

International Journal of Engineering Sciences & Research Technology

(A Peer Reviewed Online Journal)
Impact Factor: 5.164



Chief Editor
Dr. J.B. Helonde

Executive Editor
Mr. Somil Mayur Shah

ABSTRACT

The status of the implementation of University's rules, regulations and policies was the main objective of the present study. The assessment was made with the teachers and students on the six (6) campuses of President Ramon Magsaysay State University (formerly Ramon Magsaysay Technological University). Descriptive research design was used in the conduct of the study through the use of a questionnaire as the main instrument to gather data. The study involved 210 faculty members and 384 students. The coverage of the study dealt with the rules, regulations and policies on faculty hiring, faculty promotion and development, discipline, field trip, student organization, and admission, registration and enrolment. The study revealed that the most of the faculty were female adult, served for seven years. The mean salary of the faculty is nineteen thousand six hundred ninety pesos and most of them have Master's degree units. Faculty-respondents perceived that the university often implements policies, rules and regulations on faculty hiring, faculty promotion and development. The students-respondents on the other hand perceived that policies, rules and regulations on discipline, field trip, student organization and admission, registration and enrolment were also often implemented.

KEYWORDS: University Rules, Regulations, Policies, Teachers & Implementation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Crime, violence, and disorder in schools have become major national issues, as reported in various national surveys of school order and safety. These problems not only endanger students and teachers, but they also prevent teachers from concentrating on teaching and students from concentrating on learning (North Central Regional Laboratory, 2006). This reflects the astonishing diversity of educational institutions, ranging from small rural elementary schools to very large universities and colleges. It relates also to the varied nature of the problems encountered in schools and colleges, which require different approaches and solutions. More than ever before, today's schools are serving children from dysfunctional homes, children living in poverty, children of teenage parents, and special education students. Unfortunately, resources to adequately serve the total range of needs presented by these students are becoming increasingly limited. Adequate parental supervision and control of these students has weakened, and many students have diminished respect for all forms of authority, including the authority of school personnel. As a result, schools are confronted with problems of students possessing weapons, students involved with gang recruitment and rivalry, and students engaged in drug trafficking, both as sellers and buyers. Such problems lead to violent acts in and around schools. In order to create a safe environment that is conducive to learning, schools must implement safety plans and comprehensive prevention programs that address the root causes of violence (Arum, 2003).

This changing educational climate has created an imperative need for schools to identify tools, strategies, and model programs that enhance the safety and success of all children and the professionals who serve them. Because young people are legally required to attend school, school personnel have a corresponding duty to provide children with a safe, secure, and peaceful environment in which learning can occur. Achieving this end requires that every school district and each individual school develop a school safety plan. Development of such plans is not limited to the school alone but must necessarily involve the entire community.



Some policy analysts see policy as a value-laden concept, approaching it from the perspective of goals, values, and practices. Maluleke (2000) refers to the views of Rezaee, et al. (2001), who sees policy as a projected program of goals, values, and practices, and to the opposing view of other policy analysts such as Eulau & Prewitt (as cited by Carr, 2005) who see policy as a standing decision characterized by behavior consistency and repetitiveness on the part of both those who make it and those who abide by it.

The policy should be understood in terms of the values and principles espoused in the constitutional body. This means that at the end of the implementation process, the above values and principles should have acted as beacons showing the way to the correct application of the policy. This view is substantiated by Kelsen's Pure Theory of Law (1967), in which he claims that the Grundnorm is the starting point of the chain of legal norms. He states that: "It is at the apex of the hierarchy of the legal norms and is the original source of authorization for decisions and actions taken throughout the system, down to the lowest level." The President Ramon Magsaysay State University's (formerly Ramon Magsaysay Technological University) clearly sets out the vision for education, and one could assume that there are no conflicting interests in the implementation of these policies, since consensus was reached. Motala (1998 as cited in McKay, et al., 2007) comments on this by stating that the uninformed often make assumptions that: "(Because of) the ostensible agreement in the policy arena and the niceties of consensual statements about the goals to be achieved, there is no likelihood of conflicting interests in regard to the implementation of policies" (Carr, 2005). To verify if the policies have been properly implemented one must see the practices and procedures it get through. This means that the policy is more than just practice or implementation, but that a stage has been reached whereby the policy implementation has developed to a level where everyone concerned with it knows exactly how to respond to the particular issues involved. The viewpoint of McNiff, Lomax & Whitehead (1996) is that praxis is informed; committed action that gives rise to knowledge rather than just successful action... it leads to knowledge from and about educational practice.

It is in this context that this study was conducted to determine the implementation of the President Ramon Magsaysay State University's rules, regulations and policies as a whole. The findings of this study would help the administrators to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the university's rules, regulations and policies and serve as basis in implementing improvement and changes. The university's human resource management office would have indispensable information in matters concerning faculty that would serve as their guide in selecting, promoting and improving competent teachers. On the other hand, teachers would have more knowledge on how the University implements faculty hiring, promotion and development which will provide them tools to submit themselves with the procedures. Additionally, they would be provided with the knowledge on how the students should behave and react within the campus and their respective classroom. The local leaders as partner agency in keeping of peace and order within the community can be of help in the implementation of the rules, regulations and policies within the university, making them understand the cases of which the students are involved with. Lastly the parents and the students would be more confident on the University's disciplinary procedure and security system as well as treatment which is fair and just.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study aimed to determine the implementation of President Ramon Magsaysay State University's (formerly Ramon Magsaysay Technological University) rules, regulations and policies as perceived by the faculty members and students. Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the faculty-respondent in terms of:
 - 1.1 Age;
 - 1.2 Sex;
 - 1.3 Length of Service;
 - 1.4 Monthly Income; and
 - 1.5 Highest Educational Attainment?
2. How do the faculty-respondents perceive the implementation of the university's rules, regulations and policies on the following areas:
 - 2.1 Faculty Hiring; and
 - 2.2 Faculty Promotion and Development?
3. How do the student-respondents perceive the implementation of the university's rules, regulations and policies on the following areas:



- 3.1 Student Discipline;
- 3.2 Field Trip;
- 3.3 Student Organization; and
- 3.4 Admission, Registration and Enrolment?

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study used descriptive-evaluation design of research. The researchers utilized this design in order to understand how the existing environment affects the behaviors and outcomes of the programs. The program which deals with the implementation of the rules, regulations and policies was evaluated to determine whether it works and under what conditions. The result of the evaluation will be used to better address the issues regarding the existing programs. For Paraggua, et al. (2012), evaluation research assesses the value and worth of an existing program or policy. It is increasingly popular and active research specialty. The topics appropriate for evaluation research are limitless

The respondents of the study consisted of President Ramon Magsaysay State University (formerly Ramon Magsaysay Technological University) faculty members and students who are officially enrolled during the school year 2012-2013. The respondents consisted of 210 faculty members and 384 students. The faculty-respondents were from Iba Campus where majority of the courses and programs were offered; from Sta. Cruz, Candelaria, Masinloc, San Marcelino, Castillejos campuses.

The study encompassed two sets of survey questionnaire. The first dealt with the perceptions of the faculty-respondents towards the implementation of rules, regulations and policies of the university in terms of faculty hiring and faculty promotion and development. The second set dealt with the perceptions of the students-respondents towards the implementation of rules, regulations and policies of the university which pertains to discipline, field trip, student organization and admission, registration and enrolment. A draft of a questionnaire was submitted to the experts from PRMSU for comments and suggestions. The researcher followed the prescribed revisions of the instruments. The questionnaires were validated in a dry-run to the selected thirty (30) faculty members and thirty (30) students of Institute of Evening Opportunity Program and Laboratory High School of Iba Campus of President Ramon Magsaysay State University, who were not selected during the final administration of the questionnaire. Having found the instrument valid and reliable, the researchers sought the permission and approval of the PRMSU Presidents and assistance of the Directors of the six campuses of the said institution to administer the survey questionnaires to the identified respondents (teachers and students). The data collected were classified according to variables. These were tabulated to determine their frequency distribution and application of appropriate statistical tools such as frequency counts, simple percentage and weighted mean.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

a. Profile of the Teacher - Respondents

Table2 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Faculty in terms of Age

Age	<i>f</i>	%
55-60	33	15.71
48-54	30	14.29
41-47	16	7.62
34-40	41	19.52
27-33	51	24.29
20-26	39	18.57
Total	210	100.00
Mean Age = 38		
Sex	<i>f</i>	%
Male	96	46
Female	114	54

Total	210	100
Length of Service	f	%
32 years above	30	14.29
24-31 years	24	11.43
16-23 years	16	7.62
8-15 years	66	31.43
1-7 years	74	35.24
Total	210	100.00
Mean Length of Service = 9.90		
Monthly Income	f	%
above Php 35,000.00	10	4.76
Php 30,000.00- Php 34,999.00	9	4.29
Php 25,000.00- Php 29,999.00	33	15.71
Php 20,000.00- Php 24,999.00	36	17.14
Php 15,000.00- Php 19,999.00	45	21.43
Php 10,000.00- Php 14,999.00	77	36.67
Total	210	100.00
Mean Monthly Income		Php19,690.00
Highest Educational Attainment	f	%
Doctorate degree	12	5.71
With doctorate units	21	10.00
With MA degree	51	24.29
With MA units	87	41.43
College Degree	39	18.57
Total	210	100.00

Table 2 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of faculty in terms of variables age, sex, length of service, monthly income and highest educational attainment. For the result on sex, Fifty-one (51) or 24.29 percent of the faculty-respondents belonged to age bracket of 27-33; followed by forty-one (41) or 19.52 percent belonged to age bracket of 34-40; and thirty-nine (39) or 18.57 percent belonged to age bracket of 20-26. The mean age of the faculty-respondent is 38. This finding implies that the faculty-respondents were on their middle adulthood. According to Armstrong (2008), middle adulthood ranges from 35 to 40 years old who often accommodate bigger responsibilities in life.

In terms of sex. Ninety-six (96) or 46 percent of the faculty-respondents were male. One hundred fourteen (114) or 54 percent of the faculty-respondents were female. This means that majority of the teacher-respondents of the present study is represented by women. The findings supports the study of Suyu-Tattao (2013) which concludes that educational community is female dominated. Also, according to Morell (2010) there are more women drawn in this profession because women tend to be more nurturing, patient, and enjoy being around children but it doesn't mean that women are better.

Table 1 also shows the frequency and percentage distribution of faculty in terms of length of service. One hundred one (74) or 35.24 percent of the faculty-respondents has 1-7 years of service; followed by sixty-six (66) or 31.43 percent who has 8-15 years of service. In this study, the teachers rendered their service for not quite long as supported by numbers of holders of Bachelor's degree with MA units (41.43%). The finding of the current study is also consistent with Tucker (1990) who found that the average length of teaching of a faculty member in higher institutions is 10 years. According to her, this is the new trend in educational setting. Also, McGrath (1988) writes that faculty today is relatively young and no student is looking for middle-aged professors.

For the result on respondents' monthly income, seventy-seven (77) or 36.67 percent of the faculty-respondents has 10,000.00- Php 14,999.00 monthly income followed by forty-five (45) or 21.43 percent who has Php 15,000.00- Php 19,999.00 monthly income. The mean monthly income of the faculty-respondents is Php19,690.00. Since most of the faculties who were responded occupy the instructor academic rank their salary

is in accordance with the salary standardization law. According to the faculty interviewed, it is difficult to get salary increased as one should have to meet the qualification standards and minimum requirements of the Civil Service Commission and the Department of Budget and Management.

In terms of faculty members' highest educational attainment, eighty-seven (87) or 41.43 percent of the faculty-respondents has Master's units followed by fifty-one (51) or 24.29 percent who are holders of Master's degree. This can be attributed on the CHED policies as well as the Civil Service Rules on qualification standards which imposed higher educational attainment for university faculty. It can be noted the data that most of the respondents have tried to improve their educational profile, others were provided with scholarship program while others still remain with their baccalaureate degree. Based on the interview with the faculty, some of them have not submitted for NBC 461 evaluation because they have seen that the implementation of the result took long years, so they prefer to be awarded with step increment. Under the MC 10 series of 2012 of the Civil Service Commission, all faculty of SUCs and LUCs with Instructor 1- 111 and Assistant Professor 1- IV positions are required to have their Master's degree.

b. Weighted Mean, Descriptive Rating and Rank of Faculty's Perception on the Implementation of Rules, Regulations and Policies of the University

Table 2 Faculty's Perception on the Implementation of Rules, Regulations and Policies of the University in terms of FACULTY HIRING

No:	Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating	Rank
1	Recruitment is limited to those who meet the minimum requirement prescribed for the rank.	3.37	Sometimes Implemented	7
2	No religious inquiry shall be applied in during nor shall the religious or political and tribal affiliation of an applicant for employment in the university be a matter of evaluation inquiry.	3.91	Often Implemented	1
3	Publication of vacant position at 3 conspicuous places inside the university for at least ten (10) days. Use of appropriate modes of publication for vacancy is considered.	3.57	Often Implemented	4
4	The rank is determined through a set of criteria with equivalent points.	3.64	Often Implemented	2
5	All appointment to the position of faculty is made strictly on the basis of merit.	3.24	Sometimes Implemented	9
6	The filling of vacant position is made after ten days from their publication.	3.41	Often Implemented	6
7	Incoming faculty members are required to undergo and pose complete medical and mental examinations prior to appointment.	3.61	Often Implemented	3
8	Transferee from other state or local university or colleges may be admitted at their present faculty rank, in the absence of qualified faculty.	3.30	Sometimes Implemented	8
9	The committees in charge carefully evaluate, test the competency and verify the requirements/competency of each applicant through interview and panel discussion.	3.50	Often Implemented	5
10	Report and post the result of selection and rank of applicants accordingly.	3.09	Sometimes Implemented	10
Overall Weighted Mean		3.47	Often Implemented	

Table 2 shows the weighted mean, descriptive rating and rank of faculty's perception on the implementation of rules, regulations and policies of the university in terms of faculty hiring. Among the indicators, "No religious inquiry shall be applied during nor shall the religious or political and tribal affiliation of an applicant for employment in the university be a matter of evaluation inquiry" rank 1 and perceived as often implemented with

a weighted mean of 3.91. “The rank is determined through a set of criteria with equivalent points” rank 2 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.64. “Incoming faculty members are required to undergo and pose complete medical and mental examination prior to appointment” rank 3 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.61. “Publication of vacant position at three (3) conspicuous places inside the university for at least ten (10) days. Use of appropriate modes of publications for vacancy is considered” rank 4 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.57. “The committees in charge carefully evaluate, test the competency and verify the requirements/competency of each applicant through interview and panel discussion” rank 5 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.50. “The filling of vacant position is made after ten (10) days from their publication” rank 6 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.41. “Recruitment is limited to those who meet the minimum requirement prescribed for the rank” rank7 and perceived as sometimes implemented with a weighted mean of 3.37. “Transferee from other state or local university or colleges may be admitted at their present faculty rank, in the absence of qualified faculty” rank 8 and perceived as sometimes implemented with a weighted mean of 3.30. “All appointment to the position of faculty is made strictly on the basis of merit” rank 9 and perceived as sometimes implemented with a weighted mean of 3.24. “Report and post the result of selection and rank of applicants accordingly” rank 10 and perceived as sometimes implemented with a weighted mean of 3.09. The overall weighted mean of the faculty-respondents’ perception on the implementation of the rules, regulations and policies of the university in terms of faculty hiring is 3.47 interpreted as often implemented. Data reveals that faculty-respondents believe that the university abides in the Faculty Manual, the University Code and the Civil Service Commission rulings in hiring. However, they also believe that prerogative in hiring is also practiced by the administration as they want that there is a good employer-employee relationship to be established.

Table 3 Faculty’s Perception on the Implementation of Rules, Regulations and Policies of the University in terms of FACULTY PROMOTION AND DEVELOPMENT

No :	Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating	Rank
1	Promotion to higher rank is determined and evaluated by the faculty evaluation committee based on NBC 461.	4.11	Often Implemented	1
2	Faculty member intending to apply for scholarship should meet minimum requirements.	3.84	Often Implemented	2
3	Promotion within 6 months prior to compulsory retirement shall not be allowed.	2.61	Sometimes Implemented	10
4	Positions belonging to the closed career system are exempted from the three-salary grade limitations or promotions.	3.34	Sometimes Implemented	8
5	The filing and pendency of an administrative case against a faculty member shall not constitute a disqualification for promotion.	3.31	Sometimes Implemented	9
6	Develop and implement continuing program of training and development for faculty members.	3.56	Often Implemented	5
7	Encourage and pursue relevant local and foreign assisted training/scholarship grant, allied services, conference, etc.	3.64	Often Implemented	3
8	Selection of participation in training progress is based on actual needs for specialization and enhancement of competency.	3.39	Sometimes Implemented	7
9	Provision of opportunity for professional and academic growth of the faculty members.	3.58	Often Implemented	4
10	Evaluation of the faculty merit and accomplishment accordingly is the basis for appointment and promotion.	3.43	Often Implemented	6
Overall Weighted Mean		3.48	Often Implemented	

Table 3 shows the weighted mean, descriptive rating and rank of faculty’s perception on the implementation of rules, regulations and policies of the university in terms of faculty promotion and development. Among the

indicators, "Promotion to higher rank is determined and evaluated by the faculty evaluation committee based on NBC" rank 1 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 4.11. "Faculty member intending to apply for scholarship should meet minimum requirements" rank 2 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.84. "Encourage and pursue relevant local and foreign assisted training/scholarship grant, allied services, conference, etc." rank 3 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.64. "Provision of opportunity for professional and academic growth of the faculty members" rank 4 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.58. "Develop and implement continuing program of training and development for faculty members" rank 5 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.56. "Evaluation of the faculty merit and accomplishment accordingly is the basis for appointment an promotion rank 6 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.43. "Selection of participation in training progress is based on actual needs for specialization and enhancement of competency" rank 7 and perceived as sometimes implemented with a weighted mean of 3.39. "Positions belonging to the closed career system are exempted from the tree-salary grade limitations or promotions" rank 8 and perceived as sometimes implemented with a weighted mean of 3.34. "The filling and pendency of an administrative case against a faculty member shall not constitute s disqualification for promotion" rank 9 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.31. "Promotion within 6 months prior to compulsory retirement shall not be allowed rank 10 and perceived as sometimes implemented with a weighted mean of 2.61. The overall weighted mean of the faculty-respondents' perception on the implementation of the rules, regulations and policies of the university in terms of faculty promotion and development is 3.48 interpreted as often implemented. SUCs and LUCs administrators are guided by the laws issued by the Civil service Commission supported by the Department of Budget and Management which they implement in the promotion of their faculty. Likewise in the professional development of their faculty they abide in the guidelines of the approved Faculty Manual, administrative Manual and their respective Administrative Code.

c. Weighted Mean, Descriptive Rating and Rank of Student's Perception on the Implementation of Rules, Regulations and Policies of the University

Table 4 Student's Perception on the Implementation of Rules, Regulations and Policies of the University in terms of DISCIPLINE

No:	Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating	Rank
1	Attendance on weekly flag ceremony of the students.	3.37	Often Implemented	10
2	Proper wearing of school uniform and college/department uniform.	4.35	Always Implemented	1
3	Proper dissemination of announcements and communication for the student guidance.	3.69	Often Implemented	5
4	Students enter campus with proper ID.	4.16	Often Implemented	2
5	Observance of cleanliness of classrooms and surroundings.	3.45	Often Implemented	9
6	Maintenance of campus peace and order.	3.60	Often Implemented	8
7	Non- wearing of earrings for male students.	3.64	Often Implemented	6.5
8	Practice of honesty at all times.	3.64	Often Implemented	6.5
9	Keeping the properties of the school.	3.73	Often Implemented	4
10	Respect of authority and fellow students.	3.87	Often Implemented	3
Overall Weighted Mean		3.75	Often Implemented	

Table 4 shows the weighted mean, descriptive rating and rank of students' perception on the implementation of rules, regulations and policies of the university in terms of discipline. Among the indicators, "Proper wearing of school uniform and college/department uniform" rank 1 and perceived as always implemented with a weighted mean of 4.35. "Students enter campus with proper ID" rank 2 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 4.16. "Respect of authority and fellow students" rank 3 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.87. "Keeping the properties of the school" rank 4 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.73. "Proper dissemination of announcement and communication for the

student guidance” rank 5 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.69. “Non-wearing of earrings for male students” and “Practice of honesty at all times” both rank 6.5 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.64 respectively. “Maintenance of campus peace and order” rank 8 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.60. “Observance of cleanliness of classrooms and surroundings” rank 9 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.45. “Attendance on weekly flag ceremony of the students” rank 10 and perceived as sometimes implemented with a weighted mean of 3.37. The overall weighted mean of the student-respondents’ perception on the implementation of the rules, regulations and policies of the university in terms discipline is 3.75 interpreted as often implemented. The present findings seem to be consistent with other research which found that schools had specific policies and identified expected behaviors from the students (Horner, et al., 2000; Steffanhagen, 2005 & Brint, et al., 2001). This study has been able to demonstrate that wearing school uniforms, wearing school ID’s and respect of authority and fellow students were the most followed policies in the school.

Table 5 Student’s Perception on the Implementation of Rules, Regulations and Policies of the University in terms of FIELD TRIP

No:	Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating	Rank
1	Requirement of medical clearance by parent or physician.	3.22	Sometimes Implemented	9
2	Provision of medical kits during the travel.	3.13	Sometimes Implemented	10
3	Provision of written schedule of fees disseminated to concerned stakeholders.	3.50	Often Implemented	3
4	Provision of the program of activities or itinerary of travel.	3.39	Sometimes Implemented	6
5	Provision of a parallel school activity with similar acquisition of knowledge of the required practical competencies and achieve learning objectives to students who cannot join the field trip.	3.47	Often Implemented	4
6	Provision of consideration to students with disabilities.	3.54	Often Implemented	2
7	Coordination of travel with concerned LGU’s and NGO’s.	3.37	Sometimes Implemented	7
8	Assessment report filled by faculty and students.	3.36	Sometimes Implemented	8
9	Duly notarized parent consent submitted before the activity.	3.43	Often Implemented	5
10	Inform the person in authority of the field trip.	3.96	Often Implemented	1
Overall Weighted Mean		3.44	Often Implemented	

Table 5 shows the weighted mean, descriptive rating and rank of students’ perception on the implementation of rules, regulations and policies of the university in terms of field trip. Among the indicators, “Inform the person in authority of the field trip” rank 1 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.96. “Provision of consideration to students with disabilities” rank 2 and perceived as 3.54 with a weighted mean of often implemented. “Provision of written schedule of fees disseminated to concerned stakeholders” rank 3 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.50. “Provision of a parallel school activity with similar acquisition of knowledge of the required practical competencies and achieve learning objectives to students who cannot join in the field trip” rank 4 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.47. “Duly notarized parent consent submitted before the activity” rank 5 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.43. “Provision of the program of activities of itinerary of travel” rank 6 and perceived as sometimes implemented with a weighted mean of 3.39. “Coordination of travel with concerned LGU’s and NGO’s” rank 7 and perceived as sometimes implemented with a weighted mean of 3.37. “Assessment report filled by faculty and students” rank 8 and perceived as sometimes implemented with a

weighted mean of 3.36. Provision of medical kits during travel” rank 10 and perceived as sometimes implemented with a weighted mean of 3.13. The overall weighted mean of the student-respondents’ perception on the implementation of the rules, regulations and policies of the university in terms field trip is 3.44 interpreted as often implemented.

These findings and observations are related to the content of the latest policy issued by the Commission on Higher Education, that there is a need for securing permits from the region for field trips conducted by HEIs to ensure the safety of the students. Field Trip Activities according to Raudys (2013) are effective platform for experiential learning activities because they let students’ bridge educational experiences to actual settings. It create new connections and reinforce the lessons they’ve learned by putting them into practice in a fun, engaging context.

Table 6 Student’s Perception on the Implementation of Rules, Regulations and Policies of the University in terms of STUDENT ORGANIZATION

No:	Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating	Rank
1	Accreditation of student organizations.	3.78	Often Implemented	2
2	Officers of student organization have no conditional or failing grades in the last semester term attended.	3.80	Often Implemented	1
3	Selection of student leader is based on good leadership potential and good moral character.	3.52	Often Implemented	7
4	Exercise of privileges like free use of institutional facilities for its operation.	3.60	Often Implemented	3.5
5	Privilege to participate in institutional activities.	3.60	Often Implemented	3.5
6	Submission of financial report after activities to the Office of Student Affairs.	3.53	Often Implemented	6
7	Submission of reports on activities conducted.	3.55	Often Implemented	5
8	Right to select their own faculty adviser.	3.15	Sometimes Implemented	10
9	Approval from the DSWD of the permit to conduct fund raising activity to be conducted outside the university.	3.34	Sometimes Implemented	9
10	Informs officials of the university to conduct activities.	3.38	Sometimes Implemented	8
Overall Weighted Mean		3.53	Often Implemented	

Table 6 shows the weighted mean, descriptive rating and rank of students’ perception on the implementation of rules, regulations and policies of the university in terms of student organization. Among the indicators, “Officers of student organization have no conditional or failing grades in the last semester attended” rank 1 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.80.”Accreditation of student organizations” rank 2 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.78. “Privilege to participate in institutional activities” and “Exercise of privilege like free use of institutional facilities for its operation” both rank 3.5 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.60. “Submission of report on activities conducted” rank 5 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.55 “Submission of financial report after activities to the Office of Student Affairs” rank 6 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.53. “Selection of student leader is based on good leadership potential and good moral character” rank 7 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.52. “Informs officials of the university to conduct activities” rank 8 and perceived as sometimes implemented with a weighted mean of 3.38. “Approval from the DSWD of the permit to conduct fund raising activity to be conducted outside the university” rank 9 and perceived as sometimes implemented with a weighted mean of 3.34. “Right to select their own faculty adviser”

rank 10 and perceived as sometimes implemented with a weighted mean of 3.15. The overall weighted mean of the student-respondents' perception on the implementation of the rules, regulations and policies of the university in terms student organization is 3.53 interpreted as often implemented.

Code effectiveness is also influenced by its implementation which includes reporting, enforcement and follow-up processes. Whether or not ethical breaches are reported is a complex issue. McKay, Kidwell & Kling (20017) recommended that universities track the frequency of behaviors and how they are perceived by stakeholders. As implied above, patterns in compliance and non-compliance may become evident; but the organization needs a process that gathers and analyses that data. Adams, Tashchian & Shore (2001) suggested that enforcement or its absence can affect code efficacy. As implied above, patterns in compliance and noncompliance may become evident; but the organization needs a process that gathers and analyses that data.

Table 7 Student's Perception on the Implementation of Rules, Regulations and Policies of the University in terms of Admission, Registration and Enrolment

ADMISSION, REGISTRATION AND ENROLMENT				
No:	Statement	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Rating	Rank
1	Beginning freshmen students qualify in the average grade requirement set by the college/university.	3.77	Often Implemented	2
2	20 percent of the required hours of unexcused absences results to a grade of 5.0 for any subject.	3.56	Often Implemented	4
3	Prompt and regular attendance in all classes.	3.38	Sometimes Implemented	8
4	Dropping of subjects before midterm.	3.30	Sometimes Implemented	9
5	Full refund of tuition fees within two weeks after the start of classes.	2.87	Sometimes Implemented	10
6	Foreign students must meet all the prescribed requirements by the DFA and the BID.	3.45	Often Implemented	6.5
7	Student registration in the days specified for enrolment.	3.43	Often Implemented	7
8	Rules of sequencing of subjects in the curriculum.	3.87	Often Implemented	1
9	Permission to cross enroll from the dean and campus registrar.	3.74	Often Implemented	3
10	Academic load is in accordance with the program in the college.	3.45	Often Implemented	6.5
Overall Weighted Mean		3.48	Often Implemented	

Table 7 shows the weighted mean, descriptive rating and rank of students' perception on the implementation of rules, regulations and policies of the university in terms of admission, registration and enrolment. Among the indicators, "Rules of sequencing of subjects in the curriculum" rank 1 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.87. "Beginning freshman students qualify in the average grade requirement set by the college /university" rank 2 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.77. "Permission to cross enroll from the dean and campus registrar" rank 3 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.74. "20 percent of the required hours of unexcused absences results to a grade of 5.0 for any subject" rank 4 and perceived as often implemented with a weighted mean of 3.56. "Foreign students must refund of tuition fees within two weeks after the start of classes" rank 10 and perceived as sometimes implemented with weighted mean of 2.87. The overall weighted mean of the student-respondents' perception on the implementation of the rules in terms admission, registration and enrolment is 3.48 interpreted as often implemented.

Stakeholder involvement is critical in code design. Gray (1996) asserted that attaining stakeholder commitment was one of five steps for building a viable code. One study suggested that faculty members were not as involved as the president or vice-president of academic affairs in code preparation; greater faculty involvement was recommended for consensus building (Rezaee et. al. 2001). Faculty involvement should transcend all levels of rank. McKay, et. al. (2007) cited a study that found differences in attitudes among information systems faculty that affected conduct. With regard to the prevention of academic dishonesty, Kibler (1994) pointed out the importance of stakeholder involvement; effectiveness of honor codes is enhanced when faculty members play key roles.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study the following conclusions were drawn.

1. Generally, a faculty-respondent is a 38-year old female faculty with 9.90 year service in the university, and a monthly income of Php 19,690.00 and currently pursuing their master's and doctor's degree.
2. Faculty-respondents perceived that rules, regulations and policies of university in terms of faculty hiring as often implemented mainly the provision that no religious inquiry shall be applied for employment in the university and the faculty promotion and development as often implemented primarily the promotion to higher rank/academic position by the faculty evaluation committee based on NBC 461.
3. Student-respondents perceived that rules, regulations and policies of university were often implemented specifically on aspects Discipline like the proper wearing of school uniform and college/department uniform; on informing the person in authority of the Field Trip; on grade requirements for officers of Student Organization and rules of sequencing of subjects in the curriculum for the Admission, Registration and Enrolment.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the foregoing conclusions of the study, the following recommendations were advanced:

1. Concerned officials, faculty and other members of school community should adhere/abide to university rules, regulations and policies to ensure its strict implementation.
2. Further evaluation of the implementation of rules, regulations and policies to address the weaknesses of the system.
3. A committee to monitor and evaluate the implementation of university rules, regulations and policies maybe created to keep the smooth operation of the institution.
4. Further study to determine the factors which hinder the smooth implementation of the rules, regulations and policies.

REFERENCES

- [1] North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. (2006). Critical Issue: Developing and Maintaining Safe Schools. Retrieved from <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/envrnmnt/drugfree/sa200.html>
- [2] Arum, R. (2003). Judging School Discipline: The Crisis of Moral Authority.
- [3] Maluleke, M. (2000). Policy and legislation, in: Hoppers, C., Mokgatle, M., Maluleke, M., Zuma, S., Hlophe, S., Crouch, L., Lombard, C., Lolwana, P. and Makhene, M. (eds.), *Maintaining Order and Discipline. Classroom management or criminal conduct?* Voice. 2(3).
- [4] McKay, R. B., Kidwell, L. A., & Kling, J. A. (2007). Faculty ethics from the perspective of college of business administrators. *Proceedings of the Academy of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues*, 10(1)
- [5] Carr, I.A. (2005). From policy to Praxis: A study of the implementation of representative councils of Learners in the Western Cape from 1997 to 2003. Unpublished Dissertation, University of Western Cape. Retrieved from http://etd.uwc.ac.za/usrfiles/modules/etd/docs/etd_init_5009_1174553175.pdf
- [6] McNiff, J., Lomax, P., and Whitehead, J. (1996). *You And Your Action Research Project*.
- [7] Parragua, V.Q., Diviva, R.C., Millar, J.M., & Panado, A.M.. (2012). *Research Methodology for Beginners*. St. Andrew Publishing House.
- [8] Armstrong, T. (2008). *The Human Odyssey: Navigating the Twelve Stages of Life*. New York: Sterling, 2008. <http://www.institute4learning.com/resources/articles/the-12-stages-of-life/>



- [9] Morell, K. (2010) **Standards of Practice**<http://www.oct.ca/public/professional-standards/standards-of-practice>
- [10] Horner, R.H., Sugar, G., Horner, H.F. (2000). A school-wide approach to school discipline. *The School Administrator*. February 20-23.
- [11] Steffenhagen, J. (2005). Protecting Majority of Students Priority of Educators. *The Vancouver Sun*. January 20.
- [12] Brint, S. et al. (2001). Socialization Messages in Primary Schools: An Organizational Analysis. *Sociology of Education*. Vol. 74: 157-180. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- [13] Raudys, J. (2013). Experiential Learning Activities to Engage Students. March 15, 2013. <https://www.prodigygame.com/blog/experiential-learning-activities/>
- [14] Adams, J. S., Tashchian, A. & Shore, T. H. (2001). Codes of ethics as signals for ethical behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 29(3).
- [15] Gray, S. T. (1996). Codify your ethics. *Association Management*, 48(8)
- [16] Rezaee, Z., Elmore, R. C., & Szendi, J. Z. (2001). Ethical behavior in higher educational institutions: the role of the code of conduct. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 30(2).
- [17] Kibler, W. L. (1994). Addressing academic dishonesty: what are institutions of higher learning doing and not doing? *NASPA Journal*, 31(2).

