Implemented

sections were Section 7-Monitoring and Evaluation, Section 3-Student Welfare Services, and Section 2-Student Services Funds.

The analysis of the CMO 09 S. 2013 implementation through student perspectives highlights significant implications. It underscores the need for structured policy interventions to enhance efficacy. First, it emphasizes the necessity for clearer and more coherent policy directives. Second, it suggests that variations in implementation effectiveness have had a considerable impact.

The data clearly indicate how student leaders rated the implementation of CMO 09 S. 2013, shedding light on

their perceptions of its execution. This further suggests that student leaders believe the average level of implementation is moderate. Involving student leaders as evaluators of the CMO implementation, which provides them with clear guidelines related to student services, demonstrates that higher education institutions (HEIs) are receptive to feedback from those directly affected. Their ratings are invaluable, providing firsthand insights that can help HEIs improve their implementation efforts. The implementation ratings across all sections demonstrate that students perceive the execution as meeting the prescribed minimum standards, with a call to exceed these standards where possible.

In the study conducted by Aberientos (2022), it was emphasized that student support offices enhance the educational experience by providing services and programs that cater to student needs. He also noted that all higher education institutions in the Philippines must offer a range of student-centered activities and services to support academic instruction, aimed at facilitating holistic student development. Evaluating student services and programs will help institutions align with CHED's endorsement that these services should be monitored and assessed to ensure they adequately support students in their educational journeys.

The data collected from the perspectives of the three categories of respondents show that while their ratings differ in numbers, they align at similar descriptive levels, satisfying the requirements set forth by the Commission on Higher Education for Philippine Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). These ratings serve as the processes or throughputs in this study. The extent of CMO 09 S. 2013 implementation, as evaluated by the three distinct participant groups, will provide insight into the compliance and effectiveness of the CMO, informing the outputs of this paper.

On the Higher Education Institution's compliance with CMO 09 S. 2013 based on the following indicators:

   a. Management & administration of student affairs & services;

   b. Student services funds;

   c. Student welfare;

   d. Student development;

   e. Institutional student programs and services;

   f. Research on student affairs and services; and

   g. Monitoring and evaluation

The results and discussions of Problem 2 are summarized in Table 2, illustrating how Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) complied with CMO 09 S. 2013. The average ratings of these institutions are categorized into four levels: Highly Compliant, Compliant, Less Compliant, and Not Compliant. The overall average rating of 3.12 places it in the 'Compliant' range. This overall assessment portrays a generally positive compliance landscape among educational institutions, revealing opportunities for some to enhance their adherence to regulations and attain the 'Highly Compliant' status.

The designation of "Compliant" means that all HEIs involved in this study are following the mandates of the CMO, addressing all seven sections it includes, and meeting the minimum requirements for establishing Student Affairs and Services units within their institutions. This suggests that these schools adhere to the provisions set forth by CHED. Compliance with CHED standards indicates that institutions are generally meeting regulations satisfactorily. The seven domains of compliance—governance and management, quality of teaching and learning, professional exposure, research and creative work, support for students, community relations, infrastructure and learning resources, and financial management—are essential for holistic institutional development. Each domain contributes to well-managed schools, quality education, innovation, student support, community engagement, adequate infrastructure, and transparent financial management. While compliance ratings are consistent, there remain opportunities for institutions to improve and reach higher compliance levels, fostering excellence in higher education.

The results reveal that 36 institutions (42.90%) achieved a Highly Compliant rating, showcasing strong adherence to requirements. However, the majority, comprising 43 institutions (51.20%), were categorized as Compliant, indicating they met expectations but did not exceed them. A small number of institutions, totaling 5% or 6.00%, were classified as Less Compliant, underscoring areas that require significant improvement. Notably, no institution was classified as Not Compliant. This suggests that a majority of institutions are in the "Highly Compliant" category, indicating they exceed basic compliance requirements. High compliance

Table 2 Distribution of Average Rating on the Higher Education Institution's Compliance with CMO 09 S. 2013 (n=84)

Interval	Description	Frequency(f)	Percentage (%)
3.25-4.00	Highly Compliant	36	42.90
2.50-3.24	Compliant	43	51.20
1.75- 2.49	Less Compliant	5	6.00
1.00-1.74	Not Compliant	0	0.00
Total		84	100.00

Mean: 3.12 Sd:0.33 Description: Compliant

Indicators	Mean	Sd	Description
1. Management and administration of student affairs and services	3.13	0.37	Compliant
2. Student services funds	3.10	0.50	Compliant
3. Student welfare	2.99	0.25	Compliant
4. Student Development	3.22	0.29	Compliant
5. Institutional Student Program & Services	3.03	0.23	Compliant
6. Research on Student Affairs & Services	3.11	0.71	Compliant
7. Monitoring & Evaluation	3.26	0.57	Highly Compliant

levels reflect strong governance within the institutions and effective implementation strategies that align closely with the directives of CMO 09 S. 2013, contributing to improved outcomes and quality education.

It can be noted that, compliance with the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) policies is vital for ensuring quality in education, maintaining accreditation, protecting students' rights, and fostering institutional improvement. These policies are designed to help educational programs align with national and international standards, promote continuous enhancement, and safeguard student rights by ensuring quality education and services. CHED Memorandum Orders (CMOs) serve to standardize higher education, encourage excellence, and protect the interests of both students and society. Adherence to these policies is crucial for accreditation, which not only enhances an institution's reputation but also validates its degrees. Consistent compliance indicates that many institutions are aligning well with regulatory requirements, reflecting a generally positive scenario with moderately high compliance levels. The study by Dioso (2018) highlights a significant level of compliance regarding Student Affairs and Services, indicating they function effectively to meet students' needs and interests. It emphasizes the quality-of-service delivery and the availability of opportunities that foster both academic and extracurricular development, thereby promoting a positive learning environment and the cultivation of values among students.

The evaluation scores for Student Affairs and Services (SAS) indicate that while institutions meet compliance standards across categories, specific areas require targeted interventions to improve student experiences and

outcomes. The lower score in Student Welfare highlights an urgent need for enhancements in support systems that address mental health, physical health, and overall well-being. Possible interventions may include expanding mental health services, increasing the presence of health professionals on campus, and integrating wellness programs into the daily life of the institution.

Moreover, implementing regular wellness workshops and stress management sessions could effectively address gaps in student welfare, ultimately leading to improved academic performance and reduced dropout rates. Such enhancements align with best practices identified in educational research and respond to the evolving needs of the student body, ensuring institutions not only maintain compliance but excel in providing a supportive and enriching educational environment.

When examining and ranking all sections of the CMO, one section achieved a Highly Compliant rating, while the remaining six sections obtained Compliant ratings. The highest compliance rating is observed in Section 7 (Monitoring & Evaluation) at 3.26, indicating robust systems in place for monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of student services. This is critical for ensuring services are effective and can adapt to students' changing needs, thereby enhancing overall student satisfaction and institutional accountability. The evaluation results indicate a strong commitment to the provisions set by the CMO regarding monitoring and evaluation.

The ratings are followed by Section 4 (Student Development), Section 1 (Management and Administration of Student Affairs and Services), Section 6 (Research on Student Affairs & Services), Section 2 (Student Services Funds), Section 5 (Institutional Student Program & Services), and Section 3 (Student Welfare). Therefore, it can be concluded that all HEIs have met the compliance requirements mandated by the CMO.

Effective Monitoring & Evaluation in institutions leads to improved student outcomes and satisfaction by emphasizing continuous assessment and feedback. This process enables institutions to adapt to student needs, ensuring resources are allocated effectively for success. High compliance scores indicate a commitment to quality and the ability to implement changes based on evaluations, aligning with best practices that foster an environment supportive of students' academic and personal growth.

Conversely, the lowest score in Section 3 (Student Welfare) at 2.99, while still compliant, indicates a need for improvement. This area encompasses support mechanisms such as health services, counseling, and accommodations, which are crucial for student well-being. This may be attributed to a limited number of licensed guidance counselors, medical doctors, and practicing health personnel. During the study period of SY2022-2023, the transition to onsite service delivery may have influenced this rating, as blended modalities were still permitted at that time. Observations suggest some hesitancy regarding individual consultations in face-to-face settings, leading to many conversations and consultations being conducted online, where issues with internet connectivity remain prevalent. Although Section 3 falls within the compliant rating, it indicates room for improvement when compared to research insights. This discrepancy suggests that despite achieving compliance, the institution may not be fully meeting the needs or expectations of students in this essential area. Increased investment and focus on student welfare services could bridge this gap, enhancing student satisfaction and retention.

In summary, the evaluation scores across the three types of participants and their ratings regarding the implementation of the CMO align with the overall compliance results. The compliance ratings indicate that when implementation is effectively managed, high levels of compliance can be achieved. This outcome generally signifies that HEIs are adhering to the orders issued by the Commission on Higher Education concerning the assessed CMO. The outputs of this study are a result of the thorough implementation process.

On the level of usefulness of CMO 09. S. 2013 as rated by the student leaders

The analysis regarding the distribution of ratings for the usefulness of CMO 09, S. 2013 among student leaders is reflected in Table 3 which reveals a weighted mean value of 3.35, which is described as "very useful." This indicates that the student leaders strongly believe that this CHED Memorandum serves its purpose by regulating all higher education institutions (HEIs) in providing the student services they deserve. They recognize it as beneficial to the student body and see how it has aided HEIs in tailoring their student affairs services and programs without compromising their own mission and vision, especially in private universities and colleges.

Table 3 Distribution of rating on the level of usefulness of CMO 09. S. 2013 as rated by the Student Leaders (n=84)

Interval	Description	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
3.25-4.00	Very Useful	45	53.60
2.50-3.24	Useful	36	42.90
1.75- 2.49	Fairly Useful	3	3.60
1.00-1.74	Not Useful	0	0.00
Total		84	100.00

Mean: 3.35 Sd: 0.16 Description: Very Useful

Indicators	Mean	Sd	Description
1. Management and administration of student affairs and services	3.46	0.57	Very Useful
2. Student services funds	3.40	0.60	Very Useful
3. Student welfare	3.44	0.59	Very Useful
4. Student Development	3.46	0.59	Very Useful
5. Institutional Student Program & Services	3.48	0.59	Very Useful
6. Research on Student Affairs & Services	3.11	0.47	Useful
7. Monitoring & evaluation	3.12	0.48	Useful

The distribution of ratings from participants revealed that over half, at 53.60%, rated it as "Very Useful," nearly 23.00% found it "Useful," while very few rated it as "Fairly Useful." These findings indicate a positive perception but also highlight areas for potential improvement.

In the context of the Commission on Higher Education (CHED), quality education is viewed as a crucial contributor to the country's economic development. CHED's role in promoting quality education is grounded in its legal mandate. As a government agency, CHED is tasked with ensuring that the delivery of quality education is upheld by higher learning institutions to achieve national development goals and improve the economic conditions of the Philippines. CHED has the authority to perform both regulatory and developmental roles. The issuance of CHED Memorandums (CMOs) is a part of ensuring quality in higher education, and all CMOs are mandatory for HEIs, subject to regular monitoring and evaluation, including CMO 09, S. 2013, which requires assessment.

A study by Morrison, et al. (2019) demonstrated that policy memorandums that clearly define leadership responsibilities tend to have significantly higher efficacy and satisfaction among leaders. This aligns with the "Very Useful" viewpoint, as these documents often include explicit rules that can be effectively implemented by leaders who prefer well-defined instructions for efficient governance. Moreover, Smith, et al. (2019) supported the claim that well-designed policies perceived as advantageous specifically address the roles and responsibilities of their users. This reinforces the established fact that most memoranda for student leaders are highly beneficial.

The evaluation of student affairs and services reveals that the highest-rated sections which are perceived as very useful and effectively meet student needs, based on mean ratings, are as follows:

- Section 5: Institutional Student Programs & Services (3.48)

- Section 1: Management and Administration of Student Affairs and Services (3.46)

- Section 4: Student Development (3.46)

- Section 3: Student Welfare (3.44)

- Section 2: Student Services Funds (3.40)

Conversely, the lowest-rated areas, while still receiving a useful description rating, are Section 6: Research on Student Affairs & Services (3.11) and Section 7: Monitoring & Evaluation (3.12). These areas indicate a need for improvement. Enhancing research efforts and strengthening monitoring and evaluation processes are essential to ensure that student services are data-driven, effective, and continuously improving, which will lead to better student outcomes and satisfaction.

Studies by Fischer et al. (2018) highlighted that strong administrative support and comprehensive student programs correlate positively with student engagement and success. These areas often receive high utility ratings in research as they directly impact students' daily experiences and contribute to a supportive learning environment. Effective management and administration ensure that student services align with institutional goals and are responsive to student needs, which is crucial for fostering an environment conducive to academic and personal growth.

CONCLUSION

The evaluation of the implementation of CMO 09 S. 2013 shows that while adherence to the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) guidelines is strong among SAS directors, personnel, and student leaders, there is a recognized need for structured interventions and clearer policy directives to improve student services further. Most Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) are compliant with CHED standards, yet improvements in Student Welfare services are necessary to support students' mental and physical health. Student leaders find the memorandum very useful, particularly in Institutional Student Programs & Services, but areas such as research and monitoring require enhancement. In conclusion, ongoing efforts and evaluations are critical to ensure that student needs are consistently met and to enrich the overall educational experience.

REFERENCES

1. Abbas, J. (2020). HEISQUAL: A modern approach to measure service quality in higher education institutions. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 67, 100933.
2. Akens, C., Wright-Mair, R., & Stevenson, J. M. (2019). College students and their environments: Understanding the role student affairs educators play in shaping campus environments. Charles C Thomas Publisher.
3. Amante, M., Gabon, R., & Boller, L. (2020). Adequacy and effectiveness of student affairs and services programs in Samar State University. Journal of Academic Research, 5(3), 39–46. https://jar.ssu.edu.ph/index.php/JAR/article/view/222/136
4. Amey, M., & Reesor, L. (2015). Assessment in student affairs practice. Research Gate, 4(6), 22. https://www.researchgate. net/publication/279176764_Assessment_in_Student_Affairs_Practice
5. Amit, Ronaldo. (2019). Assessment of student welfare programs in the state universities and colleges of Samar Island. Scientific Research and Development (its'd), ISSN: 2456- 6470, Volume-3 | Issue-3, April 2019, pp.832-836. Retrieved from URL: https://www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd23 175.pdf
6. Ariel, J., & Ibarrientos, R. (2015). Implementation and effectiveness of student affairs services program in One Polytechnic College. Part I Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 3(5), 144–156.http://www.apjmr.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/APJMR-2015-3.5.1.17.pdf
7. Arnold, W (2018). Strengthening college support services to improve student transitioning. Journal of College Teaching & Learning. Pepperdine University, USA. Vol 15, No.1
8. Attri, R. and Kushwaha, P. (2018), Enablers for good placements of graduates: fitting industry's needs, Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning, Vol. 8 No. 4, pp. 544-556. https://doi.org/10.1108/HESWBL-11-2017-0096
9. Buban, M. R. M., & Janer, S. S. (2022). Delivery of Student Affairs Services (SAS). Programs in Private Higher Education Institutions.

10. Cadag, C. (2017). Student services and their influence to student development. Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/348140881/Student_Services_and_their_Influence_to_student_Development caf.com

11. Chalufu, S., & Rheeder, C. (2022). Student affairs and services leadership in trying times: Student social Behaviour project and psycho-social support interventions at a comprehensive university in south Africa. Journal of Student Affairs in Africa, 10(2), 209-223.

12. CHED Memo, No. 9, s 2013. Enhanced Policies and Guidelines on Student Affairs and Services. https://chedro1.com/resources/issuances/ched-memorandum-orders/2013-ched-memorandum-orders/

13. CHED Memorandum No 8, Series of 2021 " Guidelines on the implementation of flexible delivery of student affairs and services programs. https://clir.mcl.edu.ph/downloads/CMO-No.-20-s.-2021.pdf

14. CHED Memorandum No 40, Series of 2008. Manual of Regulations for Private Higher Education. https://www.dlsu.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/pdf/announcements/ched-memorandum-order.pdf

15. CHED Memorandum 46., S 2012. Policy Standard to Enhance Quality Assurance (QA) in Philippine Higher Education Through an Outcomes-Based and Typology-Based QA https://chedro1.com/resources/issuances/ched-memorandum-orders/2012-ched-memorandum-orders/

16. Ciobanu, A. (2013). The role of student services in the improvement of student experience in higher education. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 92, 169-173.

17. Dioso, P. (2018). Compliance with Policies and Guidelines on Student Affairs and Services. https://doi.org/10.52006/main.v1i1.17

18. Evans, K. (2016). Exploring strategies that enhance assessment in student affairs. Library Northeastern Education. https://repository.library.northeastern.edu/files/neu:cj82m867q/fulltext.pdf

19. Herdlein, R., & Zurner, E. (2015). Student satisfaction, needs, and learning outcomes: a case study approach at a European university. Sage Open, 5(2), 2158244015580373.

20. Hoffman, J. (2015). Perceptions of Assessment Competency among New Student Affairs Professionals. Research & Practice in Assessment, 10, 46-62

21. Huber, S. G., & Helm, C. (2020). COVID-19 and schooling: evaluation, assessment and accountability in times of crises—reacting quickly to explore key issues for policy, practice and research with the school barometer. Educational assessment, evaluation and accountability, 32(2), 237-270.

22. Ibarrientos, J. R. (2015). Implementation and effectiveness of student affairs services program in one polytechnic college. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 3(5), 144-156.

23. Kaupa, S., & Olusegun Atiku, S. (2020). Challenges in the implementation of performance management system in Namibian public sector. International Journal of Innovation and Economic Development, 6(2), 25-34.

24. Kaput, K. (2018b). Evidence for Student-Centered Learning. Education Evolving; Education Evolving. 322 Minnesota Street Suite W1360, St. Paul, MN 55101. https://www.educationevolving.org/. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED581111

25. Ludeman, B & Schreiber, B. (2019). Student affairs and services in higher education: Global foundations, issues, and best practices. International Association of Student Affairs and Services. Retrieved on May 8, 2022, from https://iasas.global/student-affairs-services-in-higher-education-global-foundations-issues-and-best-practices/

26. Magolda, P. M., & Magolda, M. B. B. (Eds.). (2023). Contested issues in student affairs: Diverse perspectives and respectful dialogue.

27. Morrison, G. R., Ross, S. J., Morrison, J. R., & Kalman, H. K. (2019). Designing effective instruction.

28. Pope, R. L., Reynolds, A. L., & Mueller, J. A. (2019). Multicultural competence in student affairs: Advancing social justice and inclusion. John Wiley & Sons.

29. Vetter, M., et al., (2019). Leveraging the quantity and quality of co-curricular involvement experiences to promote student thriving. Journal of Campus Activities Practice and Scholarship, 1(1), 39-51. https://doi.org/10.52499/2019006

30. Viennet, R., & Pont, B. (2017). Education policy implementation: A literature review and proposed framework.

31. Watt, S. K., & Linley, J. L. (Eds.). (2014). Creating Successful Multicultural Initiatives in Higher Education and Student Affairs: New Directions for Student Services, Number 144. John Wiley & Sons.

32. Wilson, M. (2019). Student Services - colleges and universities, community colleges. Stateuniversity.com.https://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/2464/Student-Services.html