



Higher Education Institutions' Security Capability the Leads to the Creation of Standardized Campus Security System

Januarn Jose B. Aydinan

Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers, Vol. 14 (2)

<https://jett.labosfor.com/>

Date of reception: 11 Jan 2023

Date of revision: 05 Mar 2023

Date of acceptance: 06 Mar 2023

Januarn Jose B. Aydinan (2023). Higher Education Institutions' Security Capability the Leads to the Creation of Standardized Campus Security System. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, Vol. 14(2). 356-369.

¹Faculty member, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology



Higher Education Institutions' Security Capability the Leads to the Creation of Standardized Campus Security System

Januarn Jose B. Aydinan

Faculty member, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology

Email: jennilynmina011@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to assess the current state of campus security in selected HEIs in Nueva Ecija. It utilizes the descriptive-quantitative method of research. This study was conducted at the selected HEIs in Nueva Ecija. The administrators, faculty and students, and security personnel are the respondents of the study, and a questionnaire was used to gather pertinent data. Weighted mean was used to determine the current state of campus security, the satisfaction of respondents with the security services and the function of security personnel. Findings revealed that the five selected HEIs adhere to security practices and procedures in terms of physical security, personnel security, and document security as rated by respondents to be very much implemented. Among the fifteen problems encountered, the top three are: "There are limited CCTV cameras installed in strategic locations". "Sprinkler systems and smoke detectors are not installed in offices and laboratories" and "There are inconsistent in the implementation of the NO-ID NO Entry Policy, Visitor's ID and logbook, and Gate Pass policy". The findings show that the five selected HEIs have no difference in their current state of campus security. The very much satisfaction rating in the area of the chief security officer and much satisfaction along security guards by the group of respondents signify that they are pleased with the function and services rendered by security personnel. It is recommended that selected HEIs shall continue and maintain the security practices and procedures that were already put into operation. Installation of Security cameras in strategic locations should be considered including sprinkler systems. Security guards should continue and consistently implement the security policies, rules, and regulations of the school. Future studies should be conducted focusing on safety measures against a natural or manmade disaster that would happen inside the campus and creating a Safety manual for the college and Adoption of the proposed security manual for the improvement of the implementation of campus security.

Keywords: HEIs, NEUST, Sprinkler, State

INTRODUCTION

Security needs were simple, but as civilization became more complex, so did man's security requirements. Throughout the ages, men started practicing the efficient utilization of workers and equipment in order to protect their well-being and property. Thus, civilized man adopts security measures to have adequate protection against unsecured and unsafe conditions. Security measures are inevitable or necessary for the attainment of goals and objectives of a certain individual, group, or organization. It follows that when an individual or organization is exposed to hazards, their productivity is adversely affected (Manwong and Delizo, 2005).

A safe and secure environment is a prerequisite for effective teaching and learning. Threats to the safety and security of people and property can arise from natural hazards, for example, earthquakes, floods, and storms, or from human actions such as vandalism, arson, and violent crime. While catastrophic events and human tragedies cannot be eliminated entirely, there is a role for facility designers, institutional managers, emergency response teams, and post-crisis intervention in mitigating their negative impact (Lupos, 2017).

Non-violent events such as alcohol-related deaths, date rape, dormitory fires, and drug-related deaths are also further affecting the overall perception of campus safety. These tragic events which have been occurring on the nation's higher education campuses in recent years have influenced the decision-making process for many prospective students and their parents.

Today's colleges and universities are faced with many challenges in their attempt to provide a campus that is safe and secure. The college campus has traditionally been known as a safe haven for students, but recent tragic events have left the leaders of higher education with the challenges of preparing for tragedies that could happen on their campuses (Carrico, 2016).

In the Philippines, Schools at the university belt near Malacañang that received bomb threats include the College of the Holy Spirit Manila, Centro Escolar University, San Beda College, Eulogio "Amang" Rodriguez Institute

of Science and Technology, Emilio Aguinaldo College, as well as the University of the Philippines in Diliman, Quezon City (Sunstar, 2017).

Security of Higher Educational Institutions is mandated under Section 28. Safety and Security Services of the Commission on Higher Education Memorandum No. 09, series of 2013. It states under Section 28.1 that, "There should be a safe, accessible, and secure environment, buildings and facilities shall comply with government standards."

In addition, Section 28.5 of the Commission on Higher Education Memorandum No. 09, series of 2013, states that,

"There shall be an established mechanism for the students to help a crime prevention, safety, and security of the concerned higher education Institution (CMO 09, s2013)".

Schools face a wide range of threats. Criminal activities, such as illegal drugs, kidnappings, physical injuries, extortion, and theft are some of them. Fraternity hazing can sometimes lead to tragic consequences. Terrorism is shown in the form of bomb threats and detonation of improvised explosive devices. Attacks on cybernetic security disable computer networks and communication facilities. This requires all educational institutions to come-up with a modern strategy in securing their school premises.

Theoretical Framework

Under social control theory, most people would commit crimes if not for the controls that society places on individuals through institutions such as schools, workplaces, churches, and families. Strict implementation of security policies in the university campus such as regular monitoring of ID at entrances, regular monitoring of car entering and going out the campus is a deterrent to crime (Alviola,2014.)

There are three components to consider in understanding social control theory the first one refers to attachment; this component refers to the implementation of policies. If the policies are regularly and equally implemented, there is a bigger possibility that the clients will conform to the policies regularly. The second component is commitment; safety around the school campus is second to nothing if the security personnel are dedicated to his job and is committed in implementing the policies of the school, the third component is involvement; this component pertains to interaction between clients and the security personnel. As a security personnel one of the best ways to maintain security in your area is gain the trust and confidence of your clients (Alviola,2014).

Likewise, in social disorganization theory, the seasonal implementation of policy or even the non-implementation of policy will trigger the possible occurrence of crime considering persons entering the premises think that since policies, rules, and regulations are not properly implemented, it is right to violate them (Alviola, 2014).

School Security

US Department of Education's (2017) Handbook for Campus Safety and Security Reporting states that campus security and safety are important feature of postsecondary education. The Department of Education is committed to assisting schools in providing students nationwide a safe environment in which to learn and to keeping students, parents, and employees well informed about campus security. These goals were advanced by the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990. The Department is committed to ensuring that postsecondary institutions are in full compliance with that Act, and enforcement of the Act is a priority of the Department.

In 2016, Schafer et al., in their study College Student Perceptions of Campus Safety Initiatives, cited that in the aftermath of tragic campus-based incidents causing injury and death, it has become common to see discussions concerning the safety measures institutions should be taking to prevent or mitigate the harm of such events. The recommended approaches reflect a degree of face validity but largely lack empirical grounding or clear evidence of support from the largest population they seek to protect—college students. Using survey data from six Illinois colleges, this study examines the level of student support for campus safety practices. Applying a framework derived from literature on fear of crime and other salient concepts, multivariate modeling is used to explain variation in the observed level of student support. The explanatory models offer limited insight into the factors shaping why students do or do not support campus safety practices. The findings demonstrate the importance of considering the views of students when institutions make decisions about campus safety policies.

Presado, J.E. 2016 on her study of the Level of Security Management in the University of Eastern Philippines, she found that security is one of the prime concerns of institutions as it is considered one of the important components of student services. The study traced the security personnel's profile, as well as the perceptions of the respondents on the level of security management, and the problems encountered by the respondents. Thirty-seven security personnel and one hundred and six other respondents composed of administrators, heads of offices, employees, and students, were the respondents of the study. The descriptive-correlational research method was used using a survey questionnaire in gathering data, statistically treated using frequency counts, percentages, ranking, mean, and chi-square test. Majority of the security personnel respondents were young, married, college graduates. Most had few years in service and have not attended trainings. Security management level was rated very satisfactory. Civil status and attendance to trainings significantly related to security

management level. Majority of the security personnel respondents encountered problems on the lack of monetary allowance and security equipment. There is a need to exert improvement in the security management in the University.

Physical Security

Physical security is the protection of personnel, hardware, software, networks, and data from physical actions and events that could cause serious loss or damage to an enterprise, agency, or institution. This includes protection from fire, flood, natural disasters, burglary, theft, vandalism, and terrorism.

Physical security has three important components: access control, surveillance, and testing. Obstacles should be placed in the way of potential attackers, and physical sites should be hardened against accidents, attacks, or environmental disasters. Such hardening measures include fencing, locks, access control cards, biometric access control systems, and fire suppression systems. Second, physical locations should be monitored using surveillance cameras and notification systems, such as intrusion detection sensors, heat sensors, and smoke detectors. Third, disaster recovery policies and procedures should be tested on a regular basis to ensure safety and reduce the time it takes to recover from disruptive man-made or natural disasters (Techtarget, 2017).

Despite the known degrading impact of high nuisance and false alarm rates (NAR/FAR) on operator performance, analyses of security systems often ignores operator performance. We developed a model to analyze the impact of nuisance alarm rates on operator performance and on overall system performance. The model demonstrates that current methods that do not account for operator performance produce optimistic estimates of system performance. As shown in our model, even low NAR/FAR levels and the associated alarm queueing effect can increase operator detection and response times, which in turn reduces the amount of time the response force, has to interrupt the intruder. An illustrative analysis shows that alarm processing times can be higher than the assessment time due to queue wait times and that systems with only one or two operators can become overwhelmed as NAR increases, decreasing system performance.

Document Security

Almost every individual, government agency, and business owner has documents that are processed on a daily basis, regardless of whether they have a paperless office system. During any given day, we process a great deal of transactions without ever having to print copies, however, items such as contracts, invoices, receipts, purchase orders, and all legal documents require paper backup for filing purposes.

Document security is defined as the means by which important documents are filed, stored, processed, backed up, delivered, and eventually disposed of. Storage and backup of your documents involve a great deal more planning than simply deciding which type of filing cabinet or lock you will purchase. It involves understanding the space and means in which to store documents for safekeeping and easy retrieval.

In an attempt to save space, many companies hire document storage facilities like Kenwood Moving and Storage to store the documents instead of paying to lease more space. This is a cost effective method of document storage, however, there is an even more important reason to consider storing your documents than saving space. It is called document security.

Document security is a highly sophisticated document storage service that requires a facility to be safe, secure and have trained individuals who handle, retrieve and store documents on behalf of other companies. If documents are not properly packaged and labeled, it can be difficult to locate the file (Kenwood Moving & Storage, 2017).

Personnel Security

Personnel security is a system of policies and procedures which seek to mitigate the risk of workers (insiders) exploiting their legitimate access to an organization's assets for unauthorized purposes. People security is about shaping and controlling the environment to promote vigilance and an effective security culture, and to influence and deter those seeking to cause harm (Center for Protection of National Infrastructure, 2017).

Personnel security is important in the protection of an agency's people, information, and assets because: it identifies an agency's vulnerability to a range of insider threats, which can be harmful, costly, embarrassing, and disruptive, it delivers a level of assurance about the credentials and integrity of the agency's workforce, an agency's protection against threats is only as good as the weakest element of its protective security. The personnel security risk assessment may impact and should complement, information and physical security controls (New Zealand Security Intelligence Service, 2017).

Problem on School Security

In the old days, smoking in the boy's room was the infraction of the day. Today, school officials must deal with violence, sexual harassment, statutory rape, drugs, weapons, gangs, bombs, shootings, murders, computer hacking, theft, irate parents, and violence in students' homes. One of the biggest obstacles keeping schools from achieving a secure environment is "the big D" a.k.a. Denial. The "It can't happen here" syndrome prevents

officials from being proactive in their security efforts. Furthermore, concerns about “image,” low reports of incidents, fear of disrupting daily routines, or reluctance to be “alarmist” stalls any security efforts.

Be proactive in reducing the threat of school violence. Train teachers to use reasonable methods of defusing escalating situations. Involve teachers and students in an ongoing safety and security strategy. Make them part of the solution by giving them the tools they need to gain control during crises and identify hazards (Siciliano, R,2006).

The recent stabbing and shooting incidents, including hazing and bullying activities that occurred inside school premises in different parts of the country, have put the spotlight on campus security. Likewise, the resurgence of illegal drugs has not spared schools. These alarming events have pushed schools to submit their security systems under deeper and more thorough scrutiny to avoid criticism from public and private stakeholders.

Schools are very different from other public institutions in terms of control. Management over the campus environment is mainly placed on the shoulders of the school administrators. School administrators dictate the access policies to the campus. They formulate and schedule classes and have the power to require all students to be present during school hours. The school administrators also dictate the level of supervision over the campuses, as they have the authority to implement or establish strict rules of conduct and behavior. They can also implement policies such as bag inspections, locker searches and the use of metal detectors, if necessary. The administrators can also implement controls on vehicle access and, in some cases, conduct searches on vehicles parked inside the campus area.

They are also empowered to discipline students or any member of the school community and even suspend, dismiss, or expel anyone from the school.

At a more practical level, school security is negatively affected when administrators are inconsistent in enforcing school rules and regulations. For example, when the bell rings for the first period in the morning, students and teachers are required to be inside the classroom for their lessons. It becomes easy for the school to determine the non-students or unauthorized persons. If a student opts to be absent or performs any action in violation of existing school policy on conduct and behavior, the school must apply the prescribed penalty, with respect to the principle of justice, fairness and respect for the rights of all other students (Deguzman, E, 2013).

While schools are thriving to meet the educational needs of the pupils and of the community as a whole, they themselves, as open systems, are open to every kind of security threat coming from inside and outside of the school environment. Due to the social, economic, and cultural conditions of our time, various individual or group threats may be consciously or unconsciously exerted on schools. Schools may also be exposed to pandemic diseases, fires, and many natural disasters such as earthquakes, floods, landslides, and so on. And the school management, together with the school community, has to be prepared for all of these kinds of threads, and have to develop strategies to deal adequately with them. Since the threads to school security may stem from various sources in society, school safety issues should involve a wide range of bodies, such as educators, students, managers, parents, law enforcement agencies, health institutions, businesses, and the like. And, schools, which accommodate so many students, teachers, managers, and other supportive individuals, are compelled to provide safe working conditions for staff and for the students. The schools can ensure a safe environment by focusing on prevention, intervention, and response phases in their safety efforts.

To deal effectively with the antisocial and crime behavior, schools should promote positive school climate and school-wide effective prevention and intervention strategies (Ozmen,et.al. 2010).

Synthesis

The Handbook for Campus Safety and Security Reporting is related with the study since it discusses how campus security and safety are important feature of postsecondary education wherein the present study determined the current state of campus security. Further, the study conducted by Schafer, et. al. has variance with the present study since the present study deals with the level of satisfaction of respondents on security services while the previous study deals with level of student support for campus safety practices. Nevertheless both studies allocate on campus security.

The perceptions of the respondents on the level of security management, and the problems encountered by the respondents studied by Presado have a direct bearing on the current study, for it also tries to determine the level of implementation of campus security and the satisfaction of respondents with the security services. The difference is that Presado’s study includes the profile of security personnel in which the current study did not take into account.

Physical security is the protection of personnel, hardware, software, networks, and data from physical actions and events that could cause serious loss or damage to an enterprise, agency, or institution. This statement has a direct bearing with the study since the present study finds out the current state of campus security in terms of physical security. Document security is defined as the means by which important documents are filed, stored, processed, backed up, delivered, and eventually disposed of. This description is related to the study because one of the aspects of the present study was to ascertain the current state of campus security in terms of document security. Personnel security is a system of policies and procedures which seek to mitigate the risk of workers (insiders) exploiting their legitimate access to an organization’s assets for unauthorized purposes. This phrase is

related to the study because one of the aspects of the present study determined the current state of campus security in terms of personnel security.

The statement of Siciliano regarding problems with school security is directly related to the study since the present study established some problems regarding school security, however, the statement is more on man-made and natural disasters and the present study is on problems regarding the implementation of school security. Finally, anomie theory, crime is rampant to a place where there is a poor implementation of law or worst, no policies are being implemented. Therefore, rules and regulations should be created and implemented without fear or favor.

Paradigm of the Study

The paradigm of the study is composed of independent and dependent variables. Independent variables are; the current state of school security in terms of physical security, personnel security, and document security, the problems encountered by the respondents regarding school security, the difference in the implementation of campus security in selected HEIs in Nueva Ecija, the level of satisfaction of the respondents with security services and functions of security personnel in the implementation of campus security; and the reference to a security manual. The dependent variable is the Standardized Security Manual.

METHODS

This study utilizes the descriptive-quantitative method of research using questionnaires as the main instrument for gathering pertinent data. Descriptive-survey is suitable wherever the subjects vary among themselves and one is interested to know the extent to which different conditions and situations are obtained among subjects. The word "survey" signifies the gathering of data regarding the present condition. A survey is useful in providing the value of facts and focusing attention on the most important things to be reported (L. Calmorin and M. Calmorin, 2007). Furthermore, this study utilizes descriptive since it describes the extent of implementation of campus security: satisfaction with security services and functions of security personnel; the problems encountered in the implementation of campus security in the selected HEIs in Nueva Ecija; and the level of difference in the implementation of campus security among the selected HEI's.

Sampling Technique

The schools are selected through a purposive sampling technique. The purposive sampling technique is based on selecting individuals as samples according to the purposes of the researcher as his control. An individual is selected as part of the sample due to good evidence that he is representative of the total population (L. Calmorin, M. Calmorin, 2007). There were five Higher Educational Institutions that was selected as respondents namely: Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Eduardo L. Joson Memorial College, Wesleyan University-Philippines, Araullo University, College of Immaculate Concepcion. They were selected as the subjects since the five selected HEIs are composed of one state university, one state college, one private college, and two private universities that are to balance the population of private and public schools. Further, they represent the total population by being the largest schools and earliest institutions of learning.

The Respondents

Among the five HEIs selected, there are three groups of respondents utilized in this study, namely: administrators, faculty and students, and security personnel. The two groups of respondents (Administrator and Security Personnel) are represented by ten individuals, faculty and students are represented by twenty individuals, 10 for faculty and 10 for students. A total of 40 respondents per school and a total of 200 respondents from the five selected HEIs.

The selected schools are Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Cabanatuan City with 40 or 20 percent Administrator, Faculty and Students, and Security personnel, are included as a sample; Wesleyan University – Philippines, Cabanatuan City with 40 Or 20 percent Administrator, Faculty and Students, and Security personnel, are included as subjects; Eduardo L. Joson Memorial College, Palayan City with 40 Or 20 percent Administrator, Faculty and Students, and Security personnel are included as samples; College of Immaculate Concepcion, Cabanatuan City with 40 Or 20 percent

Administrators, faculty, students, and security personnel are included; Araullo University, Cabanatuan City with 40 Or 20 percent administrators, faculty, students, and Security personnel are included as samples. Table 1 shows the distribution of subjects.

Research Locale

This study was conducted at the selected HEIs in Nueva Ecija, namely: Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology (Sumacab Campus), Eduardo L. Joson Memorial College, Wesleyan University – Philippines (Cabanatuan), College of Immaculate Concepcion and Araullo University.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire was used as a research instrument in gathering pertinent data from the respondents. As a preliminary preparation, the researcher review some related literature as the bases for the formulation of the questionnaire. It is composed of three sets of questionnaires, the first set is for administrators wherein the particular questions attempt to elicit the current state of campus security in the selected HEIs in Nueva Ecija; the second set is for security guards wherein it tries to determine the level of satisfaction of the security services and functions of the chief security; and the third set is for students and faculty, it tries to determine the level of satisfaction of the security services and functions of security guards and the problems encountered in the implementation of campus security in the selected HEI’s.

Test for Reliability

For reliability, the researcher used the test-retest method. The questionnaires were administered twice to the students of PLT College Inc., Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya. The second administration was after ten days after the first administration. The internal consistency between the first and second administration of the questionnaires was computed with the use of Cronbach’s Alpha.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher construct a communication letter to the Presidents of the selected HEIs to be signed by the Adviser asking permission to conduct the study in their schools. After that, the researcher proceeded to the selected HEIs to distribute the questionnaires. The researcher gave the respondents ten days to answer the questionnaire. After ten days the researcher retrieved the questionnaires. The questionnaires were also aided by an interview. The respondents were advised that the results of the study were utilized in improving campus security services. In the construction of the security manual, some documentary sources were utilized in constructing the proposed security manual aside from the data gathered.

Statistical Treatment of Data

Weighted mean was used to determine the current state of campus security; satisfaction of respondents on the security services and function of security personnel.

Weighted mean was computed using the formula

$$X = \sum X / N$$

Where: X = mean

$\sum X$ = sum of scores

N = total of respondents

Categorization of data. The descriptive equivalent rating and ways of values are presented below using 4-point Likert Scale.

Table 1. Basis of Interpretation of Data

A. Current state of campus security.	
Mean Range	Descriptive Equivalent
3.26-4.00	Very Much Implemented/VMI
2.51-3.25	Much Implemented/MI
1.76-2.50	Moderately Implemented/ModI
1.00-1.75	Not Implemented/NI
B. Level of satisfaction of campus security services and functions.	
Mean Range	Descriptive Equivalent
3.26-4.00	Very Much Satisfied/VMS
2.51-3.25	Much Satisfied/MS
1.76-2.50	Moderately Satisfied/ModS
1.00-1.75	Not Satisfied/NS
C. Problems encountered in the selected HEI’s in Nueva Ecija in the implementation of campus security were computed by frequency counts.	
D. The level of difference in the current state of School Security among the selected HEI’s in Nueva Ecijawas computed using the Chi Square test.	

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

A. Current State of Campus Security

The first group of respondents which is the administrators rated the currents state of campus security in terms of physical security, document security and personnel security.

Physical Security

Table 2. Current state of Campus Security in terms of physical security

Particulars	Total	WM	DE
A. Physical Security			
A.1 Perimeter Barrier			
1. The boundaries of the perimeter are well defined and are protected by perimeter barriers.	156	3.4	Very Much Implemented
2. Perimeter barriers have a standard height with at least 7 feet.	154	3.4	Very Much Implemented
3. The perimeter barriers have top guard with at least 1 foot.	141	3.1	Much Implemented
4. The gates are closely monitored by security guards.	165	3.6	Very Much Implemented
Mean		3.4	Very Much Implemented
A.2 Protective Lighting			
1. Lightings are provided at main entrances/exits.	157	3.4	Very Much Implemented
2. Parking areas are well illuminated.	137	3	Much Implemented
3. Alleys, hallways, sidewalks or any passages are well illuminated.	144	3.1	Much Implemented
4. Emergency lightings are readily available when needed.	146	3.2	Much Implemented
5. The boundaries are well illuminated.	140	3	Much Implemented
Mean		3.2	Much Implemented
A.3 Electronic Devices			
1. CCTV cameras are located in strategic areas of the campus.	132	2.9	Much Implemented
2. Fire alarm is installed to warn every body of any when incident arises.	141	3.1	Much Implemented
3. Two way radios are available among security personnel.	143	3.1	Much Implemented
Mean		3	Much Implemented
A.4 Protective locks and key control			
1. Gates are secured with padlocks when the campus is closed.	156	3.4	Very Much Implemented
2. High risk areas are secured by high security locks.	148	3.2	Much Implemented
3. Keys are regularly inspected to ensure they have not been damaged or lost.	142	3.1	Much Implemented
4. A key depositor is centrally available.	145	3.2	Much Implemented
5. Issuance of key/s is well monitored and logged.	144	3.1	Much Implemented
Mean		3.2	Much Implemented
A.5 Security Cabinet			
1. Appropriate container is available for safekeeping of important document on all offices.	148	3.2	Much Implemented
2. Vault is available at cashier's office for security.	156	3.4	Very Much Implemented
3. Documents at registrar's office are placed in a file room for deeper security.	160	3.5	Very Much Implemented
Mean		3.4	Very Much Implemented
A.6 Personnel identification and movement control			
1. Checking of identification document is implemented to monitor persons entering the premises (pass system).	159	3.5	Very Much Implemented
2. Packages brought inside and outside is inspected and cleared by security personnel.	148	3.2	Much Implemented
3. Privately owned vehicles complies with the gate pass policy of the institution.	153	3.3	Very Much Implemented
4. Traffic sign are available to guide everybody in their destination.	137	3	Much Implemented

5. Appropriate warning signs are available to all restricted and danger zone areas.	139	3	Much Implemented
6. Access to restricted areas is limited to authorize personnel only.	149	3.2	Much Implemented
Mean		3.2	Much Implemented
A.7 Protective Alarms/Fire Alarm System			
1. Fire alarms are installed in every building.	149	3.2	Much Implemented
Mean		3.2	Much Implemented
A.8 Security Guard Forces			
1. The security guards are equipped with basic security equipment like whistle, two-way radio and prescribed weapon.	157	3.4	Very Much Implemented
2. The security personnel are constantly available.	164	3.6	Very Much Implemented
3. Approachable attitude for security personnel.	158	3.4	Very Much Implemented
4. The security personnel regularly implements the no id no entry policy of the university.	156	3.4	Very Much Implemented
Mean		3.5	Very Much Implemented
Overall Mean		3.3	Very Much Implemented

Table 2 represents the current state of campus security in terms of physical security. The data shows that the first group of respondents perceived the current state of campus security in terms of physical security to be very well implemented. Considering the table below shows that the perimeter barrier is very much implemented, with a weighted mean of 3.35. This is true since, in actual observation, most of the selected HEIs have perimeter barriers. Item A.5 Security Cabinet, garnered the highest mean of 3.36 or very much implemented since storage facilities are obvious during the distribution of questionnaires. In an interview conducted by the researcher, some students, faculty, and staff are great concern about the importance of perimeter barriers, that according to them, security personnel and the administration shall see to it that since perimeter barrier is the first line of defense from intrusion; it must at least possess the minimum standard. The height of the perimeter barrier of the school denies easy access to intruders to the school. Further, students, faculty, and staff said that CCTV is very helpful in the sense that it secures their belongings, especially at the offices where valuable documents and valuable properties are located. Moreover, in an interview with some security personnel, they said that they were having problems with the offices that were not being locked by the respected occupant of that office. They said that some offices were not locked after office hours, that may be, the occupant of that office forget to lock the said office. According to them, one key should be under the supervision of the security unit and the other key should be under the supervision of the head of the respected office for them to lock offices that were left open after office hours.

Personnel Security

Table 3 exemplifies the current state of campus security in terms of personnel security. The data represents that the first group of respondents perceived the current state of campus security in terms of personnel security to be very much implemented. This suggests that the selected Higher Educational Institutions adhere to the practices and procedures of recruiting security personnel for the school. In an interview with some of the security personnel, they said that their security agency asks them for documentary requirements before applying like security licenses, and clearances. They also mention that they were interviewed by the Chief Security of the school before they are deployed.

Table 3. Current state of Campus Security in terms of Personnel Security

Particulars	Total	WM	DE
1. Conduct bidding for security agencies to choose better provider of security services.	160	3.5	Very Much Implemented
2. Submission of Licensed to Operate from the Security Agency	159	3.5	Very Much Implemented
3. Submission of Security Licensed	157	3.4	Very Much Implemented
4. Submission of Good Moral Character	159	3.5	Very Much Implemented
5. Submission of Certificate of Trainings	156	3.4	Very Much Implemented
6. Submission of School Records (Diploma, Transcript of Records)	158	3.4	Very Much Implemented
7. Submission of Duty Detailed Order	165	3.6	Very Much Implemented
8. Submission of Clearance (PNP, Court, NBI,)	160	3.5	Very Much Implemented

9. Conduct of Personal Interview	156	3.4	Very Much Implemented
10. Conduct of Background Investigation	155	3.4	Very Much Implemented
Mean		3.5	Very Much Implemented

Document Security

Table 4 presents the current state of campus security in terms of document security. The first group of respondents rated document security as "very much implemented," with a total weighted mean of 3.43. Table Item 5 stating that sensitive data are entrusted to authorized representatives gained the highest weighted mean of 3.50 or very much implemented. It implies that sensitive information is kept by the person with authority. Concerning one of the phrases about document security state that Storage and backup of documents involve a great deal, more planning than simply deciding which type of filing cabinet or lock will be will purchase. It involves understanding the space and means in which to store documents for safekeeping and easy retrieval.

Table 4. Current state of Campus Security in terms of Document Security

Particulars	Total	WM	DE
1. Storing sensitive documents in secured containers.	154	3.35	Very Much Implemented
2. Written communication or any classified matter are not disclose to unauthorized person.	157	3.41	Very Much Implemented
3. Classified matter shall be released for public consumption only upon the consent of the department head or his authorized representative.	160	3.48	Very Much Implemented
4. Normally all information are released through public information officers.	160	3.48	Very Much Implemented
5. Sensitive data are entrusted to authorized persons.	161	3.5	Very Much Implemented
6. Employees are aware of sensitive data in the company and their responsibility in protecting it.	157	3.41	Very Much Implemented
7. Classified document are logged in showing all received and to whom it was transmitted.	159	3.46	Very Much Implemented
8. Dissemination of classified matter shall be restricted to persons whose duties required knowledge or possession thereof.	157	3.41	Very Much Implemented
9. Classified Documents are dispose of properly	157	3.41	Very Much Implemented
Mean		3.43	Very Much Implemented

Analyzing the three parameters, Physical security obtains an overall mean of 3.25 and is interpreted as very much implemented, Personnel security attains a mean of 3.45 and is interpreted to be very much implemented, and Information security gains a mean of 3.43 and is interpreted to be very much implemented. Specifically, along with Physical security item A.3 Electronic devices obtains the lowest mean rating of 3.01 or much implemented. It was rated the lowest since in actual observation there were limited electronic devices like security cameras, two-way radios for security guards, and fire alarms and sprinkler systems. In Personnel security all items were interpreted as very much implemented and likewise information security was rated as very much implemented. In connection to Presado, J.E. 2016 in her study Level of Security Management at the University of Eastern Philippines, finds that Security is one of the prime concerns of institutions as it is considered one of the important components of student services.

B. Problems encountered by respondents regarding implementation of Campus Security

Table 5. Problems encountered by the respondents

Problems Encountered	Total	Rank
Limited CCTV cameras are installed in strategic locations.	54	1
Sprinkler system and smoke detector is not installed in offices and laboratories.	53	2
Inconsistent in the implementation of NO-ID NO Entry Policy, Visitor's ID and logbook, and Gate Pass policy.	51	3
Inadequate security trainings, professional and doctrine development among security guards.	46	4
Visual surveillance of the parking area is not possible in the guard post.	45	5.5
Insufficient funds in the construction, installation, purchase and improvement of	45	5.5

security facilities and equipment.		
There is no security manual of the college/university.	43	7
Poor lighting in the main entrances/exits and areas for possible intrusion.	41	8
Lacking numbers of security guards.	38	9
Destruction of fence or sections is not repaired immediately.	36	10
Absence of emergency lighting in offices and laboratories.	35	11.5
High risk security areas like offices and laboratories are not secured with high security doors and locks.	35	11.5
Fire alarm and fire extinguisher is inadequate.	33	13.5
Classified matters are released for public consumption without the consent of authorized personnel.	33	13.5
There is no policy in recruitment and selection of security guards.	17	15

The second group of respondents which was the Students and Faculty ascertain the following problems regarding school security. Table 5 shows the ranking of possible situations that was encountered by the respondents regarding school security. The table also shows that item 7 which states that Limited CCTV cameras are installed in strategic location was ranked as number one followed by item 8 stating that sprinkler system and smoke detector is not installed in offices and laboratories and item 10 stating that Inconsistent in the implementation of NO-ID NO Entry Policy, Visitor's ID and logbook, and Gate Pass policy was ranked as number three. In addition to the statement of Sciliano, R. 2006, in the old days, smoking in the boy's room was the infraction of the day. Today, school officials must deal with violence, sexual harassment, statutory rape, drugs, weapons, gangs, bombs, shootings, murders, computer hacking, theft, irate parents, and violence in students' homes. In an interview with some of the students they mentioned that they only notice CCTV cameras on entrance and exits of the school. They also said that CCTV camera should also be installed on parking areas and hallways to help security guards in case of intrusion. They also made mention the absence of sprinkler system and smoke detector; this is maybe because the building was old or outmoded

C. Difference in the current state of school security among the selected HEI's

Table 6. Result of the Significant Difference of the Selected HEI's

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Rows	611.5804	85	7.195064	75.78823	2.6	1.309231
Columns	38.60628	4	9.65157	101.6635	7.8	2.398211
Error	32.27839	340	0.094936			
Total	682.4651	429				

Table 6 represents the overall result of chi-square test for the five HEI's. The p-value obtain was 2.6 which is greater than 0.05 and interpreted that the five selected HEI's has no difference in the current state of campus security. This indicates that the five selected HEI's are similarly implementing campus security practices.

D. Level of Satisfaction of the respondents on Security Services

Table 7. Level of satisfaction of security services and function in the implementation of campus security in terms of Chief Security

A. Security services and function of chief security	Total	WM	DE
1. Presides over all meetings and forums of the security services office.	158	3.43	VMS
2. Discusses matters and issues with the security guards concerning college policies and related concerns and solicits suggestions and recommendations to solve problems encountered.	168	3.65	VMS
3. Prepares and implement weekly schedule of duties of the security guards.	172	3.74	VMS
4. Prepares and submits to the Director for Administrative and Finance Services reports of accomplished duties monthly and annually.	168	3.65	VMS
5. Keeps a record of all events concerning security matters whether such occurrence happens to a student, personnel or a visitor/guest.	169	3.67	VMS
6. Coordinates with the City Police for support of security to all grand events that may	162	3.52	VMS

be conducted inside the college.			
7. Represents the School Safety Officer in the Administrative Council	161	3.5	VMS
8. Prepare a contingency plan for flood, fire and earthquake, bombing and any other form of disaster.	170	3.7	VMS
9. Supervises effectiveness of security programs implemented by the unit.	172	3.74	VMS
10. Supervise the performance of security personnel, appearance, competence and the condition of security equipment.	174	3.78	VMS
11. Conducts Security Education and develop security training for security personnel	158	3.43	VMS
Mean		3.62	VMS

The third group of respondents which were the security guards rated the level of satisfaction of security services and function in the implementation of campus security in terms of Chief Security. The second group of respondents which was the Students and Faculty rated the level of satisfaction of security services and function in the implantation of campus security in terms of security guards. It can be observe in table 7 that the satisfaction of respondents on security services and function of Chief security attained an overall weighted mean of 3.62 or very much satisfied. Table also shows that item 10; supervise the performance of security personnel, appearance, competence and the condition of security equipment gained the highest mean rating of 3.78, described as very much satisfied. The finding showed the satisfaction of respondents to the Chief Security officer as head of Campus Security was very much satisfied. In an interview with some of the staff they said that the chief security made rounds on the facilities of the school to monitor weather the security guards are on their post or monitoring their area of jurisdiction. Some of the Security guards that were interviewed said that the Chief security conducts meetings after flag ceremony and remind them of their duty and check their uniforms and equipment.

Table 8. Level of satisfaction of security services and function in the implementation of campus security in terms of Security Guards

A. Security services and function of security guard	Total	WM	DE
1. Record daily events concerning security matters whether such occurrence happens to a student, a personnel or visitor/guest.	318	3.18	MS
2. Maintain a logbook in-and-out entry of personnel.	333	3.33	VMS
3. Work with the City Police during grand events that may happen inside the school.	277	2.77	MS
4. Keep the post manned and attended all the time.	307	3.07	MS
5. Implement the No-ID, No Entry Policy for all entering the school premises.	319	3.19	MS
6. Assist visitors and guest for offices to be visited.	309	3.09	MS
7. Interrogate outsiders who are entering the school for suspicious acts and motives.	294	2.94	MS
8. Check students and visitors for unlawful possessions of firearms, ammunitions, and sharp pointed - deadly materials or illegal drugs.	295	2.95	MS
9. Maintain a regular foot patrol around campus and its vicinity.	302	3.02	MS
10. Maintain a regulated flow of traffic	271	2.71	MS
11. Observes proper courtesy in dealing with clients.	283	2.83	MS
12. Carries complete equipment like first aid kit, flashlight, and two way radio while on duty.	274	2.74	MS
Mean		2.99	MS

Table 8 shows that the level of satisfaction of respondents in terms of security guards was high with an overall weighted mean of 2.99. Vividly shown in Table, item two Maintain a logbook in-and-out entry of personnel obtained the highest mean rating of 3.33 or very much satisfied. It shows that the security guards have records personnel coming in-and-out of the campus. This is followed by item one record daily event concerning security matters whether such occurrence happens to a student, a personnel or visitor/guest with a mean rating of 3.18 much satisfied. In an interview conducted by the researcher with some of the staff, they said that security guards roam around campus. They also mentioned that the security guards sometimes accompany visitors on the offices they are going to visit. Moreover, in the Researchers personal encounter during the distribution of questionnaires the security guards let him log in on the log book before entering the premises. Some security guards also escorted the researcher to the office he was going to visit.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Based from the findings, the researcher came out with the following conclusion:

1. The five selected HEI's adheres to security practices and procedures in terms of physical security, personnel security, and document security as rated by respondents to be very much implemented. This shows that the schools implement school security excellently.
2. Among the fifteen problems encountered, the top three are: there is Limited CCTV cameras installed in strategic locations; sprinkler system and smoke detector is not installed in offices and laboratories; and inconsistent in the implementation of NO-ID NO Entry Policy, Visitor's ID and logbook, and Gate Pass policy. With these problems it can be said that there is no impeccable security.
3. The findings shows that the five selected HEI's have no difference in their current state of campus security. Based on actual observation security practices and procedures are carried out.
4. The very much satisfaction rating along the area of chief security officer and much satisfaction along security guards by the group of respondents signify that they are pleased with the function and services rendered by security personnel.

Recommendations

The researcher made the following recommendations based from the conclusions:

1. The selected HEI's shall continue and maintain the security practices and procedures that were already put into operation.
2. Installation of Security cameras on strategic locations should be considered including sprinkler systems and strict implementation of No ID No entry policy, visitors logbook and gate pass policy.
3. Security guards should continue and consistently implement the security policies, rules and regulations of the school.
4. Security personnel shall continue performing their duties and function and maintain good relationship with their clients.
5. Creation of security manual based on the findings of this study for the improvement of implementation of campus security.

REFERENCES

1. Alasaas, JP. R. (2016). Campus Security of North Luzon Philippines State College, Candon City, Ilocos Sur. Unpublished Thesis, CICOSAT Colleges,Lingsat, City of San Fernando, La Union
2. Alviola, A. A. (2014). Introduction to Criminology and Psychology of Crimes. Philippines: Wiseman's Book Trading, Inc.
3. Brian Andrew Carrico (2016). The Effects of Students' Perceptions of Campus Safety and Security on Student Enrollment. Retrieved on (6:10pm, 10/14/17) from <http://mds.marshall.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2010&context=etd>
4. Calmorin, L. P. and Calmorin, M. A. (2007).Research Methods and Thesis Writing (Second Edition). Philippines: Rex Book Store
5. English oxford living dictionary.(2017). Security. Retrieved on (11:55am , 10/13/2017) from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/security>
6. Gilford, J. (2017). Clery Act. Retrieved on (6:18, 10/14/17) from <http://uwupd.wisc.edu/crime-data/clery-act/>
7. Lupos, J. S. (2017). Physical Security at Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Cabanatuan City, Nueva Ecija. Unpublished thesis, CICOSAT Colleges,Lingsat, City of San Fernando, La Union
8. Manwong, R. K. and Delizo, B. (2005).Industrial Security Management. Philippines: Wiseman's Book Trading, Inc.
9. Official Gazzette (2017).The 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines, Article III. Retrieved on October 17, 2017 from <http://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/constitutions/the-1987-constitution-of-the-republic-of-the-philippines/the-1987-constitution-of-the-republic-of-the-philippines-article-iii/>
10. Presado, J.E. (2016). The Level of Security Management in the University of Eastern Philippines. Retrieved on October 17, 2017 from <http://uruae.org/siteadmin/upload/5695UH0516138.pdf>
11. Schafer, J.A. (2016). College Student Perceptions of Campus Safety Initiatives. Retrieved on (9:16, 10/14/17) from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0887403416631804>
12. St. Scholastica's College (2017).Safety and Security Office. Retrieved on (12:30, 10/13/17) from <http://ssc.edu.ph/ssc-community/offices/safety-and-security-office/>

13. Sunstar Manila (2016). Senators urge tighter security in schools amid bomb scares. Retrieved on (2:54, 10/13/17) from <http://www.sunstar.com.ph/manila/local-news/2016/09/09/senators-urge-tighter-security-schools-amid-bomb-scares-496685>
14. Tamagawa (2017). Campus Security. Retrieved on October 17, 2017 from <http://www.tamagawa.jp/en/about/challenge/security.html>
15. United Nations (2017). Chapter VII Action with respect to threats to the peace breaches to the peace and acts of aggression. Retrieved on (2:55, 10/14/2017) from <http://www.un.org/en/sections/un-charter/chapter-vii/index.html>
16. US Department of Education (2017). The Handbook for Campus Safety and Security Reporting. Retrieved on October 17, 2017 from <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/campus.html>
17. Zulig, K. J. (2015). Preliminary Development of the Student Perceptions of School Safety Officers Scale. Retrieved on (9:04, 10/14/17) from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15388220.2015.1116994>