



EMPLOYEES' LEVEL OF SATISFACTION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SECURITY AND SAFETY PRACTICES AT 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

Abstract: *Security Management is about protection of a building and other assets of the building. Security management encompasses a field of management related to asset management, physical security and human resource safety functions. It entails the identification of an organization's information assets and the development, documentation and implementation of policies, standards, procedures and guidelines. The study aimed to assess the employees' level of satisfaction on the implementation of the security and safety practices of Cagayan State University-Piat campus. This study utilized the descriptive-quantitative research method to describe the employees' level of satisfaction on the implementation of the security and safety practices of Cagayan State University-Piat campus as assessed by the participants of the study. In light of the findings of the study, it is concluded that the respondents have showed "moderate satisfaction" on the security systems along personnel and document security system which manifest that the implementation of the security measures in the Campus is moderately satisfactory. In the view of the findings of this study, it is recommended that documents pertaining to sensitive issues should be properly kept with utmost confidentiality and future researchers may 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.*

Keywords: *employee, level of satisfaction, security and safety practices, personnel security, documents security, physical security*



INTRODUCTION

Campus Security is traditionally defined as one of the most pervasive problems that a campus or university must address. There is rarely has a campus issue, problem, or challenge that requires the recruitment of everyone in the university to solve. Security is an essential issue for every organization in government, private, commercial or educational institution. Thus, university security personnel such as campus security officers and campus security guard need to have a strong understanding of campus security.

Security Management is about protection of a building and other assets of the building. Security management encompasses a field of management related to asset management, physical security and human resource safety functions. It entails the identification of an organization's information assets and the development, documentation and implementation of policies, standards, procedures and guidelines.

There are many important responsibilities that are being brought out in running a university. One of the most important is proper security management. Campus security is necessary in order to keep employees and their belongings safe.

The Minnesota Community and Technical College (2010) stressed that all students and college community members to be fully aware of the safety issues on and around the campus and to take action to prevent and to report illegal and inappropriate activities. Applying personal awareness and personal security practices is the foundation of a safety community. It further emphasized that the concept of campus security is to ensure the safety and security of faculty, students and its staff and aims to decrease violence on campuses throughout the country. While educational institutions continue to educate the youth and develop their intellect, reality would show that our schools, particularly the colleges and universities experience the same challenges and threats present in a larger society (School and Campus Security, 2012). Casella (2006) mentioned that best practices



for creating a safe and successful schools are attained by an effective comprehensive and collaborative efforts requiring the dedication and commitment of all school staff and relevant community members because school safety and positive school climate are not achieved by singular actions like purchasing a designated program or piece of equipment.

Some effective approaches to prevent violence and promote learning, sufficient time to implement these approaches and ongoing evaluation requires for safe schools which are following a cohesive approach that facilitates multidisciplinary collaboration, learning supports (e.g. behavioral, mental health, and social services), instruction, and school management within a comprehensive are fully integrated (Haynes & Comer, 2006).

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 employees' level of satisfaction on the implementation of the security and safety practices of Cagayan State University-Piat campus. Specifically, it sought to answer the question:



1. What is the level of employees' satisfaction on the implementation of the security and safety practices of Cagayan State University-Piat Campus along:
 - 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 employees' level of satisfaction on the implementation of the security and safety practices of Cagayan State University-Piat campus as assessed by the participants of the study.

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/ personnel | Administrative | 48 | 20.00 |
| Students | | 136 | 56.67 |
| Total | | 240 | 100.00 |

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 level of satisfaction of implementation of the security system. The 4-point Likert scale was used and interpreted as:

3.26–4.00 – Much Satisfied (The implementation of the security measures is very satisfactory)

2.51–3.25 – Moderately Satisfied (The implementation of the security measures is moderately satisfactory)



1.76–2.50 – Fairly Satisfied (The implementation of security measures is fairly satisfactory)

1.00-1.75 –less Satisfied (The implementation of the security systems is unsatisfactory)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 2: Summary Table on The Level of Satisfaction of Respondents on the Implementation of the Security System of CSU Piat Along the Three Areas

| Security Measures | Weighted Mean | Verbal Interpretation |
|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|
| A. Physical Security | 2.27 | Fairly satisfied |
| B. Personnel Security | 2.94 | Moderately satisfied |
| C. Document Security | 2.71 | Moderately satisfied |
| Over-All Mean | 2.58 | Moderately satisfied |

Table 2 presents the level of satisfaction on the implementation of the Security System of the Cagayan State University, Piat Campus. As gleaned from the figure, the respondents are moderately satisfied of the implementation of the security system of the Cagayan State University, Piat Campus as shown in the area mean of 2.58. Therefore, the respondents are moderately satisfied with the security measures of the university campus.

This is in line to the objective of the security aspect of the University to ensuring the safety of her students, faculty, staff, and guests within the catchment area of the University as a way of enhancing their educational experience. CSU's approach to crime prevention and personal safety has often taken the shape of creating awareness among members of her community of a need to take certain precautions. It has, through the many initiatives also emphasized a need to make the individual responsible for their own safety and by extension the safety of others.

Summary on the Level of Satisfaction

Data in Table 2 reflects the summary on the level of satisfaction of respondents on the implementation of the security systems of CSU Piat, Cagayan.



Among the three security measures, respondents are “moderately satisfied” on personnel and document and security system with weighted means of 2.94 and 2.71 respectively. On the other hand, respondents are “fairly satisfied” on the physical system with a weighted mean of 2.27.

Table 3: Level of Satisfaction of Respondents on the Security System in Terms of Physical Security

| | Weighted | Verbal |
|--|----------|----------------------|
| A. PHYSICAL SECURITY | Mean | Interpretation |
| 1. Providing security locks to buildings to control people entering school buildings | 2.56 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 2. Secured school buildings to prevent people in entering school buildings | 2.63 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 3. University boundaries and/or policies are properly defined | 2.64 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 4. Protecting the University boundaries and/or premises | 2.62 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 5. Entry points of the university are secured with padlocks | 2.72 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 6. Monitoring of the exit points of the university by the security guards | 2.44 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 7. Fencing the school grounds/premises | 2.32 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 8. Ensuring the accessibility of the school by the patrolling security guards | 2.48 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 9. Providing a proper perimeter fence for the campus | 2.22 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 10. Installing barbed wires on the perimeter fence | 2.13 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 11. Securing gates with padlocks and/or chains | 2.07 | Fairly Satisfied |



| | | |
|--|-------------|-------------------------|
| when campus is closed | | |
| 12. Providing boundary edges free from trees and/or telephone poles | 2.14 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 13. Eliminating the accessibility of persons to the roofs of house units in the campus | 2.17 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 14. Protecting high risk areas by high security locks and/or alarm systems | 2.04 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 15. Providing lights on entrances and/or possible points of possible intrusion | 2.12 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 16. Lighting properly the hallways during night time | 2.25 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 17. Providing proper lighting on parking spaces in the campus premises | 1.99 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 18. Lighting properly the comfort rooms during night time | 2.02 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 19. Situating the restrooms within the school buildings | 2.05 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 20. Installing CCTV cameras in strategic locations in the campus | 2.07 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 21. Conducting inspections to campus premises for possible entrance of outsiders | 2.03 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 22. Providing visual surveillance among security personnel on parking lots of the campus | 2.28 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 23. Providing grills to protect windows of offices/laboratories and the high risk areas | 2.12 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 24. Restricting visitors in entering classrooms/offices without proper gate passes | 2.31 | Fairly Satisfied |
| Sub-Area Mean | 2.27 | Fairly Satisfied |

Physical Security



Physical security is the aspect of security that refers to the protection of the buildings, assets and all facilities of an institution. Table 3 shows the level of satisfaction of respondents along physical system. As reflected in the table, the highest weighted mean of 2.72 indicates that respondents are “moderately satisfied” in the item that entry points of the university are secured with padlocks followed by the weighted mean of 2.64 where respondents are likewise moderately satisfied that university boundaries and/or policies are properly defined. The same result was found on the items that school buildings are secured to prevent people from entering the school buildings.

Respondents are “fairly satisfied in other items under physical system as contained in Table 3.

This is not in consonance with an online article (June 2006) “Encouraging Healthy Environment,” where it was 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. By implication, the respondents felt insecure and had experienced campus crimes as they stayed in the campus.

Moreover, the defensible space theory suggests that the physical design of a living environment can be used to reduce crime. This likewise is stated in the labeling theory that one of the possible factors why security guards stand up to negative expectations of people they serve is because they are tagged or labeled to be lousy or incompetent.

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
4. Great harm may occur if prevention and intervention strategies are not implemented.

By implication, the respondents felt unsecure and had experienced campus crimes as they stayed in the campus.

Further, the respondents expressed that the security has moved higher and higher for educational establishments as the threat of crime and violence has increased. They also expressed that the university often with limited resources – need cost-effective, reliable and flexible security systems – to help them deliver their duty of care to staff and students.

On the contrary, the respondents are fairly satisfied on the implementation of physical systems of the university, particularly on the following: monitoring of exit points of the university by the security guards, installing barbed wires on the perimeter fencing of the campus, and securing gates with padlocks/chains when the campus is closed.

Along this line, Glariana& Solar (2015) in their research on “Status of School Safety and Security among Elementary Schools,” had found that school facilities can have a profound impact on both teacher and student outcomes. The researchers concluded that without adequate facilities and resources, it is extremely difficult to serve large numbers of children with complex needs. They also stressed that besides general maintenance and construction issues, researchers have found most schools lack 21st century facilities in the form of infrastructure, laboratories, and instructional space. More than half do not have sufficiently flexible instructional space for effective teaching to take place. Thus, facility quality is an



important predictor of teacher retention and student learning. The physical and emotional health of students and teachers depend on the quality of the physical location, which makes establishing safe, healthy buildings essential.

They further stressed that improving the quality of school facilities is an expensive undertaking. However, when the positive impacts of facility improvement on teachers and students are translated into monetary figures, the rewards of such investments far outstrip the cost of the investments.

Anderson (2014) stated that a growing body of research has found that school facilities can have a profound impact on both teacher and student outcomes. With respect to teachers, school facilities affect teacher recruitment, retention, commitment, and effort. With respect to students, school facilities affect health, behavior, engagement, learning, and growth in achievement. Thus, researchers generally conclude that without adequate facilities and resources, it is extremely difficult to serve large numbers of children with complex needs. He further said that besides general maintenance and construction issues, researchers have found most schools lack 21st century facilities in the form of infrastructure, laboratories, and instructional space. More than half do not have sufficiently flexible instructional space for effective teaching to take place. Thus, facility quality is an important predictor of teacher retention and student learning. The physical and emotional health of students and teachers depend on the quality of the physical location, which makes establishing safe, healthy buildings essential.

Clark et.al. (2005) cited that according to "Crime and Fear on Campus," a court ruling in the 1866 case of *People v. Wheaton College*, in which the courts upheld a postsecondary institution's prohibition of student membership in secret societies, resulted in a doctrine called "in loco parentis," literally meaning "in the place of parents." Additionally, he stressed that this doctrine made it possible for universities to self-govern in providing care to students who have been entrusted to them and to provide safety for students in the absence of their parents. This doctrine also placed additional responsibility in the hands of



the college or university and, as a result, made the institution liable for criminal victimizations. In subsequent cases, the courts imposed a duty on colleges and universities in two areas directly related to victimization: (a) a duty to warn students about known risks and (b) a duty to provide students with adequate security protection.

In the comparison of the extent of satisfaction of the Security measures of the campus as perceived by the respondents, the teachers had expressed their fairly satisfied extent of the implementation of the security measures of the university as shown in Table 6.

Table 4: Level of Satisfaction of Respondents on the Security Systems in Terms of Personnel Security

| B.PERSONNEL SECURITY | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------------------|
| B.1. Recruitment | | |
| 1. Advertising job vacancies publicly | 2.53 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 2. Allowing anyone to apply for all job vacancies | 2.73 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 3. Providing potential candidates about the job descriptions and its requirements | 2.65 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 4. Checking completeness of requirements of applicant's for competency based qualification | 3.09 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 5. Evaluating applicants' qualifications against competency-based qualification standards | 3.01 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 6. Examining the reference persons of the applicant's application letter | 2.98 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 7. Verifying the reference persons provided in the applicant's application letter | 2.88 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 8. Assuring that the applicant is clear criminal record | 3.23 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 9. Conducting an inquiry into the character of the prospective employee | 2.81 | Moderately Satisfied |
| Sub-Area Mean | 2.88 | Moderately Satisfied |



B.2. Selection

| | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Providing an objective, process among job applicants | 2.84 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 2. Organizing a selection panel to oversee the appointment process | 2.93 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 3. Administering written examination to the applicants to determine the personal profile vis-à-vis the position profile of job applicants | 2.80 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 4. Administering skills test to assess technical competencies of job applicants | 2.81 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 5. Administering personality test to measure behavioral tendencies in different | 2.92 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 6. Conducting behavioral Event Interview to get behavioral past performance of job applicants | 2.77 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 7. Conducting background investigation to get vital information about the applicant | 2.70 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 8. Providing a standard assessment criteria for all levels of position | 2.98 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 9. Notifying applicants about their assessment results | 2.85 | Moderately Satisfied |
| Sub-Area Mean | 2.84 | Moderately Satisfied |

B.3. Promotion

| | | |
|---|------|----------------------|
| 1. Providing a clear criteria for evaluation as bases for promotion among personnel | 3.18 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 2. Informing candidates the criteria for the procedures on promotion | 2.95 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 3. Providing a clear criteria for evaluation as bases for promotion among personnel | 3.02 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 4. Eliminating discrimination to applicants for | 2.75 | Moderately Satisfied |



promotion

- | | | |
|---|------|----------------------|
| 5. Strict policy on promotion on point system on: | 3.01 | Moderately Satisfied |
| a. Performance evaluation; | | |
| b. Application of the seniority rule; | | |
| c. Trainings attended; and | | |
| d. Qualifications | | |
| 6. Implementing a strict policy that rank and file employees are represented in the promotion board to insure objectivity in the selection of employees for promotion | 3.10 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 7. Implementing a strict policy that the most competent or the best qualified personnel for the position is qualified for promotion | 3.26 | Very Satisfied |

Sub-Area Mean

3.04

Moderately Satisfied

B.4. Separation

- | | | |
|---|------|----------------------|
| 1. Compliance of a written notice of resignation of a personnel should be forwarded to the human resource officer | 3.16 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 2. The effective date of resignation of a personnel should be forwarded to the human resource officer | 2.98 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 3. Habitual absentee among any employee may a cause of separation of an employee | 2.68 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 4. Providing a strict compliance on the causes of the separation of employees | 3.14 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 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 | 2.68 | Moderately Satisfied |



| | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------------------|
| service or dropped from the rolls without prior notice | | |
| 6. Presenting/submitting a certified true copy of the decision rendered where the penalty of dismissal was imposed | 3.16 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 7. Qualifying personnel who had rendered 15 or more years of continuous government service to retire | 3.08 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 8. Explanation on lack of funds is a reason of separating an employee | 2.71 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 9. Explaining the policy that performing below par is one reason of separating employees | 2.91 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 10. Providing a policy that the death of an employee leaves the position vacant | 3.02 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 11. Seeking for transfer should be made through a written request for transfer to the head of the agency | 3.24 | Moderately Satisfied |
| Sub-Area Mean | 2.99 | Moderately Satisfied |
| Area Mean | 2.94 | Moderately Satisfied |

Personnel Security

As shown in Table 4, respondents expressed that they are very satisfied with the implementation of a strict policy that the most competent or the best qualified personnel for positions of university faculty and staff is qualified for promotion. This implies that the policy of transparency on promotion is very much satisfying in their security of tenure in the university. They further mentioned that the university is transparent with their employees and that they tend to be more successful. This means that this type of environment leaves employees feeling valued. They are encouraged to be creative and share their input.



Transparency fosters a type of comfort that allows employees to communicate effectively and thus progress.

The non-teaching staff and the students, however, are moderately satisfied with the security measures of the university. Evidently, the non-teaching staffs are very satisfied in the promotion security measures of the university. They expressed that the university is transparent in their promotions.

It is at this content that Johnson (2017) stressed that promoting transparency and collaboration takes a lot of effort and will. It may take some work to encourage people to buy into such a mindset. Miscommunication and siloes can be avoided if everyone knows how everyone else is contributing and that everyone else is looking at and acting on the same quality information.

It is along this line that Berggren and Bernshteyn (2007) said that transparency refers to aspects such as how feedback is communicated, as well as how well structure, strategy and goals are communicated to employees. They further claim that transparency of goals makes it easier for employees to understand what kind of contributions that are desired by the company, and it also makes it possible to track the impact that individual contributions have in the organization. It can also help managers, as communication of strategy and goals enables performance to be tracked easier. It can also help managers, as communication of strategy and goals enables performance to be tracked easier. The bottlenecks are thus possible to be identified to a greater extent. Moreover, (Mankins & Steele, 2005) stressed that a clear understanding and alignment of individual goals are of great importance to execute the strategy.

Table 5. Level of Satisfaction of Respondents on the Security Systems in Terms of Document Security

| C. DOCUMENT SECURITY | Mean | Verbal |
|----------------------|------|--------|
|----------------------|------|--------|



| | | | Interpretation |
|----|---|------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Instilling awareness among employees of the existence of sensitive issues/data in the company and how to protect them in the right procedures | 2.67 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 2. | Storing sensitive documents separately in containers for which special security precautions are taken authorized representative | 2.44 | Fairly Satisfied |
| 3. | Imposing area controls within a facility among different classes of employee with respect to certain information or operations | 2.63 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 4. | Maintaining a registry of classified matter showing all classified matter received and to whom transmitted | 2.51 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 5. | Specifying the dissemination of classified matter shall be restricted to properly cleared persons whose official duties required knowledge or possession thereof | 2.63 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 6. | Providing procedures on pre-employment screening techniques | 2.96 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 7. | Maintaining that classified matter originating from another department shall not be disseminated to other departments without the consent of the originating department | 2.78 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 8. | Stipulating that all information should be released through the Public Information Officer | 2.85 | Moderately Satisfied |
| 9. | Stipulating that classified matter shall be released for public consumption upon the consent of the department head or authorized representative | 2.85 | Moderately Satisfied |



| | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------------------|
| 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 | 2.78 | Moderately Satisfied |
| Sub-Area Mean | 2.71 | Moderately Satisfied |
| OVER-ALL MEAN | 2.58 | Moderately Satisfied |

Document Security

Table 5 shows the level of satisfaction of respondents in the implementation of the security system along document security.

Respondents are moderately satisfied in the area of document security measures with an area mean of 2.71. However, the respondents are fairly satisfied with the indicator of storing sensitive documents separately in containers for which special security precautions are taken care of by authorized representative. The respondents expressed that these sensitive documents should be placed on steel cabinets whose key is placed at the University Administration's officer for a safer place, that whatever happens, it is evidently clear who will take responsible of the incident.

Donnellon (2018) stressed that academic institutions of all kinds have unique challenges to overcome when it comes to managing document security. Managed document services are hugely important for ensuring the security and continued reliability of school systems. Not only does your institution need to invest in a dependable document security solution for meeting today's threats, but the solution has to work effectively for years to come, depending on your budgeting framework. Managed information technology services provide the best way to ensure that your cyber security solution remains effective well because the



service provider has incentives to continually update its services to meet new demands. This gives your institution the dynamic defense it needs to assure continual security.

Table 6. Level of Satisfaction of the Implementation of Security Measures According to Group

| | A | B | C |
|---|------|------|-------|
| A. PHYSICAL SECURITY | (56) | (48) | (136) |
| 1. Controlling people entering school buildings | 2.07 | 2.69 | 2.72 |
| 2. Supervising people entering school buildings | 2.09 | 2.56 | 2.87 |
| 3. Defining the University boundaries and/or policies | 2.14 | 2.69 | 2.83 |
| 4. Protecting the University boundaries and/or premises | 2.13 | 2.79 | 2.77 |
| 5. Monitoring of the entry points of the university by the security guards | 2.09 | 2.60 | 3.03 |
| 6. Monitoring of the exit points of the university by the security guards | 1.73 | 2.54 | 2.69 |
| 7. Fencing the school grounds/premises | 1.71 | 2.69 | 2.44 |
| 8. Ensuring the accessibility of the school by the patrolling security guards | 2.14 | 2.27 | 2.69 |
| 9. Providing a proper perimeter fence for the campus | 1.75 | 2.13 | 2.45 |
| 10. Installing barbed wires on the perimeter fence | 1.71 | 2.35 | 2.22 |
| 11. Securing gates with padlocks and/or | 1.68 | 2.19 | 2.18 |



| | | | |
|--|------|------|------|
| chains when campus is closed | | | |
| 12. Providing boundary edges free from trees and/or telephone poles | 1.86 | 2.35 | 2.18 |
| 13. Eliminating the accessibility of persons to the roofs of house units in the campus | 1.71 | 2.19 | 2.35 |
| 14. Protecting high risk areas by high security locks and/or alarm systems | 1.52 | 2.17 | 2.21 |
| 15. Providing lights on entrances and/or possible points of possible intrusion | 1.84 | 1.98 | 2.29 |
| 16. Lighting properly the hallways during night time | 1.88 | 2.46 | 2.33 |
| 17. Providing proper lighting on parking spaces in the campus premises | 1.73 | 2.50 | 1.92 |
| 18. Lighting properly the comfort rooms during night time | 1.59 | 2.46 | 2.05 |
| 19. Situating the restrooms within the school buildings | 1.71 | 2.44 | 2.05 |
| 20. Installing CCTV cameras in strategic locations in the campus | 1.46 | 2.56 | 2.15 |
| 21. Conducting inspections to campus premises for possible entrance of outsiders | 1.86 | 1.92 | 2.14 |
| 22. Providing visual surveillance among security personnel on parking lots of the campus | 1.77 | 2.23 | 2.50 |
| 23. Providing grills to protect windows of offices/laboratories and the high risk areas | 1.84 | 2.40 | 2.14 |



| | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 24. Restricting visitors in entering classrooms/offices without proper gate passes | 1.77 | 2.69 | 2.40 |
| Sub-Area Mean | 1.82 | 2.41 | 2.40 |
| | Fairly Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied |

| | | | |
|--|------|------|------|
| B. PERSONNEL SECURITY | | | |
| b.1. Recruitment | | | |
| 1. Advertising job vacancies publicly | 2.38 | 2.94 | 2.45 |
| 2. Allowing anyone to apply for all job vacancies | 2.23 | 3.21 | 2.77 |
| 3. Providing potential candidates about the job descriptions and its requirements | 2.55 | 2.90 | 2.60 |
| 4. Checking completeness of requirements of applicant's for competency based qualification | 2.86 | 3.04 | 3.21 |
| 5. Evaluating applicants' qualifications against competency-based qualification standards | 2.96 | 3.19 | 2.96 |
| 6. Examining the reference persons of the applicant's application letter | 2.79 | 3.19 | 2.99 |
| 7. Verifying the reference persons provided in the applicant's application letter | 2.23 | 3.06 | 3.08 |
| 8. Assuring that the applicant is clear from any criminal record | 2.52 | 3.42 | 3.45 |



| | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 9. Conducting an inquiry into the character of the prospective employee | 2.29 | 2.92 | 2.99 |
| Sub-Area Mean | 2.53 | 3.10 | 2.94 |
| | Moderately Satisfied | Moderately Satisfied | Moderately Satisfied |

| | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| B.2 Selection | | | |
| 1. Providing an objective, process among job applicants | 2.75 | 3.21 | 2.74 |
| 2. Organizing a selection panel to oversee the appointment process | 3.02 | 3.33 | 2.76 |
| 3. Administering written examination to the applicants to determine the personal profile vis-à-vis the position profile of job applicants | 2.77 | 2.75 | 2.83 |
| 4. Administering skills test to assess technical competencies of job applicants | 2.46 | 2.94 | 2.91 |
| 5. Administering personality test to measure behavioral tendencies in different | 2.73 | 3.42 | 2.82 |
| 6. Conducting behavioral Event Interview to get behavioral past performance of job applicants | 2.43 | 3.13 | 2.79 |
| 7. Conducting background investigation to get vital information about the applicant | 2.36 | 2.60 | 2.88 |
| 8. Providing a standard assessment | 2.61 | 3.19 | 3.05 |



| | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| criteria for all levels of position | | | |
| 9. Notifying applicants about their assessment results | 2.66 | 3.00 | 2.87 |
| Sub-Area Mean | 2.64 | 3.06 | 2.85 |
| | Moderately Satisfied | Moderately Satisfied | Moderately Satisfied |
| B.3. Promotion | | | |
| 1. Providing a clear criteria for evaluation as bases for promotion among personnel | 3.23 | 3.52 | 3.04 |
| 2. Informing candidates the criteria for the procedures on promotion | 2.86 | 3.08 | 2.94 |
| 3. Providing a clear criteria for evaluation as bases for promotion among personnel | 2.88 | 3.10 | 3.05 |
| 4. Eliminating discrimination to applicants for promotion | 2.50 | 3.25 | 2.67 |
| 5. Strict policy on promotion on point system on: | 2.6 | 3.19 | 3.09 |
| a. Performance evaluation; | 7 | | |
| b. Application of the seniority rule; | | | |
| c. Trainings attended; and | | | |
| d. Qualifications | | | |
| 6. Implementing a strict policy that rank and file employees are represented in the promotion board to insure objectivity in the selection of employees for | 2.8 | 3.27 | 3.14 |
| | 4 | | |



| | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| promotion | | | |
| 7. Implementing a strict policy that the most competent or the best qualified personnel for the position is qualified for promotion | 3.00 | 3.38 | 3.32 |
| Sub-Area Mean | 2.85 | 3.26 | 3.04 |
| | Moderately Satisfied | Very Satisfied | Moderately Satisfied |
| B.4. Separation | | | |
| 1. Compliance of a written notice of resignation of a personnel should be forwarded to the human resource officer | 3.04 | 3.52 | 3.08 |
| 2. The effective date of resignation of a personnel should be forwarded to the human resource officer | 2.70 | 3.31 | 2.97 |
| 3. Habitual absentee among any employee may a cause of separation of an employee | 2.34 | 3.10 | 2.87 |
| 4. Providing a strict compliance on the causes of the separation of employees | 3.02 | 3.29 | 3.13 |
| 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 | 2.36 | 2.63 | 2.83 |



dropped from the rolls without
prior notice

| | | | |
|--|------|------|------|
| 6. Presenting/submitting a certified true copy of the decision rendered where the penalty of dismissal was imposed | 2.82 | 3.15 | 3.31 |
| 7. Qualifying personnel who had rendered 15 or more years of continuous government service to retire | 2.93 | 3.00 | 3.17 |
| 8. Explanation on lack of funds is a reason of separating an employee | 2.48 | 2.56 | 2.85 |
| 9. Explaining the policy that performing below par is one reason of separating employees | 2.22 | 3.13 | 3.12 |
| 10. Providing a policy that the death of an employee leaves the position vacant | 2.98 | 3.19 | 2.97 |
| 11. Seeking for transfer should be made through a written request for transfer to the head of the agency | 3.07 | 3.46 | 3.24 |

| | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Sub-Area Mean | 2.72 | 3.12 | 3.05 |
| Area Mean | 2.69 | 3.13 | 2.97 |
| | Moderately Satisfied | Moderately Satisfied | Moderately Satisfied |

C. DOCUMENT SECURITY

| | | | |
|---|------|------|------|
| 1. Instilling awareness among employees of the existence of | 2.00 | 2.63 | 2.96 |
|---|------|------|------|



| | | | |
|--|------|------|------|
| sensitive issues/data in the company and how to protect them in the right procedures | | | |
| 2. Storing sensitive documents separately in containers for which special security precautions are taken authorized representative | 1.66 | 2.23 | 2.83 |
| 3. Imposing area controls within a facility among different classes of employee with respect to certain information or operations | 2.04 | 2.56 | 2.90 |
| 4. Maintaining a registry of classified matter showing all classified matter received and to whom transmitted | 1.80 | 2.56 | 2.79 |
| 5. Specifying the dissemination of classified matter shall be restricted to properly cleared persons whose official duties required knowledge or possession thereof | 2.04 | 2.42 | 2.95 |
| 6. Providing procedures on pre-employment screening techniques | 2.75 | 3.00 | 3.03 |
| 7. Maintaining that classified matter originating from another department shall not be disseminated to other departments without the consent of the originating department | 2.34 | 2.46 | 3.08 |



| | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 8. Stipulating that all information should be released through the Public Information Officer | 2.54 | 2.96 | 2.94 |
| 9. Stipulating that classified matter shall be released for public consumption upon the consent of the department head or authorized representative | 2.50 | 2.77 | 3.03 |
| 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. | 2.39 | 2.65 | 2.99 |
| Sub-Area Mean | 2.21 | 2.62 | 2.95 |
| | Fairly Satisfied | Moderately Satisfied | Moderately Satisfied |
| OVER-ALL MEAN | 2.24 | 2.72 | 2.77 |
| | Fairly Satisfied | Moderately Satisfied | Moderately Satisfied |

According to Group

Table 6 presents the comparison of the extent of satisfaction of the respondents on the implementation of the security measures of the campus according to group.

In the comparison of the extent of satisfaction of the Security measures of the campus as perceived by the respondents, the teachers had expressed their fairly satisfied extent of the implementation of the security measures of the university as shown in Table 12.



The non-teaching staff and the students, however, are moderately satisfied with the security measures of the university. Evidently, the non-teaching staffs are very satisfied in the promotion security measures of the University. They expressed that the university is transparent in their promotions.

It is at this content that Johnson (2017) stressed that promoting transparency and collaboration takes a lot of effort and will. It may take some work to encourage people to buy into such a mindset. Miscommunication and siloes can be avoided if everyone knows how everyone else is contributing and that everyone else is looking at and acting on the same quality information.

It is along this line that Berggren & Bernshteyn (2007) said that transparency refers to aspects such as how feedback is communicated, as well as how well structure, strategy and goals are communicated to employees. They further claim that transparency of goals makes it easier for employees to understand what kind of contributions that are desired by the company, and it also makes it possible to track the impact that individual contributions have in the organization. It can also help managers, as communication of strategy and goals enables performance to be tracked easier. It can also help managers, as communication of strategy and goals enables performance to be tracked easier. The bottlenecks are thus possible to be identified to a greater extent. Moreover, (Mankins & Steele, 2005) stressed that a clear understanding and alignment of individual goals are of great importance to execute the strategy.

Moreover, in the Analysis of Variance as seen in table 7, the computed F-ratio of 1.7992 is less than the tabled F-ratio of 5.14, thus, the null hypothesis. Therefore, the extent of satisfaction of the implementation of the security measures does not vary considering the group of the respondents.



A comprehensive school safety management approach had not been fully adopted by schools in the studied sample.

While involvement in safety practices was evident, many actions appeared to be carried out without full consideration of the wider promotion of school safety. It is thus stressed that training and awareness activities are important for education professionals in order to build and promote safety culture and to facilitate the introduction of a comprehensive school safety approach in the day-to-day management of schools

Table 7. Summary Table for the ANOVA on the Level of Satisfaction 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 | 0.5177 | | 2 | 0.2589 | |
| Within | 0.8633 | | 6 | 0.1439 | 1.7992 |
| F.05 = 5.14 | | Decision: Reject Ho | | | |

ANOVA Table on the Level of Satisfaction

Table 7 shows the analysis on the difference in the level of satisfaction of respondents according to group. The F-ratio of 1.7992 indicates that there exists significant difference in the level of satisfaction of the three groups of respondents considering that the f-ratio is lower than the f-value at .05 which is 5.14. Thus, the hypothesis which states “There is no significant difference in the level of satisfaction of the three groups of respondents” is rejected. This implies that the respondents differ significantly in their level of satisfaction.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

As to the satisfaction of the respondents on the security system of CSU Piat Campus, it was found out that among the three security measures, respondents are “moderately satisfied” on personnel and document and security system with weighted means of 2.94 and 2.71



respectively. On the other hand, respondents are “fairly satisfied” on the physical system with a weighted mean of 2.27.

CONCLUSIONS

In light of the findings of the study, it is concluded that the respondents have showed “moderate satisfaction” on the security systems along personnel and document security system which manifest that the implementation of the security measures in the Campus is moderately satisfactory.

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. The 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., & Wroblewski 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 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. 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. 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>
- Artmier, 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. 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
- 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>
› Choice Theory

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

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

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

nces.ed.gov.

Newyork.mfa.gov.ph.

Safety | Safe Supportive Learning". safesupportivelearning.ed.gov. Retrieved February 4,
2018.

School and Campus Security (2012). Retrieved from
http://www.securittymanagement.com/sites/securitymanagement.com/files/casestudy-schoolcampussecurity_2012-08.

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

"Student ID cards". 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 › Blog

The NCES Fast Facts Tool provides quick answers to many education questions (National
Center for Education Statistics)". 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. 18th 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.