



AN ASSESSMENT OF THE SAFETY AND SECURITY MEASURES OF METRO DUMAGUETE COLLEGE CAMPUS 1 AND CAMPUS 2: BASIS FOR POLICY ENHANCEMENT

Dr. Eva C. Melon, Dr. Cristina P. Calisang, Margielen P. Alcoreza, LPT, MBA, Renze O. Largrada, MAEd, Jerry A. Pariscal, LPT, Dr. Annabelle T. Catarata, PhD CJ, Dr. Gepil Mae Bacud-Mariño, PhD CJ, Charmis G. Tubil, MSCJ

*Metro Dumaguete College, Dumaguete City
Negros Oriental, 6200, Philippines*

ABSTRACT

This study assesses the extent of implementation, effectiveness, and challenges of current safety and security measures at Metro Dumaguete College Campuses 1 and 2. Specifically, it examines the areas of emergency preparedness and response, access control and physical security, incident response and reporting systems, surveillance and monitoring, and health and sanitation protocols, as well as the perceptions of key stakeholders and the existing gaps in safety practices. The study employs a descriptive-correlational research design involving administrators, faculty members, and students, as respondents. Data were collected through a structured survey questionnaire and analyzed using weighted mean, Pearson's r , and p -value to determine the relationship between implementation and effectiveness, and between stakeholder perceptions and existing challenges. Findings reveal that the implementation and effectiveness of safety and security measures are both rated high to very high, particularly in access control, surveillance, and health protocols. Significant positive relationships are found between the extent of implementation and effectiveness across all safety domains ($p < 0.001$). However, no significant relationship is observed between stakeholders' perceptions of adequacy and the challenges identified in policy enforcement, infrastructure, and community preparedness. Overall, the results highlight that while Metro Dumaguete College maintains strong safety systems, there remains a need for continued improvement in policy consistency, infrastructure upgrading, and stakeholder engagement in preparedness activities.

Keywords: *safety and security measures, policy enhancement, emergency preparedness, incident response*

INTRODUCTION

Around the world, schools and universities have increasingly recognized that safety and security are foundational for learning, wellbeing, and institutional reputation. Recent research indicates that many higher education campuses are still vulnerable to physical and environmental safety risks, crime, and inadequate emergency response systems. For example, in South China, a study of 196 university students found that perceptions of safety were strongly influenced by environmental cues poor lighting, lack of natural surveillance, and unsafe walkways correlated with lower feelings of safety (Huang et al., 2022). Another global concern is cyber-physical security; institutions integrating “smart campus” features have been found to have network vulnerabilities if safety protocols and infrastructure lag behind (Yuhong et al., 2023). These findings highlight that safety is multi-dimensional and that both physical and system infrastructures must be considered.

Similar issues are emerging in educational institutions in the Philippines, where safety policies and security measures are often patchy or reactive rather than proactive. A study conducted in Nueva Ecija examined the safety and security measures implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic, focusing on facilities, equipment, and personnel welfare. The findings suggested that while universities had protocols in place, these often lacked consistency (Mina et al., 2021). Likewise, a more recent descriptive study in higher education institutions assessed the current status of campus security in terms of physical facilities, personnel, and document safety. Results showed that while basic practices existed, areas such as emergency preparedness and information security required stronger reinforcement (Aydinan, 2023). These studies suggest that while awareness of security needs is growing, implementation still varies among institutions in the Philippines.

Despite these insights, several gaps remain. First, many studies focus on what security measures exist (e.g., gates, guards, equipment) rather than how effective they are from the perspective of students, staff, and stakeholders. Second, few studies compare safety and security practices across multiple campuses of the same college, which may differ in terms of layouts, resources, or vulnerabilities. Third, there is limited examination of how policies are enforced, how frequently they are reviewed, and how well institutional leadership supports security personnel and practices over time. Moreover, although environmental design and safety perceptions have been studied globally (Huang et al., 2022), little work has been done in Dumaguete or similar mid-sized schools to see how local geography, campus layout, and community conditions influence safety. These gaps limit the ability of policy makers to make improvements.

Because of these gaps, it was essential to conduct a study at Metro Dumaguete College Campuses 1 and 2 to assess the current safety and security measures and

identify where policies could be enhanced. Understanding both the existence and effectiveness of measures including physical, personnel, environmental, emergency preparedness, and information security provides actionable data for decision makers. This study also contributes to Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education) by helping ensure that learning environments are safe and inclusive, and to SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities) by promoting safe, accessible infrastructure. Ultimately, this assessment serves as a basis for strengthening policies that protect students, staff, and the institution, making Metro Dumaguete College a safer place for everyone.

Research Questions

This study aimed to assess the existing safety and security measures in Metro Dumaguete College (MDC) Campus 1 and Campus 2, with the end goal of proposing policy enhancements.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent are the current safety and security measures being implemented at Metro Dumaguete College Campus 1 and Campus 2 In terms of:
 - 1.1 Emergency Preparedness and Response System;
 - 1.2 Access Control and Physical Security; and
 - 1.3 Surveillance and Incident Monitoring?
2. To what extent are these measures effective in addressing the following areas:
 - 2.1 Emergency preparedness (e.g., fire, earthquake, medical emergencies);
 - 2.2 Access control and perimeter security;
 - 2.3 Incident response and reporting systems;
 - 2.4 Surveillance and monitoring (e.g., CCTV, security personnel); and
 - 2.5 Health and sanitation protocols (especially post-pandemic)?
3. To what extent do stakeholders perceive the adequacy and proper implementation of the existing safety and security measures at Metro Dumaguete College (MDC)?
4. What is the extent of the challenges and gaps that exist in the current safety and security protocols at Campus 1 and Campus 2 in terms of:
 - 4.1 Policy implementation and enforcement;
 - 4.2 Infrastructure and resources limitations; and
 - 4.3 MDC community awareness and preparedness?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of implementation of safety and security measures and their extent of effectiveness in the following areas:
 - 5.1 Emergency Preparedness and Response System;
 - 5.2 Access Control and Physical Security;
 - 5.3 Surveillance and Incident Monitoring; and
 - 5.4 Health and Sanitation Protocols?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the perceptions of key stakeholders (administrators, faculty, and students) regarding the adequacy and implementation of current safety and security measures and the extent of challenges and gaps they encountered?

METHODOLOGY

Research design. The study employed a descriptive research design. This approach was appropriate since it aimed to assess and describe the existing safety and security measures of Metro Dumaguete College Campus 1 and Campus 2. The design allowed the researchers to gather factual information, analyze the data, and identify areas that needed improvement, which served as the basis for policy enhancement.

Research respondents. The respondents of the study were individuals who had been part of Metro Dumaguete College (MDC) for at least one year, since this period was considered enough for them to become familiar with the institution's safety and security practices. A total of 264 respondents took part in the study, including administrators, faculty, staff, and selected students from different programs.

Purposive sampling was used to choose participants who could best provide meaningful insights and relevant experiences regarding the safety and security measures in both Campus 1 and Campus 2. This ensured that the data gathered came from respondents who had direct experience with the institution's policies, facilities, and daily practices.

Administrators were included because they were responsible for making decisions and overseeing institutional policies, including those on campus safety. Faculty members were considered important respondents, as they spent significant time on campus and were responsible for guiding and protecting students during academic activities. Non-teaching staff were also included since they were directly involved in the daily operations of the college and had a role in implementing and observing security procedures. Finally, selected students from various programs were chosen because they were the primary stakeholders of the institution and were directly affected by how effective the safety and security measures were.

RESULTS

Table 1.1 shows that the respondents agree to a high extent (composite mean = 4.04) that Metro Dumaguete College implements effective emergency preparedness and response measures. All indicators obtained high ratings, with the highest mean (4.17) for prompt emergency alerts and the lowest (3.96) for visible evacuation routes. This indicates that the college maintains strong safety protocols and awareness among stakeholders across both campuses.

Table 1.1
Extent of the Current Safety and Security Measures being implemented at Metro Dumaguete College Campus 1 and Campus 2 in terms of Emergency Preparedness and Response System

Statements	\bar{Wx}	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
1. I can easily find posted emergency evacuation routes around my campus.	3.96	Agree	High
2. I have participated in emergency drills (e.g., fire, earthquake, lockdown) conducted by the school.	4.05	Agree	High
3. I know where to find first aid kits and emergency supplies on campus.	3.97	Agree	High
4. I believe the administrator, staff, and faculty are trained to respond to emergencies effectively.	4.06	Agree	High
5. I am aware that an emergency response team exists and operates in our campus.	4.05	Agree	High
6. I feel confident that I will be alerted promptly through alarms or messages in case of an emergency in the campus	4.17	Agree	High
Composite	4.04	Agree	High

Legend: Scale	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
4.21 – 5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
3.41 – 4.20	Agree	High
2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Agree	Moderate
1.81 – 2.60	Disagree	Low
1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

Table 1.2 reveals that respondents strongly agree to a very high extent (composite mean = 4.31) that Metro Dumaguete College effectively implements access control and physical security measures. All indicators rated very high, with the highest mean (4.41) for the presence of security personnel at entry and exit points. This indicates that the college maintains strict security protocols to ensure campus safety and prevent unauthorized access

Table 1.3 shows that respondents strongly agree to a very high extent (composite mean = 4.22) that Metro Dumaguete College has an effective surveillance and incident monitoring system. The high ratings indicate proactive monitoring, proper incident documentation, and a strong sense of safety on campus.

Table 1.2
Extent of the Current Safety and Security Measures being implemented at Metro Dumaguete College Campus 1 and Campus 2 in terms of Access Control and Physical Security

Statements	\bar{w}_x	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
1. I see security personnel stationed at the entry and exit points of the campus.	4.41	Strongly Agree	Very High
2. I am always required to show valid ID (or log in if necessary) when entering the campus.	4.39	Strongly Agree	Very High
3. I am always asked to wear or present my ID while inside the campus.	4.37	Strongly Agree	Very High
4. I have seen security personnel routinely inspecting classrooms and school facilities.	4.21	Strongly Agree	Very High
5. I feel that the campus gates and fences are effective in preventing unauthorized access.	4.23	Strongly Agree	Very High
6. I have noticed that doors and buildings are securely locked during off-hours.	4.23	Strongly Agree	Very High
Composite	4.31	Strongly Agree	Very High

Legend: Scale	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
4.21 – 5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
3.41 – 4.20	Agree	High
2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Agree	Moderate
1.81 – 2.60	Disagree	Low
1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

Table 1.3
Extent of the Current Safety and Security Measures being implemented at Metro Dumaguete College Campus 1 and Campus 2 in terms of Surveillance and Incident Monitoring

Statements	\bar{w}_x	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
1. I have noticed surveillance cameras installed in key areas around the campus.	4.20	Agree	High

2.	I believe security and TMG staff are actively monitoring the CCTV footage.	4.19	Agree	High
3.	I know how to report suspicious behavior or security incidents on campus.	4.18	Agree	High
4.	I have observed that security issues are dealt with promptly and appropriately.	4.17	Agree	High
5.	I feel safer knowing that there is a working surveillance system on campus.	4.36	Strongly Agree	Very High
6.	I believe the school maintains logs and records of incidents for future reference.	4.25	Strongly Agree	Very High
Composite		4.22	Strongly Agree	Very High

Legend: Scale	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
4.21 – 5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
3.41 – 4.20	Agree	High
2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Agree	Moderate
1.81 – 2.60	Disagree	Low
1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

Table 2.1 indicates that respondents agree to a high extent (composite mean = 4.10) that the college’s emergency preparedness measures are effective. The high ratings imply that students and staff are well-informed about emergency plans, drills, exits, and safety equipment, reflecting a well-organized and responsive preparedness system.

Table 2.2 shows that respondents strongly agree to a very high extent (composite mean = 4.29) that the college’s access control and perimeter security measures are effective. The consistently high ratings highlight strict ID enforcement, active security presence, and controlled entry points, demonstrating that the institution maintains a secure and well-regulated campus environment.

Table 2.3 indicates that respondents agree to a high extent (composite mean = 4.16) that the college’s incident response and reporting systems are effective. The findings signify that reporting channels are clear, responses are prompt, and confidentiality is maintained, fostering a culture of safety, accountability, and trust within the campus community.

Table 2.1
Extent of these Measures Effective in Addressing the Emergency Preparedness (e.g., fire, earthquake, medical emergencies)

Statements	$\bar{w}\bar{x}$	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
1. I clearly understand the emergency plans posted in my classroom, office, or hallway, and I feel confident they provide clear and useful steps to follow during emergencies.	4.19	Agree	High
2. The emergency drills I've joined (e.g., fire, earthquake) were realistic and well-organized, helping me feel more prepared to respond in actual emergency situations.	4.16	Agree	High
3. I know where to find emergency kits or first aid supplies on campus, and I believe they are fully stocked, regularly checked, and accessible in case of an emergency.	4.03	Agree	High
4. I have received basic training or orientation that clearly taught me how to respond during emergencies like fires, earthquakes, or medical situations.	4.06	Agree	High
5. I can easily locate emergency exits around the campus, and they are clearly marked, unobstructed, and easy to access at all times.	4.08	Agree	High
Composite	4.10	Agree	High

Legend: Scale	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
4.21 – 5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
3.41 – 4.20	Agree	High
2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Agree	Moderate
1.81 – 2.60	Disagree	Low
1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

Table 2.2
Extent of these Measures Effective in Addressing the Access Control and Perimeter Security

Statements	$\bar{w}\bar{x}$	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
1. I consistently see security guards stationed at the campus entry and exit points, and they are diligent in checking IDs to ensure that only authorized individuals are allowed access. <i>(This visible presence of security personnel gives me a sense of assurance that the school prioritizes our safety).</i>	4.32	Strongly Agree	Very High

2.	I have observed that all visitors are required to log in or register their details before being allowed to enter the school premises. <i>(This controlled access process helps prevent unauthorized entry and keeps track of everyone on campus).</i>	4.29	Strongly Agree	Very High
3.	I believe the school's perimeter fences and entrance gates are well-designed and effective in limiting unauthorized access, thereby contributing significantly to campus security. <i>(Their strategic placement gives a clear message that the campus is a protected environment).</i>	4.25	Strongly Agree	Very High
4.	I am required to wear or present my school ID at all times while on campus, and I've observed that this policy is strictly enforced. <i>(This consistent enforcement strengthens identity verification and access control).</i>	4.33	Strongly Agree	Very High
5.	I have noticed that restricted or sensitive areas, such as computer laboratories, faculty rooms, and administrative offices, are always either securely locked or closely monitored. <i>(This ensures that only authorized personnel can access these areas).</i>	4.24	Strongly Agree	Very High
Composite		4.29	Strongly Agree	Very High

Legend: Scale	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
4.21 – 5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
3.41 – 4.20	Agree	High
2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Agree	Moderate
1.81 – 2.60	Disagree	Low
1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

Table 2.3
Extent of these Measures Effective in Addressing the Incident Response and Reporting Systems

Statements	\bar{w}_x	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
1. I know exactly where to go and who to approach when reporting emergencies, safety concerns, or cases of harassment on campus. <i>(Clear reporting channels make me feel that my concerns will be taken seriously).</i>	4.21	Strongly Agree	Very High

2.	I have a clear understanding of the step-by-step process involved in reporting any type of incident at school. <i>(This gives me the confidence to act responsibly should the need arise).</i>	4.13	Agree	High
3.	In my experience, school personnel respond promptly and appropriately when incidents are reported. <i>(Their swift actions show a genuine commitment to student and faculty safety and well-being).</i>	4.17	Agree	High
4.	I feel confident that any report I submit will be handled with confidentiality, sensitivity, and respect for those involved. <i>(This encourages a culture of openness and accountability).</i>	4.17	Agree	High
5.	I have either witnessed or personally experienced appropriate follow-up and resolution after an incident has been reported. <i>(This gives me assurance that the system is not only reactive but also proactive).</i>	4.13	Agree	High
Composite		4.16	Agree	High

Legend: Scale	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
4.21 – 5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
3.41 – 4.20	Agree	High
2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Agree	Moderate
1.81 – 2.60	Disagree	Low
1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

Table 2.4 shows that respondents strongly agree to a very high extent (composite mean = 4.25) that the college’s surveillance and monitoring measures are effective. The results indicate that CCTV systems and security patrols are well-maintained, actively monitored, and strategically placed, enhancing safety and deterrence while supporting prompt and informed responses to campus incidents

Table 2.4
Extent of these Measures Effective in Addressing the Surveillance and Monitoring (e.g., CCTV, security personnel)

Statements	$\bar{w}\bar{x}$	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
1. I have seen CCTV cameras installed in important locations across the campus, and I believe they are strategically positioned to monitor critical areas effectively. <i>(Their visibility serves both as a preventive measure to misconduct and a tool for reviewing incidents).</i>	4.26	Strongly Agree	Very High
2. I often notice security personnel patrolling various parts of the school, which increases my sense of safety and awareness. <i>(Their presence is both reassuring and preventive).</i>	4.21	Strongly Agree	Very High
3. I believe that the school's CCTV system is actively monitored in real-time by trained personnel who know how to respond when issues arise. <i>(This monitoring helps in immediate action and incident prevention).</i>	4.24	Strongly Agree	Very High
4. I feel confident that the surveillance equipment, including cameras and alarms, is functioning properly and is checked for maintenance. <i>(This ensures that the system remains reliable and effective).</i>	4.27	Strongly Agree	Very High
5. I believe the school makes effective use of CCTV recordings for reviewing incidents, addressing complaints, and continuously improving campus security. <i>(This shows that surveillance is part of an active safety strategy of the school's safety).</i>	4.28	Strongly Agree	Very High
Composite	4.25	Strongly Agree	Very High
Legend: Scale	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent	
4.21 – 5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High	
3.41 – 4.20	Agree	High	
2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Agree	Moderate	
1.81 – 2.60	Disagree	Low	
1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree	Very Low	

Table 2.5 indicates that respondents agree to a high extent (composite mean = 4.04) that the college's health and sanitation protocols are effective. The findings reflect consistent cleaning routines, accessible hygiene facilities, and clear health policies,

showing that the institution maintains a clean and health-conscious environment, particularly in the post-pandemic context.

Table 2.5
Extent of these Measures Effective in Addressing the Health and Sanitation Protocols (especially post-pandemic)

Statements	$\bar{w}\bar{x}$	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
1. I can easily access clean and working hand-washing stations or hand sanitizers located in key areas like cafeteria, restrooms, and hallways. <i>(This makes it easy to maintain proper hygiene throughout the day).</i>	4.08	Agree	High
2. I regularly see that classrooms, restrooms, and common spaces are thoroughly cleaned and disinfected daily. <i>(This consistent sanitation routine helps reduce health risks on campus).</i>	3.97	Agree	High
3. I have personally experienced or observed health screening protocols, such as temperature checks or health declarations, especially during high-risk periods (epidemic). <i>(These measures make me feel that the school takes public health seriously).</i>	3.93	Agree	High
4. I clearly understand the school's health policy, which includes staying home or notifying school authorities when I feel unwell. <i>(Knowing this policy helps me act responsibly for my own health and the safety of others).</i>	4.14	Agree	High
5. I regularly receive updates, announcements, or reminders about hygiene practices, health safety, and illness prevention in our school. <i>(This keeps health awareness top of mind and shared responsibility).</i>	4.06	Agree	High
Composite	4.04	Agree	High

Legend: Scale	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
4.21 – 5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
3.41 – 4.20	Agree	High
2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Agree	Moderate
1.81 – 2.60	Disagree	Low
1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

Table 3 reveals that respondents agree to a high extent (composite mean = 4.14) that the current safety and security measures at Metro Dumaguete College are adequate and properly implemented. The consistently high ratings indicate that stakeholders perceive the campus as safe, with effective policies, trained personnel, and well-maintained facilities contributing to a secure learning environment

Table 3
The extent to which stakeholders perceive the adequacy and proper implementation of the existing safety and security measures at Metro Dumaguete College (MDC)

Statements	\bar{w}_x	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
1. I believe the current safety and security measures in place are sufficient to address potential risks or threats on campus.	4.13	Agree	High
2. I feel that safety and security protocols are consistently implemented and followed by both school personnel and students.	4.13	Agree	High
3. I trust that school leadership prioritizes safety and regularly reviews or updates security policies.	4.18	Agree	High
4. I believe the school has enough trained personnel (e.g., security guards, medical responders) to handle emergencies or security concerns effectively.	4.17	Agree	High
5. I feel that physical safety features (such as gates, CCTV, fire extinguishers, emergency exits) are present, working, and properly maintained.	4.17	Agree	High
6. I have received clear and regular orientation regarding safety rules, emergency procedures, and security protocols.	4.10	Agree	High
7. I believe incidents and safety concerns are addressed quickly, fairly, and transparently by school authorities.	4.11	Agree	High
8. I feel safe and secure when I am on campus, both during regular school hours and after class activities.	4.16	Agree	High
Composite	4.14	Agree	High

Legend: Scale	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
4.21 – 5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
3.41 – 4.20	Agree	High
2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Agree	Moderate

1.81 – 2.60	Disagree	Low
1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

Table 4.1 shows that respondents agree to a great extent (composite mean = 3.46) that there are challenges in policy implementation and enforcement at Metro Dumaguete College. The findings reveal that occasional inconsistency in enforcing safety rules, unclear communication of policies, and lapses in monitoring certain areas, indicating the need for stronger policy enforcement and awareness across campuses.

Table 4.1
Extent of the Challenges and Gaps that Exist in the Current Safety and Security Protocols at Campus 1 and Campus 2 in terms of Policy Implementation and Enforcement

Statements	\bar{Wx}	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
1. I have noticed that some safety and security policies are not consistently enforced in different areas of the campus.	3.53	Agree	High
2. I sometimes see students, staff, or visitors ignoring safety protocols without facing any consequences.	3.50	Agree	High
3. I feel that some school safety rules are unclear or not effectively communicated to everyone on campus.	3.48	Agree	High
4. I have experienced or observed situations where safety policies were disregarded without proper follow-up from school authorities (smoking inside campus, loitering, and throwing of garbage anywhere).	3.39	Moderately Agree	To a Moderate Extent
5. I believe there are certain times or areas, such as after class hours or in less monitored locations, where safety protocols are not properly implemented (enough lights in the corridor or stairways).	3.41	Agree	High
Composite	3.46	Agree	High
Legend: Scale	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent	
4.21 – 5.00	Strongly Agree	To a Very Great Extent	
3.41 – 4.20	Agree	To a Great Extent	
2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Agree	To a Moderate Extent	
1.81 – 2.60	Disagree	To a Small Extent	
1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree	Not at all	

Table 4.2 indicates that respondents moderately agree (composite mean = 3.36) that infrastructure and resource limitations pose challenges to campus safety and security. The results imply that issues such as outdated equipment, insufficient lighting,

limited trained personnel, and delayed maintenance, highlighting the need for facility upgrades and increased resource allocation to strengthen safety measures.

Table 4.2
Extent of the Challenges and Gaps that Exist in the Current Safety and Security Protocols at Campus 1 and Campus 2 in terms of Infrastructure and Resources Limitations

Statements	\bar{w}_x	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
1. I believe that some safety equipment (e.g., fire extinguishers, alarms, CCTV cameras) is outdated, non-functional, or insufficient.	3.33	Moderately Agree	To a Moderate Extent
2. I have noticed areas on campus that lack proper lighting, fencing, or surveillance, making them feel unsafe (e.g. kubo and other existing student lounges).	3.38	Moderately Agree	To a Moderate Extent
3. I think there are not enough trained security or emergency personnel to respond effectively during any incidents or emergencies.	3.30	Moderately Agree	To a Moderate Extent
4. I have experienced or seen delays in maintenance or repairs of safety-related facilities (e.g., broken windows and destroyed lounges, exit signs, emergency exits).	3.44	Agree	High
5. I feel that the campus lacks sufficient budget or investment to support comprehensive safety and security systems.	3.36	Moderately Agree	To a Moderate Extent
Composite	3.36	Moderately Agree	To a Moderate Extent

Legend: Scale	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
4.21 – 5.00	Strongly Agree	To a Very Great Extent
3.41 – 4.20	Agree	To a Great Extent
2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Agree	To a Moderate Extent
1.81 – 2.60	Disagree	To a Small Extent
1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree	Not at all

Table 4.3 shows that respondents moderately agree (composite mean = 3.28) that there are gaps in community awareness and preparedness at Metro Dumaguete College. The findings point to limited safety orientations, inadequate access to emergency information, and low participation in drills, indicating the need to strengthen safety education and engagement among students and staff.

Table 4.3
Extent of the Challenges and Gaps that Exist in the Current Safety and Security Protocols at Campus 1 and Campus 2 in terms of MDC Community Awareness and Preparedness

Statements	\bar{w}_x	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
1. I believe many students and staff are unaware of what to do in case of emergencies (e.g., fire, earthquake, medical issues).	3.32	Moderately Agree	To a Moderate Extent
2. I have not received regular safety orientations, drills, or briefings since being part of the MDC community.	3.19	Moderately Agree	To a Moderate Extent
3. I feel that there is no clear or widely known reporting system for security or emergency incidents.	3.28	Moderately Agree	To a Moderate Extent
4. I believe that safety information (e.g., emergency maps, contact numbers, evacuation procedures) is not easily accessible or visible on campus.	3.30	Moderately Agree	To a Moderate Extent
5. I think there is a general lack of engagement or participation from students and s teaching and nonteaching staff in safety and emergency preparedness activities.	3.31	Moderately Agree	To a Moderate Extent
Composite	3.28	Moderately Agree	To a Moderate Extent

Legend: Scale	Verbal Description	Verbal Equivalent
4.21 – 5.00	Strongly Agree	To a Very Great Extent
3.41 – 4.20	Agree	To a Great Extent
2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Agree	To a Moderate Extent
1.81 – 2.60	Disagree	To a Small Extent
1.00 – 1.80	Strongly Disagree	Not at all

Table 5.1 reveals a significant positive relationship between the extent of implementation and the effectiveness of safety and security measures across all areas. The highest correlation ($r = 0.786$) is found in the Emergency Preparedness and Response System, showing a strong link between proper implementation and effectiveness. All correlations are statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), indicating that well-executed safety measures contribute to greater efficiency and responsiveness on campus.

Table 5.2 shows a significant positive relationship between the extent of implementation and the effectiveness of safety and security measures in Access Control and Physical Security. The strongest correlation ($r = 0.687$) is observed within the same variable, indicating that consistent enforcement of access protocols enhances their

overall effectiveness. All relationships are statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), confirming that well-implemented access control measures contribute substantially to campus safety and security.

Table 5.1
Significant Relationship between the Extent of Implementation of Safety and Security Measures and their Extent of Effectiveness in the Emergency Preparedness and Response System

Variables Correlated	r	p-value	Decision	Remark
Emergency Preparedness and Response System				
Emergency Preparedness and Response System	0.786	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant
Access Control and Physical Security	0.533	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant
Incident response and reporting systems	0.582	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant
Surveillance and monitoring (e.g., CCTV, security personnel)	0.631	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant
Health and sanitation protocols (especially post-pandemic)	0.639	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant

Table 5.2
Significant Relationship between the Extent of Implementation of Safety and Security Measures and their Extent of Effectiveness in the Access Control and Physical Security

Variables Correlated	r	p-value	Decision	Remark
Access Control and Physical Security				
Emergency Preparedness and Response System	0.653	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant
Access Control and Physical Security	0.687	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant
Incident response and reporting systems	0.597	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant
Surveillance and monitoring (e.g., CCTV, security personnel)	0.567	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant
Health and sanitation protocols (especially post-pandemic)	0.528	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant

Table 5.3 reveals a significant positive relationship between the extent of implementation and the effectiveness of safety and security measures in Surveillance and Incident Monitoring. The strongest correlation ($r = 0.719$) is observed in the area of Surveillance and Incident Monitoring itself, indicating that active and consistent monitoring enhances overall security performance. All relationships are statistically

significant ($p < 0.001$), confirming that effective surveillance systems play an essential role in maintaining campus safety.

Table 5.3
Significant Relationship between the Extent of Implementation of Safety and Security Measures and their Extent of Effectiveness in the Surveillance and Incident Monitoring

Variables Correlated	r	p-value	Decision	Remark
Surveillance and Incident Monitoring				
Emergency Preparedness and Response System	0.680	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant
Access Control and Physical Security	0.601	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant
Incident response and reporting systems	0.675	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant
Surveillance and monitoring (e.g., CCTV, security personnel)	0.719	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant
Health and sanitation protocols (especially post-pandemic)	0.609	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant

Table 5.4 reveals a significant positive relationship between the extent of implementation and the effectiveness of safety and security measures in Health and Sanitation Protocols. The highest correlation ($r = 0.762$) is found with the Emergency Preparedness and Response System, indicating that effective health measures strengthen overall emergency readiness. All relationships are statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), demonstrating that well-implemented health and sanitation practices enhance the overall safety and well-being of the campus community.

Table 5.4
Significant Relationship between the Extent of Implementation of Safety and Security Measures and their Extent of Effectiveness in the Health and Sanitation Protocols

Variables Correlated	r	p-value	Decision	Remark
Health and Sanitation Protocols				
Emergency Preparedness and Response System	0.762	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant
Access Control and Physical Security	0.506	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant
Incident response and reporting systems	0.640	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant
Surveillance and monitoring (e.g., CCTV, security personnel)	0.674	<0.001	Reject H_{01}	Significant

Table 6 indicates that there is no significant relationship between the perceptions of key stakeholders on the adequacy and implementation of current safety and security measures and the extent of challenges and gaps encountered. The results, with all p-values greater than 0.05, imply that stakeholders' positive perceptions of safety implementation do not necessarily correspond to the level of issues related to policy enforcement, infrastructure limitations, or community preparedness across the two campuses.

Table 6
Significant Relationship between the Perceptions of Key Stakeholders (Administrators, Faculty, Students, and Security Personnel) regarding the Adequacy and Implementation of Current Safety and Security Measures and the Extent of Challenges and Gaps they Encountered

Variables Correlated	r	p-value	Decision	Remark
Perceptions of Key Stakeholders regarding the Adequacy and Implementation of Current Safety and Security Measures				
Policy Implementation and Enforcement	0.006	0.924	Failed to Reject H ₀₂	Not Significant
Infrastructure and Resources Limitations	-0.067	0.279	Failed to Reject H ₀₂	Not Significant
MDC Community Awareness and Preparedness	-0.053	0.394	Failed to Reject H ₀₂	Not Significant

DISCUSSION

The extent to which existing safety and security measures are effectively implemented across Metro Dumaguete College Campus 1 and Campus 2

1.1 Emergency Preparedness and Response System

The findings in Table 1.1 show that the safety and security measures at Metro Dumaguete College Campuses 1 and 2, particularly in terms of emergency preparedness and response, are highly implemented, with a composite mean of 4.04 (Agree – High). This indicates that the institution demonstrates commendable readiness during emergencies. Respondents expressed the strongest agreement with their confidence in prompt alerts (M = 4.17), belief that faculty and staff are trained to respond effectively (M = 4.06), and awareness of an emergency response team (M = 4.05). Meanwhile, slightly lower ratings were observed in the visibility of evacuation routes (M = 3.96) and accessibility of first aid kits (M = 3.97). Although still high, these areas indicate opportunities for improvement through clearer signage and better placement of emergency materials. These results imply that the college is operationally ready but should continuously enhance practical aspects and conduct regular drills to maintain preparedness.

These findings align with previous studies emphasizing the importance of structured preparedness programs in educational institutions. Seddighi et al. (2020) reported that school-based disaster training significantly improves students' awareness and responsiveness. Similarly, Patel et al. (2023) found that comprehensive training and communication systems increase university students' confidence in handling crises. Herstein et al. (2021) also highlighted that adaptive preparedness frameworks are essential to sustain institutional resilience in emergencies. These studies reinforce the value of continuous safety education and system enhancement in fostering a secure campus environment.

1.2 Access Control and Physical Security

The data in Table 1.2 show that the safety and security measures at Metro Dumaguete College Campuses 1 and 2 in terms of access control and physical security are implemented to a very high extent, with a composite mean of 4.31 (Strongly Agree). This suggests that the institution has a well-established and reliable security system. The highest ratings were for the presence of security personnel at entry and exit points (M = 4.41), consistent ID verification (M = 4.39), and the requirement to wear identification cards (M = 4.37). These findings reflect effective enforcement of access control policies, which help maintain order and ensure safety on campus. The routine inspection of facilities (M = 4.21) and secure gates and buildings (M = 4.23) also highlight proactive safety management.

These results imply that the college's strong access control system fosters a secure learning environment. However, continuous improvement through system reviews, personnel training, and technology integration (e.g., CCTV and digital access systems) remains essential. These findings align with prior research emphasizing that visible security measures and restricted access reduce risks and enhance safety perceptions (Kelman et al., 2020). Similarly, Huang et al. (2022) noted that effective physical barriers and monitoring systems improve campus safety, while Paci-Green et al. (2020) emphasized that combining human vigilance with infrastructure is vital to a comprehensive safety framework.

1.3 Surveillance and Incident Monitoring

The results from Table 1.3 indicate that the extent of surveillance and incident-monitoring measures at Metro Dumaguete College Campuses 1 and 2 is rated at a "Very High" level, with a composite mean of 4.22 (Strongly Agree). Respondents especially feel safer knowing that a functional surveillance system is in place (M = 4.36), and believe that incident-logs are maintained (M = 4.25). Other items (monitoring by staff, ability to report suspicious behavior, sightings of cameras) all scored in the "High" range (around 4.17–4.20). These findings imply that the institution has a strong surveillance and reporting infrastructure, contributing to stakeholder confidence in campus safety. However, although the mean values are high, the variation among items reveals opportunities to further strengthen the system, particularly in ensuring perceived staff monitoring and incident follow-up remain consistently visible. These findings align with

research showing that educational settings deploy CCTV and incident-monitoring systems to enhance safety perceptions (Tran et al., 2022) and raise ethical, privacy, and operational transparency concerns tied to these practices (Andrejevic & Selwyn, 2020). Taken together, the college is performing well in this area but should continue to refine its incident-monitoring protocols, make reporting mechanisms more transparent, and verify that all students and staff are aware of them.

Extent of effectiveness of the implemented measures in addressing the following areas:

2.1 Emergency preparedness (e.g., fire, earthquake, medical emergencies)

The results in Table 2.1 indicate that emergency preparedness measures at Metro Dumaguete College Campuses 1 and 2 are implemented at a high level, with a composite mean of 4.10 (Agree – High). Respondents generally understand the posted emergency plans (M = 4.19) and find drills realistic and helpful (M = 4.16). Slightly lower ratings were given to awareness of first-aid kits (M = 4.03) and training (M = 4.06), while accessibility of emergency exits remained high (M = 4.08). These findings imply that the college maintains good preparedness but could still improve in equipment awareness and training consistency. Strengthening first-aid accessibility, conducting regular refresher sessions, and ensuring clearer signage would help elevate preparedness from “High” to “Very High.”

In support, recent studies emphasize that training, drills, and preparedness education help enhance students’ and staff’s emergency readiness. For instance, Liu et al. (2021) noted that college students’ ability to respond to emergencies increases when drills and training are systematically implemented. Similarly, Jie et al. (2023) found that active participation in emergency education and drills strengthens university students’ preparedness attitudes and behaviors.

2.2 Access control and perimeter security

The data in Table 2.2 indicate that the safety and security measures on access control and perimeter security at Metro Dumaguete College Campuses 1 and 2 are implemented to a very high extent, with a composite mean of 4.29 (Strongly Agree – Very High). Respondents strongly agreed that security guards are consistently visible and diligent in checking IDs (M = 4.32), visitors are properly logged before entry (M = 4.29), and perimeter fences and gates effectively prevent unauthorized access (M = 4.25). They also acknowledged the strict implementation of ID policies (M = 4.33) and the secure monitoring of restricted areas (M = 4.24). These results suggest that the college’s security system is efficient, visible, and well-enforced, contributing to a strong sense of safety among students and personnel.

The findings imply that strict access control and perimeter security measures foster a safe and orderly learning environment. Continuous guard training, technology upgrades, and regular monitoring can further strengthen these practices. Similar studies

affirm that consistent access-control enforcement enhances campus safety and stakeholder trust (Aydinan, 2023; Ekpoh et al., 2020).

2.3 Incident response and reporting systems

The data in Table 2.3 reveal that the incident response and reporting systems at Metro Dumaguete College Campuses 1 and 2 are implemented to a high extent, with a composite mean of 4.16 (Agree – High). Respondents expressed strong awareness of where to report emergencies or concerns (M = 4.21) and confidence in the confidentiality and promptness of responses (M = 4.17). These findings indicate that the college has established clear and trustworthy channels for incident reporting, which contribute to a secure and accountable campus environment.

The data imply that while the current systems effectively promote safety and trust, further improvement in response timeliness and visibility of follow-up actions could raise their effectiveness to a “Very High” level. Consistent staff training and increased awareness campaigns can also strengthen the culture of safety and openness. Similar studies emphasize that clear, confidential, and responsive reporting systems significantly enhance campus safety and community confidence (Benevento, 2023; Moore et al., 2025).

2.4 Surveillance and monitoring (e.g., CCTV, security personnel)

The data in Table 2.4 show that surveillance and monitoring measures at Metro Dumaguete College Campuses 1 and 2 are implemented to a very high extent, with a composite mean of 4.25 (Strongly Agree – Very High). Respondents strongly agreed that CCTV cameras are strategically placed (M = 4.26), properly maintained (M = 4.27), and actively monitored (M = 4.24). They also noted that security personnel conduct regular patrols (M = 4.21) and that surveillance recordings are effectively used to enhance safety measures (M = 4.28).

The data imply that the college has established a reliable surveillance system that strengthens both safety assurance and deterrence of misconduct. However, to sustain this high level of security, the school should continue regular equipment maintenance, optimize camera coverage, and ensure clear reporting protocols. Similarly, studies affirm that well-managed CCTV systems enhance institutional safety and stakeholder confidence (Alshammari, 2023; Ghimire & Rana, 2023).

2.5 Health and sanitation protocols (especially post-pandemic)

The data in Table 2.5 indicate that the measures for health and sanitation protocols at Metro Dumaguete College (Campuses 1 & 2) are implemented at a high level, with a composite mean of 4.04 (Agree – High). Respondents reported good access to functioning hand-washing stations or hand sanitizers in key areas (M = 4.08), consistent cleaning routines in classrooms and common spaces (M = 3.97), experience of health

screening protocols (M = 3.93), clear understanding of the school's health policy (M = 4.14), and regular updates on hygiene and illness-prevention reminders (M = 4.06).

The data imply that the college has maintained a strong foundational hygiene and health-awareness infrastructure especially important in a post-pandemic context. However, the somewhat lower scores on sanitation routines and health screening indicate an opportunity to further strengthen these practices. Enhancing cleaning frequency, conducting visible health-screening activities, and reinforcing the hygiene communication strategy could raise performance further. Supporting this, recent research shows that schools which implement enough water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) measures and engage in ongoing health promotion report improved hygiene behaviors and safer environments (Poague et al., 2024; Sormunen et al., 2022).

The extent to which stakeholders perceive the adequacy and proper implementation of the existing safety and security measures at Metro Dumaguete College (MDC)

The data in Table 3 show that the perceptions of key stakeholders (administrators, faculty, students, and support personnel) regarding the adequacy and implementation of current safety and security measures at the two campuses are solidly positive, registering a composite mean of 4.14 ("Agree – High"). Individual items reflect that stakeholders believe safety protocols are sufficient (M = 4.13), consistently implemented (M = 4.13), and that leadership prioritizes safety and policy review (M = 4.18). Moreover, respondents feel the school is well-equipped with trained personnel (M = 4.17), maintains physical safety features (M = 4.17), provides clear orientation (M = 4.10), addresses incidents fairly (M = 4.11), and supports a sense of safety on and after class hours (M = 4.16).

These imply that the institution enjoys a broadly positive safety climate among its key stakeholders, which is an important foundation for trust, engagement, and ongoing compliance. However, because the ratings remain in the "High" rather than "Very High" band, it signifies there is still room for enhancement such as increasing transparency of policy review, boosting frequency of stakeholder orientation, and ensuring consistency of implementation across all groups. Research supports this interpretation: for example, perceptions of campus safety are significantly shaped by environmental design, policy visibility and stakeholder engagement (Huang et al., 2022), and studies indicate that campus populations who believe safety measures are reliable also display greater confidence and use of facilities (Azevedo et al., 2022)

The extent of existing challenges and gaps in the current safety and security protocols at Campus 1 and Campus 2

4.1 Policy implementation and enforcement

The data in Table 4.1 reveal that stakeholders perceive several notable challenges and gaps in the implementation and enforcement of safety and security protocols at Metro Dumaguete College Campuses 1 & 2, as reflected by a composite mean of 3.46 (Agree

– High). Specific items include inconsistent enforcement of policies across campus areas (M = 3.53), observations of students, staff or visitors disregarding protocols without consequences (M = 3.50), unclear or poorly communicated safety rules (M = 3.48), lack of follow-up when rules are broken (M = 3.39), and weaker protocol application in less-monitored zones or after hours (M = 3.41).

The data imply that although the institution has safety and security measures in place, their consistency and visibility in execution require reinforcement. Gaps in policy enforcement and communication may undermine confidence in protocols and create uneven protection across campus. To address this, the college should undertake periodic audits of policy compliance, strengthen mechanisms in handling violations, enhance communication of rules, and pay special attention to after-hours and less-monitored areas. This aligns with extant research showing that the presence of clearly communicated, consistently enforced safety policies is associated with higher levels of perceived effectiveness and actual functioning of security systems in educational settings (Huang et al., 2022; Osegbue et al., 2025).

4.2 Infrastructure and resources limitations

The results in Table 4.2 reveal that challenges related to infrastructure and resource limitations at Metro Dumaguete College Campuses 1 and 2 exist to a moderate extent, with a composite mean of 3.36. Respondents noted that some safety equipment is outdated or insufficient, certain areas lack proper lighting or surveillance, and there are delays in maintaining safety facilities. Additionally, they perceived a shortage of trained security personnel and limited funding for comprehensive safety systems. These findings imply that while safety measures are in place, gaps in equipment, maintenance, manpower, and budget hinder full readiness. Strengthening maintenance, upgrading facilities, and allocating more resources could enhance overall campus safety (Fernández et al., 2025; Agyei et al., 2024).

4.3 MDC community awareness and prepared

The results in Table 4.3 indicate that challenges related to community awareness and preparedness at Metro Dumaguete College Campuses 1 and 2 exist to a moderate extent, with a composite mean of 3.28. Respondents moderately agreed that many students and staff lack adequate knowledge of emergency procedures, have not received regular safety orientations or drills, and are unaware of clear reporting systems. Additionally, safety information is not easily accessible, and participation in preparedness activities remains low. These findings emphasize that while safety initiatives are present, awareness and engagement among the campus community need strengthening. Enhancing training programs, visibility of safety information, and consistent communication can significantly improve readiness and safety culture among its community members (Patel et al., 2023; Albuero, 2025).

The relationship between the extent of implementation of safety and security measures and their extent of effectiveness

5.1 Emergency Preparedness and Response System

The results in Table 5.1 reveal a significant positive relationship between the extent of implementation of safety and security measures and their effectiveness in the emergency preparedness and response system. Correlation coefficients ($r = 0.533\text{--}0.786$, $p < 0.001$) indicate that as the level of implementation improves, so does the perceived effectiveness across all domains such as emergency preparedness, access control, incident reporting, surveillance, and health protocols. This implies that consistent and well-executed safety initiatives contribute substantially to campus resilience and readiness. Similarly, Ahsan et al. (2024) and Dablo and Pabalan (2025) emphasized that effective implementation of safety policies directly enhances emergency responsiveness and institutional safety culture in higher education institutions.

5.2 Access Control and Physical Security

The results in Table 5.2 show a significant positive relationship between the extent of implementation of safety and security measures and their effectiveness in access control and physical security ($r = 0.687$, $p < 0.001$). This strong correlation indicates that consistent enforcement of access protocols, such as ID verification, gate supervision, and surveillance, directly enhances the efficiency of campus safety systems. Other areas including emergency preparedness, incident response, surveillance, and health protocols also display significant associations ($r = 0.528\text{--}0.653$, $p < 0.001$), which reflects a cohesive and well-coordinated safety framework within the institution. The data imply that a strong access control policy contributes substantially to risk prevention and overall safety performance. In parallel, Huang et al. (2022) noted that students' sense of security improves when entry points are well-managed and surveillance systems function effectively. Likewise, Azevedo (2022) reported that visible security presence and clear access policies foster greater trust and confidence among university stakeholders. These findings confirm that Metro Dumaguete College's commitment to structured and well-enforced access measures strengthens the institution's safety environment.

5.3 Surveillance and Incident Monitoring

The findings in Table 5.3 show a significant positive relationship between the implementation of safety and security measures and their effectiveness in surveillance and incident monitoring. The strongest correlation occurs within the surveillance domain itself ($r = 0.719$, $p < 0.001$), followed by emergency preparedness ($r = 0.680$, $p < 0.001$) and incident response ($r = 0.675$, $p < 0.001$). These results indicate that well-managed surveillance systems through active monitoring, functioning CCTV units, and visible security presence enhance both safety oversight and emergency responsiveness. The data imply that consistent surveillance operations play a vital role in ensuring a secure campus environment. Huang et al. (2022) highlighted that organized monitoring increases students' perception of safety, while Azevedo (2022) noted that visible surveillance and

trained personnel reinforce trust in institutional safety. Thus, Metro Dumaguete College's surveillance system serves as a core element in sustaining campus security.

5.4 Health and Sanitation Protocols

The results in Table 5.4 demonstrate a significant positive relationship between the extent of implementation of safety and security measures and their effectiveness in health and sanitation protocols. The strongest correlation appears with emergency preparedness ($r = 0.762$, $p < 0.001$), followed by surveillance and monitoring ($r = 0.674$, $p < 0.001$). These results show that strong implementation of preparedness systems and consistent surveillance enhance the success of sanitation policies and overall health protection on campus. The data imply that well-enforced health protocols such as hygiene facilities, cleaning routines, and health monitoring contribute greatly to campus resilience and community safety. Consistent with this, Izumi et al. (2021) found that effective sanitation management and institutional preparedness reduce health risks in educational settings. Likewise, Tang et al. (2021) emphasized that visible hygiene infrastructure and compliance enforcement sustain public confidence and well-being. Hence, Metro Dumaguete College's strong adherence to sanitation standards strengthens both safety effectiveness and institutional reliability.

The relationship between stakeholders' perceptions of the adequacy and implementation of current safety and security measures and the extent of challenges and gaps encountered

Table 6 presents non-significant relationships between stakeholders' perceptions of the adequacy and implementation of safety and security measures and the extent of challenges or gaps encountered across three domains: policy implementation and enforcement ($r = 0.006$, $p = .924$), infrastructure and resource limitations ($r = -0.067$, $p = .279$), and community awareness and preparedness ($r = -0.053$, $p = .394$). These results indicate that stakeholders' views of the sufficiency of safety measures do not correspond with their reported experiences of gaps or limitations in policy and resource implementation.

The data indicate that, in this context, positive perceptions of safety and security do not necessarily align with the actual presence of challenges or deficiencies. Stakeholders may consider the measures adequate even when structural or procedural gaps persist, or they may identify shortcomings without perceiving overall safety provisions as insufficient. This further implies that favorable perceptions of safety implementation do not necessarily correspond to issues related to policy enforcement, infrastructure constraints, or community preparedness across the two campuses.

These findings reveal a possible disconnect between perceived adequacy and actual implementation gaps, emphasizing the need for deeper qualitative inquiry, enhanced transparency, and broader stakeholder engagement to reconcile perceptions with institutional realities. Prior studies highlight the complexity of such relationships,

showing that visible security measures do not always lead to improved perceptions of safety (Mowen & Freng, 2019; Byrd et al., 2025).

Conclusions.

“ A bad system will defeat a good person every time.” — *W. Edwards Deming*. This quote reflects the study’s results that while Metro Dumaguete College has effectively implemented its safety and security measures, particularly in access control, surveillance, and health protocols, gaps in policy enforcement, infrastructure, and community awareness remain. These weaknesses highlight that even with committed stakeholders, inconsistent systems and limited resources can hinder the full effectiveness of safety initiatives.

Recommendations

Based on the study’s findings, the following recommendations are addressed to specific offices and personnel of Metro Dumaguete College to enhance the school’s safety and security system:

A. For the School Administration. The administration must enforce safety and security policies more consistently across all departments and campuses. It must also provide adequate budget to support the improvement of facilities, equipment, and staff capability related to safety and security.

B. For the Security In-Charge. The security in-charge must ensure strict enforcement of school policies, monitor compliance in all areas, and evaluate existing safety protocols to determine gaps or weaknesses that need correction.

C. For the Security Personnel. Security guards must attend regular training sessions on emergency response, first aid, and incident handling. They must maintain vigilance in enforcing entry protocols, patrol critical areas, and respond promptly to any security issues.

D. For the MDC IT Operations Center. The IT Operations Center must upgrade and maintain CCTV systems, alarms, and communication devices. It must also ensure full functionality of these tools and integrate surveillance data into a coordinated system for quick and accurate response to incidents.

E. For the Student Affairs Office. The Student Affairs Office must organize regular safety drills and simulations such as fire, earthquake, and evacuation exercises. It must ensure consistency in these activities and promote active participation among students, faculty, and staff to strengthen preparedness.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

The research entitled “An Assessment of the Safety and Security Measures of Metro Dumaguete College Campus 1 and Campus 2: Basis for Policy Enhancement” was carried out in accordance with established ethical standards and institutional guidelines for studies involving human participants.

Participants were fully informed of the study’s aims, procedures, and their rights as voluntary respondents. Before the questionnaire was administered, each participant provided written consent, as explained in the introductory part of the instrument.

All responses gathered were handled with utmost care and confidentiality. No identifying information appeared in any reports or analyses. The collected data were stored in a secure location and accessed solely by the research team. After the completion, presentation, and defense of the study, all survey forms and related materials were properly destroyed through shredding to protect respondent privacy and maintain data integrity.

In addition, the institution affirmed its commitment to the responsible integration of artificial intelligence tools in support of academic advancement, research improvement, and administrative efficiency. AI applications were used exclusively for linguistic enhancement and formatting tasks. The researchers retained complete authorship and accountability for all intellectual and scholarly contributions.

Acknowledgments

The completion of this research would not have been possible without the guidance, assistance, and support of numerous individuals and offices, to whom the researchers are deeply indebted.

The researchers are grateful to **Dr. Delma P. Manila, CESO V**, College President, for her leadership and steadfast commitment to the institution’s mission of academic excellence, which inspired the researchers throughout this journey.

Sincere thanks are extended to the administrators for their insightful comments, academic guidance, and encouragement that enriched the quality of this study.

The researchers also extend heartfelt appreciation to the administrators whose support in the financial and publication processes ensured the timely completion of this research endeavor

Acknowledgment is also due to **Sir Jerry A. Pariscal**, the statistician, for his technical assistance, valuable advice, and data analysis, which strengthened the credibility of the findings.

Most of all, the researchers are deeply thankful to the **respondents** for their cooperation and honest participation, without whom this study would not have been possible.

REFERENCES

- Agyei, E. A., Ananim, S. K., Acquah, B. Y. S., Sebu, J., & Agyei, S. K. (2024). Education infrastructure inequality and academic performance in Ghana. *Heliyon*, 10(14). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e34041>
- Ahsan, A. H. M., Hasan, M. K., Rumi, M. H., Ahmed, T., & Aunto, T. K. (2024). Students' safety culture at tertiary level academic institutes in Bangladesh: A cross-sectional study. *Heliyon*, 10(22). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e40155>
- Alburo, E. (2025). Emergency Preparedness in Higher Education: A Literature Review on Institutional Readiness and Disaster Response. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies in Higher Education*, 2(3), 87–99. <https://doi.org/10.70847/632222>
- Alshammari, A. (2023). Developing a Security Policy for the Use of CCTV in the Northern Border University. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 14(6). <https://dx.doi.org/10.14569/IJACSA.2023.0140669>
- Andrejevic, M., & Selwyn, N. (2020). Facial recognition technology in schools: Critical questions and concerns. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 45(2), 115-128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1686014>
- Aydinan, J. J. B. (2023). Higher Education Institutions' Security Capability the Leads to the Creation of Standardized Campus Security System. *Journal of Education and Teaching in Emerging Regions*, 14(2), 295–306. <https://doi.org/10.47750/jett.2023.14.02.034>
- Azevedo, V., Nunes, L. M., & Sani, A. (2022). Is campus a place of (in) security and crime? Perceptions and predictors among higher education students. *European journal of investigation in health, psychology and education*, 12(2), 193-208. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe12020015>
- Benevento, M., Nicoli, S., Mandarelli, G., Ferorelli, D., Cicolini, G., Marrone, M., ... & Solarino, B. (2023). Strengths and weaknesses of the incident reporting system: an Italian experience. *Journal of Patient Safety and Risk Management*, 28(1), 15-20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/25160435221150568>
- Byrd, K., Kapadia, K., & John, R. (2025). Perceived effectiveness and intrusiveness of school security countermeasures among parents, students, and staff. *Environment Systems and Decisions*, 45(1), 11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10669-025-10004-7>
- Dablo, M. R. S., & Pabalan, A. P. (2025). RISKS AND MANAGEMENT IN SCHOOLS. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary RESEARCH*, 3 (2), 1053-1072. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14965604>
- Ekpoh, U. I., Edet, A. O., & Ukpong, N. N. (2020). Security challenges in Universities: Implications for safe school environment. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 10(6), 112-112. <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2020-0113>
- Fernández, R., Correal, J. F., D'ayala, D., & Medaglia, A. L. (2025). A decision-making framework for school infrastructure improvement programs. *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering*, 21(2), 165-184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15732479.2023.2199361>
- Ghimire, S. N., & Rana, K. (2023). CCTV in schools: An examination of perceived value of surveillance. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, 28(4), 351-379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10824669.2022.2092110>

- Herstein, J. J., Schwedhelm, M. M., Vasa, A., Biddinger, P. D., & Hewlett, A. L. (2021). Emergency preparedness: What is the future?. *Antimicrobial Stewardship & Healthcare Epidemiology*, 1(1), e29. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ash.2021.190>
- Huang, D., Ceccato, V., & Kytta, M (2022). Safety perceptions in university campuses: The role of environment. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, 24(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41300-022-00148-y>
- Izumi, T., Sukhwani, V., Surjan, A., & Shaw, R. (2021). Managing and responding to pandemics in higher educational institutions: initial learning from COVID-19. *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment*, 12(1), 51-66. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJDRBE-06-2020-0054>
- Jie, D., Mengzhe, Y., Huiwen, L., Junchang, L., & Yuhui, Z. (2023). Analysis of university students' participation in emergency education and its influencing factors in Shandong province. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 11, 1097917. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1097917>
- Kelman, I., Sydnes, A. K., Duda, P. I., Nikitina, E., & Webersik, C. (2020). Norway-Russia disaster diplomacy for Svalbard. *Safety Science*, 130, 104896. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2020.104896>
- Liu, Y., Zhou, W., & Song, Y. (2021). Evaluation of College Students 'Emergency Response Capability Based on Questionnaire-TOPSIS Innovative Algorithm. *Complexity*, 2021(1), 6295003. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/6295003>
- Mina, J. B., Aydinan, L. C., Campos, R. A., & Ayeo-eo, J. R. (2021). Assessment of safety and security measures implemented by universities in Nueva Ecija during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Open Access Library Journal*, 8(7), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1107076>
- Mowen, T. J., & Freng, A. (2019). Is more necessarily better? School security and perceptions of safety among students and parents in the United States. *American journal of criminal justice*, 44(3), 376-394. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-018-9461-7>
- Osegbue, G. C., Ohamobi, I. N., & Alordiah, C. O. (2025). Enhancing School Safety and Security: Developing and Implementing Effective Protocols for a Secured Learning Environment. *African Journal of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 15(2). Retrieved from: <https://tinyurl.com/2h3hwys>
- Patel, R. K., Pamidimukkala, A., Kermanshachi, S., & Etmnani-Ghasrodashti, R. (2023). Disaster preparedness and awareness among university students: a structural equation analysis. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 20(5), 4447. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20054447>
- Paci-Green, R., Varchetta, A., McFarlane, K., Iyer, P., & Goyeneche, M. (2020). Comprehensive school safety policy: A global baseline survey. *International journal of disaster risk reduction*, 44, 101399. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2019.101399>
- Poague, K. I., Blanford, J. I., Martínez, J. A., & Anthonj, C. (2024). Preparing schools for future pandemics: Insights on water, sanitation and hygiene solutions from the Brazilian school reopening policies. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health*, 257, 114325. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2024.114325>
- Moore, P., Diliberti, M. K., Simmons, I., Schwartz, H. L., & Jackson, B. A. (2025). Safety

- and Security at Institutions of Higher Education: Understanding Trends, Practices, and Future Needs. Research Report. RR-A2999-1. RAND Corporation. PO Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138. <https://doi.org/10.7249/RRA2999-1>
- Seddighi, H., Sajjadi, H., Yousefzadeh, S., López, M. L., Vameghi, M., Rafiey, H., ... & Fonseca, M. G. (2020). Students 'preparedness for disasters in schools: a systematic review protocol. *BMJ paediatrics open*, 4(1), e000913. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjpo-2020-000913>
- Sormunen, M., Lattke, L., Leksy, K., Dadaczynski, K., Sakellari, E., Velasco, V., ... & Rosário, R. (2022). Health promoting schools and COVID-19: preparing for the future. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 50(6), 655-659. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14034948221091155>
- Tang, C. M. (2021). Strategies for Campus Safety and Environmental Planning in the Post-Pandemic Era. *Journal of Education Research*, (323), 4-21. <https://doi:10.3966/168063602021030323001>
- Tran, K., Nguyen, T., Phan, L., Tran, M., Trinh, M., & Pham, L. (2022). Stakeholders ' attitudes towards the installations of closed-circuit television cameras in reducing school violence. *Heliyon*, 8(9). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10645>
- Yuhong, Y., Zhuo, S., & Monreal, R. N. (2023). Design of the network security architecture for smart campus. *Journal of Knowledge, Learning and Science and Technology*, 4(2), 18–28. <https://doi.org/10.60087/mrb0hh55>

APA Citation:

Melon, E. C., Calisang, C. P., Alcoreza, M. P., Lagrada, R. O., Pariscal, J. A., Catarata, A. T., Bacud-Mariño, G. M., & Tubil, C. G. (2026). AN ASSESSMENT OF THE SAFETY AND SECURITY MEASURES OF METRO DUMAGUETE COLLEGE CAMPUS 1 AND CAMPUS 2: BASIS FOR POLICY ENHANCEMENT. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(5), 2534–2564. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20429081>

renze.lagrada@mdci.edu.ph
calisang.cristina@mdci.edu.ph