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Physical Security Lab

**Lab Purpose (In Your Own Words)**

The goal of this lab was to introduce us to the fundamentals of physical security through a hands-on audit of a building. It encouraged us to adopt a more security-conscious perspective while evaluating real-world vulnerabilities. Working alongside Ethan, we collaborated to efficiently survey the premises and gather insights by speaking with a few staff members on-site. The teamwork aspect allowed us to divide tasks and explore more areas in less time, making the process both thorough and engaging.

**Tools & Resources Required**

* Microsoft Word was used to document observations, organize findings, and compile the final audit report in a clear and professional format.
* My Legs served as the primary mode of transportation throughout the building—essential for physically navigating different areas, checking entrances, exits, and blind spots.
* My Eyes were critical for visually inspecting security features (or lack thereof), identifying surveillance cameras, and spotting potential vulnerabilities in the building layout.
* Team Collaboration: Partnering with Cameron allowed for broader coverage and faster data collection, as well as exchanging insights and verifying observations.
* On-Site Interviews: Brief conversations with building staff provided context about security procedures, door locking schedules, and general awareness of safety protocols.
* Personal experience

**Lab Procedures (Minimum of 1 Page)**

For my physical security audit, I selected the Brinkley Center—a building I’m quite familiar with and have long had concerns about. One of the first things I noticed was the main entrance near the parking garage, which features handicap-accessible buttons to automatically open the doors. While the doors are equipped with locks, there are no additional security measures such as guards or access control systems in place.

Throughout the building, there appears to be minimal deterrence against unauthorized access. I was able to walk freely without being questioned or stopped, and the only surveillance present consists of a few security cameras. Even these are sparsely placed, making it relatively easy for someone to avoid detection by wearing a mask or simply blending in with casual attire.

Multiple exterior doors are located on both the first and second floors. Based on my observations and conversations with staff, most of these doors are locked manually at certain times of day, with only two being automatically secured. This reliance on manual locking introduces the risk of human error—one forgotten door could compromise the entire building’s security.

Emergency exits are clearly marked and easily accessible, which is a positive aspect. However, in the rear section of the building where faculty offices are located, many offices currently lack doors due to ongoing renovations. One professor has opted for a curtain, but this setup leaves sensitive areas vulnerable to intrusion and tampering.

Another point of concern is the skybridge connecting the Brinkley Center to the Carnage Hotel. Even if Brinkley’s exterior doors are locked, someone could potentially gain access via the hotel. Additionally, trash bins around the building are unsecured, and while some offices contain shredders, there’s little protection against information theft from discarded materials.

To improve security, I recommend installing keycard access or a password-protected entry system at all main doors. Renovations in the faculty office area should be completed promptly, with proper doors installed to safeguard personal and institutional property. Increasing the number of surveillance cameras—especially in interior corridors and secondary entrances—would also enhance monitoring capabilities. Finally, automating more of the door locks would reduce dependence on custodial staff and minimize the risk of oversight.

**Observations (Minimum of ½ a Page)**

The Brinkley Center lacks adequate security measures, which raises broader concerns about the safety of other campus buildings—especially older ones. Despite its relatively modern design, Brinkley falls short in key areas of physical security. Many of the individuals working in the building seem unaware of basic security details, such as the number and placement of surveillance cameras.

It’s surprising that Brinkley, with its updated infrastructure, still doesn’t utilize keycard access systems, especially when other modern buildings like the Culp Center have implemented multiple layers of security, including locked doors and advanced access controls.

Overall, Brinkley’s security is weak but could be significantly improved with relatively simple upgrades—particularly to the entry points. The limited number of cameras creates numerous blind spots, making it disturbingly easy for someone to walk off with something valuable, like a laptop, without being noticed.

Introducing patrolling security personnel could serve as a strong deterrent to potential misconduct, even if incidents are currently rare. While I haven’t personally witnessed or heard of any serious security breaches in Brinkley, recent tragic events at other institutions across the country highlight the importance of proactive safety measures. It’s my hope that enhancements like keycard systems, increased surveillance, and better awareness among staff will be considered and implemented in the near future.

