

# The Role of Registrar's Office in Delivering of Services in One State University

**Frances Riza N. Garcia**

Office of the Registrar, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Siniloan, Laguna, Philippines

## **Abstract**

This Descriptive-correlational study evaluated the role of the Registrar's Office in providing services at Laguna State Polytechnic University (LSPU) in terms of institutional context, operational efficiency, and quality of service delivery. It examined the effect of technology infrastructure, learning of the staff, resource allocation, and policy implementation on core services, such as course registration, academic advising, transcript processing, and graduation certification. Data were gathered by survey questionnaire to students, faculty, and administrative staff. For quantitative analysis, weighted means and Pearson correlation were used to identify relationships existing between the given variables. Results show the highest levels of satisfaction across all areas of service. Technology infrastructure, (mean = 4.31), and staff learning (mean = 4.27) significantly contribute to improving operational effectiveness. Resource allocation and well-articulated policies promote transparency and reliability in the registrar services. Course registration and graduation certification processes exhibit the highest satisfaction levels due to their efficient systems and punctuality. High associations between institutional factors and service quality were noted, especially significant relationships between resource allocation and graduation certification ( $r = 0.854$ ), and staff learning with overall satisfaction ( $r = 0.871$ ). Recommendations include continuing the institution's investment in digital infrastructure, staff training on regular basis, and sufficient resource allocation for tackling increasing service demands during peak hours. Policies must be student-centered and clearly articulated to improve efficiency and build trust in registrar services. It is anticipated that these measures will positively affect student satisfaction and institutional effectiveness.

**KEYWORDS:** Registrar's Office, Service Delivery, Operational Effectiveness, Service Quality

## **INTRODUCTION**

Modifications in technologies and automation overhauls have drastically affected the duties performed by a university registrar (Parks & Taylor, 2019). Once viewed as solely responsible for an extensive amount of manual work, including typing, filling out paper forms, and keeping the academic history of graduates, the office of the registrar more or less now behaves like a department of computers; there is total reliance on computers in all its processes.

According to Crabtree and Wright (2021), some tasks, such as filling out forms for data collection and preparing statistical returns, are being automated, but registrars are also adjusting by using their systems thinking, creativity, and venture management skills. This makes registrars crucial in enrollment management as they work with other departments to oversee the admission, retention, the graduation stages, as well as alumni relations.

One of the primary administrative units in an academic institution is the Office of the Registrar, which serves as the center for storing student records and oversees processes such as enrollment, student registration, transcript issuance and graduation clearance (Metto et al., 2020). The services rendered by this office are critical for the functioning of academic programs and the management of academic records. In higher education institutions such as Laguna State Polytechnic University (LSPU), the Office of the Registrar bridges a student's academic life from enrollment to graduation. The services of the Office of the Registrar go beyond enhancing students' satisfaction to also enhance their academic experience and the reputation of the institution.

Even though most of the literature discusses the conventional operational aspects of registrars' offices, there are hardly any publications focusing on how registrars can cope with the technologization of their duties and even take on additional responsibilities, such as managing the student life cycle and enrollment management. This lack of literature calls for recognizing the need to investigate the changing functions of the registrar's office in this era, especially in state universities.

This research investigated and evaluated the services of the Registrar's Office. More specifically, the study considered various approaches to service delivery in terms of timeliness and efficiency of enrollment and registration periods, the integrity of academic records, and the levels of satisfaction of both students and faculty regarding all services rendered.

It aimed to highlight the registrar's office's strengths and weaknesses in anticipation of future improvements in the quality of service offered. By collecting views from students, teachers, and administrative personnel, this study conducted a balanced assessment of the Registrar's Office's performance and differentiated its influence on the academic process in the LSPU Dean's Office.

## **OBJECTIVES**

This research aimed to assess the service delivery of the Office of the Registrar at Laguna State Polytechnic University (LSPU). Specifically, it sought to determine the demographic profile of respondents in terms of sex, age, marital status, campus, role at the institution, and years in the institution. It also aimed to assess the level of institutional context, focusing on technology infrastructure, staff learning, resource allocation, and policies and procedures. Additionally, the study evaluated the roles of the Office of the Registrar, specifically in relation to course registration, academic advising, transcript processing, and graduation certification. The research further aimed to measure the quality-of-service delivery in terms of overall satisfaction, service quality, efficiency, access to information, and timeliness. The study also sought to determine the significant relationships between institutional context and the roles of the registrar, institutional context and service delivery quality, and the roles of the registrar and service delivery quality. Lastly, it aimed to identify significant differences in service delivery perceptions based on the respondents' roles within the university.

## **METHODS**

A quantitative, descriptive-correlational design was used to examine relationships among institutional context, registrar functions, and service delivery outcomes (Creswell, 2014). The sample consisted of 396 respondents from LSPU's four campuses, including students, alumni, faculty, and staff. Systematic sampling ensured representative coverage across demographic categories (Taherdoost, 2016). A validated structured questionnaire using a 5-point Likert scale measured variables such as institutional context (technology infrastructure, staff learning, policies, resources), registrar roles, and service delivery quality.

Prior authorization from LSPU administration was secured. Respondents provided informed consent, and data confidentiality was strictly observed. Descriptive statistics summarized data. Pearson correlation and ANOVA tested associations between independent and dependent variables using SPSS v.26.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

### Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Three Hundred Ninety-Six (396) respondents are considered for demographic profiling, wherein 58% of the population are female, while the rest constitute 42% males. Age-wise, too, quite a large sample (95%) comprises individuals within the 16-25 age range, so the majority are young students or purposefully drawn from that segment. Such a large sample portrayal is also seen with respect to civil status; almost 95% are single, compared to a few married, separated, common-law, or widowed individuals. This further suggests that most respondents are at an early stage regarding their academic and professional career paths.

**Table 1. Demographic profile of the respondents.**

CATEGORY	VARIABLE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)
Sex			
	Male	167	42
	Female	229	58
Age			
	16-25	375	95
	26-35	12	3
	36-45	5	1
	46-55	2	0.5
	56-65	2	0.5
Civil Status			
	Married	14	3.5
	Single	376	95
	Separated/Divorced	1	0.25
	Common Law (Live In)	3	0.75
	Widow/Widower	2	0.5
Campus			
	Campus A	63	16
	Campus B	105	27
	Campus C	95	24
	Campus D	133	33
Role at the Institution			
	Alumni	9	2
	Non-Teaching	9	2
	Official	2	0.5
	Student	373	94.75
	Teaching	3	0.75
Years in the Institution			

	1-5 Years	376	95
	5-10 Years	9	2
	15-20 Years	7	2
	More than 20 Years	4	1
	Total	396	100

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the respondents. If representation is to be considered, most respondents are from Campus D (33%), Campus B with 27%, Campus C with 24%, and Campus A with 16%. This has a wide representation across campuses, with concentration at Sta. Cruz and San Pablo campuses. Mostly, regarding the roles they have assigned in an institution, 94.75% of them are students, which is considerably less when compared to other small proportions, such as alumni, non-teaching staff, officials, and teaching personnel. Therefore, this shows that the study was chiefly focused on the experience or perspective of students.

Most (95%) of respondents surveyed have spent between one and five years in the institution. This confirms that most are likely current students, with only a few possibly including staff or alumni who have stayed this long. These responses paint a clear demographic picture of a young population dominated by students with little time spent in the institution. Therefore, they are important sources of feedback for understanding and improving student services and the institution's operations.

## Level of Institutional Context

### Technology Infrastructure

Based on Table 2, responses from surveys regarding the technology infrastructure of institutions yield remarkably favorable results, with a general weighted mean of 4.3121, interpreted as "Very High". Those surveyed noted the effective integration of digital tools into student registration and management of academic records and the availability of user-friendly online systems. The consistently high ratings suggest that the office effectively provides digital services to address student needs for convenience and accessibility.

The findings also indicate that the office continues to establish and improve its digital infrastructure to deliver excellent delivery service. This strong agreement indicates a very proactive approach to integrating technology into the administrative processes. These systems should be maintained and upgraded regularly to ensure service quality and preparedness for future requirements.

**Table 2. Level of Technology Infrastructure**

Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The office thoroughly implements the use of digital tools to manage student registration and academic records.	4.3586	.77799	Very High
Students can access and manage their academic records online at digital office interfaces.	4.3106	.80315	Very High
The office has maximally embraced digital technology for the effective processing of student registrations and other administrative services.	4.3081	.79622	Very High

The office ensures user-friendly, accessible digital systems for all students.	4.2980	.78730	Very High
The office has continuously improved the digital infrastructure to enhance efficiency and service delivery.	4.2854	.79357	Very High
Overall	4.3121	.72087	Very High

Legend: 3.26–4.00–Very High; 2.51–3.25–High; 1.76–2.50–Low; 1.00–1.75–Very Low

Technology infrastructure is important in promoting efficiency and transparency concerning e-governance regarding higher education within university registrar (Dar, 2022). An established technology framework with proper maintenance guarantees secure, accessible, and reliable electronic services to the students. These fasten record processing and offer services that run timely in registration, advising, and issuance of graduation certificates. Investing in up-to-date and digital systems with absolute data security and confidentiality guarantees streamlined operations, reduced turnaround time, and transparency and accountability enhancement, thus enhancing good governance and service delivery in the universities.

## Staff Learning

The results on Staff Learning show the institution's strong commitment to continuous improvement and professional development. A general weighted mean of 4.2687, interpreted as "Very High," indicates that respondents recognize the institution's prioritization of life-long learning and its effort to ensure that the staff have regular updates of knowledge and skills. High scores also reflect faith in the staff's ability to handle complex tasks, deliver related services, and demonstrate proficiency and mastery in their roles.

**Table 3. Level of Staff Learning**

Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The institution devotes itself to lifelong learning and improvement.	4.3232	.78374	Very High
To stay relevant to market demands, the office's staff updates their knowledge and skills regularly.	4.2304	.80927	Very High
I trust the workforce's capabilities to understand and process complicated requests effectively.	4.2500	.82101	Very High
The staff demonstrates proficiency and mastery of roles.	4.2652	.85263	Very High
Training and development programs for staff further improve the service delivery.	4.2727	.80904	Very High
Overall	4.2687	.73957	Very High

Legend: 3.26–4.00–Very High; 2.51–3.25–High; 1.76–2.50–Low; 1.00–1.75–Very Low

Furthermore, the positive feedback highlights the importance of continuous training and development programs to enhance service delivery. The institution views staff learning as essential for ensuring that employees remain competent and adaptive to evolving requirements, thereby translating into overall efficiency and student satisfaction. It involves continuing, as it is inevitable, to keep high-use standards.

In an efficient management of student records in university registrar offices, a continuous staff development program is of utmost importance, as the study has suggested. This ongoing training will keep the staff updated with knowledge concerning records creation, classification, storing, and retrieving in dealing with challenges faced by private and public institutions (Metto et. Al, 2022). The culture of continuous learning, which includes exchanging best practices, should therefore be promoted by universities to help in the standardization of processes, efficiency in records management, and reliability and secure access to student information in varied institutional settings.

## Resource Allocation

Resource Allocation statistics describe a favorable response, with a general weighted average of 4.2994, interpreted as “Very High.” Respondents agree that the policies of student records under the university registrar are regularly reviewed, published, and aligned with the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) standards. Clear, easily accessible policies help toward transparency and equity, thus instilling confidence in the management of student records.

In addition, the visibility and demonstration of the regularly reviewed and revised university policies belong to an office committed to continuously improving services. Respondents strongly agree that resource allocation should be effectively managed to ensure clear communication, compliance, and fairness, which are all vital to maintaining efficient and transparent processes in the academic world.

**Table 4. Level of Resource Allocation**

Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The university registrar keeps policies in place whereby students have their academic records updated and well-publicized.	4.3182	.81117	Very High
University policies concerning student registration are clear and available to all students and staff.	4.3005	.82253	Very High
The office aligns with the Commission on Higher Education Policies regarding the University.	4.3443	.78884	Very High
University policies in the office are regularly reviewed and revised to improve service delivery.	4.2677	.83836	Very High
They promoted the transparency and fairness of student records managed by the office.	4.2652	.84667	Very High
Overall	4.2994	.76319	Very High

Legend: 3.26–4.00–Very High; 2.51–3.25–High; 1.76– 2.50–Low; 1.00–1.75- Very Low

Resource allocation becomes an important part of the university office for smooth operations. The distribution of financial, human, and technological resources aligns activities such as admissions processing, records management, graduation certification, and student services (Babatola, n.d.). Data-driven decision-making and continuous improvement improve service quality by promoting transparency and timely, accurate service delivery at student-centered services.



## University Policy and Procedure

The findings relative to the University Policy and Procedure show an overwhelmingly affirmative view, with an overall weighted mean of 4.2424, interpreted as "Very High." According to the respondents, the university registrar has effectively maintained updated academic records, well-publicized policies, and clearly defined student registration procedures. This further enhances the office's credibility and compliance with the national Commission on Higher Education (CHED) policy alignment standards.

In addition, the regular review and revision of the policies showcase the university's dedication to improving service delivery. It emphasizes transparency and fairness in the maintenance of student records, which builds trust and confidence among students and staff in an efficient and accountable academic environment.

Policies and procedures implemented at the university level significantly enhance the efficiency of the registrar's office and the effective disposition of its work. Clarity and strictness in policies bring about consistency in processes about the admission of students, maintenance of records, graduation certification, and delivery of services (Jacob & Solomon, 2021). In the university system in Nigeria, considerations for challenges such as funding inadequacies, staff issues, and the inability to develop capacity must focus on very strong policies that will create avenues for accountability, resource allocation, and staff training.

**Table 5. Level of University Policy and Procedure**

Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The university registrar keeps policies in place whereby students have their academic records updated and well-publicized.	4.2247	.82523	Very High
University policies concerning student registration are clear and available to all students and staff.	4.2500	.81792	Very High
The office aligns with the Commission on Higher Education Policies regarding the University.	4.2247	.85536	Very High
University policies in the office are regularly reviewed and revised to improve service delivery.	4.2430	.85001	Very High
They promoted the transparency and fairness of student records managed by the office.	4.2677	.82313	Very High
Overall	4.2424	.76560	Very High

Legend: 3.26–4.00–Very High; 2.51–3.25–High; 1.76–2.50–Low; 1.00–1.75–Very Low

## Level of Roles of the Office of the Registrar

### Course Registration

The outcome of the Course Registration under the Level of Roles of the Office of the Registrar is highly favorable, judging from an overall average score of 4.3273, which is interpreted as "Very High". Respondents recognize the efficiency and convenience of the enrollment process, with the highest score of 4.4419 about satisfaction caused by streamlined and accessible systems. Registration is further made easier for students with clear instructions and staff availability.

Moreover, there is an endorsement that handling registration errors within the process is clear and feasible, resulting in minimal interruption. The outcome indicates how well the office has provided a functioning

course registration system, therefore falling within student expectations of it being convenient and supportive; thus, strengthening the institution's promise to the roles of the office of the registrar.

**Table 6. Level of Course Registration**

Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
It is efficient to enroll in the course registration process.	4.4419	.80452	Very High
Explicit instructions regarding the process for requesting course registration changes are available at the Office.	4.3737	.79347	Very High
I am satisfied with the staff's availability during course registration.	4.3157	.84125	Very High
The process for dealing with registration errors is open and easy to manage.	4.2374	.87103	Very High
The whole course registration system is what I expect from this system regarding convenience.	4.2677	.83230	Very High
Overall	4.3273	.74287	Very High

Legend: 3.26–4.00–Very High; 2.51–3.25–High; 1.76– 2.50–Low; 1.00–1.75- Very Low

Course registration has changed dramatically through the university registrar's office with the introduction of mobiles, providing students more flexibility, convenience, and accessibility (Uche & Kanifing, 2020). Mobile course registration allows students to enroll for courses anytime and from anywhere, eliminating the requirement to be physically present on campus.

As universities continue to adopt mobile solutions, the registrar's role will expand to managing and executing such technology to facilitate a seamless and student-friendly experience, ultimately improving service and satisfaction levels among students.

## Academic Advising

This indicates a very strong positive impression regarding Academic Advising, with a general weighted mean of 4.268, interpreted as "Very High." Respondents acknowledged that academic advising services fairly assist in planning their academic path, and personalized guidance meets their expectations. The highest score of 4.3485 highlights the accessibility of information regarding academic policies and requirements, which supports informed decision-making for students.

Moreover, it strongly affirms that the registrar's office provides enough support to students in addressing academic concerns, similar to the professional advising sessions with the student in mind. This highlights the institution's commitment to being responsive and student-centered in academic advising services that add value to and enrich a student's learning experience.

The university's registrar is evolving beyond administrative tasks for academic advising in data and system integration. Accurate, real-time data from the registrar informs decision-making about student progress, course planning, and degree completion from the combined resources of technology and expertise in managing student record-keeping. Registrars, uniquely positioned between academic and student affairs,



play a crucial role in coordinating efforts within the university to improve the advising process, ensuring students receive timely guidance and support throughout their educational journey (Parks & Taylor, 2019).

**Table 7. Level of Academic Advising**

Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Academic advising services are available and will assist me in planning my academic path.	4.2146	.84006	Very High
The quality of the academic advising procedure meets my expectations about personalized guidance.	4.2197	.82045	Very High
The Registrar's office provides adequate support to pursue academic grievances and queries.	4.2828	.78325	Very High
Advising sessions are conducted more professionally, focusing on student needs.	4.2753	.78756	Very High
Information about academic policies and requirements is easily accessible.	4.3485	.80490	Very High
Overall	4.2682	.72851	Very High

Legend: 3.26–4.00–Very High; 2.51–3.25–High; 1.76–2.50–Low; 1.00–1.75–Very Low

## Transcript Processing

The findings on Transcript Processing show that the response is highly favorable, with an overall weighted mean of 4.2702, interpreted as "Very High." Respondents reported that the processing was efficient, with transcript requests fulfilled within a reasonable time frame and the information being accurate and error-free. Communication from the office regarding the TOR procedure was also clear, which helped smooth the student experience.

Furthermore, the simplicity and ease of the request process, coupled with effective assistance for any inquiries, highlight the office's commitment to delivering reliable and efficient services. These positive impressions suggest that the institution maintains high standards in transcript processing, ensuring continued student satisfaction.

**Table 8. Level of Transcript Processing**

Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Requests for transcripts of records (TOR) are processed within a reasonable timeframe.	4.2677	.82925	Very High
The information mentioned in my transcript of records is accurate and without errors	4.2727	.80276	Very High
The office has very good communication regarding the process of TOR.	4.2929	.80508	Very High

The TOR request process is very easy and user-friendly.	4.2601	.82402	Very High
I'm satisfied with the extent of quality assistance concerning TOR issues.	4.2576	.80147	Very High
Overall	4.2702	.74495	Very High

Legend: 3.26–4.00–Very High; 2.51–3.25–High; 1.76– 2.50–Low; 1:00–1.75- Very Low

The university registrar processes the student's transcript by checking course completions, grades, and degree requirements to create an official transcript that accurately reflects a student's academic achievements. As the custodian of academic data, the registrar ensures that transcripts comply with institutional guidelines and external verification requirements. This process is a crucial factor in facilitating students' transition into further education, jobs, or professional licensing bodies (AL-Tahtamoni, 2019). Attention to detail and a commitment to data integrity by the registrar are essential to maintaining the credibility and reliability of academic records.

## Graduation Certification

Roles of the Office of the Registrar indicate that the results drawn from the University Policy and Procedure were viewed positively. The general weighted mean is 4.2596, interpreted as "Strongly Agree." Respondents confirmed that graduation requirements and processes are clearly outlined and easily understood, giving students the confidence to go through important academic milestones. The system also ensures that certification requests are handled competently and delivered in a timely manner.

The office effectively addressed academic load-related queries and actively provided support in resolving problems regarding graduation and certification. Overall, students have great confidence in the accuracy and timely receipt of graduation-related documents, reflecting the institution's commitment to upholding high standards in administrative processes to ensure student satisfaction and trust.

According to Samson et al. (2024), the university registrar certifies that students have met all academic requirements for graduation. They are responsible for issuing official certificates and diplomas, ensuring their accuracy and authenticity.

**Table 9. Level of Graduation Certification**

Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Graduation requirements and processes are well spelled out and easily understood.	4.2475	.80779	Very High
Certification requests are processed accurately, and time-bound delivery is fulfilled.	4.2626	.79347	Very High
Effective Management of Academic Load-related Queries; the Office.	4.2500	.79913	Very High
Support effectively and reliably resolving issues related to graduation and certification.	4.2626	.80926	Very High
I'm confident about the accuracy and timeliness of graduation-related documents.	4.2753	.80347	Very High

Overall	4.2596	.74717	Very High
---------	--------	--------	-----------

Legend: 3.26–4.00–Very High; 2.51–3.25–High; 1.76–2.50–Low; 1.00–1.75–Very Low

## Level of Service Delivery Quality

### Overall Satisfaction

Overall Satisfaction results under Level of Service Delivery Quality reflect a favorable response, with a weighted mean of 4.2566, interpreted as "Very High." Respondents expressed satisfaction with the overall quality of services provided by the Office, as their needs and expectations were reportedly being constantly met. The high ratings indicate that services are satisfactory from the students' point of view, and they appreciate their options available to them.

In addition, greater agreement means that students would easily recommend the services to others, thereby establishing trust through high-quality experiences. Feedback on overall satisfaction will further validate the office's effectiveness in sustaining reliable and student-centered service delivery.

**Table 10. Level of Overall Satisfaction**

Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
I am content with the university's overall quality of service rendered to me by the office.	4.3081	.83350	Very High
The options the office provides are as much as I require.	4.2475	.82638	Very High
I recommend the office services to fellow students.	4.2652	.85560	Very High
The office is usually happy to deliver high-grade experiences.	4.2424	.83700	Very High
My overall experience with the office has been satisfactory.	4.2197	.85667	Very High
Overall	4.2566	.76904	Very High

Legend: 3.26–4.00–Very High; 2.51–3.25–High; 1.76–2.50–Low; 1.00–1.75–Very Low

Good processes, accurate record information, and responsive customer services drive overall satisfaction with the university registrar (Chavez, 2024). In this way, the timely provision of services such as enrollment, transcript processing, and graduation certification strengthens student experience and builds trust in academic administration.

### Service Quality

The results for Service Quality indicate that a strong positive perception is held consistently, with a general weighted mean of 4.2586, categorizing it as "Very High." The students appreciated the office for informing them via timely communication regarding key policies and procedures, especially concerning registration. The staff's knowledge and skills in addressing student concerns about registration and academic records are also highly regarded.

**Table 11. Level of Service Quality**

Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The office will inform students regarding time-bound policies and registration procedures.	4.2727	.83975	Very High
The office staff is quite knowledgeable and adept at helping students resolve registration and other academic records-related issues.	4.2904	.81692	Very High
They provide accurate information to students during registration regarding processes, dates, deadlines and policies.	4.2525	.85202	Very High
The office manages the problems and concerns of students in a very professional and timely manner.	4.2449	.85572	Very High
Students are content with the services that the registrar has offered.	4.2323	.84588	Very High
Overall	4.2586	.77073	Very High

Legend: 3.26–4.00–Very High; 2.51–3.25–High; 1.76–2.50–Low; 1.00–1.75–Very Low

In addition, the office's accurate information, impeccable standard of professionalism, and alacrity in tackling student issues are commendable attributes. Altogether, these findings represent the students' satisfaction with registrar services, focusing on reliability, efficiency, and student-orientedness.

The service quality that the university registrar's offices provide is critical to the efficient and correct delivery of services, since it directly associates with student satisfaction (Chavez & Namoco, 2024). By addressing common issues such as delays and errors, which are among the most common problems faced by most registrar environments, through systematic quality improvement strategies in the registrar's office, process improvement in efficiency, accuracy, and responsiveness will take place, thereby fostering a more reliable, student-centered experience.

## Efficiency

The results for Efficiency reveal a really positive perception generally, with a weighted average of 4.2121, interpreted as "Very High." The students acknowledged that the office has indeed made efforts to facilitate registration and records services in a timely and accurate manner, thereby improving their appreciation of constant enhancement of processes for efficient service delivery.

However, there is some concern regarding delays at peak periods—registration and graduation—where responses tend to be "Fairly Agree." This implies an area for further enhancement of the office's methods of managing high demand to ensure they can maintain the same efficiency level throughout the year.

The study found that the efficient management of student records determines the efficiency of a university registrar's office (Metto et al., 2022). This study made a case for clear policies, resources, up-to-date electronic systems for record-keeping, and regular staff training to ensure accurate, secure, and accessible student information, which, in turn, helps to streamline service delivery and enhance institutional efficiency.

**Table 12. Level of Efficiency**

Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The office receives and processes requests for registration and records services for students quickly and efficiently.	4.2323	.83685	Very High
Students experience minimal delays in obtaining services from the office.	4.1768	.86803	High
Efficiency and accuracy characterize the office in providing student services.	4.2475	.82023	Very High
At peak times, such as registration and graduation periods, the office operates efficiently without significant delays.	4.1616	.85633	High
The office continuously works to improve the processes for developing service efficiency.	4.2424	.86086	Very High
Overall	4.2121	.76602	Very High

Legend: 3.26–4.00–Very High; 2.51–3.25–High; 1.76–2.50–Low; 1.00–1.75–Very Low

## Access to Information

The Access to Information results indicate very high satisfaction levels, with a weighted mean of 4.2636, interpreted as “Very High.” Respondents confirmed that the registrar's office keeps accurate and up-to-date records, ensuring strong protective measures for data security and privacy. The reliability of data management practices in place, and routine audits safeguards the completeness and accuracy of student data.

Furthermore, respondents appreciate the transparent process for updating student records. This stands as a testimony to the office's commitment to ensuring accessibility and accountability in processing student data. These findings convey the office's better performance in providing a secure and reliable way of accessing information.

**Table 13. Level of Access to Information**

Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
The Office accurately maintains student records up to date.	4.2601	.84525	Very High
The office has systems in place to effectively maintain the security and privacy of the student data.	4.2828	.81493	Very High
Data management practices at the office ensure that student information is accessible and reliable.	4.2702	.84507	Very High

Student Records are audited regularly by the Registrars for completeness and accuracy checks.	4.2576	.82020	Very High
A transparent process in the office allows students to change their records when necessary.	4.2475	.84156	Very High
Overall	4.2636	.76717	Very High

Legend: 3.26–4.00–Very High; 2.51–3.25–High; 1.76–2.50–Low; 1.00–1.75–Very Low

In the automated information systems developed for academic reference, university registrars are the main actors (Habib et al., 2021). They use management information systems to allow students and faculty easy access to crucial records, course content, and academic services, thereby encouraging transparency, convenience, and efficacy of the institution.

## Timeliness

Timeliness was rated mostly positively with a general weighted mean of 4.2035, interpreted as “Very High.” Timeliness matters greatly to students; they appreciate that the services offered from the office are generally completed within a reasonable timeframe, and their staff members address their concerns promptly. This emphasis on timeliness shows the efficiency of the office's delivery service.

**Table 14. Level of Timeliness**

Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Office services have time standards that are met within a reasonable range of completion.	4.2096	.86215	Very High
I am satisfied with how promptly the staff addressed my concerns.	4.2096	.85921	Very High
The processing time for requests is below expectations.	4.1692	.87100	Very High
The office ensures effective communication in case of any service delays.	4.1894	.85209	Very High
Timeliness is one thing the office considers highly in its services.	4.23992	.83319	Very High
Overall	4.2035	.78394	Very High

However, some slight concerns have been pointed out regarding the processing and communication of service delays, hence, the Fairly Agree ratings. This shows that there is still an opportunity to further improve the speed of service and communication when delays do happen.

The study emphasizes timely service delivery in registration offices as one of the major objectives of acquiring automated systems (Bagacay et al., 2024). Thus, by optimizing processes and minimizing manual intervention, the registrar's office can enhance the turnaround time for all academic records, ensuring efficiency and prompt service to students and stakeholders.



## Relationship between Institutional Context and Roles of the Office of the Registrar

Examining the relationship between institutional context, including technology infrastructure, staff education, the allocation of resources, and policies and procedures, was undertaken in the case of operational efficiency in the Registrar's Office. The results provided evidence of strong positive relationships between those institutional factors and core operational functions such as course registration, academic advising, processing transcripts, and graduation certification. Particularly, the infrastructure for technology had a strong association with graduation certification ( $r=0.829$ ), indicating that newer and reliable technological systems are essential for delivering timely and precise services related to graduation. On the other hand, staff education exhibited the highest correlation with graduation certification ( $r=0.846$ ), stating that continuous training and development are vital to equip the workforce with the needed competencies to run complex academic procedures efficiently. Similarly, resource allocation has shown a very high correlation with graduation certification ( $r=0.854$ ), confirming that the proper distribution of resources, whether human, financial, or technological, plays an important role in maintaining seamless operations, in particular at peak demand times. Similarly, clear policies and procedures were strongly correlated with graduation certification ( $r = 0.847$ ), indicating that well-defined guidelines contribute to consistency, transparency, and ease of service delivery.

**Table 15. Relationship between Institutional Context and Roles of the Office of the Registrar**

Correlation Values	Roles of the Office of the Registrar				Interpretation	Conclusion
	Course Registration	Academic Advising	Transcript Processing	Graduation Certificate		
Technology Infrastructure	0.786	0.793	0.799	0.829	Reject the Null Hypothesis	Significant
Staff Learning	0.794	0.826	0.835	0.846	Reject the Null Hypothesis	Significant
Policy and Procedures	0.784	0.816	0.82	0.847	Reject the Null Hypothesis	Significant
Resource Allocation	0.781	0.821	0.832	0.854	Reject the Null Hypothesis	Significant

**\*\* All obtained 0.00 p-value indicating significance**

The implications of these findings show that enhancing these institutional factors can bring improvements in the roles of the registrar's office. Investment in high technology will make the processes smoother and reduce delays, while continuing staff development makes personnel knowledgeable and skilled. All these would mean necessary resource allocation to keep the department efficient and avoid service disruptions. Thus, simple, clear, and student-friendly policies and procedures compel a smoother transaction, all with less effort on building student trust and satisfaction. Ultimately, these improvements lead to improved quality, busier service delivery in the university, and a higher student satisfaction index, thus improving the institution's reputation as a whole for operational excellence.

The interrelationship between the contextual factors in the institution and roles in the university registrar's office makes for an infallible efficiency of service delivery and maintenance of academic integrity. The

operations of the registrar are subject to the influence of the rules and regulations of the relevant institutions, the technological infrastructure, and the governance structures, whose interplay determines how effective these actors will be in the management of student records, enrollment procedures, and certification services (Folorunso, 2024). Therefore, where their operations are in tandem with the institutions' goals and are supported by a good technological infrastructure, enhancement of accuracy, data security, and promptness can become a reality for the registrar's office. This further integration enables smooth delivery of academic services by strengthening operational efficiency and enhancing stakeholder trust.

## Relationship between Institutional Context and Service Delivery Quality of Registrar's Office

Findings establish a relationship between the elements of institutional context and the service delivery quality of the Registrar's Office. Major institutional factors-much such as technology infrastructure (TI), staff learning (SL), resource allocation (RA), as well as policies and procedures (PAP)-were all found to be significantly correlated with different dimensions of services quality including overall satisfaction (OS), service quality (SQ), process efficiency or Delay on Service Encounter (DOSE), access to information (ATI), and timeliness (T).

Generally, technology infrastructure showed a strong relationship with access to information ( $r=0.846$ ), indicating that an efficient system ensures the data is accessible, accurate, and secure. Staff learning had a greater correlation with overall satisfaction ( $r=0.871$ ), suggesting that the student experiences and confidence in services are hugely improved by well-trained staff. Resource allocation and Policy and Procedures also demonstrated strong correlations across all areas of service delivery, particularly in access to information (RA from  $r=0.873$ ) and policies and procedures showing the highest correlation with access to information ( $r = 0.882$ ) This indicates the importance of having efficient processes and properly allocated resources in place to ensure effectiveness and the quality of services delivered.

Such results suggest that improving institutional support, technological investments, continuous staff development, adequate resource endowment, and well-defined operational guidelines could directly strengthen the quality-of-service delivery. This would increase student satisfaction, ensure timely and efficient service, and provide reassurance of reliability. The Registrar's Office, therefore, stands to benefit from higher institutional standards by attaining better operational performance, which, in turn, would enhance the overall student experience.

**Table 16. Relationship between Institutional Context and Service Delivery Quality**

Correlation al Values	Service Delivery Quality					Interpretati on	Conclusio n
	Overall Satisfactio n	Servic e Qualit y	Efficienc y	Access to Informatio n	Timeline ss		
Technology Infrastructur e	0.821	0.826	0.815	0.846	0.811	Reject the Null Hypothesis	Significan t
Staff Learning	0.871	0.839	0.857	0.868	0.839	Reject the Null Hypothesis	Significan t

Policy and Procedures	0.869	0.871	0.866	0.882	0.86	Reject the Null Hypothesis	Significant
Resource Allocation	0.868	0.875	0.872	0.873	0.857	Reject the Null Hypothesis	Significant

**\*\* All obtained 0.00 p-value indicating significance**

Institutional policies, resources, and technological capabilities all directly impact the registrar's role in managing enrollment, registration, or records management. Clear institutional guidelines, sufficient staffing, and well-established systems could enable the registrar's office to provide timely, accurate, and perhaps student-centered services (Lumadi, 2021). On the other hand, poorly resourced or inefficient administrative structures might lead to delays, inaccuracies, and student dissatisfaction. By strengthening institutional support, the registrar's office could deliver more effective, high-quality service, better fulfilling student needs.

## Relationship between Roles of the Office of the Registrar and Service Delivery Quality of the Registrar's Office

The analysis results revealed that the roles within the Registrar's Office play a strong and significant role in determining service quality delivery. Indeed, the roles represented by Course Registration (CR), Academic Advising (AA), Transcript Processing (TP), and Graduation Certification (GC), all showed positive correlations with service quality indicators. Graduation Certification (GC) had the greatest positive correlation with timeliness (T) at  $r = .821$ , implying that the efficiency of managing the graduation requirements majorly contributes to timely service. In addition, Academic Advising (AA) exhibited the greatest correlation with overall satisfaction (OS) at  $r = .813$ , highlighting that personalized academic guidance actively improves students' perceptions of registrar services.

High correlations are also evident in Transcript Processing (TP), particularly in relation to access to information (ATI) at  $r = .807$  and timeliness (T) at  $r = .811$ . This reaffirms that accurate and timely handling of student records is the crux of efficient information management and service delivery. Course Registration (CR) also demonstrated a significant correlation, though slightly lower than the other factors, further emphasizing the relevance of a smooth registration process to service quality and efficiency.

Implications of the findings indicate that increasing the Roles of the Office of the Registrar will directly affect service delivery quality. Well-managed processes such as registration, advising, records management, and graduation certification lead to greater satisfaction of students with timely services, access to reliable information, and overall efficiency. Thus, further improvement in these operational areas is crucial for preserving high-quality services and living up to the expectations of students.

According to Namasaka et. al (2020), the roles of the office of the registrar and service delivery quality closely intertwined within the aspects of the university registrar's office. Efficient internal processes, like fast-track recruitment and ongoing staff training, allow the registrar's office to provide timely, accurate, high-quality service to students. With streamlined operations, such as through technology, clear-cut procedures, and trained personnel, the registrar's office may efficiently process student records, enrollment, and certification. This service delivery quality aspect now means fast response time, fewer processing application mistakes, and reliable office support.

**Table 17. Relationship between Roles of the Office of the Registrar and Service Delivery Quality**

Correlation al Values	Service Delivery Quality					Interpretati on	Conclusio n
	Overall Satisfactio n	Servic e Qualit y	Efficienc y	Access to Informatio n	Timeline ss		
Course Registration	.798	.774	.757	.769	.761	Reject the Null Hypothesis	Significan t
Academic Advising	.813	.793	.805	.791	.804	Reject the Null Hypothesis	Significan t
Transcript Processing	.805	.807	.784	.807	.811	Reject the Null Hypothesis	Significan t
Graduation Certification	.811	.800	.810	.810	.821	Reject the Null Hypothesis	Significan t

**\*\* All obtained 0.00 p value indicating significance**

## Significant Difference Among Responses Grouped According to Role in the Institution

The role of the respondent strongly affected the perception of various key areas, as indicated by the ANOVA results. Statistically significant differences were observed in the average scores in the areas of Transcript Processing, Graduation Certification, Technology Infrastructure, Overall Satisfaction, Efficiency, and Access to Information along the different roles within the university ( $p < 0.05$  for all conditions). This implies that people in different roles are more likely to experience varying expectations and levels of satisfaction with these particular services and resources.

For the variables where the effect of "Role in the Institution" was significant (Transcript Processing, Graduation Certification, Technology Infrastructure, Overall Satisfaction, Efficiency, and Access to Information), staff, students, and faculty members probably have different average perceptions of these services or aspects within the university. For instance, students may view Transcript Processing differently—the students request it, directly interfacing with that service—while faculty view it based on their use or submission of information relating to it. The staff using that technology infrastructure daily may hold an entirely different perspective regarding the functioning of that infrastructure compared to students or faculty. These significant differences indicate that the distinct groups have had differing experiences and priorities for these particular areas. Consequently, programs designed to enhance or evaluate Transcript Processing, Gradation Certification, Technology Infrastructure, Overall Satisfaction, Efficiency, and Access to Information must foreground and rigorously evaluate the differing perspectives, barriers, and expectations for staff, students, and faculty to be truly effective.

However, for multiple other variables like Course Registration, Academic Advising, Staff Learning, Policy and Procedures, Resource Allocation, Service Quality Timeliness, the ANOVA revealed that the respondent's role in the institution did not create a statistically significant difference in the reported average

scores (all  $p > 0.05$ ). The interpretation of this is that, on average, the people in the different roles included in the study perceive these particular services and aspects of the institutional context similarly.

**Table 18. Differences among Variables when grouped according to Roles in the institution**

Variables	Mean Square	F	p	Interpretation	Conclusion
Course Registration	0.883	1.61	0.171	Fail to reject the null hypothesis.	Not significant
Academic Advising	0.966	1.836	0.121	Fail to reject the null hypothesis.	Not significant
Transcript Processing	1.424	2.608	0.035	Reject the null hypothesis.	Significant
Graduation Certification	1.335	2.425	0.048	Reject the null hypothesis.	Significant
Technology Infrastructure	1.721	3.392	0.01	Reject the null hypothesis.	Significant
Staff Learning	1.229	2.276	0.06	Fail to reject the null hypothesis.	Not significant
Policy and Procedures	1.339	2.33	0.056	Fail to reject the null hypothesis.	Not significant
Resource Allocation	1.08	1.858	0.117	Fail to reject the null hypothesis.	Not significant
Overall Satisfaction	1.555	2.673	0.032	Reject the null hypothesis.	Significant
Service Quality	1.201	2.043	0.088	Fail to reject the null hypothesis.	Not significant
Efficiency	1.545	2.677	0.032	Reject the null hypothesis.	Significant
Access to Information	1.533	2.648	0.033	Reject the null hypothesis.	Significant
Timeliness	1.195	1.964	0.099	Fail to reject the null hypothesis.	Not significant

**\*\*Significant at  $p > 0.05$  NS- Not significant s- Significant**

In contrast, although several variables are not statistically significant (Course Registration, Academic Advising, Staff Learning, Policies and Procedures, Resource Allocation, Service Quality, and Timeliness), the groups seem to hold similar perceptions. This implies that their experiences or opinions about services like Course Registration, Academic Advising, and the perceived Service Quality and Timeliness are reasonably homogeneous across these main institutional roles. Individual differences certainly exist within each group, but the average perception among staff, students, and faculty across these areas does not differ significantly.

This may suggest that any university-wide initiatives aimed at improving or marketing Courses Registration, Academic Advising, Staff Learning, Policies and Procedures, Resource Allocation, Service Quality, and Timeliness will presumably resonate in a similar fashion among these major populations. Still, monitoring the feedback provided by the differing groups will provide further insight concerning the general efficacy of their interventions and help spot variations existing at some subgroup level, which falls beyond the scope of this particular analysis.

## CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results, the researcher infers rejection of the null hypothesis. The findings indicate that institutional context and roles in the university registrar's office positively and significantly correlate. Institutional factors such as technology infrastructure, staff learning, resource allocation, and clearly defined policies and procedures strongly correlate with key operational functions: course registration, academic advising, transcript processing, and graduation certification. Therefore, the first hypothesis was rejected, which stated that there is no significance between institutional context and the roles of the registrar's office.

This established a significant relationship between institutional context and service delivery quality. The findings revealed that deliberately well-developed institutional structures directly affected different facets of service delivery, including general satisfaction among students, quality of service, efficiency of processes, access to information, and timeliness. As a result, institutional factors such as resource allocation and policy clarity were particularly influential in ensuring services were delivered efficiently, reliably, and student-centered. Therefore, the second null hypothesis, stating that there is no significant relationship between institutional context and service delivery quality of the registrar's office, was rejected. Finally, the results confirmed a significant relationship between the registrar's office's roles and service delivery quality. The effectiveness of processes such as graduation certification and academic advising had a very strong correlation with the timely delivery of services, satisfaction, and access to reliable student information. Given these facts and the strong correlation, this led to the third null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between the roles of the registrar's office and the service delivery quality of the registrar's office being rejected. These findings underscored the importance of supporting institutions and the roles of the registrar's office in increasing the quality of services undertaken by the registrar's office.

The positive interrelationships highlighted in this study further correlate with the five dimensions characterized by the SERVQUAL Model—namely, tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy—that differentiate their presence or absence in the registrar's service delivery at LSPU. The significant correlations among institutional context, the roles of the registrar, and service quality illustrated conditions in which improved infrastructure, staff competency, and clarity in processes enhanced the responsiveness and reliability with which student needs are addressed. Hence, aligning the registrar's service functions with the SERVQUAL framework would allow LSPU to satisfy or exceed stakeholders' expectations, resulting in student satisfaction and enhanced institutional credibility.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

From these results, the researcher drew the following recommendations:

1. Increasing efficiency in peak periods by considering strategies for managing high-demand periods, such as registration and graduation seasons, to address complaints of delays.



2. Enhance communication regarding service delays by providing students enough timely notice of any processing concerns, ensuring transparency and effective control of expectations.
3. During peak service periods, make additional staff available so that response times can be expedited and service efficiency maintained, especially for enrollment and graduation certification.
4. Minimize processing times for student requests by further optimizing set workflows for consistent and automated service delivery.
5. Provide regular training on customer service and time management to help staff members acquire the skills to handle inquiries effectively and with high levels of student satisfaction.

## REFERENCES

### A. BOOKS

1. Angrave, L., Jensen, K.J., Zhang, Z., Mahipal, C., Mussulman, D., Schmitz, C.D., Baird, R., Liu, H.G., Sui, R., Wu, M., & Kooper, R. (2020). Improving student accessibility, equity, course performance, and lab skills: How introduction of ClassTranscribe is changing engineering education at the University of Illinois.
2. Carvajal, A.C., & Sotelo, N.L. (2021). Políticas, enseñanza y aprendizaje de la escritura en la universidad.
3. Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
4. Wolz, E., Gottlieb, M., & Pongratz, H. (2021). Digital Credentials in Higher Education Institutions: A Literature Review. Lecture Notes in Information Systems and Organisation.
5. Hope, J. (2022). Design a graduation application process that promotes completion. The Successful Registrar.
6. Hope, J. (2022). Review lessons from the pandemic to be ready for the next crisis. The Successful Registrar.

### B. JOURNALS AND OTHER PUBLICATIONS

1. AGUNZA, S. (2024). GOVERNANCE IN NIGERIA UNIVERSITIES: THE POSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY REGISTRAR. International Journal of Assessment and Evaluation in Education.
2. Akhmetsadyk, Z., Mynbayeva, A., & Kudaibergenova, A. (2023). University psychological support services in Almaty. The Journal of Psychology & Sociology.
3. Akinlabi (2021). GOAL SETTING AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE: A STUDY OF SOUTHWEST UNIVERSITIES' REGISTRY WORKERS IN NIGERIA.
4. Al-Maskari, A., Al-Riyami, T., & Kunjumuhammed, S.K. (2021). Students academic and social concerns during COVID-19 pandemic. Education and Information Technologies, 27, 1 - 21.
5. AL-Tahtamoni, H. M. S. (2019). Investigating Oral Communication Strategies Used by Registrar's Office Employees in an International University Context: A Case Study (Master's thesis, Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU)-Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi (DAÜ)).
6. Arndt, T., & Guercio, A. (2020). Blockchain-Based Transcripts for Mobile Higher-Education. International Journal of Information and Education Technology, 10, 84-89.
7. Arvanitakis, J., Judd, M., Kinash, S., Jorre de st Jorre, T., & McCluskey, T. (2019). Research into the diversification of university careers in learning and teaching and intentionally closing-the-loop on graduate employability. Journal of Teaching and Learning for Graduate Employability.

8. Assiri, A., Al-malaise, A.S., & Brdesee, H.S. (2020). From Traditional to Intelligent Academic Advising: A Systematic Literature Review of e-Academic Advising. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 11.
9. Ayodele, M.S., & Oginni, B.O. (2019). Effect Of Product Innovation On Customer Satisfaction: An Overview Of Insight Into Nigerian Service Market. *International journal of social sciences*, 4, 1-7.
10. Azizah, A., Bujawati, E., & Arranury, Z. (2022). OVERVIEW OF SATISFACTION SOCIETY OF SERVICE COUNTER REGISTRATION OF OUTPATIENT HEALTH. *Hospital Management Studies Journal*.
11. Babatola, J. E. T. The Registry–Administrative Approaches and Strategies in the University System.
12. Bagacay, I. R. V., Talatala, E. A., & Soberano, K. T. (2024). Streamlining School Registration: An Innovative Automated System for Registrars.
13. Begum, S.S. (2024). JARVIS - Customer Support Chatbot with ML. *INTERANTIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN ENGINEERING AND MANAGEMENT*.
14. Chavez, J. C., & Namoco, C. S. (2024). A Cross-Institutional Analysis of Service Quality Improvements Using SPC and SERVQUAL Frameworks in University Registrar Offices. *Journal of Harbin Engineering University*, 45(7), 183-194.
15. Chavez, J. C. (2024). Integrating SERVQUAL and Statistical Process Control Techniques for Service Quality Improvements in a University's Registrar Office.
16. Chen, M.C., Sze, S.N., Goh, S.L., Sabar, N.R., & Kendall, G. (2021). A Survey of University Course Timetabling Problem: Perspectives, Trends and Opportunities. *IEEE Access*, 9, 106515-106529.
17. Cooharojananone, N., Dilokpabhaphat, J., Rimnong-ang, T., Choosuan, M., Bunram, P., Atchariyachanvanich, K., & Pongnumkul, S. (2019). A Data Visualization for Helping Students Decide Which General Education Courses to Enroll: Case of Chulalongkorn University. *International Conference on Innovative Technologies and Learning*.
18. Crabtree, G., & Wright, D. (2021). Beyond Collaboration: A Registrar and Institutional Research Journey. *Strategic Enrollment Management Quarterly*, 9(2), 37-47.
19. Dar, S. A. (2022). Role of E-governance in Higher Education in Jammu and Kashmir. *Journal of Psychology and Political Science (JPPS)* ISSN, 2799-1024.
20. Delaney, M.K., Cleary, A., Cohen, P., & Devlin, B. (2020). Library Staff Learning to Support Learners Learning: Reflections from a Two-Year Professional Development Project. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 26, 56 - 78.
21. Ellepola, C., Ragel, R.G., Sandirigama, M., & Kumari, K.W. (2022). The Effectiveness of Policies on ICT Resources and Passwords in Sri Lankan Universities. *2022 2nd International Conference on Advanced Research in Computing (ICARC)*, 290-295.
22. Ershadi, M.J., Jalalimanesh, A., & Nasiri, J.A. (2019). Designing a Metadata Quality Model: Case Study of Registration System of Iranian Research Institute for Information Science and Technology. *Iranian Journal of Information Processing & Management*, 34, 1505-1534.
23. Falolo, V. M., Capillas, K. T., Vergarra, N. A., & Cerbito, A. F. (2022). Student Registration and Records Management Services towards Digitization. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 3(1), 149-165.

24. Falolo, V. M., Capillas, K. T., Vergarra, N. A., & Cerbito, A. F. (2022). Student Registration and Records Management Services towards Digitization. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 3(1), 149-165.
25. Fernández-Caramés, T.M., & Fraga-Lamas, P. (2019). Towards Next Generation Teaching, Learning, and Context-Aware Applications for Higher Education: A Review on Blockchain, IoT, Fog and Edge Computing Enabled Smart Campuses and Universities. *Applied Sciences*.
26. Folorunso, A. (2024). Cybersecurity and its global applicability to decision making: a comprehensive approach in the university system. Available at SSRN 4955601.
27. Gander, M., Girardi, A., & Paull, M. (2019). The careers of university professional staff: a systematic literature review. *Career Development International*.
28. Ghanem, D.R., & Rao, D.S. (2021). Academic advising overview in higher education (Literature review). *International Journal of Advanced Academic Studies*.
29. Glomo-Narzoles, D.T., & Palermo, D.G. (2021). Examining the Academic and Non-Academic Correlates of Student Retention.
30. Habib, M. N., Jamal, W., Khalil, U., & Khan, Z. (2021). Transforming universities in interactive digital platform: case of city university of science and information technology. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26, 517-541.
31. Hasan, Z., Junita, R., Mulia, S.I., Sofiani, I.K., & Ali, M.H. (2023). Analysis of Public Satisfaction at the Bengkalis Regency Population and Civil Registration Office Riau Province Indonesia. *Jurnal Public Policy*.
32. Honda, C., Watanabe, M., Tomizawa, R., & Sakai, N. (2019). Update on Osaka University Twin Registry: An Overview of Multidisciplinary Research Resources and Biobank at Osaka University Center for Twin Research. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, 22, 597 - 601.
33. Hurtubise, D. (2022). The Impact of External Factors on Academic Governance in Universities. *Advances in Educational Marketing, Administration, and Leadership*.
34. Ingersoll, E., Elliott, S., & Dracar, S.S. (2021). Spiritual and Religious Support for Underrepresented First-Generation, Low-Income (UFGLI) Students. *Religions*.
35. Isma, C.N., Rahmi, R., & Jamin, H. (2022). URGENSI DIGITALISASI PENDIDIKAN SEKOLAH. AT-TA'DIB: JURNAL ILMIAH PRODI PENDIDIKAN AGAMA ISLAM.
36. Jacob, O. N., & Solomon, A. T. (2021). Office of the Registrar in Nigerian Public Universities: Problems and Suggestions. *Academicia Globe: Inderscience Research*, 11.
37. Jameel, A. S., Hamdi, S. S., Kareem, M. A., & Raewf, M. B. (2021, February). E-Satisfaction based on E-service Quality among university students. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (Vol. 1804, No. 1, p. 012039). IOP Publishing.
38. Jo, Y.J. (2024). A Study on the Development of Subject Certification System in University: Focusing on University A. *Korean Association For Learner-Centered Curriculum And Instruction*.
39. J S, K., G, V., S K, R., R., P., & S, G. (2022). TNAU Post Graduate Students Academic Data Management System: An Overview. *Madras Agricultural Journal*.
40. Jarkasih, A. (2024). Enhancing Public Service Quality in Tejamulya Village: Challenges and Opportunities. *Indonesian Journal of Education and Social Sciences*.
41. Kakada, P., Deshpande, Y.M., & Bisen, S.S. (2019). Technology Support, Social Support, Academic Support, Service Support, and Student Satisfaction. *J. Inf. Technol. Educ. Res.*, 18, 549-570.

42. Lazem, M., & Sheikhtaheri, A. (2022). Barriers and facilitators for disease registry systems: a mixed-method study. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 22(1), 97.
43. Litoussi, M., Fartitchou, M., Makkaoui, K.E., Ezzati, A., & Allali, Z.E. (2022). Digital Certifications in Moroccan Universities: Concepts, Challenges, and Solutions. *ANT/EDI40*.
44. Liu, Q., Geertshuis, S., & Grainger, R. (2020). Understanding academics' adoption of learning technologies: A systematic review. *Comput. Educ.*, 151, 103857.
45. Lumadi, R. I. (2021). Enhancing student development through support services in an open distance learning institution: a case study in South Africa. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 35(1), 113-126.
46. Luthuli, L.P., & Buthelezi, T.K. (2021). Strategies for Digitizing Records in Academic Higher Education in South Africa. *Advances in Library and Information Science*.
47. Mallares, D., Alegata, W. C., & Bual, J. (2024). Admission and Registrar Office (ARO) Mobile Document Scanner with Archiving System.
48. Masango, M.G., Muloiwa, T., Wagner, F., & Pinheiro, G.T. (2020). Design and Implementation of a Student Biographical Questionnaire (BQ) Online Platform for Effective Student Success. *Journal of Student Affairs in Africa*, 8, 93-110.
49. Metto, E., Kinuthia, B. N., & Mwita, M. (2022). A Model for Effective Management of Students Records in the Academic Registrars' Offices in Kenyan Universities. *African Journal of Empirical Research*, 3(1), 78-89.
50. Metto, E., Mwita, M., & Kinuthia, B. N. (2022). A study of the management of student records in academic registrars' offices in Kenyan Universities. *African Journal of Empirical Research*, 3(1), 68-77.
51. Mohd Yusof, N., Asimira, S., & Abdul Kadir, S. (2022). Student Satisfaction of University Service Quality in Malaysia: A Review. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*.
52. Moriña, A., & Biagiotti, G. (2021). Academic success factors in university students with disabilities: a systematic review. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 37, 729 - 746.
53. Mulhem, A.A. (2020). Exploring the Key Factors in the Use of an E-Learning System Among Students at King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia. *Int. J. Interact. Mob. Technol.*, 14, 19-37.
54. Namasaka, D. B., Koech, C. S., & Monari, F. (2020). Electronic- Recruitment Practice (E-Rp) and Service Quality in Public Universities in Kenya: The Interaction Role of Organizational Factors. *The International Journal of Business & Management*, 8(11). <https://doi.org/10.24940/theijbm/2020/v8/i11/BM2011-042>
55. Nikam, R. (2021). Research Study of Governing Bodies in Indian Universities: An Overview of Current Scenario. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology*.
56. Ntorukiri, T.B., Kirugua, J.M., & Kirimi, F. (2022). Policy and infrastructure challenges influencing ICT implementation in universities: a literature review. *Discover Education*.
57. Nzimande, E. T. (2022). Challenges with student's registration processes at the Durban University of Technology: a case study of Midlands Campuses of Riverside and Indumiso (Doctoral dissertation).
58. Palma, L. M., Vigil, M. A., Pereira, F. L., & Martina, J. E. (2019). Blockchain and smart contracts for higher education registry in Brazil. *International Journal of Network Management*, 29(3), e2061.
59. Parks, R., & Taylor, A. (2019). The emerging role of the registrar in enrollment management. *College and University*, 94(2), 25-30.

60. Samson, A. A. C., Abarquez, J. K. S. L., Llave, J. N. J., Sing, J. A. P., & Estrella, N. E. (2024, December). BEYOND THE ARCH: a web and mobile alumni record verification system for the University of Santo Tomas Office of the Registrar. In International Conference on Green Energy, Computing and Intelligent Technology 2024 (GEn-CITy 2024) (Vol. 2024, pp. 56-65). IET.
61. Samuel, M.I., Tarsilla, K., & Gichohi, P.M. (2023). The role of government policies on students' inter-university transfer among selected private universities in Kenya. Editon Consortium Journal of Curriculum and Educational Studies.
62. Savinykh, G., Ilyukhin, B.V., & Masharova, T.V. (2021). On the state of internal systems for assessing the quality of education in Russian schools: data-driven management perspectives.
63. Savinykh, G., Shmeleva, A.G., Ponomarev, V.G., Kozlova, N.P., & Polozhentseva, I.V. (2021). Data-driven education quality management. Laplage em Revista, 7, 509-518.
64. Sell, A.J. (2023). Contextual factors associated with the morale of academic and support staff in universities. Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 27, 41 - 50.
65. Sherlywati, S., Kristine, F., & Junita, I. (2022). Qualitative Review of Academic Advising Perceptions: Some Students Satisfied and Need It, Some Don't. Humaniora.
66. Sukums, F., Kisenge, R., & Wamala-Larsson, C. (2023). Assessment of ICT services using the Information Technology Infrastructure Library Framework at Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences, Tanzania. East African Journal of Science, Technology and Innovation.
67. Sultana, F., & Nasrin, S. (2021). Students' Satisfaction on Academic Services in Higher Education: Public and Private Universities of Bangladesh.
68. Taherdoost, H. (2016). Sampling methods in research methodology; how to choose a sampling technique for research. International Journal of Academic Research in Management, 5(2), 18-27.
69. Telukdarie, A., & Munsamy, M. (2019). Digitization of Higher Education Institutions. 2019 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management (IEEM), 716-721.
70. Turarkyzy, M. (2019). Digitisation to optimise administrative procedures: a case study of Nazarbayev University (Doctoral dissertation, NAZARBAYEV UNIVERSITY).
71. Uche, F. S., & Kanifing, S. (2020, August). M-Course Registration: A Mobile Students' Course Registration Platform. In IJISRT (Vol. 5, No. 8, pp. 423-445).
72. Wigati, N.A., Wibisono, A., & Hidayanto, A.N. (2021). Challenges of Infrastructure in Cloud Computing for Education Field: A Systematic Literature Review. International Conference on Enterprise Information Systems.
73. Zewary, S.M. (2021). The Effects of Academic Advising on Juniors and Seniors of English Department at Balkh University. European Journal of Social Science Education and Research.
74. Zhang, L., Jeong, D., & Lee, S. (2021). Data quality management in the internet of things. Sensors, 21(17), 5834.
75. C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS
76. Cox, K. (2022). Alternatives for Certification Implementing of the Academic Process of HEIs \*.
77. D. ELECTRONIC SOURCES
78. Istiqamah, A.N., Cisadane, M.A., Kamasi, J.J., & Haryono, D. (2024). Efektivitas Sistem Informasi Akademik (SIKAD) dalam Mendukung Proses Pelayanan Mahasiswa Di Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Tadulako. Jurnal ADMINISTRATOR.



79. Keter, S.J. (2021). Policy Related Strategies to Curb Examination Malpractices among Undergraduate Students in Kenyan Universities.
80. Malese, L.P., & Molina, J.I. (2020). APLIKASI WEB PENGINGAT REGISTRASI MAHASISWA BERBASIS SMS (SHORT MESSAGE SERVICE) GATEWAY STUDI KASUS : UNIVERSITAS TRIBUANA KALABAHI.
81. Pramatha, C.R., & Mimba, N. (2020). Udayana University International Student Management: A Business Process Reengineering Approach.
82. Suleman, S. (2019). Kualitas Pelayanan e-KTP di Dinas Kependudukan dan Catatan Sipil Kabupaten Halmahera Selatan.
83. Tiniyyah, A.K., Sugiarto, D., Mutohar, P.M., & Muhajir, A. (2023). Manajemen Peningkatan Mutu Madrasah Dalam Membentuk Madrasah Efektif di Era Global. *Al-Idaroh: Jurnal Studi Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*.
84. Wiryadi, R., Sihombing, M., & Isnaini, I. (2020). Analisis Kualitas Pelayanan dalam Pencatatan AK 1 dalam Memberikan Kepuasan kepada Masyarakat pada Dinas Transmigrasi dan Tenaga Kerja Kabupaten Aceh Singkil.