



REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF SECURITY SERVICES

Double Tap Security Agency, Inc.

(Covering the Period December 2023 – May 2024)

Prepared by: **Office of Monitoring and Evaluation**

Prepared for: **Office of the Chancellor** - DTI #: 2024 032 296

Security and Investigation Division (SID) - DTI #: 2024 032 299

Double Tap Security Agency, Inc. - DTI #: 2024 032 306

Procurement Management Division (PMD) - DTI #: 2024 032 309

MSU-IIT Bids and Awards Committee (BAC) - DTI #: 2024 032 311

Submitted on: **June 26, 2024**

OC	Received by	Date
-	<u>Aurinda</u>	<u>8/6/24</u>
SID	<u>Cheryn</u>	
Double Tap	<u>ARM BACAR M. MACARAIG</u>	<u>8/5/24</u>
PMD	<u>An</u>	
BAC	<u>RENDICO, XJS</u>	<u>8/5/24</u>



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page Number
Executive Summary	1
Survey Objectives	2
Methodology	
Survey Respondents	2
Data Collection Procedure	2-3
Data Analysis	3-4
Results and Discussions	4-18
Recommendations	19-22



Executive Summary

The Office of Monitoring and Evaluation (OME) facilitated the **first phase of the performance evaluation for the Fiscal Year 2024** of the University's existing Security Services provider, **Double Tap Security Agency, Inc.**, covering the period from **December 2023 to May 2024**.

Two surveys were conducted by the OME throughout Fiscal Year 2024. The first survey assessed the performance of the security personnel, with responses gathered from employees (excluding those from the Security and Investigation Division) and students. The second survey evaluated the compliance of the security services provider with the contract and the University's Internal House Rules and was completed by the Security and Investigation Division head and staff. The results of both surveys were averaged accordingly.

A total of **223 responses** were collected and tabulated from **Responsibility Center Heads, employees (faculty and administrative staff), and students**. Additionally, **8 responses** were gathered and tabulated from the **Security and Investigation Division respondents**

Survey Objectives

The performance of the security services provider, specifically regarding its human resources (security guards), is evaluated twice a year. The first phase of the evaluation encompasses the period from December of the previous year to May of the current year, while the second phase covers June to November of the current year. The objectives of this evaluation, as outlined in the Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR), are as follows:

1. To assess the performance of the security service providers;
2. To determine the compliance of the security service provider with the contract and other existing laws and regulations imposed by the Institute;
3. To recommend to the top management the result of the evaluation if such services meet its satisfactory requirement and;



4. To help the top management in decision making whether to renew, allow or disallow the participation of any service existing security service provider based on verified reports.

Methodology

a. Survey Respondents

The survey respondents included seven (7) Responsibility Center Heads, eighteen (18) faculty members, twenty (20) non-teaching/administrative staff, and one hundred seventy-eight (178) students. In total, two hundred twenty-three (223) individuals completed the survey via Google Forms, as devised by the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation.

Additionally, the survey on contract compliance garnered responses from eight (8) individuals from the Security and Investigation Division, including the SID Head and staff. This survey was also conducted using Google Forms.

b. Data Collection Procedure

As outlined in the Implementing Rules and Regulations for conducting this survey, the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation (OME) is tasked with reviewing the implementation and compliance of security services providers according to the terms specified in the contract between the University and the external provider. In accordance with its mandate to coordinate with relevant offices and agencies for monitoring and evaluating projects and services, the OME facilitated the performance evaluation survey of the security services provider through the following procedures:

1. The Office of Monitoring and Evaluation prepared two survey instruments using an online survey tool (Google Forms): one to evaluate the performance of security personnel and another to assess the compliance of the Security Services provider with the contract and the University's internal house rules.
2. The Office issued a call for participation in the survey to evaluate the security services provider's performance for the period from December 2023 to May 2024 through **Memorandum Order No. 2024-006-OME, dated June 5, 2024**.





3. The memorandum was sent to the respondents via their respective email addresses, including a link to the online survey questionnaire. The respondents included the University's Responsibility Center Heads, teaching and non-teaching employees, students, and the Head and Staff of the Security and Investigation Division.
4. To ensure a high survey turnout, the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation team coordinated with the Information and Communication Technology Center (ICTC), led by Director Dante M. Dinawanao and Mr. Richard Micubo, to make the security services survey tool accessible on the My.IIT portal.
5. The survey was conducted throughout the year, with responses collected from December 2023 to June 24, 2024. The Office of Monitoring and Evaluation transported all survey responses from Google Forms to Microsoft Excel to facilitate accurate and efficient tabulation and processing of the results.

c. Data Analysis

The survey used Google Forms to distribute the evaluation tool, which included statement indicators allowing respondents to rate each statement with scores that best describe each item or indicator. The survey questionnaire for evaluating the performance of security personnel comprised two categories:

- 1. Provision of Safety and Security**
- 2. Overall Standards of Security Personnel**, including alertness/vigilance, attitude, ability to meet client needs, honesty and integrity, leadership and followership, and communication skills.

The final section of the questionnaire gathered comments and suggestions from respondents regarding the performance of the security personnel provided by the University's existing security service provider.

In addition, the survey questionnaire for the Security and Investigation Division included indicators to assess the compliance of the security services provider with the contract and the University's internal house rules.



Below is a table showing the range of rating scores, adjectival ratings, and the corresponding descriptive remarks used:

Rating Score	Adjectival Rating	Mean Value	Descriptive Remark
1	Poor	1.00-1.99	Needs major improvement in most or all areas
2	Unsatisfactory	2.00-2.99	Needs improvement in some areas
3	Satisfactory	3.00-3.99	Meets most of our expectations
4	Very Satisfactory	4.00-4.99	Meets all our expectations
5	Outstanding	5.00	Exceeds our expectations

To analyze the data, frequency counts and mean values were utilized as statistical tools. The average responses of respondents for each statement indicator were calculated using the weighted mean formula as outlined below:

$$\text{WM} = \frac{f_1(1) + f_2(2) + f_3(3) + f_4(4) + f_5(5)}{f_1+f_2+f_3+f_4+f_5}$$

Results and Discussions

The Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) specify that "at least 20 students will be randomly selected, and 10% of the population of each cost center will be selected to answer the survey questions." For this phase of the evaluation survey for Fiscal Year 2024, covering December 2023 to May 2024, the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation gathered a total of 223 responses for the security personnel performance evaluation. This included:

20 responses (8.97%) from non-teaching staff

18 responses (8.07%) from faculty

178 responses (79.82%) from students

7 responses (3.14%) from the heads of cost centers

Additionally, for the survey evaluating the compliance of the security services provider with the contract and the University's Internal House Rules, eight responses were collected from the Head and Staff of the Security and Investigation Division.



SURVEY ON SECURITY SERVICES PROVIDER EVALUATION
For the Period December 2023 to May 2024
RESPONDENTS BY DESIGNATION

Faculty, Staff, RC/Cost Center Heads and Students (Non-SID)

Designation	(f)	%
Faculty	18	8.07%
Non-Teaching Staff/Administrative Staff	20	8.97%
Responsibility Center Head/Cost Center Head	7	3.14%
Student	178	79.82%
Grand Total	223	100%

Security and Investigation Division

Designation	(f)
Head	1
Staff/Personnel	7
Grand Total	8

The tables below illustrate the distribution of all survey respondents, including Responsibility/Cost Center Heads and their respective offices/colleges.

Table 1. Responsibility/Cost Center Heads Respondents and their Offices

OFFICE/COLLEGE	(f)
Responsibility Center Head/Cost Center Head	
Center for Culture and Arts	1
College of Computer Studies	1
Mindanao Heritage and Indigenous Research Center (MHIRC)	1
Natural Museum	1
Office of Admission, Scholarship and Grants	1
Office of the Vice-Chancellor for Planning and Development	1
WE CARE Office	1
Total:	7
Percentage Distribution:	3.14%

Table 2. Distribution of Faculty Respondents with their Respective Colleges

OFFICE/COLLEGE	(f)
Faculty	
Center for Advanced Education and Lifelong Learning	1
College of Arts and Social Sciences	9
College of Economics, Business, and Accountancy	1



College of Education	2
College of Education-Integrated Developmental School	1
College of Engineering and Technology	2
College of Science and Mathematics	1
Office of Sports, Physical Fitness, and Recreation MSU-IIT	1
Total:	18
Percentage Distribution:	8.07%

Table 3. Distribution of Student Respondents Per College

OFFICE/COLLEGE	(f)
Student	
Center for Information and Communication Technology	1
College of Arts and Social Sciences	40
College of Computer Studies	14
College of Economics, Business, and Accountancy	15
College of Education	32
College of Engineering and Technology	39
College of Health Sciences	9
College of Science and Mathematics	25
Office of the University Registrar	1
School of Interdisciplinary Studies	2
Total:	178
Percentage Distribution:	79.82%

In this survey, the Non-Teaching Personnel includes various administrative roles and positions, such as technical staff, research assistants, financial assistants, and other related roles from different colleges and offices within the University.

Table 4. Non-Teaching Staff Respondents and their Corresponding Offices

OFFICE/COLLEGE	(f)
Non-Teaching Staff/Administrative Staff	
Accounting Division	1
College of Arts and Social Sciences	1
College of Education	1
College of Engineering and Technology	2
College of Science and Mathematics	3
Internal Audit Services Unit	1
Legal Services Office	1
Office of Admission, Scholarship and Grants	1
Office of Guidance and Counseling	1
Office of the Budget Management	1
Office of the Vice-Chancellor for Research and Enterprise	1
Physical Plant Division	2



Premier Research Institute of Science and Mathematics	1
Procurement Management Division	1
University Library	2
Total:	20
Percentage Distribution:	8.97%

Summary of the Overall Tabulated Results

The table displays the overall and tabulated results of the survey responses from 223 participants on the Security Services Provider Evaluation for the period December 2023 to May 2024, based on raw data collected via Google Forms. Additionally, Table 5 provides the rating for each question within each category. The results are presented in tabular form, showing the average ratings received by the security services provider for the specified period, followed by narrative descriptions of the data.

Table 5. Frequency, Percentage Distribution, Average Rating and Weighted Mean of the University's Security Services Provider's Performance Evaluation for the Period December 2023 to May 2024 (Non-SID Respondents)

Security Services Provider (Non-SID Evaluation)	5- Outstanding		4- Very Satisfactory		3- Satisfactory		2- Unsatisfactory		1- Poor		Weighted Mean (Average Rating)	Adjectival Rating	
	(f)	%	(f)	%	(f)	%	(f)	%	(f)	%			
PROVISION OF SECURITY AND SAFETY													
Ability of the security personnel to direct employees and clients to a safe process or procedure when inside or out of the campus' premises.	119	53.36%	62	27.80%	35	15.70%	7	3.14%	0	0.00%	4.31	Very Satisfactory	
Performance of duties and responsibilities of the security personnel in promoting a secured and safe environment.	119	53.36%	62	27.80%	33	14.80%	9	4.04%	0	0.00%	4.30	Very Satisfactory	
Security personnel's expression of professionalism and politeness.	122	54.71%	53	23.77%	25	11.21%	18	8.07%	5	2.24%	4.21	Very Satisfactory	
Attention given by the security personnel to address security issues and concerns.	124	55.61%	59	26.46%	32	14.35%	7	3.14%	1	0.45%	4.34	Very Satisfactory	
Availability of the security personnel when the need of their services arise.	127	56.95%	57	25.56%	33	14.80%	5	2.24%	1	0.45%	4.36	Very Satisfactory	
The security personnel's exercise of the University's security and safety policies and protocols.	133	59.64%	46	20.63%	36	16.14%	8	3.59%	0	0.00%	4.36	Very Satisfactory	
Category 1 : Percentage Distribution:	55.61%		25.34%		14.50%		4.04%		0.52%		Average Mean:	4.31	Very Satisfactory
The over-all standard of the security personnel in terms of:													
Alertness/Vigilance	115	51.57%	59	26.46%	42	18.83%	6	2.69%	1	0.45%	4.26	Very Satisfactory	
Attitude	105	47.09%	57	25.56%	37	16.59%	17	7.62%	7	3.14%	4.06	Very Satisfactory	
Ability to serve Client's Needs	124	55.61%	54	24.22%	37	16.59%	6	2.69%	2	0.90%	4.31	Very Satisfactory	
Honesty and Integrity	121	54.26%	61	27.35%	37	16.59%	2	0.90%	2	0.90%	4.33	Very Satisfactory	
Lead and Follow	123	55.16%	59	26.46%	31	13.90%	7	3.14%	3	1.35%	4.31	Very Satisfactory	
Ability to communicate well	113	50.67%	47	21.08%	44	19.73%	12	5.38%	7	3.14%	4.11	Very Satisfactory	
Category 2 : Percentage Distribution:	52.39%		25.19%		17.04%		3.74%		1.64%		Average Mean:	4.23	Very Satisfactory
AVERAGE PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION:	54.00%		25.26%		15.77%		3.89%		1.08%		WEIGHTED AVERAGE/NUMERICAL RATING:	4.27	Very Satisfactory



Table 5.1. Frequency, Percentage Distribution, Average Rating and Weighted Mean of the University's Security Services Provider's Performance Evaluation for the Period December 2023 to May 2024 (SID Respondents)

Security Services Provider (SID Evaluation)	5- Outstanding		4- Very Satisfactory		3- Satisfactory		2- Unsatisfactory		1- Poor		Weighted Mean (Average Rating)	Adjectival Rating
	(f)	%	(f)	%	(f)	%	(f)	%	(f)	%		
CONTRACT COMPLIANCE												
The Agency provided the Institute with eighty-seven (87) security guards, three (3) Shift Supervisors and one (1) Detachment Commander, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, including Sundays and special holidays.	3	37.50%	4	50.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4.25	Very Satisfactory
The Agency provided an appropriate number of guards for three (3) eight-hour shifts a day.	3	37.50%	3	37.50%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4.13	Very Satisfactory
No guard was made to render more than eight hours per duty/ shift per day by the Agency.	1	12.50%	1	12.50%	4	50.00%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	3.13	Satisfactory
The Agency provided reserved guards (relievers) of not less than 10% the total number of regular guards to avoid excess hours of required duty.	3	37.50%	2	25.00%	2	25.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	3.88	Satisfactory
The guards were licensed, uniformed, bonded and qualified as stipulated in the contract.	1	12.50%	4	50.00%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.75	Satisfactory
The Agency provided firearms, ammunitions, handheld radios, night sticks, flashlights, whistles and other paraphernalia to the Institute.	2	25.00%	3	37.50%	2	25.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	3.75	Satisfactory
The SID Office received a certification from the Agency that all guards assigned to the Institute were paid their wages under the pertinent Wage Orders and Security Laws.	2	25.00%	4	50.00%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4.00	Very Satisfactory
The Agency observed proper monitoring of scheduled posts/security personnel as provided in Section VI of the bidding documents.	1	12.50%	3	37.50%	4	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.63	Satisfactory
The Agency consistently submitted on time concise, accurate, and objective accounts of daily activities and critical incidents.	1	12.50%	2	25.00%	4	50.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	3.38	Satisfactory
The Agency consistently maintained equipment and/or weapons in excellent condition.	1	12.50%	5	62.50%	1	12.50%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	3.75	Satisfactory
The Agency practiced preventive maintenance and reported defective equipment in a timely manner.	1	12.50%	3	37.50%	3	37.50%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	3.50	Satisfactory
Category 1 : Percentage Distribution:	21.59%		38.64%		31.82%		7.95%		0.00%		Average Mean: 3.74	
INTERNAL HOUSE RULES												
All times, extended security and protection to the Institute's personnel, authorized visitors and the personnel's properties within the premises of the campus.	1	12.50%	5	62.50%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.88	Satisfactory
Assigned one (1) security personnel as detachment commander, without additional costs, who was responsible for the 24-hour supervision and monitoring of the guards at the Institute assigned to the Institute.	1	12.50%	5	62.50%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.88	Satisfactory
Ensured and guaranteed that the security guards familiarized themselves with the Institute's officials and personnel and at all times accorded them with the highest respect and authority.	1	12.50%	2	25.00%	4	50.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	3.38	Satisfactory
Through its assigned security guards, extended security and prevented intrusion of unauthorized person(s) within the campus' premises.	1	12.50%	5	62.50%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.88	Satisfactory
Recognized the right of the Institute to set meetings with its officers to advance better service.	2	25.00%	5	62.50%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4.13	Very Satisfactory
Exercised effective administration, control, supervision and inspection through its Shift-in-Charge to prevent any violation, omission and other anomalous acts of the guards on duty.	1	12.50%	5	62.50%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.88	Satisfactory
Did not implement any action which affected the guards' services without the prior knowledge of the Chief Security Officer of the Institute.]	1	12.50%	5	62.50%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.88	Satisfactory
Guaranteed that guards followed regulations, policies and security programs and plans of the Institute.	1	12.50%	5	62.50%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.88	Satisfactory
Guaranteed that guards continuously improve their performance, efficiency, discipline, fitness and preparedness.	0	0.00%	4	50.00%	4	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.50	Satisfactory
Shouldered the responsibility for any indemnification and reparation, to any loss or damage of property, injury or death, if after investigation, that such losses and damages were due to the fault or negligence of the guard on duty.	2	25.00%	5	62.50%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4.13	Very Satisfactory
Gave prior notice to the Institute of any guard replacement and secure its approval prior to actual deployment.	2	25.00%	4	50.00%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4.00	Very Satisfactory
Recognized that the guards were under the supervision and control of the Institute with respect to deployment, work shifts and execution of security plans.	1	12.50%	5	62.50%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.88	Satisfactory
The Agency management at all times, coordinated with the Institute before conducting spot checks or surprise visits to the deployed security guards in order to prevent untoward incidents or misunderstanding between representatives of both parties.	1	12.50%	5	62.50%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.88	Satisfactory
Notified the guards at the time of hiring as to wages and working conditions under which they are employed including wages payables, calculation of wages, periodicity of wage-payment hours, day and placement and any change with respect to any of the mentioned items.	1	12.50%	3	37.50%	4	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.63	Satisfactory
Furnished the Institute a performance bond in the form of any of the following: 5% for cash, certified check, cashier's check, bank draft or irrevocable letter of credit; 10% for bank guarantee; 30% for surety bond or 100% for a foreign government of the approved budget of the contract in Philippine currency.	1	12.50%	5	62.50%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3.88	Satisfactory
Did not subcontract nor assign the security service to another security agency.	0	0.00%	5	62.50%	2	25.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	3.50	Satisfactory
Category 2 : Percentage Distribution:	13.28%		57.03%		28.13%		1.56%		0.00%		Average Mean: 3.82	
AVERAGE PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION:	17.44%		47.83%		29.97%		4.76%		0.00%			
	OVERALL WEIGHTED AVERAGE/NUMERICAL RATING:										3.78	Satisfactory



Performance of the Security Services Provider

As indicated in Table 5, the performance of the security services provider in the two categories—**Provision of Safety and Security and the overall standard of the security personnel**—was rated as **VERY SATISFACTORY**, with an average rating of **4.27** for the second phase of evaluation for Fiscal Year 2024, covering December 2023 to May 2024.

Furthermore, the table shows that most respondents rated the overall performance of the security services provider as **Outstanding**, with an **average percentage distribution of 54%**. This was followed by a **Very Satisfactory** rating at **25.26%**. Only **1.08% of respondents rated the performance as Poor**.

Compliance with the Contract and University's Internal House Rules of the Security Services Provider

As illustrated in Table 5.1, the security services provider's **compliance with both the Contract and the University's Internal House Rules** for the period is rated as **SATISFACTORY**, with an average rating of **3.78**. This rating represents a **decrease from the previous phase's evaluation, which had a rating of 4.09**.

Among the eleven (11) indicators for Contract Compliance and sixteen (16) indicators for Internal House Rules, **only three (3) indicators from each category received a Very Satisfactory rating** from the respondents. Furthermore, the table reveals that **most respondents from the Security and Investigation Division rated the provider's compliance as Very Satisfactory, with an average percentage distribution of 47.83%, followed by Satisfactory at 29.97%**. Notably, **no respondents rated the compliance as Poor (0.00%)**.



Ratings Per Category

The evaluation of the security services provider was conducted on two key aspects:

1. Performance of the Security Personnel

This aspect is divided into two categories:

- ***Provision of Safety and Security:*** This category measures the following:
 1. The ability of security personnel to guide employees and clients to safe processes or procedures within or outside the campus premises.
 2. The performance of duties and responsibilities in maintaining a secure and safe environment.
 3. The expression of professionalism and politeness by the security personnel.
 4. Attention given to addressing security issues and concerns.
 5. The availability of security personnel when their services are required.
 6. The exercise of the University's security and safety policies and protocols by the security personnel.
- ***Overall Standard of the Security Personnel:*** This category assesses:
 1. Alertness/vigilance.
 2. Attitude.
 3. Ability to serve clients' needs.
 4. Honesty and integrity.
 5. Leadership and follow-through.
 6. Communication skills.

2. Compliance with the Contract and the University's Internal House Rules

The results for each of these categories are detailed in Tables 6, 6.1, 7, and 7.1.



**Table 6. Summary of Ratings Per Category
(Average Rating and Weighted Mean)**
Non-SID Evaluation

CATEGORIES	NUMERICAL RATING (Weighted Mean)	ADJECTIVAL RATING	Total Respondents
Provision of Security and Safety	4.31	Very Satisfactory	223
Over-All Standard of the Security Personnel	4.23	Very Satisfactory	
Weighted Average:	4.27	Very Satisfactory	

Table 6 summarizes the ratings per category for the non-SID evaluation:

- **Provision of Safety and Security:** The performance of the security services provider in this category received a numerical rating of **4.31**, which corresponds to a **VERY SATISFACTORY** adjectival rating.
- **Overall Standard of Security Personnel:** This category garnered a numerical rating of **4.23**, also reflecting a **VERY SATISFACTORY** performance.

Combining these ratings, the overall performance of the security services provider is rated as **4.27**, interpreted as **VERY SATISFACTORY**.

**Table 6.1. Summary of Ratings Per Category
(Average Rating and Weighted Mean) | SID Evaluation**

CATEGORIES	NUMERICAL RATING (Weighted Mean)	ADJECTIVAL RATING	Total Respondents
CONTRACT COMPLIANCE	3.74	Satisfactory	8
INTERNAL HOUSE RULES	3.82	Satisfactory	
Weighted Average:	3.78	Satisfactory	

Summary of Ratings for SID's Evaluation (December 2023 to May 2024)

Table 6.1 summarizes the ratings per category for the Security and Investigation Division (SID) evaluation:

- **Contract Compliance:** The performance of the security services provider in terms of contract compliance received a numerical rating of **3.74**, corresponding



to a **SATISFACTORY** adjectival rating. This represents a decrease from the last phase's rating of **4.00**.

- **Compliance with Internal House Rules:** The performance in this category received a numerical rating of **3.82**, also rated as **SATISFACTORY**. This rating has decreased from the previous phase's rating of **4.18**.

Overall, the ratings indicate a decline in compliance performance compared to the previous evaluation phase.

**Table 7. Summary of Ratings Per Category
(Frequency and Percentage Distribution) | Non-SID Evaluation**

CATEGORIES	Outstandin g	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactor y	Unsatisfactor y	Poor
Provision of Security and Safety	55.61%	25.34%	14.50%	4.04%	0.52%
Over-All Standard of Security Personnel	52.39%	25.19%	17.04%	3.74%	1.64%
Average Frequency Distribution:	54.00%	25.26%	15.77%	3.89%	1.08%
Total Respondents					223

Table 7. *Summary of Ratings Per Category (Frequency and Percentage Distribution) for Non-SID Evaluation* shows that **most respondents** rated the security services in terms of the **provision of security and safety** as **Outstanding**, with an average percentage distribution of **55.61%**, followed by **Very Satisfactory**, with an average distribution percentage of **25.34%**. Meanwhile, **0.52%** of the total respondents said that the provision of security services was **Poor**.

The **non-SID respondents rated the overall standard of security personnel as Outstanding**, with an average percentage distribution of **52.39%**. This was followed by **Very Satisfactory**, with an average distribution percentage of **25.19%** among the 223 respondents. Additionally, **1.64% of the respondents rated the overall standard of security personnel as Poor**.

These results reflect a positive perception of the security services among non-SID respondents, with a majority rating the provision of security and safety and the



overall standard of security personnel as Outstanding. However, there is a small percentage indicating dissatisfaction.

**Table 7.1. Summary of Ratings Per Category
(Frequency and Percentage Distribution) | SID Evaluation**

CATEGORIES	Outstanding	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Poor
CONTRACT COMPLIANCE	21.59%	38.64%	31.82%	7.95%	0.00%
INTERNAL HOUSE RULES	13.28%	57.03%	28.13%	1.56%	0.00%
OVERALL AVERAGE RATING:	17.44%	47.83%	29.97%	4.76%	0.00%
Total Respondents					8

Table 7.1. *Summary of Ratings Per Category (Frequency and Percentage Distribution)* for SID Evaluation shows that **most respondents** rated the security services in terms of **contract compliance** as **Very Satisfactory**, with **an average percentage distribution of 38.64%**, followed by **Satisfactory, 31.82%**. Meanwhile, **none or 0%** of the total respondents said that the contract compliance was **Poor**.

On the other hand, the SID respondents rated the **compliance of the internal house rules** category as **Very Satisfactory** with an **average distribution percentage of 57.03%**, followed by **Satisfactory, 28.13%**. Moreover, **none or 0%** have said that the compliance of the internal house rules mentioned was **Poor**.

The results indicate a generally positive perception among SID respondents, with a significant portion rating the compliance with both the contract and internal house rules as Very Satisfactory. There is no indication of Poor ratings in either category.

Combined Results on the Evaluation of Security Services Provider

Table 8 and 9 show the combined results of the two (2) surveys (SID and Non-SID survey), the **average weighted mean** and the **percentage distribution**.

COMBINED RESULTS

Table 8. Weighted Mean

Adjectival Rating	Weighted Mean	Adjectival Rating
RC HEADS, FACULTY & STAFF, STUDENTS & GENERAL PUBLIC	4.27	Very Satisfactory



SECURITY AND INVESTIGATION DIVISION (SID)	3.78	Satisfactory
OVERALL WEIGHTED MEAN:	4.03	Very Satisfactory

The **average weighted mean** of both surveys (SID and Non-SID) is **4.03** with an adjectival rating of **VERY SATISFACTORY**. This means that the security services provider **met the expectations** of the University.

Table 9. Percentage Distribution

ADJECTIVAL RATING	RE HEADS, FACULTY & STAFF, & STUDENTS	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATION DIVISION (SID)	COMBINED AVERAGE
Outstanding	54.00%	17.44%	35.72%
Very Satisfactory	25.26%	47.83%	36.55%
Satisfactory	15.77%	29.97%	22.87%
Unsatisfactory	3.89%	4.76%	4.32%
Poor	1.08%	0.00%	0.54%

With the percentage distribution, majority of the **non-SID respondents said that the security services were Outstanding**, while majority of the **SID respondents said that services provided were Very Satisfactory**. This leads to an **average percentage distribution of Outstanding**.

The combined survey results show that:

- The **Provision of Safety and Security** and the **Overall Standard of Security Personnel** both achieved an average rating of **4.27**, indicating a **Very Satisfactory performance**, with **most respondents** rating these aspects as **Outstanding**.
- **Contract Compliance and Compliance with Internal House Rules** both received an average rating of **3.78**, reflecting a **Satisfactory performance**. **Most respondents** rated these aspects as **Very Satisfactory**, with **no Poor ratings reported**.

**Table 10. Raw Comments/Suggestions from the Respondents**

The raw comments and suggestions collected from both surveys (SID and Non-SID) were categorized into two main aspects: the **Character/Personality** exhibited by the security personnel, and their **Performance of Duties and Responsibilities** during the period from December 2023 to May 2024.

These comments pertain to both internal (MSU-IIT) and external (Double Tap Security Agency, Inc.) security personnel of the University. Therefore, **they address issues across all security staff, not just one group**. The table below includes only those comments and suggestions that require urgent action.

Table 10. Raw Comments/Suggestions/Issues (Non-SID Survey)

COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS/ISSUES	Category
-New security guards should not be assigned in the main entrance gate to avoid traffic. -Security guards should be especially alert watching near the traffic light inside the campus since students still cross the pedestrian even during stop signs. They should avoid chitchatting with other guards while on duty on those posts to effectively man the traffic lights. -There should be relievers in posts where guards have to do their religious duties (sambayang) so there are still guards to call in emergencies. Its difficult to call any security guards from nearby vicinities (COE, GYM, CED) at 6pm onwards.	Duties and Responsibilities
In my almost 15 months in the campus, I can say that the securities assigned at the entrance of the institute has changed a lot, especially to the security at the male section. I observed that they are no longer checking the bag of the students properly and sometimes they just let you pass as long as they see you wearing your ID. In my own perception, it feels like they disregarded the effort of the students who already opened their bag yet being rejected and that is one of the reasons why I decided to answer this form. Another reason is the possibility of other risks, maybe one of the students is bringing a gun, knife, or any other harmful materials that has a bad intention. With that, the only way was to check each of our bag properly to avoid the mentioned risks and to execute proper security.	Duties and Responsibilities
Please provide a more high tech entry for ids ie electronic scanning like a barcode. Other universities use it to avoid unidentified entry and a more safe space for students. Also the guards are not well informed of their duties including traffic rules and regulation. Monitoring positions and routes also the guidelines of the institution.	Duties and Responsibilities
They don't check our bags properly, and for me I find it very important for the safety of all students and faculties inside the campus. they should be thorough in checking the bags of the students, staff and faculties as well. Please take my suggestion, Thankyou. over all the security team were good and approachable. Good Job	Duties and Responsibilities
Security needs to assist driver when parking a car.	Duties and Responsibilities
Most of the guards are nice but there are still some of them are really rude and impolite. The other day, my classmate changed his clothes and forgot to re-wear his I.D but the this one guard shouted and called him out to the point that the students around us were watching. We gave our reasons and stuff (because the room we just had our lecture in was hot and the AC was off that's why he changed clothes and forgot the ID) but the guard grabbed the I.D, scolded, raised his voice and even pointed his finger on my friends face and then confiscated the ID. We are already tired, stressed, pressured and mentally unstable because of the academic struggles we are facing. We do not need people who would further increase the stress we are	Character/Personality



feeling. I know that they're just doing their job but surely, there are so many other ways to call someone out without humiliating them.

I just want to address this personal concern as a student. One time, we encountered a guard who was assigned to the main entrance. We were already inside with a very small bag; we were holding it more like a wallet bag (this happened before the bombing in MSU-MAIN, and we understand how strict it was now). His attitude towards us is so disrespectful, since we already knew that a very small bag or a wallet would not be checked because it's just too personal, and that guard didn't even approach us in a low tone or in an approachable manner; instead, he reprimanded us with a loud voice. Additionally, he even questioned why we were wearing slippers. Like, we have been here at MSU-IIT for almost 3 years, and wearing anything that you want is applicable from head to toe, and it's not even considered a slipper; it's a sandal. For his information, doesn't he know what the difference is between a slipper and a sandal? One time also, one of my blockmate borrowed a lab gown to use in their lab subject, so she needs to give her ID to the assigned person of those things to secure that the lab gown will be returned after being used. One guard saw us, especially my blockmate, who's not wearing her ID because of the said reason. We explained it to him, but he wouldn't buy our reason; instead, he said that my blockmate should wear her ID and how she entered the campus without the ID (he even accused us of entering the campus by faking or using an ID we didn't own). After a few minutes, he came back again and raised his voice at us, telling us, "Wala mo kadungog sa akong giigong ganina?" and etc. with a loud voice. That was just so disrespectful, knowing that we have a valid reason. I believe that guards are doing their job attentively, especially in times of need. But I am hoping for the development of some guards who've got a very negative attitude.

Character/Personality

Most of them are homophobic; they have to realize that most of the staff are now in mid-20's.

Character/Personality

need to educate/teach/inform (SOME) security personnel of proper decorum in communicating information/instructions from the head of SIDS regarding, for example, stickers or entry of students or faculty to the campus. but kudos to other security personnel who are really doing their job, as expected from them. salamat.

Duties and Responsibilities

That one guard on the entrance gate should not approach students with rudeness and inappropriate attitude as the students know how to respect and communicate well if that one guard would also give the same respect.

Character/Personality

No proper trainings

Duties and Responsibilities

Ensure security personnel receive effective and courteous communication training, emphasizing that cultural differences should not serve as an excuse for improper behavior.

Character/Personality

Generally, the guards are doing well as observed, they may be strict but that just means they are following their protocols, it's for everyone's safety so overall good :)). However there are instances when i personally think some may need to undergo gender sensitivity training/lecture. I do not wanna delve into personal experience/encounters but please tell them to not joke around people's preferred pronouns or preferred gender expression.

Character/Personality

This response is not applicable to all security personnel, some able manifests outstanding character yet some shows superiority especially if ID's were left home. maybe the ADMIN can able to make a initiative regarding this concern

Character/Personality



Per observation:

1. All of them are doing well to their assigned tasks.
2. Most of the them give snappy salutes to those who are riding in 4 wheel vehicle services but did not do the same to those who are riding in motorcycle services.
3. Some of them, assigned at the pedestrian lane, would directly come in front of a rolling vehicles then signal to stop. Pwede ra man siguro sa kilid sa road lang mosignal.
4. Clients are strictly directed to turn right before KTTO BUILDING from morning until 4 pm (no question about that) but some of the security personnel and their friends can easily go straight ahead to the guard house to exit anytime.
5. Many of them are polite and courteous.
6. Some of them ask unnecessary questions to some riding clients even if there are vehicle gate pass sticker and school ID, but they did do the same to others.

Character/Personality

Morning Guards are very polite, i don't know what happened to the afternoon guards maybe because of the heat or what, they be really mean sometimes and became unprofessional, but kudos to all kuya/ate guards who always greet us while entering and leaving the campus. Keep it up po mga Sir and Ma'am!

Character/Personality

Guard/s at entrance keeps asking unnecessary question while inspecting my id (note that my id is clearly visible face, id number, course, etc.). Like what I do in the school during Saturdays (I have Saturday classes, its not like we are in elementary with free weekends) and other stuff. I thought I only need to present my ID and be on my way. Normally I just answer these questions but quite bothersome sometimes since I am already late for my class. This happens during weekdays too.

Character/Personality

Also I would suggest especially the gate guards to greet people at least a good morning and not a grumpy face.

I appreciate all the security personnel. However, there are instances when they become discourteous and impolite. Their tone of voice can be scary and rude, which makes me feel terrified.

Character/Personality

I encountered several times securities with bad attitude and using their position as security to scare, insult or even raise their voice (kahit di naman kailangan) to the students.

Character/Personality

I wanted to raise my concern especially to that security personnel who's in-charge of monitoring the staffs in going-out to the campus during work hours. I feel harassed and disrespected when he calls me, as he always uses the word "HOY!" repeatedly or sometimes do the "psst psst HOYY!" it looks like his trying to call a dog, something like that. It's very unprofessional knowing his working from a prestigious University, a world-class Institute to be exact.. Is it that hard to approach the staffs and other admin personnel's by calling "Excuse me Ma'am/Sir"? And, I suspect he may have a grudge against me, possibly due to my gender or the fact that I am part of the LGBT community. Others have also experienced similar harassment and do not feel safe or respected. I hope you take disciplinary action because a guard or security personnel should ensure the safety of students and staff, not harass them. Please hide my identity for my own safety. Thank you.

Character/Personality

I suggest for the staff to be more kind because kindness is free. Everyone has their own battle both staffs, faculties, students, etc. I just have this bad encounter of this specific young lady guard in my lowest point in 3rd yr. I hope she realized that she's a little mean and could've more kinder in approaching us student. I hope she learned her lesson. Character development is free.

Character/Personality

Table 10 presents the **unedited comments and suggestions** from the survey respondents. Although the security services provider received a Very Satisfactory performance rating for the period from December 2023 to May 2024, the feedback from the 223 respondents indicates several areas needing attention, which



should be monitored by the Security and Investigation Division (SID) of the University, pertain to:

- The attitude, character, and personality of the security personnel.
- The performance of the duties and responsibilities of the security personnel.

Table 10.1 Raw Comments/Suggestions/Issues (SID Survey)

COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS/ISSUES	Category
Right now, there are still guards on duty who still need to improve their services particularly in handling visitors..	Contract Compliance
Some guards reported late to their duties. Other posts particularly at the Hinaplanon Site were found scattered cigarette butts. Many guards did not deposited their cellphones at the Assistant Shift In-Charge during their tour of duty despite of the memorandum issued by the Agency and SID stated that All Cellphones should be deposited at the ASIC.	Contract Compliance
In every renewal of contract the agency shall assured that all equipments should be in all good condition, particularly the handheld Icom radios, several of which were defective. Procurement of new equipments (with quality) to replace the old ones to prevent/mitigate downgrading the effectiveness of their duties and responsibilities which were already occurred.	Contract Compliance
The number of guards provided is 83 including the three shift supervisors and 1 detachment commander.	Contract Compliance
Excellent. However, the management of agency guards should perform their monitoring and inspection thoroughly as it is mandated to the contract. Clearly, upgrading to their guards duties and responsibilities performances including their equipments is really necessity.	Internal House Rules
The agency should have training programs to continuously improve performance, efficiency, discipline, fitness, and preparedness of the security guards.	Internal House Rules
Other guard need to familiarise the INSTITUTE OFFICIAL	Internal House Rules

Table 10.1 presents comments from the evaluation survey conducted among the eight (8) personnel from the Security and Investigation Division (SID). The comments **highlight several issues and concerns regarding the performance of security guards** from Double Tap Security Agency, Inc. Notably, the issue of **defective handheld radios persists, which was also raised during the second phase of the 2023 evaluation**. Additionally, concerns were reported about **security guards assigned to the Hinaplanon Campus violating University policies and the contract agreement with the Agency**.



Recommendations

Based on the survey results, the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation recommends the following actions:

1. Addressing Security Personnel Attitude and Behavior

- **Communication and Expectations:** The Agency (Double Tap) should clearly communicate expected behavior and attitudes to security guards, ensuring they respect University officials and personnel at all times, as outlined in the Contract Agreement (Item No. 6, Article I). Regular reminders during pep talks or meetings can help reinforce these expectations.
- **Orientation and Training:** Provide orientation for new security personnel on University regulations and security policies (Item No. 13, Article I of the Contract Agreement). Ongoing training on customer service, communication skills, and conflict resolution is recommended. Regular refresher courses on attitude and values formation should be offered.
- **Supportive Environment:** Recognize and reward positive behavior among security guards with both monetary and non-monetary incentives. Promote open communication to address concerns and frustrations.
- **Performance Reviews:** Conduct regular performance reviews to provide constructive feedback and track improvements.
- **Addressing Issues:** Promptly address incidents of negative conduct and implement disciplinary measures when necessary, following University policies and the Contract Agreement.
- **Mentorship:** Pair less experienced security guards with seasoned professionals to model positive behavior and provide support.
- **Working Conditions:** Ensure fair schedules, adequate breaks, and resources to support security guards' well-being.



- **Consistent Communication:** Hold regular meetings with security guards to discuss performance, policy updates, and any issues. Set meetings between the SID and the Agency to discuss performance and other concerns.
- **Professional Development:** Offer opportunities for professional growth and career advancement to enhance skills and job satisfaction.

2. Improving Security Procedures

- **Bag Checks:** Ensure thorough checks of individuals' bags to enhance safety and security. The Agency must exercise effective administration and supervision to prevent violations (Item No. 5, Article I of the Contract Agreement).
- **Metal Detectors:** Ensure that five functional metal detectors are provided and used, as required by the Contract Agreement (Item 6, C. Other Equipment, Item No. 4 Article I). The SID should request an explanation from the Agency for non-compliance and impose penalties if necessary.
- **Defective Equipment:** Replace defective handheld radios immediately. The SID should provide feedback on equipment issues and report non-compliances.

3. Addressing Gender Sensitivity and Cultural Bias

- **Training Programs:** Implement training programs to address gender insensitivity and cultural biases among security guards. Training in proper communication and cultural sensitivity is essential.

4. Ensuring Security Guard Visibility and Shifts

- **Regular Inspections:** Conduct regular inspections to ensure security guards are present at their assigned stations. Implement and enforce policies for relieving and shifting to manage emergencies.



- **Performance Monitoring:** The Agency should monitor performance regularly and provide the SID with reports on these activities.

5. Traffic Management Training

- **Parking and Traffic Management:** Provide training on traffic management and University parking policies to security guards.

6. Addressing Issues at Hinaplanon Campus

- **Supervision and Monitoring:** Designate a supervisor to regularly inspect the Hinaplanon Campus. Record and report inspection activities to ensure accountability.

7. Report Distribution and Follow-Up

- **Report Discussion:** The SID should provide Double Tap Security, Inc. with a copy of this report and discuss the evaluation results with the agency's head or representative.

8. Action Plan and Compliance

- **Written Report:** The Double Tap Security Agency should submit a written report on actions taken to address issues. The SID should validate these actions and submit a report on compliance within thirty (30) days to the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation.

Based on these recommendations, the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation suggests that the **Bids and Awards Committee (BAC)** and the **Procurement Management Division (PMD)** consider Double Tap Security Agency, Inc.'s participation in the next bidding cycle, subject to the implementation of all recommended actions and interventions.



Prepared by:

A blue ink signature of the name "Mark June L. Aporador".

MARK JUNE L. APORADOR, MBA

Project Development Officer III

Office of Monitoring and Evaluation

Reviewed and verified by:

A blue ink signature of the name "Melgie A. Alas".

MELGIE A. ALAS, MMBM, PGDSDS

Director, Office of Monitoring and Evaluation