

# Stakeholders' Assessment of the Implementation of The School Guidance Program on the Quality of Guidance Services: Basis for Crafting a Feedback-Based Monitoring Tool

Ana Replan Reblora

Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Email address: anarebl2@gmail.com

**Abstract**—This descriptive-correlational research design study assessed stakeholders' implementation of the school guidance program and its relationship to the quality of guidance services in public secondary schools in the Division Office of Laguna. Specifically, it determined the level of implementation of the school guidance program, the quality of guidance services categorized as developmental services and specialized services, the significant relationship that exists between the implementation of the guidance program and the quality of guidance services. The results served as the basis for the proposed feedback-based monitoring tool. The respondents consisted of teachers, registered school guidance counselors, and school administrators from six (6) public secondary schools with registered guidance counselors. A researcher-made questionnaire was used as the primary data-gathering instrument. Data were analyzed using weighted mean, standard deviation, and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. Findings revealed that stakeholders rated both the implementation of the school guidance program and the quality of developmental and specialized guidance services at very high levels. Results further indicated a significant positive relationship between the level of implementation of the school guidance program and the quality of guidance services, suggesting that greater implementation fidelity is associated with better delivery of both developmental and specialized guidance services. The stakeholders' assessment of the implementation of the school guidance program and the quality of both developmental and specialized guidance services revealed significant relationship. The results led to the rejection of the null hypotheses which implies that better program implementation leads to higher quality preventive and developmental guidance services. It is concluded that a key factor in determining the quality of guidance services offered to learners is a well-implemented School Guidance Program. The strong correlation between specialized services (i.e., individual counseling, referrals, and crisis intervention) and developmental services (i.e., orientation, information, and life-skills workshops) shows that a well-designed, adequately funded program must be implemented and produce real benefits. Based on the findings, the study recommends that stakeholders sustain existing effective practices through continuous monitoring and regular program evaluation. Emphasis should be placed on institutionalizing successful strategies, enhancing professional development, and periodically reviewing resource allocation and collaborative mechanisms to maintain program quality and ensure long-term sustainability. Additionally, future researchers are encouraged to explore related variables or to involve a broader population to validate, extend, and deepen understanding of the influence of specialized guidance services.

**Keywords**— Stakeholders, Developmental Services, Specialized Services, Monitoring Tool.

## I. INTRODUCTION

School guidance programs play a vital role in promoting students' academic success, personal development, and career readiness. These programs are designed to provide comprehensive services that address learners' developmental and specialized needs through counseling, assessment, referral, consultation, and remedial interventions. In the Philippines, the Department of Education (DepEd) mandates the implementation of guidance and counseling services as part of its commitment to holistic education and mental health advocacy. However, despite these efforts, variations in program delivery and quality remain evident across schools, often influenced by resource limitations, counselor workload, and stakeholder engagement.

The significance of guidance programs is further reinforced by national education policies and initiatives such as the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (RA 10533), the Career Guidance Act (RA 11206), and the Basic Education Mental Health and Well-Being Promotion Act (RA 12080). These laws emphasize the need for comprehensive, responsive, and developmentally appropriate guidance and counseling programs that foster learners' academic achievement, personal growth, and career readiness across all grade levels.

Despite the legal mandates currently implemented by the Department of Education, the true measure of a guidance program's effectiveness lies in its actual implementation. Effectiveness depends not only on how well the programs are carried out in alignment with their objectives but also on how they respond to the evolving needs of students and the feedback of key stakeholders, including teachers, registered school guidance counselors, and school administrators.

To ensure these programs are responsive, relevant, and aligned with learners' evolving needs, it is imperative that their implementation be assessed. Assessment gives stakeholders, e.g., teachers, registered school guidance counselors, and school administrators, the opportunity to offer insightful criticism that can identify areas of strength, point out weaknesses, and guide required changes. Assessing the

implementation of school guidance programs from stakeholders' perspectives is essential for identifying strengths, gaps, and areas for improvement. Through assessment, better service deliverables to learners can be achieved. Schools risk continuing to provide guidance services that are outdated, underutilized, or not aligned with their stated objectives if they do not conduct a thorough assessment.

While existing studies have examined guidance services, limited research has focused on integrating stakeholder assessment with measurable service quality outcomes and translating these into a structured monitoring tool, particularly in the Philippine public school context. Such tools can help schools track program implementation, measure service quality, and ensure continuous improvement. This study examined stakeholders' assessments of the implementation of the school guidance program and its relationship to the quality of guidance services. The findings will serve as the basis for crafting a feedback-based monitoring tool that supports data-driven decision-making and enhances the delivery of guidance services in schools.

### 1.1 Statement of the Problem

#### Problem/s which were addressed by the research

This study focused on assessing the implementation of the school guidance program from the perspectives of its key stakeholders and the relationship to the quality of guidance services.

1. What is the level of stakeholders' assessment of the implementation of the School Guidance Program in terms of:
  - 1.1 Planning
  - 1.2 Program Management
  - 1.3 collaboration
  - 1.4 resources and
  - 1.5 support system?
2. What is the level of quality guidance services as to developmental services in terms of:
  - 2.1 Information
  - 2.2 Orientation
  - 2.3 guidance curriculum (homeroom and career guidance); and
  - 2.4 follow up?
3. What is the level of quality of guidance services as to specialized services in terms of:
  - 3.1 Counseling
  - 3.2 assessment
  - 3.3 referral
  - 3.4 consultation; and
  - 3.5 remedial?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the level of assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program and the quality of guidance service and developmental services?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the level of assessment of the implementation of the school guidance program and the quality of guidance specialized services?

## II. METHODOLOGY

The study employed a quantitative research design with a descriptive-correlational approach. The respondents consisted of teachers, registered school guidance counselors, and school administrators from six (6) public secondary schools with registered guidance counselors. A researcher-made questionnaire was used as the primary data-gathering instrument. Data were analyzed using weighted mean, standard deviation, and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient.

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part presents the different results and discussion of the results. All the research questions in Chapter 1 under the statement of the problem are answered in this chapter. It presents the data gathered about the significant relationship between assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program and quality of guidance service as to developmental services and specialized services.

### Level of Stakeholders' Assessment of the Implementation of School Guidance Program

In this study, the level of stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of school guidance program refers to Planning, Program Management, Collaboration, Resources, and Support System. The level of stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of school guidance program was revealed in the following tables which showed the statement, mean, standard deviation, remarks and verbal interpretation from the perspectives of respondents.

Table 1 presents the level of stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program in terms of Planning, reflecting the corresponding statements, mean scores, standard deviations, and remarks based on the respondents' perceptions.

Table 1. Level of Stakeholders' Assessment of School Guidance Program Implementation in Terms of Planning

| Statements                                                                                                | Mean | SD   | Remarks        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|----------------|
| The school has a written guidance program plan communicated to stakeholders at the start of the year.     | 4.27 | 0.89 | Strongly Agree |
| Annual guidance objectives and targets are clearly defined (e.g. developmental and specialized services). | 4.16 | 0.88 | Agree          |
| Guidance activities are scheduled on a yearly calendar and shared with classes/parents.                   | 4.29 | 0.90 | Strongly Agree |
| Plans for guidance services aligning with student needs identified based on surveys, referrals, etc.      | 4.23 | 0.88 | Strongly Agree |
| The guidance plan integrates program evaluation (e.g., post-activity feedback, year-end review).          | 4.10 | 0.96 | Agree          |
| Stakeholders are consulted during planning (e.g., through meetings or surveys).                           | 4.16 | 0.88 | Agree          |
| Weighted Mean                                                                                             | 4.20 |      |                |
| SD                                                                                                        | 0.81 |      |                |
| Verbal Interpretation                                                                                     |      |      | High           |

The data show that planning practices are positively perceived by stakeholders. Guidance activities are scheduled on a yearly calendar and shared with classes and parents yielded the highest mean score ( $M = 4.29$ ,  $SD = 0.90$ ), indicating that guidance activities are systematically planned

and clearly communicated. Likewise, the school has a written guidance program plan communicated to stakeholders at the start of the year registered a similarly high mean ( $M = 4.27$ ,  $SD = 0.89$ ), recommending the presence of a formal and transparent planning framework for the guidance program. These findings highlighted the school's efforts to ensure that guidance services are organized, structured, and understood by stakeholders.

Other planning components, such as aligning guidance services with identified student needs and consulting stakeholders during the planning process, were also rated positively, reflecting a need-based and participatory approach. The indicator the guidance plan integrates program evaluation such as post-activity feedback and year-end review obtained the lowest mean score ( $M = 4.10$ ,  $SD = 0.96$ ); however, it was still verbally interpreted as Agree, indicating that evaluative mechanisms are incorporated in planning, albeit with comparatively less emphasis.

Overall, the level of stakeholders' assessment of school guidance program implementation in terms of Planning attained a weighted mean score of 4.20 and a standard deviation of 0.81, which was verbally interpreted as High. This reveals that planning for the school guidance program is generally effective, systematic, and responsive to student needs, providing a strong foundation for the successful implementation of guidance services.

Table 2 shows the level of stakeholders' assessment on implementation of the school guidance program in terms of Program Management. It also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

Table 2. Level of Stakeholders' Assessment on the Implementation of School Guidance Program in Terms of Program Management

| Statements                                                                                             | Mean      | SD   | Remarks        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------|----------------|
| Guidance activities are implemented according to schedule.                                             | 4.27      | 0.85 | Strongly Agree |
| Roles and responsibilities of the guidance staff and partners are clearly assigned and followed.       | 4.28      | 0.92 | Strongly Agree |
| Guidance services use standard operating procedures (e.g., intake, referral, case notes).              | 4.30      | 0.91 | Strongly Agree |
| Attendance, outputs, and service utilization are consistently tracked.                                 | 4.24      | 0.88 | Strongly Agree |
| Program management includes risk management (e.g., crisis referral, child protection protocols).       | 4.32      | 0.88 | Strongly Agree |
| Regular monitoring reports (e.g., quarterly/semestral) are prepared and discussed with school leaders. | 4.22      | 0.89 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean                                                                                          | 4.27      |      |                |
| SD                                                                                                     | 0.82      |      |                |
| Verbal Interpretation                                                                                  | Very High |      |                |

Among the indicators, program management includes risk management (e.g., crisis referral, child protection protocols) obtained the highest mean score ( $M = 4.32$ ), supported by a standard deviation of ( $SD = 0.88$ ), which revealed a very high level of stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program in terms of Program Management. This indicates that stakeholders strongly agree that the guidance program is effectively managed with adequate safeguards for student welfare. Similarly, guidance services use standard operating procedures (e.g., intake, referral, case

notes) recorded a high mean ( $M = 4.30$ ) with ( $SD = 0.91$ ), reflecting stakeholders' confidence in the presence of clear and consistent operational processes.

On the other hand, regular monitoring reports (e.g., quarterly/semestral) are prepared and discussed with school leaders obtained the lowest mean score ( $M = 4.22$ ) with ( $SD = 0.89$ ); however, it was still verbally interpreted as Strongly Agree, indicating that monitoring and reporting mechanisms are regularly implemented, although with slightly lower emphasis compared to other aspects of program management. Overall, the level of stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program in terms of Program Management attained a weighted mean score of 4.27 and a standard deviation of 0.82, which was verbally interpreted as Very High among the respondents. This implies that the guidance program is effectively administered, systematically monitored, and consistently implemented in accordance with established procedures and institutional policies. The findings show that guidance activities are implemented as scheduled, guided by clear roles, standard operating procedures, and effective risk-management practices, reflecting a well-organized and accountable system. Monitoring, reporting, and documentation are also consistently practiced, demonstrating strong administrative oversight and coordination with school leaders.

Table 3. Level of Stakeholders' Assessment of School Guidance Program Implementation in Terms of Collaboration

| Statements                                                                                          | Mean      | SD   | Remarks        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------|----------------|
| Guidance staff coordinates with teachers to support students' academic/behavioral needs.            | 4.30      | 0.97 | Strongly Agree |
| Parents/guardians are engaged in guidance activities or case conferences when needed.               | 4.28      | 0.86 | Strongly Agree |
| The program partners with external agencies (e.g., LGU, NGOs, HEIs, industry) for student services. | 4.29      | 0.91 | Strongly Agree |
| Collaboration processes are timely (responses within a reasonable period).                          | 4.27      | 0.85 | Strongly Agree |
| Feedback from stakeholders is incorporated into improving guidance services.                        | 4.17      | 0.91 | Agree          |
| Collaboration respects confidentiality and consent standards                                        | 4.44      | 0.85 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean                                                                                       | 4.29      |      |                |
| SD                                                                                                  | 0.80      |      |                |
| Verbal Interpretation                                                                               | Very High |      |                |

Table 3 shows the level of stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program in terms of Collaboration. It also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

Among the indicators, collaboration respects confidentiality and consent standards obtained the highest mean score ( $M = 4.44$ ), supported by a standard deviation of ( $SD = 0.85$ ), which suggests a very high level of stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program in terms of Collaboration. This indicates that stakeholders strongly agree that collaborative efforts in guidance services are conducted with due regard for ethical standards, privacy, and informed consent. Likewise, guidance staff coordinates with teachers to support students' academic and behavioral needs recorded a high mean ( $M = 4.30$ ) with

(SD = 0.97), reflecting effective coordination between guidance personnel and teaching staff in addressing student concerns.

Conversely, feedback from stakeholders is incorporated into improving guidance services obtained the lowest mean score (M = 4.17) with (SD = 0.91); however, it was still verbally interpreted as Agree, indicating that stakeholder feedback is considered in program improvement, although it may not be as consistently integrated as other collaborative practices. Overall, the level of stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program in terms of Collaboration attained a weighted mean score of 4.29 and a standard deviation of 0.80, which was verbally interpreted as Very High among the respondents.

These findings imply that strong collaborative partnerships among guidance staff, teachers, parents, and external stakeholders contribute significantly to the effective implementation of the school guidance program ensuring coordinated, responsive, and ethically grounded guidance services.

Table 4. Level of Stakeholders' Assessment of School Guidance Program Implementation in Terms of Resources

| Statements                                                                            | Mean | SD   | Remarks        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|----------------|
| The school has an adequate and accessible guidance office/care center.                | 4.41 | 0.81 | Strongly Agree |
| There are sufficient materials (e.g., tests, modules, career information, brochures). | 4.00 | 0.91 | Agree          |
| Qualified personnel (counselor/designate) are available to deliver services.          | 4.42 | 0.87 | Strongly Agree |
| There is ICT support (e.g., online forms, data system) for guidance processes.        | 3.81 | 1.14 | Agree          |
| Budget or funding is allocated for guidance activities/training.                      | 4.11 | 0.90 | Agree          |
| Students can easily access guidance services (location, schedule, contact).           | 4.36 | 0.89 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean                                                                         | 4.18 |      |                |
| SD                                                                                    | 0.78 |      |                |
| Verbal Interpretation                                                                 | High |      |                |

Table 4 shows the level of stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program in terms of Resources. It also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

Among the indicators, qualified personnel (counselor/designate) are available to deliver services obtained the highest mean score (M = 4.42), supported by a standard deviation of (SD = 0.87), which suggests a very high level of stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program in terms of Resources. This indicates that stakeholders strongly agree that competent and appropriately designated personnel are available to provide guidance services. Similarly, the school has an adequate and accessible guidance office/care center recorded a high mean score (M = 4.41) with (SD = 0.81), reflecting stakeholders' recognition of the presence of a dedicated and accessible physical space for guidance activities.

On the other hand, there is ICT support (e.g., online forms, data system) for guidance processes obtained the lowest mean score (M = 3.81) with (SD = 1.14); however, it was still

verbally interpreted as Agree, indicating that while technological support for guidance services exists, it may be less developed compared to other resource components. Likewise, there are sufficient materials such as tests, modules, and career information obtained a slightly lower mean (M = 4.00, SD = 0.91) but remained positively rated.

Overall, the level of stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program in terms of Resources attained a weighted mean score of 4.18 and a standard deviation of 0.78, which was verbally interpreted as High among the respondents. This finding suggests that human, physical, and financial resources necessary for the effective delivery of guidance services are generally adequate, although improvements in ICT support and instructional materials may further enhance program implementation.

Table 5 shows the level of stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program in terms of Support System. It also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

Table 5. Level of Stakeholders' Assessment of School Guidance Program Implementation in Terms of Support System

| Statements                                                                                         | Mean      | SD   | Remarks        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------|----------------|
| School leadership prioritizes guidance in policies and school improvement plans.                   | 4.28      | 0.88 | Strongly Agree |
| Teachers support guidance initiatives (e.g., homeroom time, referrals).                            | 4.44      | 0.82 | Strongly Agree |
| The school provides training for staff on guidance-related topics.                                 | 4.17      | 0.85 | Agree          |
| The school enforces child protection/mental health protocols alongside guidance services.          | 4.41      | 0.80 | Strongly Agree |
| There is a clear mechanism for student/parent complaints or requests related to guidance services. | 4.27      | 0.84 | Strongly Agree |
| The school culture encourages help-seeking and destigmatizes counselling.                          | 4.42      | 0.86 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean                                                                                      | 4.34      |      |                |
| SD                                                                                                 | 0.75      |      |                |
| Verbal Interpretation                                                                              | Very High |      |                |

Among the indicators, teachers support guidance initiatives (e.g., homeroom time, referrals) obtained the highest mean score (M = 4.44), supported by a standard deviation of (SD = 0.82), which suggests a very high level of stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program in terms of Support System. This indicates that teachers play an active and supportive role in the delivery of guidance services. Likewise, the school culture encourages help-seeking and destigmatizes counseling recorded a high mean score (M = 4.43) with (SD = 0.86), reflecting a positive and supportive school environment that promotes students' willingness to access guidance services.

Conversely, the schools provide training for staff on guidance-related topics obtained the lowest mean score (M = 4.19) with (SD = 0.85); however, it was still verbally interpreted as Agree, indicating that staff development opportunities related to guidance are present but may be less emphasized compared to other support mechanisms. Other indicators, such as school leadership prioritization, enforcement of child protection and mental health protocols, and mechanisms for complaints or requests, were all rated



very highly, demonstrating strong institutional backing for the guidance program.

Overall, the level of stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program in terms of Support System attained a weighted mean score of 4.34 and a standard deviation of 0.75, which was verbally interpreted as Very High among the respondents. This finding suggests that strong leadership commitment, teacher involvement, and a positive school culture collectively provide a solid support system that enhances the effectiveness and sustainability of the school guidance program.

Table 6. Composite of Stakeholders' Assessment of School Guidance Program Implementation

| Indicators            | Weighted Mean | SD   | Verbal Interpretation |
|-----------------------|---------------|------|-----------------------|
| Planning              | 4.20          | 0.81 | High                  |
| Program Management    | 4.27          | 0.82 | Very High             |
| Collaboration         | 4.29          | 0.80 | Very High             |
| Resources             | 4.18          | 0.78 | High                  |
| Support System        | 4.34          | 0.75 | Very High             |
| Grand Mean            | 4.26          |      |                       |
| SD                    | 0.79          |      |                       |
| Verbal Interpretation |               |      | Very High             |

The level of stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of school guidance program in terms of Planning, Program Management, Collaboration, Resources, and Support System. arrived at a grand mean score of 4.26 and a standard deviation of 0.79 and was verbally interpreted as very high among the respondents. This means that the stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of school guidance program.

Among the five indicators, Support System, Collaboration, and Program Management obtained very high ratings, indicating strong institutional backing, effective coordination among stakeholders, and efficient administration of guidance services. Meanwhile, Planning and Resources were rated high, suggesting that while foundational structures and resources are well established, there is still room for further enhancement. Overall, the findings imply that the school guidance program is comprehensively and effectively implemented, supported by strong leadership, collaborative practices, and sound management, which collectively contribute to the program's sustainability and effectiveness. This finding supports Stakeholder's Theory which emphasizes the importance of stakeholder participation in determining program effectiveness.

#### *Level of Guidance Services Quality as to Developmental Services*

In this study, the level of quality of guidance services as to developmental services refers to information, orientation, guidance curriculum (homeroom and career guidance), placement, and follow-up.

The following tables show the statement, mean, standard deviation, remarks and verbal interpretation from the perspectives of respondents.

Table 7 shows the level of guidance services quality as to developmental services in terms of Information. It also

displays the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

Table 7. Level of Guidance Services Quality as to Developmental Services in Terms of Information

| Statements                                                                                                          | Mean | SD   | Remarks        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|----------------|
| Students receive accurate educational and career information through multiple channels (bulletins, LMS, brochures). | 4.08 | 0.92 | Agree          |
| Information is updated and relevant (scholarships, SHS strands, college programs, jobs).                            | 4.09 | 0.90 | Agree          |
| Information materials are understandable and age- appropriate.                                                      | 4.18 | 0.88 | Agree          |
| Students/parents know where to find guidance information when needed.                                               | 4.30 | 0.84 | Strongly Agree |
| Information activities help students make decisions (subjects, strands, careers).                                   | 4.30 | 0.83 | Strongly Agree |
| Students are able to apply the information received in making informed academic or career decisions.                | 4.24 | 0.85 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean                                                                                                       | 4.20 |      |                |
| SD                                                                                                                  | 0.79 |      |                |
| Verbal Interpretation                                                                                               |      |      | High           |

Among the indicators, students/parents know where to find guidance information when needed and information activities help students make decisions (subjects, strands, careers) both obtained the highest mean score ( $M = 4.30$ ), supported by standard deviations of ( $SD = 0.84$ ) and ( $SD = 0.83$ ), respectively. These results suggest a high level of stakeholder agreement that guidance information is accessible and useful in aiding students' academic and career decision-making. Similarly, students can apply the information received in making informed academic or career decisions also yielded a high mean score ( $M = 4.24$ ,  $SD = 0.85$ ), indicating that the information provided is functional and relevant to students' needs.

Conversely, students receive accurate educational and career information through multiple channels obtained the lowest mean score ( $M = 4.08$ ) with ( $SD = 0.92$ ); however, it was still verbally interpreted as Agree, indicating that while information dissemination is effective, opportunities remain to further enhance the variety and reach of communication channels. The delivery of guidance information was consistent, as demonstrated by the positive assessment of other factors such as the relevance, clarity, and age-appropriateness of the materials.

Overall, the level of quality of guidance services as to developmental services in terms of Information attained a weighted mean score of 4.20 and a standard deviation of 0.79, which was verbally interpreted as High. This finding implies that guidance information services are generally effective, accessible, and helpful in supporting informed decision-making among students, thereby contributing positively to the overall quality of developmental guidance services.

Table 8 shows the level of quality of guidance services as to developmental services in terms of Orientation. It also

displays the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

Table 8. Level of Guidance Services Quality as to Developmental Services in Terms of Orientation

| Statements                                                                                                      | Mean | SD   | Remarks        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|----------------|
| Orientation helps students understand school policies, services, and routines.                                  | 4.44 | 0.81 | Strongly Agree |
| Orientation supports adjustment of new/transitioning students (e.g., Grade 7, SHS entrants).                    | 4.31 | 0.85 | Strongly Agree |
| Orientation includes student well-being topics (bullying prevention, safety, help lines).                       | 4.44 | 0.79 | Strongly Agree |
| Parents are provided with orientation/briefings on guidance services.                                           | 4.33 | 0.85 | Strongly Agree |
| Orientation is timely (at entry or key transitions).                                                            | 4.26 | 0.83 | Strongly Agree |
| Orientation sessions are conducted consistently at the beginning of the school year and during key transitions. | 4.35 | 0.85 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean                                                                                                   | 4.36 |      |                |
| SD                                                                                                              | 0.76 |      |                |
| Verbal Interpretation                                                                                           |      |      | Very High      |

Among the indicators, orientation helps students understand school policies, services, and routines and orientation includes student well-being topics such as bullying prevention, safety, and help lines both obtained the highest mean score ( $M = 4.44$ ), supported by standard deviations of ( $SD = 0.81$ ) and ( $SD = 0.79$ ), respectively. These results suggest a very high level of stakeholders' assessment that orientation activities are comprehensive and effectively address both academic adjustment and student well-being. Likewise, orientation sessions are conducted consistently at the beginning of the school year and during key transitions recorded a high mean score ( $M = 4.35$ ) with ( $SD = 0.85$ ), indicating consistency and timeliness in the conduct of orientation programs.

Conversely, orientation is timely (at entry or key transitions) obtained the lowest mean score ( $M = 4.26$ ) with ( $SD = 0.83$ ); however, it was still verbally interpreted as Strongly Agree, suggesting that orientation activities are generally conducted at appropriate times, though with slightly less emphasis compared to other orientation aspects. Other indicators, including parental orientation and support for transitioning students, were rated very highly, reflecting inclusive and well-structured orientation practices.

Overall, the level of quality of guidance services as to developmental services in terms of Orientation attained a weighted mean score of 4.36 and a standard deviation of 0.76, which was verbally interpreted as Very High. This finding implies that orientation services are effectively implemented and play a vital role in helping students and parents adjust to the school environment, thereby strengthening the overall delivery of developmental guidance services. Effective orientation programs help students understand school policies, routines, services, and expectations while promoting a sense of belonging and safety.

Table 9 shows the level of quality of guidance services as to developmental services in terms of guidance curriculum

(homeroom and career guidance). It also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

Table 9. Level of Guidance Services Quality as to Developmental Services in Terms of Guidance Curriculum (Homeroom and Career Guidance)

| Statements                                                                        | Mean | SD   | Remarks        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|----------------|
| Homeroom guidance lessons are delivered regularly as planned.                     | 4.39 | 0.82 | Strongly Agree |
| Lessons develop SEL/life skills (self-awareness, decision-making, relationships). | 4.30 | 0.83 | Strongly Agree |
| Career guidance modules help students explore interests and career paths.         | 4.31 | 0.90 | Strongly Agree |
| Activities use interactive methods (projects, simulations, interviews).           | 4.16 | 0.85 | Agree          |
| Assessments (reflection sheets, outputs) demonstrate learning from modules.       | 4.21 | 0.84 | Strongly Agree |
| Curriculum content is relevant to grade level and culturally responsive.          | 4.28 | 0.79 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean                                                                     | 4.27 |      |                |
| SD                                                                                | 0.79 |      |                |
| Verbal Interpretation                                                             |      |      | Very High      |

Among the indicators, homeroom guidance lessons are delivered regularly as planned obtained the highest mean score ( $M = 4.39$ ), supported by a standard deviation of ( $SD = 0.82$ ), which suggests a very high level of stakeholders' assessment of the guidance curriculum implementation. This indicates that homeroom guidance sessions are consistently conducted according to schedule. Similarly, career guidance modules help students explore interests and career paths and lessons develop social-emotional and life skills yielded high mean scores ( $M = 4.31$ ,  $SD = 0.90$ ) and ( $M = 4.30$ ,  $SD = 0.83$ ), respectively, reflecting stakeholders' strong agreement that the guidance curriculum effectively supports students' personal, social, and career development.

On the other hand, activities use interactive methods such as projects, simulations, and interviews obtained the lowest mean score ( $M = 4.16$ ) with ( $SD = 0.85$ ); however, it was still verbally interpreted as Agree, indicating that interactive strategies are used but may be implemented less consistently than other curriculum components. Other indicators, including relevance to grade level and cultural responsiveness, were rated very highly, suggesting that the guidance curriculum content is appropriate and meaningful to students.

Overall, the level of quality of guidance services as to developmental services in terms of guidance curriculum (homeroom and career guidance) attained a weighted mean score of 4.27 and a standard deviation of 0.79, which was verbally interpreted as Very High. This finding implies that the guidance curriculum is well-implemented, relevant, and effective in promoting students' social-emotional learning and career readiness as part of the developmental guidance services.

Table 10 shows the level of quality of guidance services as to developmental services in terms of Placement. It also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

Among the indicators, students and parents are guided during transition points such as elementary to junior high school, junior high school to senior high school, and senior

high school to college or work obtained the highest mean score ( $M = 4.28$ ), supported by a standard deviation of ( $SD = 0.80$ ), which suggests a very high level of stakeholders' assessment of placement services. This indicates that students and parents receive adequate guidance during critical educational transitions. Similarly, placement decisions consider assessment data such as grades, interests, and aptitude recorded a high mean score ( $M = 4.27$ ,  $SD = 0.84$ ), reflecting stakeholders' strong agreement that placement practices are data-driven and responsive to individual student profiles.

Table 10. Level of Guidance Services Quality as to Developmental Services in Terms of Placement

| Statements                                                                                                            | Mean | SD   | Remarks        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|----------------|
| Students receive advisement on subject choices or SHS tracks aligned with interests/abilities.                        | 4.26 | 0.86 | Strongly Agree |
| Placement decisions consider assessment data (grades, interests, aptitude).                                           | 4.27 | 0.84 | Strongly Agree |
| Students/parents are guided in transition points e.g. (elementary→JHS, JHS→SHS, SHS→college/work).                    | 4.28 | 0.80 | Strongly Agree |
| Documentation of placement decisions is clear and accessible to stakeholders.                                         | 4.21 | 0.87 | Strongly Agree |
| Placement support improves student satisfaction and reduces mismatch.                                                 | 4.23 | 0.83 | Strongly Agree |
| The placement service ensures that students are "in the right place" to succeed both academically and professionally. | 4.22 | 0.87 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean                                                                                                         | 4.25 |      |                |
| SD                                                                                                                    | 0.79 |      |                |
| Verbal Interpretation                                                                                                 |      |      | Very High      |

But, documentation of placement decisions is clear and accessible to stakeholders obtained the lowest mean score ( $M = 4.21$ ) with ( $SD = 0.87$ ); however, it was still verbally interpreted as Strongly Agree, indicating that placement processes are generally well documented, though clarity and accessibility may be slightly less emphasized compared to other aspects. Other indicators, including advisement aligned with students' interests and abilities and the contribution of placement services to student satisfaction, were also rated very highly.

Overall, the level of quality of guidance services as to developmental services in terms of Placement attained a weighted mean score of 4.25 and a standard deviation of 0.79, which was verbally interpreted as Very High. This finding implies that placement services are effectively implemented and play a vital role in ensuring that students are appropriately positioned to succeed academically and prepare for future educational or career pathways.

Table 11 shows the level of quality of guidance services as to developmental services in terms of Follow-up. It also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

Among the indicators, students feel supported after counseling, referral, or placement obtained the highest mean score ( $M = 4.36$ ), supported by a standard deviation of ( $SD = 0.80$ ), which suggests a very high level of stakeholders' assessment of follow-up services. This indicates that students perceive continued care and assistance after guidance

interventions. Similarly, follow-up actions are timely and documented recorded a high mean score ( $M = 4.26$ ,  $SD = 0.83$ ), reflecting stakeholders' agreement that follow-up processes are carried out promptly and with proper documentation.

Table 11. Level of Guidance Services Quality as to Developmental Services in Terms of Follow-up

| Statements                                                                                       | Mean | SD   | Remarks        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|----------------|
| The school monitors students after interventions/placements to check progress.                   | 4.24 | 0.86 | Strongly Agree |
| Follow-up actions are timely and documented.                                                     | 4.26 | 0.83 | Strongly Agree |
| Students feel supported after counseling/ referral/ placement.                                   | 4.36 | 0.80 | Strongly Agree |
| Follow-up data are used to improve services.                                                     | 4.16 | 0.90 | Agree          |
| Alumni or leaver feedback (where feasible) is solicited to refine programs                       | 4.05 | 0.91 | Agree          |
| The results of follow-up activities are documented and used to improve future guidance programs. | 4.17 | 0.92 | Agree          |
| Weighted Mean                                                                                    | 4.21 |      |                |
| SD                                                                                               | 0.80 |      |                |
| Verbal Interpretation                                                                            |      |      | Very High      |

Conversely, alumni or leaver feedback is solicited to refine programs obtained the lowest mean score ( $M = 4.05$ ) with ( $SD = 0.91$ ); however, it was still verbally interpreted as Agree, indicating that while post-school follow-up mechanisms exist, they may be less consistently implemented than other follow-up activities. Other indicators, such as monitoring student progress and using follow-up data to improve services, were still positively rated, suggesting that follow-up information is largely used for program enhancement.

Overall, the level of quality of guidance services as to developmental services in terms of Follow-up attained a weighted mean score of 4.21 and a standard deviation of 0.80, which was verbally interpreted as Very High. This finding implies that follow-up practices are effectively implemented and play an important role in sustaining student support and ensuring continuous improvement of developmental guidance services.

Table 12. Composite of Guidance Services Quality as to Developmental Services

| Indicators                                         | weighted Mean | SD   | Verbal Interpretation |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------------|------|-----------------------|
| Information                                        | 4.20          | 0.79 | Very High             |
| Orientation                                        | 4.36          | 0.76 | Very High             |
| Guidance Curriculum (Homeroom and Career Guidance) | 4.27          | 0.79 | Very High             |
| Placement                                          | 4.25          | 0.79 | Very High             |
| Follow-Up                                          | 4.21          | 0.80 | Very High             |
| Grand Mean                                         | 4.26          |      |                       |
| SD                                                 | 0.79          |      |                       |
| Verbal Interpretation                              |               |      | Very High             |

The composite results in Table 12 show that the quality of guidance services as to developmental services was assessed at a very high level, as evidenced by a grand mean of 4.26 and a standard deviation of 0.79. All indicators e.g. information, orientation, guidance curriculum (homeroom and career guidance), placement, and follow-up were verbally interpreted



as very high, indicating that developmental guidance services are consistently and effectively delivered. This suggests that schools demonstrated strong adherence to structured guidance practices, which may contribute to consistent service delivery.

Among these, orientation and guidance curriculum registered the highest assessments, reflecting strong support for student adjustment, personal development, and career readiness. Overall, the findings suggest that developmental guidance services are comprehensive, responsive to student needs, and well implemented, contributing significantly to students' academic, personal, and career development.

#### Level of Guidance Services Quality as to Specialized Services

In this study, the level of quality of guidance services as to specialized services refers to counseling, assessment, referral, consultation, and remedial. The following tables show the statement, mean, standard deviation, remarks and verbal interpretation from the perspectives of respondents.

Table 13 shows the level of quality of guidance services as to specialized services in terms of Counseling. It also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

Table 13. Level of Guidance Services Quality as to Specialized Services in Terms of Counseling

| Statements                                                                      | Mean | SD   | Remarks        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|----------------|
| Students can book counseling easily-(walk- in /online/teacher referral).        | 4.31 | 0.89 | Strongly Agree |
| Counseling sessions are confidential and respectful.                            | 4.52 | 0.80 | Strongly Agree |
| Counselors use goal-focused, 'evidence-informed approaches.                     | 4.45 | 0.82 | Strongly Agree |
| Counseling reduces distress or improves coping.                                 | 4.29 | 0.86 | Strongly Agree |
| Written case notes and plans (without breaching privacy) are kept consistently. | 4.44 | 0.86 | Strongly Agree |
| Students are satisfied with counseling support.                                 | 4.30 | 0.84 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean SD                                                                | 4.39 |      |                |
| Verbal Interpretation                                                           | 0.78 |      | Very High      |

Among the indicators, counseling sessions are confidential and respectful obtained the highest mean score ( $M = 4.52$ ), supported by a standard deviation of ( $SD = 0.80$ ), which suggests a very high level of stakeholders' assessment of counseling services. This indicates that confidentiality and respect are strongly observed during counseling sessions, fostering trust and openness among students. Likewise, counselors use goal-focused, evidence-informed approaches yielded a high mean score ( $M = 4.45$ ,  $SD = 0.82$ ), reflecting stakeholders' confidence in the professional competence and effectiveness of counseling practices provided to students.

Conversely, counseling reduces distress or improves coping obtained the lowest mean score ( $M = 4.29$ ) with ( $SD = 0.86$ ); however, it was still verbally interpreted as Strongly Agree, indicating that counseling services are perceived as beneficial in addressing students' emotional and psychological concerns. Student happiness, consistent case note documentation, and the simplicity of scheduling counseling

sessions were among the other metrics that received exceptionally high ratings.

Overall, the level of quality of guidance services as to specialized services in terms of Counseling attained a weighted mean score of 4.39 and a standard deviation of 0.78, which was verbally interpreted as Very High. This finding implies that counseling services are effectively delivered, ethically practiced, and responsive to students' needs, contributing significantly to the overall quality of specialized guidance services.

Table 14 shows the level of quality of guidance services as to specialized services in terms of Assessment. It also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

Table 14. Level of Guidance Services Quality as to Specialized Services in Terms of Assessment

| Statements                                                                                  | Mean | SD   | Remarks        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|----------------|
| The school uses appropriate tools (interest inventories, screeners) for guidance decisions. | 4.27 | 0.84 | Strongly Agree |
| Assessments are administered and interpreted by trained personnel.                          | 4.29 | 0.89 | Strongly Agree |
| Results are explained clearly to students/parents.                                          | 4.29 | 0.89 | Strongly Agree |
| Assessment results inform advisement/placement.                                             | 4.24 | 0.87 | Strongly Agree |
| Tools are fair and culturally appropriate.                                                  | 4.29 | 0.90 | Strongly Agree |
| Assessment records are secure and used ethically.                                           | 4.35 | 0.88 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean SD                                                                            | 4.29 |      |                |
| Verbal Interpretation                                                                       | 0.83 |      | Very High      |

Among the indicators, assessment records are secure and used ethically obtained the highest mean score ( $M = 4.35$ ), supported by a standard deviation of ( $SD = 0.88$ ), which suggests a very high level of stakeholders' assessment of assessment services. This indicates that assessment procedures are conducted with strong regard for ethical standards, data security, and confidentiality. Similarly, assessments are administered and interpreted by trained personnel and results are explained clearly to students and parents both recorded high mean scores ( $M = 4.29$ ,  $SD = 0.89$ ), reflecting stakeholders' confidence in the professionalism and clarity of assessment processes.

Conversely, assessment results inform advisement and placement obtained the lowest mean score ( $M = 4.24$ ) with ( $SD = 0.87$ ); however, it was still verbally interpreted as Strongly Agree, indicating that assessment outcomes are generally utilized in guidance decisions, though with slightly less emphasis compared to other assessment practices. Other indicators, including the use of appropriate and culturally fair assessment tools, were also rated very highly, signifying consistency and appropriateness in assessment implementation.

Overall, the level of quality of guidance services as to specialized services in terms of Assessment attained a weighted mean score of 4.29 and a standard deviation of 0.83, which was verbally interpreted as Very High. This finding implies that assessment services are effectively implemented,



ethically practiced, and play an essential role in supporting informed guidance decisions within the school's specialized guidance services.

Table 15 shows the level of quality of guidance services as to specialized services in terms of Referral. It also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation, and remarks.

Table 15. Level of Guidance Services Quality as to Specialized Services in Terms of Referral

| Statements                                                                                              | Mean      | SD   | Remarks        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------|----------------|
| There is a clear referral process to internal/external services (psychologists, health, social welfare) | 4.28      | 0.84 | Strongly Agree |
| Referrals are timely relative to student needs/risk level.                                              | 4.26      | 0.85 | Strongly Agree |
| Parents/guardians are involved appropriately with consent.                                              | 4.43      | 0.80 | Strongly Agree |
| The school coordinates and tracks referral outcomes.                                                    | 4.29      | 0.85 | Strongly Agree |
| Referral partners are credible and accessible.                                                          | 4.26      | 0.89 | Strongly Agree |
| Students feel supported during and after referral                                                       | 4.32      | 0.87 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean                                                                                           | 4.32      |      |                |
| SD                                                                                                      | 0.79      |      |                |
| Verbal Interpretation                                                                                   | Very High |      |                |

Among the indicators, parents/guardians are involved appropriately with consent obtained the highest mean score ( $M = 4.43$ ), supported by a standard deviation of ( $SD = 0.80$ ), which suggests a very high level of stakeholders' assessment of referral services. This indicates that referral processes are carried out with proper parental involvement and ethical consideration. Similarly, the school coordinates and tracks referral outcomes yielded a high mean score ( $M = 4.32$ ,  $SD = 0.85$ ), reflecting stakeholders' agreement that referral cases are monitored to ensure continuity of support and effective follow-through.

Conversely, there is a clear referral process to internal and external services and referrals are timely relative to student needs or risk level both obtained the lowest mean scores ( $M = 4.28$ ) with standard deviations of ( $SD = 0.84$ ) and ( $SD = 0.85$ ), respectively; however, these were still verbally interpreted as Strongly Agree, indicating that structured and timely referral mechanisms are evidently in place. Other indicators, such as the accessibility of referral partners and students feeling supported during and after referral, were also rated very highly.

Overall, the level of quality of guidance services as to specialized services in terms of Referral attained a weighted mean score of 4.32 and a standard deviation of 0.79, which was verbally interpreted as Very High. This finding implies that referral services are effectively implemented, ethically grounded, and well-coordinated, ensuring that students with specialized needs are appropriately linked to internal and external support services.

The following tables show the statement, mean, standard deviation, remarks and verbal interpretation from the perspectives of respondents.

Table 16 presents the level of quality of guidance services as to specialized services in terms of Consultation, showing

the corresponding statements, mean scores, standard deviations, and remarks based on the respondents' assessments.

The results indicate that consultation services are implemented at a very high level. A collaborative atmosphere during consultations where the expertise of the counselor and the observations of the teacher or parent are both valued received the highest mean score ( $M = 4.40$ ,  $SD = 0.82$ ). This reflects strong stakeholder agreement that consultation practices promote mutual respect and shared decision-making among counselors, teachers, and parents. Likewise, counselors consult with teachers to address classroom or student concerns obtained a similarly high mean ( $M = 4.39$ ,  $SD = 0.92$ ), suggesting that regular professional collaboration is evident in addressing student-related issues.

Table 16. Level of Guidance Services Quality as to Specialized Services in Terms of Consultation

| Statements                                                                                                                                               | Mean      | SD   | Remarks        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------|----------------|
| Counselors consult with teachers to address classroom or student concerns.                                                                               | 4.39      | 0.92 | Strongly Agree |
| Consultation provides actionable strategies for teachers/parents.                                                                                        | 4.38      | 0.85 | Strongly Agree |
| Consultation improves classroom management or relationships.                                                                                             | 4.38      | 0.83 | Strongly Agree |
| Meetings are scheduled promptly and documented.                                                                                                          | 4.36      | 0.84 | Strongly Agree |
| Consultees report satisfaction with consultation support.                                                                                                | 4.32      | 0.85 | Strongly Agree |
| There is a collaborative atmosphere during consultations where the expertise of the counselor and the observations of the teacher/parent are both valued | 4.40      | 0.82 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean                                                                                                                                            | 4.37      |      |                |
| SD                                                                                                                                                       | 0.80      |      |                |
| Verbal Interpretation                                                                                                                                    | Very High |      |                |

Other aspects of consultation, such as the provision of actionable strategies, improvement of classroom management or relationships, and timely scheduling and documentation of meetings, were also rated very highly. The indicator consultees report satisfaction with consultation support recorded the lowest mean score ( $M = 4.32$ ,  $SD = 0.85$ ); however, it remained verbally interpreted as Strongly Agree, indicating overall satisfaction with consultation services despite minor variations in perception.

Overall, the level of quality of guidance services as to specialized services in terms of Consultation achieved a weighted mean score of 4.37 with a standard deviation of 0.80, which was verbally interpreted as Very High. This suggests that consultation services are well-implemented, collaborative, and effective in supporting teachers and parents, thereby strengthening the school's capacity to address students' academic, behavioral, and social concerns.

Table 17 presents the level of quality of guidance services as to specialized services in terms of Remedial, showing the corresponding statements, mean scores, standard deviations, and remarks based on the responses of the respondents.

The findings reveal that remedial services are perceived to be implemented at a very high level. Notably, remedial services coordinate with teachers and parents obtained the highest

mean score ( $M = 4.38$ ,  $SD = 0.82$ ), indicating strong collaboration among key stakeholders in addressing the needs of at-risk students. In addition, interventions are progress-monitored in terms of goals, sessions, and outcomes and interventions lead to observable improvements in attendance, behavior, and grades both registered high mean scores ( $M = 4.35$ ,  $SD = 0.82$ ;  $M = 4.35$ ,  $SD = 0.87$ , respectively), reflecting stakeholders' confidence in the effectiveness and monitoring of remedial interventions.

Table 17. Level of Guidance Services Quality as to Specialized Services in Terms of Remedial

| Statements                                                                             | Mean | SD   | Remarks        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|----------------|
| The school provides targeted interventions for at-risk students (academic/behavioral). | 4.34 | 0.81 | Strongly Agree |
| Remedial support is based on data (referrals, screening, grades).                      | 4.33 | 0.85 | Strongly Agree |
| Interventions are progress-monitored (goals, sessions, outcomes).                      | 4.35 | 0.82 | Strongly Agree |
| Students receive individualized plans when needed.                                     | 4.31 | 0.88 | Strongly Agree |
| Remedial services coordinate with teachers/parents.                                    | 4.38 | 0.82 | Strongly Agree |
| Interventions lead to observable improvements (attendance, behavior, grades).          | 4.35 | 0.87 | Strongly Agree |
| Weighted Mean                                                                          | 4.34 |      |                |
| SD                                                                                     | 0.78 |      |                |
| Verbal Interpretation                                                                  |      |      | Very High      |

Other aspects of remedial services, including the provision of targeted interventions, use of data-based referrals and screening, and development of individualized plans, were also rated very highly. The indicator students receive individualized plans when needed recorded the lowest mean score ( $M = 4.31$ ,  $SD = 0.88$ ); however, it was still verbally interpreted as Strongly Agree, suggesting that individualized support is consistently provided, albeit with slight variation in implementation.

Overall, the level of quality of guidance services as to specialized services in terms of Remedial attained a weighted mean score of 4.34 and a standard deviation of 0.78, which was verbally interpreted as Very High. This implies that remedial services are systematic, data-driven, and collaborative, effectively supporting students who require additional academic or behavioral interventions and contributing positively to student improvement outcomes.

Table 18. Composite of Guidance Services Quality as to Specialized Services

| Indicators            | Weighted Mean | SD   | Verbal Interpretation |
|-----------------------|---------------|------|-----------------------|
| Counseling            | 4.39          | 0.78 | Very High             |
| Assessment            | 4.29          | 0.83 | Very High             |
| Referral              | 4.32          | 0.79 | Very High             |
| Consultation          | 4.37          | 0.80 | Very High             |
| Remedial              | 4.34          | 0.78 | Very High             |
| Grand Mean            | 4.34          |      |                       |
| SD                    | 0.79          |      |                       |
| Verbal Interpretation |               |      | Very High             |

The composite results in Table 18 indicate that the quality of guidance services as to specialized services is assessed at a very high level, with a grand mean of 4.34 and a standard deviation of 0.79. All indicators—counseling, assessment, referral, consultation, and remedial services—were verbally

interpreted as very high, reflecting consistently strong implementation across interpreted as very high, reflecting consistently strong implementation across specialized guidance functions.

Counseling and consultation received the highest assessments, highlighting the effectiveness of direct support services and collaborative problem-solving practices. Overall, the findings suggest that specialized guidance services are professionally delivered, ethically managed, and responsive to students' diverse needs, thereby strengthening the school's capacity to provide comprehensive and targeted support interventions.

### Test of Association Between the Assessment of the Implementation of the School Guidance Program and Quality of Guidance Service as to Developmental Services

To test the significant relationship between the assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program and quality of guidance service as to developmental services in terms of information, orientation, guidance curriculum (homeroom and career guidance), placement, and follow-up they were treated statistically using Real Statistics Data Analysis Tools using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

A significant positive correlation was observed between assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program and quality of guidance service as to developmental services, indicating that quality of guidance services are implemented more tended to achieve higher developmental services ( $r(300)$   $p < .001$ ). This suggests that increased assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program is associated with better developmental services.

Table 19. Significant Relationship Between the Assessment of the Implementation of the School Guidance Program and Quality of Guidance Service as to Developmental Services

| Assessment on the school guidance program | Quality of Guidance Services as to Developmental Services | information | orientation | guidance curriculum | placement | follow-up |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Planning                                  | Pearson Correlation                                       | 0.762**     | 0.791**     | 0.749**             | 0.761**   | 0.757**   |
|                                           | Sig. (2-tailed)                                           | 0.000       | 0.000       | 0.000               | 0.000     | 0.000     |
|                                           | N                                                         | 300         | 300         | 300                 | 300       | 300       |
| Program Management                        | Pearson Correlation                                       | 0.808**     | 0.836**     | 0.815**             | 0.812**   | 0.833**   |
|                                           | Sig. (2-tailed)                                           | 0.000       | 0.000       | 0.000               | 0.000     | 0.000     |
|                                           | N                                                         | 300         | 300         | 300                 | 300       | 300       |
| Collaboration                             | Pearson Correlation                                       | 0.823**     | 0.845**     | 0.834**             | 0.823**   | 0.823**   |
|                                           | Sig. (2-tailed)                                           | 0.000       | 0.000       | 0.000               | 0.000     | 0.000     |
|                                           | N                                                         | 300         | 300         | 300                 | 300       | 300       |
| Resources                                 | Pearson Correlation                                       | 0.835**     | 0.844**     | 0.861**             | 0.842**   | 0.847**   |
|                                           | Sig. (2-tailed)                                           | 0.000       | 0.000       | 0.000               | 0.000     | 0.000     |
|                                           | N                                                         | 300         | 300         | 300                 | 300       | 300       |
| Support System                            | Pearson Correlation                                       | 0.819**     | 0.871**     | 0.851**             | 0.832**   | 0.848**   |
|                                           | Sig. (2-tailed)                                           | 0.000       | 0.000       | 0.000               | 0.000     | 0.000     |
|                                           | N                                                         | 300         | 300         | 300                 | 300       | 300       |

Sig. (2-tailed)

### Test of Association Between the Assessment of the Implementation of the School Guidance Program and Quality of Guidance Service as to Specialized Services

To test the significant relationship between the assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program and quality of guidance service as to specialized services in terms of counseling, assessment, referral, consultation, and remedial they were treated statistically using Real Statistics Data Analysis Tools using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

Table 20. Significant Relationship Between the Assessment of the Implementation of the School Guidance Program and Quality of Guidance Service as to Specialized Services

| Assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program |                     | Quality of Guidance Services as to Specialized Services |            |          |              |          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------|--------------|----------|
|                                                                 |                     | counseling                                              | assessment | referral | consultation | remedial |
| Planning                                                        | Pearson Correlation | 0.780**                                                 | 0.769**    | 0.786**  | 0.761**      | 0.739**  |
|                                                                 | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 0.000                                                   | 0.000      | 0.000    | 0.000        | 0.000    |
|                                                                 | N                   | 300                                                     | 300        | 300      | 300          | 300      |
| Program Management                                              | Pearson Correlation | 0.840**                                                 | 0.839**    | 0.849**  | 0.838**      | 0.802**  |
|                                                                 | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 0.000                                                   | 0.000      | 0.000    | 0.000        | 0.000    |
|                                                                 | N                   | 300                                                     | 300        | 300      | 300          | 300      |
| Collaboration                                                   | Pearson Correlation | 0.846**                                                 | 0.808**    | 0.833**  | 0.831**      | 0.802**  |
|                                                                 | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 0.000                                                   | 0.000      | 0.000    | 0.000        | 0.000    |
|                                                                 | N                   | 300                                                     | 300        | 300      | 300          | 300      |
| Resources                                                       | Pearson Correlation | 0.825**                                                 | 0.820**    | 0.821**  | 0.813**      | 0.814**  |
|                                                                 | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 0.000                                                   | 0.000      | 0.000    | 0.000        | 0.000    |
|                                                                 | N                   | 300                                                     | 300        | 300      | 300          | 300      |
| Support System                                                  | Pearson Correlation | 0.866**                                                 | 0.861**    | 0.862**  | 0.851**      | 0.827**  |
|                                                                 | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 0.000                                                   | 0.000      | 0.000    | 0.000        | 0.000    |
|                                                                 | N                   | 300                                                     | 300        | 300      | 300          | 300      |

A significant positive correlation was observed between assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program and quality of guidance service as to specialized services, indicating that quality of guidance service are implemented more tended to achieve higher developmental services ( $r(300) p < .001$ ). This suggests that increased assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program is associated with better specialized services.

The American School Counselor Association (ASCA, 2023) emphasized that specialized services function best within a well-implemented comprehensive school counseling program, as clear planning, monitoring systems, and role definition enable counselors to respond effectively to students with complex or high-risk needs.

### IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There is a significant relationship between stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program and the quality of guidance developmental services, leading to rejection of null hypotheses implying that better program implementation leads to higher quality preventive and developmental guidance services.

There is also a significant relationship between stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program and the quality of guidance specialized services, leading to rejection of null hypotheses indicating that systematic implementation strengthens the effectiveness of counseling, assessment, referral, consultation, and remedial interventions.

The null hypotheses stating that there is no significant relationship between the implementation of the school guidance program and the quality of guidance developmental and specialized services are rejected.

Based on the results of the study, the following recommendations are hereby proposed:

Given the high level of stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program in the indicator of planning, it is recommended that school administrators and guidance personnel need to plan school guidance program more systematically and sustain existing effective practices through continuous monitoring and regular program evaluation. Emphasis should be placed on institutionalizing successful strategies, enhancing professional development, and periodically reviewing resource allocation and collaborative mechanisms to maintain program quality and ensure long-term sustainability.

In view of the high level of stakeholders' assessment on the implementation of the school guidance program in the indicator of resources, this finding recommends that human, physical, and financial resources need to be more adequate which is necessary for the more effective delivery of guidance services, although improvements in ICT support and instructional materials may further enhance program implementation. In view of the high level of quality of developmental guidance services in terms of information, it is recommended that the school's Guidance Office's announcements, information and updates need to be communicated to learners, be more accessible and can guide learners' academic and career decision-making.

School heads and guidance personnel further enhance the implementation of the school guidance program, as effective planning, management, collaboration, resources, and support systems are shown to significantly improve the quality of developmental guidance services. Schools may integrate results-based monitoring and continuous improvement mechanisms under School-Based Management to ensure that preventive and developmental guidance services remain responsive, systematic, and aligned with DepEd standards.

Schools should institutionalize quarterly evaluation meetings involving teachers, counselors, and administrators to monitor guidance program implementation.





REFERENCE

- [1]. American School Counselor Association. (2023). The ASCA National Model®: A framework for school counseling programs (5th ed.).

<https://www.schoolcounselor.org/getmedia/097ddd89-fa7f-4c28-b8a4-0c219d24aaf7/asca-national-model-fifth-edition.pdf>