



## THE EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SECURITY SYSTEM OF CAGAYAN STATE UNIVERSITY-PIAT CAMPUS

JOEY R. PASCUA, Ph.D

Faculty, College of Criminal Justice Education

Cagayan State University

Piat Campus, Philippines

[joeypascua@gmail.com](mailto:joeypascua@gmail.com)

---

**ABSTRACT:** *Safety and security concerns are fast becoming an important part of any dialog about improving school wide academic performance. The present security line-up of the campus is composed of guards who are college graduates of different degrees with and without training or experience in security management systems. The study aimed to assess the extent of implementation of the security system of Cagayan State University Piat Campus. This study utilized the descriptive-quantitative research method to describe the extent of implementation of the security systems as assessed by the participants of the study. In light of the findings of the study, it is deduced that the respondents perceived the implementation of the security systems of the university as moderately implemented thus, showing the University's moderately compliant to existing requirements for the safety and protection of persons and properties in the university. On the basis of the findings and conclusions of the study, it therefore recommended that CSU Piat Campus administration should take the overall lead in the implementation of appropriate physical structures to safeguard the school perimeter, school properties, students, and the total populace in the campus;*

**Keywords:** *implementation, security system, physical security, personnel security, records security, security management*



## **INTRODUCTION**

Educators have come to realize that the foundation of all learning is safety and security. Attendance and academic performance are closely linked to how safe students perceive the school environment to be. It is hard for young people to concentrate on learning when they feel vulnerable, and a climate of fear forces teachers to shift their focus from teaching to policing. Safety and security concerns are fast becoming an important part of any dialog about improving school wide academic performance. Schools are among the safest places for school aged children.

Academia Stack Exchange (2017) stated that campus security is composed of personnel who patrol the campus on foot and in marked patrol vehicles who provide security 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. These officers observe and detect crimes and violations of campus policies and work with state and local law enforcement and emergency response agencies.

Further, Casella (2006) in an online article “Encouraging Healthy Environment,” stressed that safety in schools is necessary to support the academic success of each child. It provides them the opportunity to learn and achieve their dreams. A policy on school safety promotes learning and feeling of school unity with a decreased level of violence.

Ali (2016) further stressed that campus security plays a pivotal and evolving role in colleges and universities, community colleges, trade and vocational schools. Effective campus security finds the right balance between creating an open and free environment and upholding the duty to protect people. This starts with the acknowledgement that security must be part of the campus’s evolution. The right solution balances expenditures between personnel, technology, facility’s design and crime prevention education to develop a program that is efficient and affordable. Moreover, he stressed that today’s security officers are the front-line of an academic institution’s brand, interacting with campus community



members while serving as the eyes and ears to help keep the campus safe. With new expectations and growing responsibilities, the campus security officer continues to evolve.

Security personnel are considered the most visible employees of the institution considering the fact that they are the first contact persons of everyone whenever they get inside the installation. They offer the best services to faculty, staff, students, and visitors within an assigned area of the campus. They provide escort services, and other basic public assistance services as needed, and perform routine security and public safety patrol duties within assigned area. They remain alert to emergency situations and provide first-line response, emergency management, and/or referral if required. Their work involves reporting to specific locations at various intervals and keeping logs for ready reference.

Through House bill No. 2982, entitled “An Act Mandating Higher Education Institutions to Promote the Safety and Security of all students from internal and External Threats, thereby creating a “Crime Prevention Committee” or also known as the “Campus Safety and Security Act”, Romulo, (2013) pointed out that in the last quarter of 2012 alone, several cases of homicide and murder occurred in the University Belt Area. Several cases of violence were recorded inside and outside the campus of colleges and universities in Manila thus bringing immediate attention and have raised concerns on the safety and security of HEIs as the guardian and second home of students considering that they spend a great portion of their time inside the campus.

These cases prompted Representative Roman T. Romulo to file the creation of Crime Prevention Committee (CPC) in every HEI. Its tasks shall include the following: to formulate, in consultation, with the school head, chief of police where the university is located, punong barangay and other security specialists as they deem fit, a crime prevention strategy; to coordinate with college administrators, in the maintenance of peace and order within the campus; and to recommend to the administrator the conduct of seminars or trainings on the crime and drug prevention and control in coordination with the local police station or



DILG. Also a member of the CPC is the guidance counselor since most of those who committed suicide, were found to have never undergone counseling nor have seen a guidance counselor.

Moreover, Article IX Section 28 of the Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Order Number 09 Series of 2013 known as the “Enhanced Policies and Guidelines on Student Affairs and Services,” provides that pursuant to the commitment to the utmost achievement of quality, relevant and efficient higher institutions in the country. The CHED Memo provides that Safety and Security Services refer to the provision of a safe, accessible and secure environment, buildings and facilities that shall comply with government standards, licensed and security personnel shall ensure the safety and security of the students and their belongings.

The present security line-up of the campus is composed of guards who are college graduates of different degrees with and without training or experience in security management systems. However, the Administration of the University emphasizes that their immediate concern is the safety of the students, visitors, teaching and non-teaching personnel and school properties.

Moreover, Cagayan State University at Piat Campus is a state university whereby the security personnel are governed by the laws of the Civil Service Commission which was created by virtue of Executive Order No. 292 otherwise known as the Administrative Code of 1987. On the other hand, CSU as a government institution utilizing its employees to render security services must comply with RA 5487 particularly on the licensing and other important provisions related to security system.

### **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The study aimed to assess the extent of implementation of the security system of Cagayan State University Piat Campus. Specifically, it sought to answer the question:



1. What is the extent of the implementation of the security system of the campus in terms of the following aspects of security:
  - a. physical security
  - b. personnel security
    - b.1. recruitment
    - b.2. selection
    - b.3. promotion
    - b.4. separation
  - c. document security

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND TREATMENT**

This study utilized the descriptive-quantitative research method to describe the extent of implementation of the security systems as assessed by the participants of the study. This method likewise looked into the presence/absence of differences in the assessment on the extent of implementation of the security system given in the questionnaire.

The population of the study included the teaching, non-teaching personnel and students of the CSU Piat campus. Total enumeration was used for the teaching and non-teaching/administrative personnel of the university. Non-teaching personnel includes project in-charge and laborers of the piggery, dairy project, and the integrated farm tourism area. These individuals are stay-in employees inside the campus area. They help the security guards in securing the area as part of the verbal agreement between them and the Campus Executive Officer. This is the practice at CSU-Piat Campus. However, convenient random sampling technique was used to determine the samples among the students. The students involved in the study were the student leaders who were elected by the majority of the students. The students' perception was used to measure the implementation of the security measures of CSU Piat Campus.



The obtained sample size of 136 among the students, the researcher used the accidental sampling technique. The accidental sampling, also called convenience sampling involves, “choosing the nearest individuals, in this case students to serve as respondents and continuing that process until the required sample size has been obtained” (Cohen et al., 2007). In this case, students who happened to be readily available and accessible at the time were sought after and selected at open spaces where students mostly gather and being at other vantage points where students were easily identified and included. These students then served as “captive audiences”. Also, the convenience sampling technique was used since it coheres well with the study design.

**Table 1 shows the distribution of respondents**

| Group                      | Number of respondents | Percentage    |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Teaching                   | 56                    | 23.33         |
| Non-teaching/<br>personnel | Administrative<br>48  | 20.00         |
| Students                   | 136                   | 56.67         |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>240</b>            | <b>100.00</b> |

A questionnaire-checklist was used for data gathering instrument which was formulated by the researcher based on Republic Act 5487.

The weighted mean was used to determine the extent of implementation of the security system. The 4-point Likert scale was used and interpreted as:

3.26–4.00 – Much Implemented (The security measures are always implemented)

2.51-3.25 – Frequently Implemented (The security measures are implemented most of the time)



1.76–2.50 – Sometimes Implemented (The security measures are implemented once in a while)

1.00-1.75 –less Implemented (The security systems are never implemented)

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

**Table 2. Summary table on the Extent of Implementation of the Security System of CSU Piat Along the Three Areas (N=240)**

| Security Measures    | Weighted Mean | Verbal Interpretation         |
|----------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| Physical Security    | 2.41          | Sometimes implemented         |
| Personnel Security   | 3.06          | Frequently implemented        |
| Document Security    | 2.76          | Frequently implemented        |
| <b>Over-All Mean</b> | <b>2.76</b>   | <b>Frequently Implemented</b> |

As gleaned from the table, the security system of the Cagayan State University, Piat Campus in terms of personnel and document security system are frequently implemented with corresponding weighted means of 3.06 and 2.76 except the physical security system which is “sometimes implemented” with an overall mean of 2.41. An overall summary mean of 2.76 further indicates that the security system is frequently implemented.

The findings would imply that as shown in the area mean of 2.76, the security system of the campus is not totally implemented. The respondents feel several lapses in the implementation of the security system. These lapses include the non-compliance of the security guards on the provisions of the security system of the campus. Also, security guards are not vigilant enough in providing protection to school properties and in general, the populace. These lapses can be better understood with the occurrence of robbery in the campus which up to now remained unsolved. Some respondents had mentioned that protecting the wellbeing of students, staff, faculty, and guests had been felt not that strict and had not reduced risk and exposure for the institution itself. While this has always been



true, the university is dealing with a greater variety of incidents while also being subjected to a much higher level of public scrutiny. It is also observed that legal fees had increased and the other costs associated with incidents have driven the costs of responding to issues to extremely high levels. These costs are now so high that the only sustainable, viable model for mitigating incidents is preventing them before they can ever occur—and that requires new efforts and approaches. It was further mentioned that the most effective way to prevent incidents of all kinds, from thefts to harassment, assaults and much more, is for safety and security officials to receive advanced intelligence of a potential problem, and act before the situation can escalate. Receiving this intelligence requires open, seamless, and anonymous lines of communication between security officials and the populations they are protecting.

**Table 3: Extent of Implementation of the Security Measures of the Campus in Terms of Physical Systems as Perceived by the Respondents(N=240)**

|   | Weighted Mean | Verbal Interpretation  |
|---|---------------|------------------------|
| <b>A. PHYSICAL SECURITY</b>   |               |                        |
| 1. Providing security locks to building to Control people entering school buildings | 2.71          | Frequently Implemented |
| 2. Secured school buildings in order to prevent people in entering school buildings | 2.70          | Frequently Implemented |
| 3. University boundaries and/or policies are properly defined                       | 2.72          | Frequently Implemented |
| 4. Protecting the University boundaries and/or premises                             | 2.85          | Frequently Implemented |
| 5. Monitoring of the entry points of the university by the security guards          | 2.98          | Frequently Implemented |
| 6. Monitoring of the exit points of the university by the security guards           | 2.52          | Frequently Implemented |
| 7. Fencing the school grounds/premises  | 2.44          | Sometimes Implemented  |





---

|  |      |                        |
|--|------|------------------------|
| 8. Ensuring the accessibility of the school by the patrolling security guards            | 2.76 | Frequently Implemented |
| 9. Providing a proper perimeter fence for the campus                                     | 2.36 | Sometimes Implemented  |
| 10. Installing barbed wires on the perimeter fence                                       | 2.29 | Sometimes Implemented  |
| 11. Securing gates with padlocks and/or chains when campus is closed                     | 2.41 | Sometimes Implemented  |
| 12. Providing boundary edges free from trees and/or telephone poles                      | 2.32 | Sometimes Implemented  |
| 13. Eliminating the accessibility of persons to the roofs of house units in the campus   | 2.26 | Sometimes Implemented  |
| 14. Protecting high risk areas by high security locks and/or alarm systems               | 2.27 | Sometimes Implemented  |
| 15. Providing lights on entrances and/or possible points of possible intrusion           | 2.39 | Frequently Implemented |
| 16. Lighting properly the hallways during night time                                     | 2.29 | Sometimes Implemented  |
| 17. Providing proper lighting on parking spaces in the campus premises                   | 2.10 | Sometimes Implemented  |
| 18. Lighting properly the comfort rooms during night time                                | 2.05 | Sometimes Implemented  |
| 19. Situating the restrooms within the school buildings                                  | 2.21 | Sometimes Implemented  |
| 20. Installing CCTV cameras in strategic locations in the campus                         | 2.03 | Sometimes Implemented  |
| 21. Conducting inspections to campus premises for possible entrance of outsiders         | 2.39 | Sometimes Implemented  |
| 22. Providing visual surveillance among security personnel on parking lots of the campus | 2.26 | Sometimes Implemented  |

---




---

|   |             |                       |
|---|-------------|-----------------------|
| 23. Providing grills to protect windows of offices/laboratories and the high risk areas | 2.35        | Sometimes Implemented |
| 24. Restricting visitors in entering classrooms/offices without proper gate passes      | 2.24        | Sometimes Implemented |
| <b>Area Mean</b>  | <b>2.41</b> | Sometimes Implemented |

---

### **Physical Security**

Table 3 reflects the security system of CSU Piat campus in terms of physical systems. As gleaned from the table, the physical system of the campus is “sometimes implemented” with an area mean of 2.41. Among the items under this area, monitoring of the entry points of the university by the security guards is “ frequently implemented with the highest weighted mean of 2.98 followed by protecting the University boundaries and/or premises with a weighted mean of 2.85 or “frequently implemented. Generally, most of the items under the physical systems are “sometimes implemented.

An area mean of 2.41 further indicates that all the provisions under the physical systems are “sometimes implemented”. This result implies that the security guards of the campus have lapses in providing security to school properties and human resources. Provisions for alarms and spotlights in specific location is not aptly provided. The non-installation of CCTV’s resulted to culprits of the crimes unidentified resulting to unsolved crimes.

It should be noted that the campus does not provide official transportation for patrol mobility to secure the perimeter of the campus. While some security guards use their own motorcycle to patrol, others go on foot patrol since they do not own any vehicle. In terms of the provision of security during educational tours, no security guard is present to secure the students, instead, the class advisers and faculty take the responsibility to look into the welfare of the students.

The security system of the campus do not zero in on dormitories and cottages because the security guards have to protect school properties, campus residents, school perimeters,



school projects, visitors etc. but due to the area coverage, not all the premises are being guarded physically by the posted SGs.

The campus security program provides security to visitors visiting the campus. Upon entry to the gate of the campus, security guards escort the visitors up the place of destination in the campus and will not leave until the visitor leaves the campus. The security guards will have to be ready to respond to questions asked by the visitors regarding the campus.

The employees of the campus who live outside the campus are not provided security of their personal belongings and personal welfare after leaving the school premises. While in the campus security guards see to it that the employees are safe and secured in the campus. As the off-campus personnel get out of the campus, a log book is maintained to record the in and out of these off-campus personnel and faculty.

The campus security system is strongly linked with the PNP as well as the BFP in the Municipality of Piat in Cagayan Province. This linkage is manifested through the presence of the PNP during the robbery incidents who made an investigation of the case. Aside from the involvement of the PNP in investigating the occurrence of crimes, the PNP officers are invited by the office of Student Affairs to conduct lectures/seminars on drug addiction, crime prevention program while the BFP personnel are invited to lecture on Fire Prevention Program.

It is a practice in CSU Piat that employees may live inside the compound of the school. Many of the employees have their cottages inside the campus for free. The following are the policies on residents inside the campus:

1. Observance of curfew hours from 8:00 to 4:00 A.M.
  2. Report to the security guards any untoward incident observed
  3. Any intruder in the campus perimeter should be reported immediately to the security guards.
  4. Observance of discipline and order during campus affairs or programs.
-



5. Respect to higher authorities.

For external security of employees and students, students and employees who are on official business like educational tours and field trips; on-the-job training of students and their supervising faculty members, are provided with security but limited only to monitoring the activities of these employees and students.

In the study of Loukaitou-Sideris & Fink (2009) it was found out that there is a strong correlation between a run-down physical environment and a perceived fear of that environment. Montojo (2006) stressed that physical security is a system of barriers placed between the potential intruder and the matter to be protected.

According to Xaba (2014) espoused a unique approach to prevent crime and a mechanism that ensures the University of Cape Coast (UCC) main operating departments is harmonized into an integrated safety network. To give impetus to this issue, the University has a security section which houses security personnel of the institution. In fact, Students' safety at university and the safety of each member of the community and visitors is a primary concern which has received and continues to receive urgent attention. The University provides an array of protective measures for students, its faculty and staff. Some of the institutional initiatives aimed at ensuring safety of students include security patrol systems by unarmed security personnel of the university most of whom are not state-certified, and academically-untrained officers. These people are required to patrol every nook and cranny of the campus ensuring law and order in every part of the University campus.



**Table 4: Extent of Implementation of the Security Measures of the Campus  
In terms of Personnel Systems as Perceived by the Respondents (N=240)**

| <b>B. PERSONNEL SECURITY</b>  |             |                               |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>B.1. Recruitment</b>   |             |                               |
| 1. Advertising job vacancies publicly   | 2.49        | Frequently Implemented        |
| 2. Allowing anyone to apply for all job vacancies   | 2.88        | Frequently Implemented        |
| 3. Providing potential candidates about the job descriptions and its requirements   | 2.78        | Frequently Implemented        |
| 4. Checking completeness of requirements of applicant's for competency based qualification  | 3.32        | Much Implemented              |
| 5. Evaluating applicants' qualifications against competency-based qualification standards   | 3.13        | Frequently Implemented        |
| 6. Examining the reference persons of the applicant's application letter  | 3.16        | Frequently Implemented        |
| 7. Verifying the reference persons provided in the applicant's application letter   | 2.94        | Frequently Implemented        |
| 8. Assuring that the applicant is clear criminal record   | 3.21        | Frequently Implemented        |
| 9. Conducting an inquiry into the character of the prospective employee   | 3.02        | Frequently Implemented        |
| <b>Sub-Area Mean</b>  | <b>2.99</b> | <b>Frequently Implemented</b> |
| <b>B.2. Selection</b>   |             |                               |
| 1. Providing an objective, process among job applicants   | 3.06        | Frequently Implemented        |
| 2. Organizing a selection panel to oversee the appointment process  | 3.10        | Frequently Implemented        |
| 3. Administering written examination to the applicants to determine the personal profile vis-à-vis the position profile of job applicants | 2.87        | Frequently Implemented        |



|   |      |                        |
|---|------|------------------------|
| 4. Administering skills test to assess technical competencies of job applicants               | 2.77 | Frequently Implemented |
| 5. Administering personality test to measure behavioral tendencies in different               | 2.85 | Frequently Implemented |
| 6. Conducting behavioral Event Interview to get behavioral past performance of job applicants | 2.78 | Frequently Implemented |
| 7. Conducting background investigation to get vital information about the applicant           | 2.91 | Frequently Implemented |
| 8. Providing a standard assessment criteria for all levels of position                        | 3.05 | Frequently Implemented |
| 9. Notifying applicants about their assessment results  | 3.00 | Frequently Implemented |

|                      |             |                               |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Sub-Area Mean</b> | <b>2.93</b> | <b>Frequently Implemented</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|

**B.3. Promotion**

|   |      |                        |
|---|------|------------------------|
| 1. Providing a clear criteria for evaluation as bases for promotion among personnel   | 3.37 | Much Implemented       |
| 2. Informing candidates the criteria for the procedures on promotion  | 3.14 | Frequently Implemented |
| 3. Providing a clear criteria for evaluation as bases for promotion among personnel   | 3.18 | Frequently Implemented |
| 4. Eliminating discrimination to applicants for promotion   | 2.95 | Frequently Implemented |
| 5. Strict policy on promotion on point system on:<br>a. Performance evaluation;<br>b. Application of the seniority rule;<br>c. Trainings attended; and<br>d. Qualifications | 3.07 | Frequently Implemented |
| 6. Implementing a strict policy that rank and file employees are represented in the promotion   | 3.29 | Much Implemented       |



board to insure objectivity in the selection of employees for promotion

- |   |      |                  |
|---|------|------------------|
| 7. Implementing a strict policy that the most competent or the best qualified personnel for the position is qualified for promotion | 3.36 | Much Implemented |
|---|------|------------------|

|                      |             |                               |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Sub-Area Mean</b> | <b>3.19</b> | <b>Frequently Implemented</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|

**B.4. Separation**

- |  |      |                        |
|--|------|------------------------|
| 1. Compliance of a written notice of resignation of a personnel should be forwarded to the human resource officer                                    | 3.31 | Much Implemented       |
| 2. The effective date of resignation of a personnel should be forwarded to the human resource officer  | 3.07 | Frequently Implemented |
| 3. Habitual absentee among any employee may a cause of separation of an employee   | 2.89 | Frequently Implemented |
| 4. Providing a strict compliance on the causes of the separation of employees<br>a. Unsatisfactory performance; and/or<br>b. Physical/mentally unfit | 3.20 | Frequently Implemented |
| 5. Getting absent without approved leave for at least 30 days shall be separated from the service or dropped from the rolls without prior notice     | 2.93 | Frequently Implemented |
| 6. Presenting/submitting a certified true copy of the decision rendered where the penalty of dismissal was imposed                                   | 3.23 | Frequently Implemented |
| 7. Qualifying personnel who had rendered 15 or more years of continuous government service to retire   | 3.22 | Frequently Implemented |



|  |             |                               |
|--|-------------|-------------------------------|
| 8. Explanation on lack of funds is a reason of separating an employee                                    | 2.82        | Frequently Implemented        |
| 9. Explaining the policy that performing below par is one reason of separating employees                 | 3.13        | Frequently Implemented        |
| 10. Providing a policy that the death of an employee leaves the position vacant                          | 3.27        | Much Implemented              |
| 11. Seeking for transfer should be made through a written request for transfer to the head of the agency | 3.37        | Much Implemented              |
| <b>Sub-Area Mean</b>   | <b>3.13</b> | <b>Frequently Implemented</b> |
| <b>Area Mean</b>   | <b>3.06</b> | <b>Frequently Implemented</b> |

### Personnel Security

Personnel security is the proper hiring and firing of personnel in any institution. Table 4 reflects the security system of the campus as to personnel. In terms of recruitment, checking completeness of requirements of applicant's qualification is "much implemented" with a weighted mean of 3.32. Other provisions on recruitment were "frequently implemented".

A sub-area mean of 2.99 further shows that all the provisions on recruitment are frequently implemented. Advertising job vacancies public obtained the lowest mean of 2.49 which manifests that the security system in most cases does not publicly advertise vacant positions. On selection, the security system of the campus implements the provisions along this area "frequently implemented" with an overall sub-mean of 2.93. This implies that getting the right person to the right position should comply with the provisions of selection implemented by the campus.

According to Alfawaz (2011) human factor represents a key issue that has to be addressed by administrators for effective security management system along the personnel systems. In





this regard, he mentioned that proper selection of personnel is necessary for more efficient and effective implementation of the information security system.

On the contrary, most of the provision of security measures on promotion, and separation of the University teaching and non-teaching staff perceived these “much implemented”. These measures are: providing clear criteria for evaluation as bases for promotion among personnel; strict policy of promotion on the point system considering qualification, seminars attended, performance evaluation, and the application of seniority; implementing a strict policy that rank and file employees are represented in the promotion board to ensure objectivity of their promotion. Separation policies are likewise perceived always implemented as: the compliance of a written notice of resignation of a personnel be forwarded to the human resource officer; the provision that a death of a personnel leaves the position vacant, and seeking transfer of a personnel necessitates a written request of transfer to the head of the agency of which the employee is at present working. The personnel of the university expressed their appreciation for the strict, clear and transparent implementation of these security measures of the university.

Along this line, it is expressed in the Clery Act (Act) that requires colleges and universities to develop and implement campus security policies. The goal of a campus security program should be to provide students and employees with atmosphere free from fear of personal harm or property loss. To accomplish this goal and to comply with requirements of the Act, a university or college should develop a campus security program and train students and personnel on campus crime prevention measures, organize a campus security department, perform security surveys and patrols of the campus, and institute an access control program for the campus and student housing. However, in the Cagayan State University, it was found out campus security program had not been fully implemented. One reason is that the university had to implement these programs as suggested and approved by the National budget for all state colleges and universities. The University depends so much on its national budget and policies.



It should be remembered of Ali's (2016) comment that effective campus security finds the right balance between creating an open and free environment and upholding the duty to protect people. This starts with the acknowledgement that security must be part of the campus's evolution. The right solution balances expenditures between personnel, technology, facility's design and crime prevention education to develop a program that is efficient and affordable. He further stressed that today's security officers are the front-line of an academic institution's brand, interacting with campus community members while serving as the eyes and ears to help keep the campus safe. With new expectations and growing responsibilities, the campus security officer continues to evolve. Further, the "CAMPUS SAFETY AND SECURITY ACT," mandates higher education institutions and technical vocational institutions to ensure the safety and security of the academic community from internal and external threats, thereby creating a safety and security committee for this purpose.

Further, Oakes (2009) provides that the avoidance of injury, trouble and even loss of life requires the support of all individuals in the campus. Under the Philippine setting, organizations or establishments leave the security control of the business to the security force with the following assumptions:

1. Individuals can be more gratified for pleasure over pain and sometimes commit undesirable actions in search for gratification;
2. People are prone to commit crimes when the situation or condition is suitable and there is an opportunity to do so;
3. Crimes can be reduced through environmental manipulation; and Great harm may occur if prevention and intervention strategies are not implemented.



**Table 5: Extent of Implementation of the Security Measures of the Campus In terms of Document Security as Perceived by the Respondents (N=240)**

---

**C. DOCUMENT SECURITY**

---

|  |      |                        |
|--|------|------------------------|
| 1. Instilling awareness among employees of the existence of sensitive issues/data in the company and how to protect them in the right procedures                           | 2.83 | Frequently Implemented |
| 2. Storing sensitive documents separately in containers for which special security precautions are taken authorized representative   | 2.61 | Frequently Implemented |
| 3. Imposing area controls within a facility among different classes of employee with respect to certain information or operations  | 2.83 | Frequently Implemented |
| 4. Maintaining a registry of classified matter showing all classified matter received and to whom transmitted  | 2.60 | Frequently Implemented |
| 5. Specifying the dissemination of classified matter shall be restricted to properly cleared persons whose official duties required knowledge or possession thereof        | 2.71 | Frequently Implemented |
| 6. Providing procedures on pre-employment screening techniques   | 3.16 | Frequently Implemented |
| 7. Maintaining that classified matter originating from another department shall not be disseminated to other departments without the consent of the originating department | 2.99 | Frequently Implemented |
| 8. Stipulating that all information should be released through the Public Information Officer  | 2.99 | Frequently Implemented |
| 9. Stipulating that classified matter shall be released  | 3.06 | Frequently             |

---



|   |             |                               |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------|
| for public consumption upon the consent of the department head or authorized representative   |             | Implemented                   |
| 10. Specifying that non person in the university shall convey any classified matter not processed and cleared by the department head or his authorized representative | 2.96        | Frequently Implemented        |
| <b>Sub-Area Mean</b>  | <b>2.87</b> | <b>Frequently Implemented</b> |
| <b>OVER-ALL MEAN</b>  | <b>2.76</b> | <b>Frequently Implemented</b> |

### Document Security

Table 5 shows the findings on the extent of implementation of the security measures of the campus in terms of document security.

Table 5 reflects the security system of the campus as to document security system . The study found out that the area on document security system of the University was frequently implemented as evidenced by the area mean of 2.87. This means that the respondents perceived and recognized the fact that managed document services are hugely important for ensuring the security and continued reliability of school systems. The safety of the security of these documents is very important in the affairs of the university as a whole. Evidently, the respondents are reminded of the importance and the sanctity of these records that, the school Administration, staff and students take responsibility of the security of these documents.

As a result, the frequently implemented extent of implementation of the security measures in the University necessitates a higher level of implementation of these security measures in the objective of making the campus a healthy, conducive and a safe environment for teaching learning processes to be effective.



Lukas (2016) corroborates with the findings of the study where it is emphasized that pursuing comprehensive, accredited school safety can pave the way to a safer, healthier learning environment for children and the youth in the community.

Pain (2010) even argues that the social environment operating within particular spaces is more important to perceptions of safety and fear of crime than the physical environment. In any case, it is necessary to consider both the social and physical environment of a campus in order to completely address concerns for campus safety.

According to Franzosa (2009), the most effective way to do safety is through encouraging communication between students and campus security services. He argues that by communicating that campus security is alert and knows how to react in any situation, students are more likely to be informed and participate in campus safety measures. Students also need to be informed of the risks that exist, without being unnecessarily fearful of the campus. "The key to fighting campus insecurity is not to create fear or diminish freedom, but rather to keep resources available, raise awareness that threats exist, and maintain open lines of communication."

White, Gina & Coetzee (2015) in the article "Safety and Security in Schools in KwaZulu-Natal," stated that many higher education commentators in the UK are calling for universities to adopt a 'whole university approach' to student safety and well-being with emphasis on partnership working is designed to break down the silos within higher education institutions that prevent individuals, departments and organizations from working together towards a common and desirable goal. The aim is to create safe environments where students and staff can learn, work and thrive. They further enumerated several basis for this objective to be effective and attainable and these are: 1) Students cannot reach their full potential when impeded by issues affecting their safety, security and well-being; 2) Ensuring the safety, security and well-being of students requires a 'joined-up' approach across the student experience – partnership working is essential; 3)



All higher education staff and students are important in nurturing a positive, caring and inclusive learning environment for all students in the institution; and 4) Effectively tackling issues of student safety, security and well-being requires well-founded intelligence.

Further, Oakes (2009) provides that the avoidance of injury, trouble and even loss of life requires the support of all individuals in the campus. Under the Philippine setting, organizations or establishments leave the security control of the business to the security force with the following assumptions:

4. Individuals can be more gratified for pleasure over pain and sometimes commit undesirable actions in search for gratification;
5. People are prone to commit crimes when the situation or condition is suitable and there is an opportunity to do so;
6. Crimes can be reduced through environmental manipulation; and
7. Great harm may occur if prevention and intervention strategies are not implemented.

**Table 6: Extent of Implementation of the Security Measures of the Campus According to Group**

|   | A    | B    | C     |
|---|------|------|-------|
| <b>A. PHYSICAL SECURITY</b>                             | (56) | (48) | (136) |
| 1. Controlling people entering school buildings         | 2.38 | 2.69 | 2.86  |
| 2. Supervising people entering school buildings         | 2.39 | 2.65 | 2.84  |
| 3. Defining the University boundaries and/or policies   | 2.30 | 2.81 | 2.86  |
| 4. Protecting the University boundaries and/or premises | 2.29 | 2.81 | 3.09  |



---

|  |      |      |      |
|--|------|------|------|
| 5. Monitoring of the entry points of the university by the security guards             | 2.34 | 3.06 | 3.22 |
| 6. Monitoring of the exit points of the university by the security guards              | 1.89 | 2.54 | 2.77 |
| 7. Fencing the school grounds/premises   | 2.00 | 2.54 | 2.59 |
| 8. Ensuring the accessibility of the school by the patrolling security guards          | 2.16 | 2.63 | 3.05 |
| 9. Providing a proper perimeter fence for the campus                                   | 1.93 | 2.25 | 2.58 |
| 10. Installing barbed wires on the perimeter fence                                     | 1.80 | 2.08 | 2.56 |
| 11. Securing gates with padlocks and/or chains when campus is closed                   | 1.88 | 2.92 | 2.45 |
| 12. Providing boundary edges free from trees and/or telephone poles                    | 1.95 | 2.15 | 2.53 |
| 13. Eliminating the accessibility of persons to the roofs of house units in the campus | 1.80 | 2.27 | 2.45 |
| 14. Protecting high risk areas by high security locks and/or alarm systems             | 1.63 | 1.98 | 2.63 |
| 15. Providing lights on entrances and/or possible points of possible                   | 2.07 | 2.54 | 2.47 |



|  |                              |                              |                             |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| intrusion  |                              |                              |                             |
| 16. Lighting properly the hallways during night time                                     | 2.04                         | 2.60                         | 2.28                        |
| 17. Providing proper lighting on parking spaces in the campus premises                   | 1.79                         | 2.40                         | 2.13                        |
| 18. Lighting properly the comfort rooms during night time                                | 1.63                         | 2.33                         | 2.12                        |
| 19. Situating the restrooms within the school buildings                                  | 1.82                         | 2.50                         | 2.26                        |
| 20. Installing CCTV cameras in strategic locations in the campus                         | 1.66                         | 1.94                         | 2.22                        |
| 21. Conducting inspections to campus premises for possible entrance of outsiders         | 2.02                         | 2.44                         | 2.53                        |
| 22. Providing visual surveillance among security personnel on parking lots of the campus | 1.86                         | 2.29                         | 2.41                        |
| 23. Providing grills to protect windows of offices/laboratories and the high risk areas  | 2.00                         | 2.42                         | 2.47                        |
| 24. Restricting visitors in entering classrooms/offices without proper gate passes       | 1.91                         | 2.69                         | 2.22                        |
| <b>Sub-Area Mean</b>   | <b>1.98</b>                  | <b>2.48</b>                  | <b>2.57</b>                 |
|  | <b>Sometimes Implemented</b> | <b>Sometimes Implemented</b> | <b>Moderately Satisfied</b> |

## B. PERSONNEL SECURITY

### B.1. Recruitment





|  |                               |                               |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Advertising job vacancies publicly  | 2.46                          | 2.52                          | 2.50                          |
| 2. Allowing anyone to apply for all job vacancies  | 2.29                          | 3.29                          | 2.97                          |
| 3. Providing potential candidates about the job descriptions and its requirements          | 2.73                          | 2.96                          | 2.74                          |
| 4. Checking completeness of requirements of applicant's for competency based qualification | 3.00                          | 3.13                          | 3.45                          |
| 5. Evaluating applicants' qualifications against competency-based qualification standards  | 3.07                          | 3.21                          | 3.12                          |
| 6. Examining the reference persons of the applicant's application letter                   | 2.96                          | 3.25                          | 3.21                          |
| 7. Verifying the reference persons provided in the applicant's application letter          | 2.34                          | 3.06                          | 3.14                          |
| 8. Assuring that the applicant is clear from any criminal record                           | 2.50                          | 3.46                          | 3.42                          |
| 9. Conducting an inquiry into the character of the prospective employee                    | 2.50                          | 2.94                          | 3.26                          |
| <b>Sub-Area Mean</b>   | <b>2.65</b>                   | <b>3.09</b>                   | <b>3.09</b>                   |
|  | <b>Moderately Implemented</b> | <b>Moderately Implemented</b> | <b>Moderately Implemented</b> |

## B.2 Selection



---

|   |      |      |      |
|---|------|------|------|
| 1. Providing an objective, process among job applicants   | 2.89 | 3.31 | 3.05 |
| 2. Organizing a selection panel to oversee the appointment process  | 3.04 | 3.44 | 3.01 |
| 3. Administering written examination to the applicants to determine the personal profile vis-à-vis the position profile of job applicants | 2.82 | 2.75 | 2.94 |
| 4. Administering skills test to assess technical competencies of job applicants   | 2.57 | 2.85 | 2.83 |
| 5. Administering personality test to measure behavioral tendencies in different   | 2.50 | 2.95 | 2.96 |
| 6. Conducting behavioral Event Interview to get behavioral past performance of job applicants   | 2.55 | 3.10 | 2.76 |
| 7. Conducting background investigation to get vital information about the applicant   | 2.46 | 2.56 | 3.21 |
| 8. Providing a standard assessment criteria for all levels of position  | 2.77 | 3.27 | 3.08 |
| 9. Notifying applicants about their assessment results  | 2.71 | 3.10 | 3.08 |

---



---

|                      |                    |                    |                    |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Sub-Area Mean</b> | <b>2.70</b>        | <b>3.04</b>        | <b>2.99</b>        |
|                      | <b>Moderately</b>  | <b>Moderately</b>  | <b>Moderately</b>  |
|                      | <b>Implemented</b> | <b>Implemented</b> | <b>Implemented</b> |

---

**B.3. Promotion**

---

|   |      |      |             |
|---|------|------|-------------|
| 1. Providing a clear criteria for evaluation as bases for promotion among personnel   | 3.34 | 3.46 | 3.35        |
| 2. Informing candidates the criteria for the procedures on promotion  | 2.88 | 3.23 | 3.21        |
| 3. Providing a clear criteria for evaluation as bases for promotion among personnel   | 2.86 | 3.15 | 3.32        |
| 4. Eliminating discrimination to applicants for promotion   | 2.54 | 3.29 | <b>2.99</b> |
| 5. Strict policy on promotion on point system on:<br>a. Performance evaluation;<br>b. Application of the seniority rule;<br>c. Trainings attended; and<br>d. Qualifications | 2.72 | 3.15 | <b>3.18</b> |
| 6. Implementing a strict policy that rank and file employees are represented in the promotion board to insure objectivity in the selection of                               | 2.89 | 3.33 | 3.44        |



|   |                               |                           |                               |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| employees for promotion   |                               |                           |                               |
| 7. Implementing a strict policy that the most competent or the best qualified personnel for the position is qualified for promotion | 3.13                          | 3.40                      | 3.44                          |
| <b>Sub-Area Mean</b>  | <b>2.91</b>                   | <b>3.29</b>               | <b>3.19</b>                   |
|   | <b>Frequently Implemented</b> | <b>Always Implemented</b> | <b>Frequently Implemented</b> |
| <b>B.4. Separation</b>  |                               |                           |                               |
| 1. Compliance of a written notice of resignation of a personnel should be forwarded to the human resource officer                   | 3.11                          | 3.42                      | 3.36                          |
| 2. The effective date of resignation of a personnel should be forwarded to the human resource officer                               | 2.91                          | 3.10                      | 3.13                          |
| 3. Habitual absentee among any employee may a cause of separation of an employee  | 2.55                          | 3.04                      | 2.97                          |
| 4. Providing a strict compliance on the causes of the separation of employees   | 3.11                          | 3.21                      | 3.24                          |
| a. Unsatisfactory performance; and/or   |                               |                           |                               |
| b. Physical/mentally unfit  |                               |                           |                               |



---

|  |             |             |             |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 5. Getting absent without approved leave for at least 30 days shall be separated from the service or dropped from the rolls without prior notice | 2.54        | 2.58        | 3.22        |
| 6. Presenting/submitting a certified true copy of the decision rendered where the penalty of dismissal was imposed                               | 3.00        | 3.13        | 3.36        |
| 7. Qualifying personnel who had rendered 15 or more years of continuous government service to retire   | 3.11        | 2.94        | 3.36        |
| 8. Explanation on lack of funds is a reason of separating an employee  | 2.64        | 2.65        | 2.95        |
| 9. Explaining the policy that performing below par is one reason of separating employees   | 2.71        | 3.13        | 3.31        |
| 10. Providing a policy that the death of an employee leaves the position vacant  | 3.11        | 3.29        | 3.32        |
| 11. Seeking for transfer should be made through a written request for transfer to the head of the agency   | 3.29        | 3.46        | 3.37        |
| <b>Sub-Area Mean</b>   | <b>2.92</b> | <b>3.09</b> | <b>3.23</b> |

---



---

|   | Frequently<br>Implemented | Frequently<br>Implemented | Frequently<br>Implemented |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>C. DOCUMENT SECURITY</b>   |                           |                           |                           |
| 1. Instilling awareness among employees of the existence of sensitive issues/data in the company and how to protect them in the right procedures                    | 2.16                      | 2.75                      | 3.13                      |
| 2. Storing sensitive documents separately in containers for which special security precautions are taken authorized representative                                  | 1.68                      | 2.33                      | 3.10                      |
| 3. Imposing area controls within a facility among different classes of employee with respect to certain information or operations                                   | 2.23                      | 2.71                      | 3.12                      |
| 4. Maintaining a registry of classified matter showing all classified matter received and to whom transmitted   | 1.88                      | 2.58                      | 2.90                      |
| 5. Specifying the dissemination of classified matter shall be restricted to properly cleared persons whose official duties required knowledge or possession thereof | 2.14                      | 2.46                      | 3.04                      |
| 6. Providing procedures on pre-   | 2.86                      | 3.06                      | 3.31                      |

---



|  |                              |                               |                               |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| employment screening techniques  |                              |                               |                               |
| 7. Maintaining that classified matter originating from another department shall not be disseminated to other departments without the consent of the originating department | 2.46                         | 2.58                          | 3.35                          |
| 8. Stipulating that all information should be released through the Public Information Officer  | 2.71                         | 3.13                          | 3.06                          |
| 9. Stipulating that classified matter shall be released for public consumption upon the consent of the department head or authorized representative                        | 2.75                         | 2.85                          | 3.26                          |
| 10. Specifying that non person in the university shall convey any classified matter not processed and cleared by the department head or his authorized representative      | 2.50                         | 2.69                          | 3.24                          |
| <b>Sub-Area Mean</b>   | <b>2.34</b>                  | <b>2.71</b>                   | <b>3.15</b>                   |
|  | <b>Sometimes Implemented</b> | <b>Frequently Implemented</b> | <b>Frequently Implemented</b> |
| <b>OVER-ALL MEAN</b>   | <b>2.41</b>                  | <b>2.76</b>                   | <b>2.98</b>                   |
|  | <b>Sometimes</b>             | <b>Frequently</b>             | <b>Frequently</b>             |



**Implemented      Implemented      Implemented**

**According to Group**

Table 6 reflects the extent of implementation of the security measures of the campus according to group.

In the comparison of extent of implementation of the Security System of the Cagayan State University, Piat Campus considering the group of respondents, as shown in table 6, evidently, the teaching staff perceived that the security, obtained the lowest (sometimes implemented) as shown in the area mean of 2. 41. The non-teaching staff and the students perceived similar (frequently implemented).

This means that the teachers perceived that they are not so safe and secured of the security system the university is at present implementing. However, in the F-test, shown in table 7, the computed F-ratio of 1.6924 is less than the tabled F-ratio of 5.14 at 5 percent level of significance, thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. This means that there are no significant differences on the perceived extent of implementation of the security measures of the campus according to group of respondents. Further, group of the respondents did not vary in their perception on the extent of implementation of the security measures of the campus.

**Table 7: Summary Table for the ANOVA on the Extent of Implementation of the Security Measures of the Campus According to Group**

| Source of Variation | Mean Squares | Sum of Squares             | df | Estimated Variance | F-Ratio       |
|---------------------|--------------|----------------------------|----|--------------------|---------------|
| Between             | 0.4082       |                            | 2  | 0.2041             |               |
| Within              | 0.7234       |                            | 6  | 0.1206             | <b>1.6924</b> |
| <b>F.05 = 5.14</b>  |              | <b>Decision: Accept Ho</b> |    |                    |               |





Table 7 presents the summary table for the ANOVA on the extent of implementation of the security measures of the campus according to group of respondents.

However, in the area on physical security systems, the students perceived that these measures were moderately implemented. The non-teaching respondents perceived that the promotion security measures are always implemented in the university campus.

It is along this concept that the teachers have come to realize that the foundation of all learning is safety and security. Attendance and academic performance are closely linked to how safe students perceive the school environment to be. It is hard for young people to concentrate on learning when they feel vulnerable, and a climate of fear forces teachers to shift their focus from teaching to policing. Safety and security concerns are fast becoming an important part of any dialog about improving school wide academic performance. Moreover, the faculty staff, and students realized that the school be among the safest places for everyone to come to the university campus.

Along this context, the social environment delineates, according to Johnson (2009), the nature of interactions, or social norms, that occur among students and other members of the university, within the physical environment of the campus concludes that the social environment of the campus impacts the behavior of students both at the individual and collective levels. At the individual level, it is the student's individual beliefs, commitments, involvement, and attachment towards the social environment that impacts behavior. At the collective level, campuses with a cohesive, uniform set of social norms have a social environment which promotes collective action among students. Because the physical and social environments are invariably related to one another, it is important to consider both the campus as physical and social environments when studying campus safety.

## **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**



To summarize the findings of the study, the security system of the Cagayan State University, Piat Campus in terms of personnel and document security system are frequently implemented with corresponding weighted means of 3.06 and 2.76 except the physical security system which is “sometimes implemented” with an overall mean of 2.41. An overall summary mean of 2.76 further indicates that the security system is frequently implemented.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

In light of the findings of the study, it is deduced that the respondents perceived the implementation of the security systems of the university as moderately implemented thus, showing the University’s security systems and measures are implemented most of the time for the safety and protection of persons and properties in the university.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

On the basis of the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are forwarded:

1. The CSU Piat Campus administration should take the overall lead in the implementation of appropriate physical structures to safeguard the school perimeter, school properties, students, and the total populace in the campus;
2. Considering the lapses in the implementation of the security system, Security guards should undergo trainings and seminars along the three components of the security system for effective and efficient implementation of the school security systems;
3. Recruitment and selection of security guards should be properly advertised to attract more applicants to select from;
4. Documents pertaining to sensitive issues should be properly kept with utmost confidentiality. Records pertaining to security matters should be established;



5. Future researchers to conduct a similar study to focus on the factors, which are believed to improve the status of School Safety and Security in different levels of education

## ETHICAL CONSIDERATION

Ethical issues were considered to ensure the safety of the research participants during the process of the research. The participants have the right to participate voluntarily and the right to withdraw at any time, so that individuals are not being coerced into participation. The participants were informed of the purpose of the study, so that they understood the nature of the research and its impact on them. To ensure confidentiality of responses from participants, the real names of participants were made confidential.

The respondents were also assured that they will be informed of the results of the study through a copy of the study to be provided to the College Library. Permission was secured from the President of the University in the choice of CSU Piat Campus as the locale of the study. Data gathered were kept confidential and the dissemination of findings shall only be made to the people involved in the security system of the campus.

## REFERENCES

### A. Books

- Anderson, C. S. (2014). The Search for School Climate: A Review of the Research Literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 52, 368-420
- Currie, D. H. (2004). Women's safety on campus: Challenging the University as gendered space. *Humanity & Society*, 18(3), 24-47.
- Corpuz, W.M. & Delizo (2011). *Industrial Security Management Manual. Phils: Wisemen's Book Trading.*



Thomas, R. M. (2006). Violence in America's Schools: Understanding, Prevention, and Responses. Greenwood Publishing Group, 159–160. ISBN 0275993299.

#### **B. Journals/Magazines/Newspapers**

Ali S. (2016) Comparative Analysis of Safety and Security Measures in Public and Private Schools at Secondary Level. *J Socialomics* 169. doi:10.41 72/2167-0358.1000169 J Socialomics ISSN:2167-0358 an open access journal Volume 5, Issue 3. 1000169

Alunan, R. (2019). "Take a Stand." Campus safety and security. *Business World*. Available from: <https://www.bworldonline.com/campus-safety-and-security/>

Borja, R. (2006). "Education news". *Education Week*. Retrieved on February 3, 2018.

Berggren, E. and Bernshteyn, R. (2007) Organizational Transparency Drives Company Performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 26, 411-417. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02621710710748248>

Bracy, N. L. (2011). Student perceptions of high-security school environments. *Youth & Society*, 43, 365–395.

Brown, J. (2013). "Cards let schools, parents keep eye on their students". *USA TODAY*. Retrieved on February 1, 2018.

Busan (2008) "For Safety's Sake: A Case Study of School Security Efforts and Their Impact on Education Reform," *Journal of Applied Research on Children: Informing Policy for Children at Risk*: Volume 3: Issue 2, Article 5. Available at: <https://digitalcommons.library.tmc.edu/childrenatrisk/vol3/iss2/5>

Casella, R. (2006) Where Policy Meets the Pavement: Stages of Public Involvement in the Prevention of School Violence, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 15:3349-372.

Clarke, C. A. (2002) "Between a rock and a hard place: RCMP organizational change" *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 25(1): 14-31.

Craig, W., Harel, Y. (n d.). "Bullying, physical fighting and victimization" (PDF). *Young People's Health in Context*: 138.



- Daisey J.M. (2008) A survey and critical review of the literature on indoor air quality, ventilation and health symptoms in schools, indoor environment program (Report No. LBNL 41517). Prepared for the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA.
- Darden, E. (2006). "Search and seizure, due process, and public schools". *Journal of Applied Research on Children: Informing Policy for Children at Risk*: Vol. 3, Issue 2, Article 5.
- Design and Implementation of Campus Security System Based on Internet of Things (2017). Conference Paper: *Conference: 2017 International Conference on Robots & Intelligent System (ICRIS)*.
- Donnellon, C. (2018). Violence on college campuses: Understanding its impact on student well-being. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 24(10), 78 – 92.
- Duplechain, R.; Morris, R. & Winter (2014). "School Violence: Reported School Shootings and Making Schools Safer". *Education*. 135: 145–150 – via EBSCOhost.
- Dwyer, K., & Osher, D. (n.d.) Safeguarding Our Children: An Action Guide. Implementing Early Warning, Timely Response. Washington, D.C.
- Education in New Zealand (2017). Vandalism funding to repair school property". Retrieved on February 1, 2018.
- Encouraging Healthy Environment (2006). What are college students' perceptions about campus safety considering the environment? *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 6(3), 325 -332.
- Española, R. & Savandal, M. (2016). Campus Crimes and Student Safety Precautions: Implications to Campus Security Processes. ***Proceedings Journal of Education, Psychology and Social Science Research***.
- European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (2004), Mainstreaming occupational safety and health into education. Good practice in school and vocational education, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.
- Fisher, B. S. (2005). Crime and fear on campus. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 539, Reaction to Crime and Violence.
-



- Franzosa, A. (2009). Insecure? Keeping New England college campuses safe from violence. *New England Journal of Higher Education*, 20-21.
- Goodwin College (2016). "Importance of School Safety and Security | Goodwin College". Retrieved February 3, 2018.
- Government Gives Go-Ahead to Metal Detectors in Schools." *Education* (14637073), no. 243, 20 Oct. 2006, 3-5.
- Haynes N.M. & Comer JP (2006) Integrating schools, families, and communities through successful school reform: The school development program. *School Psychology Review*, 25(4):501–506.
- Hess, P. C., & Wroblecki P. J. (2007). Preliminary examination of safety issues on a university campus: Personal safety practices, beliefs, and attitudes of faculty and staff. *College Student Journal*, 41(4), 1149-1162.
- Higgins, B. (September 2015). "Helping At-Risk Youth Say "No" to Gangs" (PDF). *National Institute of Justice* (275): 3.
- Franzosa, A. (2009). Insecure? Keeping New England college campuses safe from violence. *New England Journal of Higher Education*, 20-21.
- Glariana, C. & Solar, F. (2015) Status of School Safety and Security among Elementary Schools...P-ISSN 2350-7756 | E-ISSN 2350-8442 | [www.apjmr.com](http://www.apjmr.com) *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, Vol. 3, No. 5
- Johnson, S. L. (2009). Improving the school environment to reduce school violence: A review of the literature. *Journal of School Health*, 79(10), 451-65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.2009.00435>.
- Kelly, B. T. & Torres, A. (2006). Campus safety: Perceptions and experiences of women students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(1), 20-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/csd.2006.0007>
- Loukaitou-Sideris, A. & Fink, C. (2009). Addressing women's fear of victimisation in transportation settings. *Urban Affairs Review*, 44(4), 554-587. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1078087408322874>
-



- Mankins, M. and Steele, R. (2005) Turning Great Strategy into Great Performance. Harvard Business Review, 83, 65-72.
- Miller, L., Hess, K., & Orthmann, C. (2010). Community Policing: Partnerships for Problem Solving (6th edition.). *Cengage Learning*, 362. ISBN 1435488687.
- Ministry of Education (2002) National Plan of Action on Education for All 2000-2006 Pakistan. Government of Pakistan. Islamabad.
- Montejo, R. (2006). Safety and security concerns: perceptions of preparedness of Safety and security concerns: ..<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org> > ...
- National Association of School Psychologists. (2013, January 9). NASP cautions against increasing armed security to improve school safety (Press Release).
- Nemorin, S. (2017) Post-panoptic pedagogies: the changing nature of school surveillance in the digital age. *Surveillance and Society*, 15 (2). pp. 239-253. ISSN 1477-7487
- Oakes, A. (2009). College campus violence: Origins, impacts, and responses. *Educational Psychology Review*, 7(1), 49 – 62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02214209>
- Pain, R. (2000). Place, social relations and the fear of crime: A review. *Progress in Human Geography*, 24(3), 365–387. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/030913200701540474>
- Saint Paul College (2009). School Safety, Security, and Emergency Preparedness | National School Boards Association". [www.nsba.org](http://www.nsba.org). Retrieved on February 1, 2018.
- School Bus Safety is a Shared Responsibility". National Electrification Administration. Retrieved on February 2, 2018.
- School Safety, Security, and Emergency Preparedness | National School Boards Association". [www.nsba.org](http://www.nsba.org). Retrieved on February 1, 2018.
- White, C.J., & Gina & Coetzee, I.E.M..(2015). Safety and security in schools in KwaZulu-Natal. *Journal of Educational Studies*, Volume 47, Issue 5, 551-564.
- Xaba, M. I. (2014). A holistic approach to safety and security at schools in South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(20), 1580 – 1589.

### C. Unpublished Materials



Carrico, B. A. (2016). "The Effects of Students' Perceptions of Campus Safety and Security on Student Enrollment" Theses, Dissertations and Capstones. Paper 1006.

#### D. Electronic and Online Resources

Academia Stack Exchange (2017). What exactly is "campus security?" Available from:

<https://academia.stackexchange.com/questions/99763/what-exactly-is-campus-security>

Artemier, J. J. (2013). What are college students' perceptions about campus safety? Contemporary Issues in Education Research, 6(3), 325 -332.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.19030/cier.v6i3.7903>

Ash, K. (2010). "Education Week: Student ID Cards Sport New Digital Features". [www.edweek.org](http://www.edweek.org). Retrieved on February 1, 2018

Becker, R. (2013). An Overview of Labeling Theory. Available at: <https://www.thoughtco.com> › ... › Sociology › Key Concepts

Bernburg, N. (2019). Strain Theory: How Social Values Produce Deviance ... Available from: <https://socialsci.libretexts.org> › ... › 7: Deviance, Social Control, and Crime

Branic, N. (2015). Routine Activities Theory – Wiley

Online Library <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com> › doi › pdf › 9781118519639.wbecpx059

Burns, L. (2007). Summary of Social Contract Theory by Hobbes, Locke ... – SSRN <https://www.ssrn.com> › ...

Campus Security - US Department of Education (2014). Available at: <https://www2.ed.gov> › admins › lead › safety › campus

Duplechain, R.; Morris, R. & Winter (2014). "School Violence: Reported School Shootings and Making Schools Safer". *Education*. 135: 145–150 – via EBSCOhost.

EBSCOhost, [search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=22828299&site=ehost-live&scope=site](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=22828299&site=ehost-live&scope=site)





**Eroukhmanoff, C. (2018). Securitization Theory: An Introduction. Available at:<https://www.e-ir.info/2018/01/14/securitisation-theory-an-introduction/>**

Falcon, G. (2006). Causal Theories of Mental Content. (Stanford Encyclopedia of ...Available at: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/content-causal>

Gray, L., & Lewis, L. (May 2015). "Public School Safety and Discipline 2013-14" (PDF).

Infed (2013). Retrieved 16 December 2016 from <http://infed.org/mobi/curriculumtheoryandpractice/>.

Ingram, C. (2017). "School Board Discusses Student ID Cards". High Point Enterprise (NC) – via EBSCOhost.

Kutus, M. (2012). "Stepping Up Security". American School and University. 88: 14–18 – via EBSCOhost.

Levin, J. (2018). "Rational choice theory" Assessed from: <https://web.stanford.edu/~jdlevin/ChoiceTheory>

Lukas, R. (2016). Theoretical Sources for a Theory of Safety and Security Ludek Lukas Department of Security Engineering Tomas Bata University in ZlínZlín, Czech Republic email: [lukas@fai.utb.cz](mailto:lukas@fai.utb.cz)

MacDonald, DK. (2016). Understanding Crisis Theory. Accessed electronically on May 29, 2016 from <http://dustinkmacdonald.com/understanding-crisis-theory>

Minnesota Community and Technical College (2010). Available from:

<https://www.minnstate.edu/board/materials/2010/june16/asa-08-mctc.pdf>

National Disaster Management Authority (2008). [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National\\_Disaster\\_Risk\\_Reduction\\_and\\_Management\\_Council](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Disaster_Risk_Reduction_and_Management_Council)

National School Boards Association (2017). How to Prevent Bullying". StopBullying.gov. Retrieved on February 3, 2018.

[nces.ed.gov](http://nces.ed.gov).

[Newyork.mfa.gov.ph](http://Newyork.mfa.gov.ph).

Safety | Safe Supportive Learning". [safesupportivelearning.ed.gov](http://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov). Retrieved February 4, 2018.

---



School and Campus Security (2012). Retrieved from [http://www.securittymanagement.com/sites/securitymanagement.com/files/casestudy-schoolcampussecurit\\_2012-08](http://www.securittymanagement.com/sites/securitymanagement.com/files/casestudy-schoolcampussecurit_2012-08).

School Fencing | Playground Fencing | CLD Fencing Systems". CLD Fencing. Retrieved On August 21, 2018.

"Student ID cards". [newyork.mfa.gov.pl](http://newyork.mfa.gov.pl). May 17, 2017. Retrieved on February 1, 2018.

**The Advantages of Using CCTV Cameras in Schools – Farsight (2019) from: [www.farsight.co.uk](http://www.farsight.co.uk) › Blog**

The NCES Fast Facts Tool provides quick answers to many education questions (National Center for Education Statistics)". [nces.ed.gov](http://nces.ed.gov). Retrieved February 4, 2018.

Shjarback, J, (2014). Personal and defensible space: The Crime Prevention Website Available from: <https://thecrimepreventionwebsite.com> › personal-and-defensible-space

#### **E. Others**

Campus Security Act (2019). Senate Bill 703. 18<sup>th</sup> Congress Republic of the Philippines.

Gelber, S. (2012). "THE ROLE OF CAMPUS SECURITY IN THE COLLEGE SETTING" U. S. Department of Justice Law Enforcement Assistance Administration National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

Senate Bill 703 (2019). Campus Safety and Security Act -Senate of the Philippines Available at: <https://www.senate.gov.ph> › lis › bill\_res › q=SBN-703

UNESCO and USAID (2005) Donor Support to Education. Lesson learned meeting, Islamabad, Pakistan.

United States Bomb Data Center Explosive Incident Report". ATF.gov. 2016.