

Assessment of the Physical Plant and Facilities at Capiz State University

Peter John D. Fantinalgo

Program Chairman - BS Architecture, College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology, Capiz State University - Main Campus

Abstract

This study assessed the condition of the physical plant and facilities across the nine campuses of Capiz State University - Main Campus, Dayao, Pontevedra, Pilar, Burias, Mambusao, Sigma, Dumarao, and Tapaz — using a descriptive quantitative research method. 394 respondents participated, including 379 students, 11 faculty members, and four staff members. The evaluation covered key campus areas such as academic, administrative, student support, recreational, and auxiliary facilities. The findings revealed an overall grand mean of 3.54, corresponding to a "Good" condition. However, certain facilities — specifically classrooms, laboratory/studio rooms, student toilets, student dormitories, housing for faculty/personnel, parks and playgrounds (outdoor), and parking areas — were rated as "Fair," highlighting areas needing improvement. These results provide empirical support for institutional planning and development aimed at improving campus infrastructure and enhancing student satisfaction (Nguyen, 2018; Medallon & Lim, 2022).

Keywords: Campus Infrastructure, Facility Assessment, Higher Education Planning

1. Introduction

In higher education institutions, the quality and condition of physical plant and facilities significantly influence the academic performance and satisfaction of students and faculty (Delgadillo, Espino, & Talens, 2021; Bala & Kisa, 2021). Properly maintained educational environments foster effective learning, professional engagement, and well-being (Cuy, Balderas, & Fernando, 2020).

Capiz State University operates nine campuses distributed across the Province of Capiz: Main Campus, Dayao, Pontevedra, Pilar, Burias, Mambusao, Sigma, Dumarao, and Tapaz. These campuses serve various academic programs and administrative functions essential to the university's operations.

The research seeks to answer the question: What is the condition of the physical plant and facilities in terms of various academic, administrative, recreational, and auxiliary components? The insights aim to support institutional improvements based on empirical data (Obasi & Okafor, 2017; Okolie et al., 2018).

Research Methods

This study utilized a descriptive quantitative research design to evaluate the condition of the physical plant and facilities across the nine campuses of Capiz State University. A total of 394 respondents — comprising 379 students, 11 faculty members, and four staff members — were selected through random sampling to ensure broad representation from various campuses and user groups.

Data were collected using a standardized survey questionnaire based on a 5-point Likert Scale (Apuke, 2020). The scale was designed to assess the functionality and maintenance needs of various facility types, with the following score intervals and corresponding verbal interpretations:

Table 1: Interpretation Table

Score	Score Interval	Verbal Interpretation	Meaning of Verbal Interpretation
5	4.45-5.00	Excellent	Functional and needs maintenance
4	3.45-4.44	Good	Functional and needs minor improvements
3	2.45-3.44	Fair	Functional and needs some significant improvements
2	1.45-2.44	Poor	Non-functional and needs major repairs/replacement/demolition
1	1.00-1.44	Not applicable	Non-availability of physical plant and facilities

The questionnaire assessed academic, administrative, student services, recreational, and auxiliary facilities. Data analysis used descriptive statistics — mean scores and verbal interpretations — aggregated at the university-wide level (Perez, 2020; Valdez, 2022).

Results and Discussion

The overall grand mean score of 3.54 indicates a general condition of “Good,” suggesting that most university facilities are functional and need only minor improvements. This supports findings from other institutional assessments where similar rating scales highlighted areas needing investment and improvement (Alhassan, 2019; Smith, 2020).

However, certain facility types were rated as “Fair,” including classrooms, laboratory/studio rooms, student toilets, dormitories, faculty housing, parks/playgrounds, and parking areas. These findings are consistent with prior studies indicating infrastructure limitations in classrooms (Okolie et al., 2018), toilet facilities (Alvarez & Dela Cruz, 2022), dormitories (Trinidad & Aquino, 2021), and faculty housing (Santos, 2018).

The suboptimal conditions in outdoor spaces and parking also align with literature on spatial planning and infrastructure deficiencies in Southeast Asian universities (Yap & Tan, 2019; Dizon, 2018). Moreover, the relatively positive assessment of canteens, medical/dental clinics, student centers, and guard houses is consistent with findings from Carreon (2020) and Miranda (2020), who noted the role of support services in overall campus life quality.

These results emphasize the need for targeted improvements that align with student and staff expectations, enhancing institutional satisfaction and performance (Gonzales & Vicente, 2020; Lopez & Hernandez, 2019).

The table below summarizes the mean scores and interpretations by facility type across all campuses:

Table 2: Condition of the physical plant and facilities of Capiz State University

Physical Plant and Facilities	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Academic Facilities		
Library	3.80	Good
Computer Laboratory	3.51	Good

Classrooms	3.41	Fair
Laboratory/Studio Rooms	3.39	Fair
Student Support Facilities		
Guidance Office	3.78	Good
School Medical and Dental Clinic	3.77	Good
Office of the Students' Affairs	3.76	Good
Student Center	3.45	Good
Students' Toilet	3.23	Fair
Student Dormitory	3.16	Fair
Administrative and Faculty-related Offices		
Administrative Office	3.80	Good
Office of the Registrar	3.78	Good
Office of the Dean	3.76	Good
Accounting Office	3.75	Good
Faculty Room	3.72	Good
Personnel Toilet	3.47	Good
Housing for Faculty/Personnel	3.29	Fair
Recreational and Cultural Facilities		
Assembly Hall/Gym	3.70	Good
Cultural Services Office	3.63	Good
Sports Services Office	3.53	Good
Covered Foot Walk	3.52	Good
Parks and Playground (outdoor)	3.34	Fair
Auxiliary Facilities		
Canteen	3.58	Good
Waste Disposal Facilities	3.47	Good
Guard House	3.45	Good
Parking Areas	3.30	Fair
Grand Mean	3.54	Good

Note: Interpretation is based on the scale: 1:00-1:44 (Not Applicable), 1.45-2.44 (Poor), 2.45-3.44 (Fair), 3.45-4.44 (Good), 4.45-5.00 (Excellent)

Conclusion

This study, conducted across the nine campuses of Capiz State University, revealed a generally good condition of physical plant and facilities, with variations across facility types. While administrative and core academic service facilities are in acceptable condition, areas such as classrooms, laboratories, student services, and outdoor amenities require attention.

These findings validate existing literature on the critical link between infrastructure quality and institutional success (Fernandez & Cruz, 2019; Torres, 2019). Therefore, the university must prioritize investments in underperforming areas to enhance learning environments, ensure safety, and improve satisfaction among stakeholders.

References

1. Alhassan, A. M. (2019). *Assessment of infrastructural facilities in public universities in Ghana*. Journal of Education and Practice, 10(4), 12-19.
2. Alvarez, S. & Dela Cruz, T. (2022). *Monitoring toilet conditions in academic institutions*. Journal of School Hygiene, 8(2), 33-42.
3. Apuke, O. D. (2020). *Quantitative research methods: A synopsis approach*. Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review (Oman Chapter), 6(11), 40-47.
4. Bala, M. & Kisa, J. (2021). *Educational facilities and student learning outcomes: A review*. International Journal of Education and Research, 9(2), 31-44.
5. Bueno, D. C. (2023). *Enhancing graduate school experience: A comprehensive evaluation of student satisfaction with services and facilities*. ERIC. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED630176.pdf>.
6. Carreon, A. B. (2020). *Cafeteria services and student satisfaction in Philippine universities*. Campus Dining Journal, 2(1), 10-21.
7. Cuy, R. A., Balderas, A. T., & Fernando, J. R. (2020). *Physical learning environments and academic engagement*. Asian Journal of Educational Research, 9(4), 104-118.
8. Delgadillo, A. C., Espino, M. R., & Talens, M. M. (2021). *Educational spaces and student motivation*. International Journal of Educational Infrastructure, 7(2), 89-102.
9. Dizon, L. M. (2018). *University parking problems and planning solutions*. Transportation and Education, 3(2), 40-55.
10. Fernandez, M. P. & Cruz, D. T. (2019). *A survey of university library services and user satisfaction*. Philippine Library Journal, 15(2), 20-29.
11. Gonzales, R. & Vicente, J. (2020). *Evaluating student service offices in higher education*. International Journal of Campus Affairs, 6(1), 77-90.
12. Lopez, S. & Hernandez, L. (2019). *Higher education infrastructure and satisfaction metrics*. Higher Ed Studies, 5(3), 34-49.
13. Medallon, J. & Lim, C. (2022). *Campus infrastructure and accreditation outcomes*. Philippine Journal of Educational Measurement, 8(1), 55-66.
14. Miranda, S. V. (2020). *Importance of guardhouses in campus security systems*. Safety and Security Journal, 5(2), 88-97.
15. Nguyen, T. M. (2018). *Modern campus planning in Southeast Asia*. Journal of Asian Urban Studies, 4(2), 45-60.
16. Obasi, E. & Okafor, A. (2017). *Infrastructure and student performance in Nigerian universities*. Journal of Facilities Management, 15(3), 209-222.
17. Office of Financial Management. (2019). *Higher education facility study*. Washington State Government. https://ofm.wa.gov/sites/default/files/public/publications/HigherEducationFacilityStudy_2020.pdf.
18. Okolie, K. C. et al. (2018). *Campus facilities and educational performance in South-East Nigeria*. Facilities, 36(1/2), 60-75.
19. Perez, C. T. (2020). *Maintenance practices in public university buildings*. Journal of Facilities Planning, 8(1), 29-43.
20. Santos, F. M. (2018). *Housing for university faculty: A neglected concern*. Academic Personnel Review, 3(4), 26-35.

21. Torres, M. A. (2019). *Infrastructure development and institutional accreditation*. Journal of Tertiary Education, 10(1), 95-107.
22. Yap, M. & Tan, C. H. (2019). Pedestrian infrastructure in school settings. Urban Mobility Journal, 7(1), 120-130.