Security Survey Results

1. Survey Methodology

Following student discussion of the security changes made starting summer 2013, this survey was written and administered by Matthew Davis and Phoebe Whitwell, the Dormitory Council Housing Chairs for 2014-2015. The survey opened on December 1, 2014, and was closed on December 15, 2014. During that time, it received over 1,000 responses. Mid-way through the time during which the survey was open, a small Techcash reward (to be awarded to four randomly selected survey participants) was offered to incentivize survey participation. On December 1, the survey was sent individually to each large dormitory social list, as well as to undergrads@mit.edu (by the UA president) and to the Panhellenic Association (by the Panhel president). There was a second email sent to each dorm social list on December 10 when the incentive was announced. The survey responses were validated by confirmation that each response included a valid kerberos account attached to it. These kerberos accounts were used only to verify the validity of the survey response and was not associated with the content of the response in any analysis.

At the time of the survey opening, it had not been reviewed by Institutional Research as it was determined that the issue was time-sensitive enough to warrant quick survey release. Before constructing this report, Matthew and Phoebe met with Jagruti Patel from IR to discuss the questions that might have been misleading, thereby providing inaccurate survey results, as well as the best ways to analyze the data. She pointed out that in many questions, the “Neutral” response is very large, which is probably due to people using “Neutral” as a “N/A” answer (no “N/A” option was provided.) She also pointed out where some wording was unclear, such as the definition of an “event” for questions 13-15 and the definition of “MIT culture” in question 21. Additionally, Ms. Patel suggested that in future surveys, statements in agree/disagree ranges should be mixed positive and negative, rather than all positive as seen here. In the future, we would certainly incorporate Ms. Patel’s suggestions, and we would like to thank her sincerely here for working with us.

2. Total Results

1. Kerberos of participants (not included here; requested only to ensure that participants were valid MIT students or staff and were not answering more than once)
2. **Class Year**
   - Freshmen: 29%
   - Sophomore: 24%
   - Junior: 23%
   - Senior: 20%
   - Undergraduate, >senior: 2%
   - Graduate: 2%
   - Housemaster: 0.354%
   - **Total**: 1,131

3. **Residence**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dormitory</th>
<th>Percent Survey Responses</th>
<th>Percent Residents of that Dorm*</th>
<th># Dorm Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton-Conner</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maseeh</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacGregor</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New House</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next House</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior House</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSILG</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus/Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>31%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*based on resident numbers found on Housing website

4. **International Students**
   - International: 7%

5. **Gender**
   - Male: 40%
   - Female: 57%
   - Other/Prefer not to disclose: 3%

6. **Student Desk Workers**
   - Desk workers: 11%
7. **Experience with professional security workers**
A professional security worker makes me feel safe.

A professional security worker makes me feel comfortable.

A professional security worker promotes a positive atmosphere.

A professional security worker is helpful in understanding security policies.

Of 397 distinct responses, 18% were clearly positive towards professional security workers. The most common positive descriptors were “friendly” and “polite”. 2% of total responses described security workers as increasing safety or “necessary”. 20% of responses were neutral, with common descriptors being “formal” (4% of total responses), “fine” or “neutral” (7% of total responses), and “distant”. 60% of total responses were clearly negative to varying degrees. 11% of total responses described security workers as “unnecessary”, while 8% described security workers as “obstructive” or otherwise
complained about the time spent checking in with the security worker and 7% described security workers as “rude” or otherwise “unprofessional”. A further 7% said they were frustrated or annoyed by security workers, while 6% of total responses went to each of the following descriptive categories: “incompetent” or “unprepared”; “awkward” or “uncomfortable”; and “uncaring”, “unfriendly”, or “unhelpful”.

Please write any comments you have about professional security workers.

There were 405 distinct responses to this question. As many responses covered more than one topic, and some responses were irrelevant (ie. when the student had no interactions with security workers), it is difficult to present accurate percentages and therefore none are included in this version of the analysis. Both positive and negative feedback of interactions with individual security worker were common, though there was more positive feedback for individual workers overall. Many people also expressed that whether the security experience was positive or negative varied greatly by the individual worker. Some students reported inappropriate conduct from individual security workers, such as harassment or undue meanness, or felt that certain of them did not perform competently.

The most common feedback not regarding individual workers was that the presence of the security workers seems unnecessary and doesn’t add anything to the way that the security was run before. Many students also noted that the security workers should be better informed about the security policies as well as the idiosyncrasies of MIT dorm culture, and that many security workers are overly strict, enforcing the rules no matter the circumstances (i.e. not letting student EMTs responding to a call into the building, or, in a less extreme example, not letting a student who had forgotten their ID back in after they had just observed the student exiting the building as a resident.) However, many responses noted that the over-adherence to policy was less due to individual workers being over-zealous and more due to the strictness of the policy itself and the desire of the workers not to lose their jobs.

Many responses proposed that it would be better to trust security to MIT employees or students rather than outside contractors and that the presence of the security workers interrupts the home-like environment of the dorms. Some responses noted that it is reassuring to have professionals in the dorms to enforce security policies, while others observed that the security policies can be confusing to students, that often security workers and student desk workers do not cooperate well with each other, that there is a lot of inconsistency in the enforcement of the rules from building to building and security worker to security worker, and that having a consistent security worker for each building who is a good fit for that building is important.

- “I appreciate how the security workers are all female in McCormick. There is one nighttime security worker who is super friendly!”
- “They are generally kind and helpful people, but it's not clear to me that their presence makes any impact on dorm security. The process of checking in a non MIT guest every single time they enter
the building is annoying enough that I simply have my guest continue walking past the front desk, and 50% of the time, they are not asked to check in.”

- “When working desk, some of the security workers will comment about what I’m doing. It’s really uncomfortable to know they’re looking over my shoulder and paying attention to what I’m doing when I work desk.”
- “Despite having set exceptions allowing for [religious Jews on the Sabbath] to get into the dorm without their ID, the professional security worker will ignore the policy, which is incredibly difficult to deal with.”
- “The fact that they are not permitted to even leave the desk shows their inefficacy to possibly avert a threat in the dormitory...not once have I seen a security worker have to deny someone entrance, or deal with an unauthorized person.”

10. Experience with Security Cameras

A security camera makes me feel safe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very True</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat True</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat False</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very False</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A security camera makes me feel comfortable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very True</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat True</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat False</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very False</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am comfortable with outside security cameras at entrances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very True</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat True</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat False</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very False</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am comfortable with outside security cameras in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very True</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat True</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat False</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very False</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am comfortable with indoor security cameras at entrances.
- Very True: 7%
- True: 17%
- Somewhat True: 14%
- Neutral: 14%
- Somewhat False: 14%
- False: 13%
- Very False: 21%

I am comfortable with indoor security cameras in general.
- Very True: 3%
- True: 6%
- Somewhat True: 8%
- Neutral: 12%
- Somewhat False: 17%
- False: 18%
- Very False: 36%

I am comfortable with security camera footage being stored indefinitely.
- Very True: 2%
- True: 7%
- Somewhat True: 9%
- Neutral: 11%
- Somewhat False: 15%
- False: 15%
- Very False: 41%

I am comfortable with security camera footage being stored for two weeks.
- Very True: 6%
- True: 18%
- Somewhat True: 22%
- Neutral: 19%
- Somewhat False: 12%
- False: 11%
- Very False: 12%

I am comfortable with security camera footage being accessed by MIT for administrative purposes.
- Very True: 4%
- True: 9%
- Somewhat True: 11%
- Neutral: 15%
- Somewhat False: 14%
- False: 15%
- Very False: 33%
I am comfortable with security camera footage being accessed by MIT for police purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very True</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat True</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat False</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very False</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Answering: 930

11. Experience with Security Cameras

There was a total of 332 text responses to this question. In general, comments regarding security cameras ranged from neutral to very negative, with many students expressing concerns about the idea of security cameras in general. In total, there were 14 overtly positive comments about security cameras.

Most student comments concerned one of the following:

- Desire to know where the security cameras are in a dorm;
- Concern about invasion of privacy;
- Concern with having cameras inside the dormitory;
- Concern with having cameras in public places, such as lounges;
- Concern with cameras viewing more than the door they are pointing at;
- Concern with cameras not being able to catch crime, or, when a crime is committed, not being accessible;
- Concern with the storage of film, specifically, there is no guarantee that film is destroyed after two weeks;
- Concern with who has access to footage, and whether this can be abused by others;
- Concern with overall transparency with the use of security cameras, requests for footage, and storage of film;
- Requests for cameras to look at bike racks.

12. Do you host events in your dormitory?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Answering: 938
13. **Effect on Event Planning**

Security policies are clear for events.
- Very True/True/Somewhat True 31%
- Neutral 22%
- Somewhat False/False/Very False 47%

I know who to contact with questions regarding security and events.
- Very True/True/Somewhat True 33%
- Neutral 18%
- Somewhat False/False/Very False 49%

Professional security workers are responsive to my event needs.
- Very True/True/Somewhat True 18%
- Neutral 51%
- Somewhat False/False/Very False 31%

Professional security workers treat guests respectfully.
- Very True/True/Somewhat True 33%
- Neutral 40%
- Somewhat False/False/Very False 27%

15. **Effect on Event Planning (text responses)**

16. **Visiting Dormitories**

How often do you visit dormitories other than your own?
- Very Often 19%
- Often 22%
- Sometimes 51%
- Never 8%

How often do you attend formal events at other dormitories?
- Very Often 2%
- Often 7%
- Sometimes 45%
- Never 46%

17. **Reasons for Visiting Dormitories (text response)**

18. For each dormitory for which you are on a guest list or frequently visit, please indicate your experience entering as a guest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dormitory</th>
<th>Frequent Visitors</th>
<th>Average Response*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>2.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton-Conner</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>2.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacGregor</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>2.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maseeh</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>2.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>2.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Please indicate your level of familiarity with each of the following.

Guest Policy
- Very Familiar: 26%
- Somewhat Familiar: 41%
- Know of it, not where to find it: 26%
- Unfamiliar: 8%

Event Policy
- Very Familiar: 7%
- Somewhat Familiar: 27%
- Know of it, not where to find it: 38%
- Unfamiliar: 27%

Security Policy
- Very Familiar: 8%
- Somewhat Familiar: 27%
- Know of it, not where to find it: 36%
- Unfamiliar: 29%

Security Camera Policy
- Very Familiar: 7%
- Somewhat Familiar: 12%
- Know of it, not where to find it: 36%
- Unfamiliar: 49%

20. Please indicate your level of satisfaction with each of the following.

Guest Policy
- Very Satisfied/Satisfied/Somewhat Satisfied: 39%
- Neutral: 11%
- Somewhat Unsatisfied/Unsatisfied/Very Unsatisfied: 50%

Event Policy
- Very Satisfied/Satisfied/Somewhat Satisfied: 23%
- Neutral: 38%
- Somewhat Unsatisfied/Unsatisfied/Very Unsatisfied: 40%

Security Policy
- Very Satisfied/Satisfied/Somewhat Satisfied: 18%
- Neutral: 25%
- Somewhat Unsatisfied/Unsatisfied/Very Unsatisfied: 57%
Security Camera Policy

Very Satisfied/Satisfied/Somewhat Satisfied 14%
Neutral 24%
Somewhat Unsatisfied/Unsatisfied/Very Unsatisfied 61%

21. **Response to Potential Changes to Security**

Allied Barton workers answering security questions.

Very Positive/Positive/Somewhat Positive 44%
Neutral 39%
Somewhat Negative/Negative/Very Negative 17%

Allied Barton workers receiving additional training on MIT culture.

Very Positive/Positive/Somewhat Positive 76%
Neutral 16%
Somewhat Negative/Negative/Very Negative 7%

Reworking guest policy with dorm governments and relevant administrators

Very Positive/Positive/Somewhat Positive 83%
Neutral 14%
Somewhat Negative/Negative/Very Negative 3%

Reworking security policy with dorm governments and relevant administrators

Very Positive/Positive/Somewhat Positive 82%
Neutral 15%
Somewhat Negative/Negative/Very Negative 4%

Reworking security camera policy with dorm governments and relevant administrators

Very Positive/Positive/Somewhat Positive 78%
Neutral 19%
Somewhat Negative/Negative/Very Negative 4%

Reworking event policy with dorm governments and relevant administrators

Very Positive/Positive/Somewhat Positive 71%
Neutral 26%
Somewhat Negative/Negative/Very Negative 3%

Removal of Allied Barton security workers and replacing them with a student deskworker

Very Positive/Positive/Somewhat Positive 62%
Neutral 16%
Somewhat Negative/Negative/Very Negative 23%

Removal of Allied Barton security and replacing them with MIT staff (ie Nightwatch)

Very Positive/Positive/Somewhat Positive 52%
Neutral 24%
Somewhat Negative/Negative/Very Negative 24%

Installing additional security cameras

Very Positive/Positive/Somewhat Positive 13%
Neutral 22%
Somewhat Negative/Negative/Very Negative 65%
Reducing existing number of security cameras
  Very Positive/Positive/Somewhat Positive 55%
  Neutral 32%
  Somewhat Negative/Negative/Very Negative 12%

Implementing an institute committee on security policies and changes
  Very Positive/Positive/Somewhat Positive 61%
  Neutral 29%
  Somewhat Negative/Negative/Very Negative 10%

Allowing access to additional doors
  Very Positive/Positive/Somewhat Positive 82%
  Neutral 13%
  Somewhat Negative/Negative/Very Negative 5%

22. Additional Ideas for Improving Security (text response)
   There were 159 distinct responses to this question. Common suggestions are listed below in order of much people suggested them:
   ● Allow access via additional doors
   ● Remove Allied-Barton workers and replace with MIT staff or student deskworkers
   ● More student participation in decision processes and policy drafting
   ● Varied guest list suggestions, many specific to individual dorms
   ● Remove all security changes made in the last two years
   ● Tailor security to individual dorms
   ● Remove cameras (all cameras or just inside cameras, depending)
   ● Automate guest list system
   ● Grant any MIT undergraduate access to any dorm
   ● Stricter guest policy for parents
   ● Give security workers the freedom to use their judgment/discretion and relax strict guidelines
   ● Standardize guest policy across dorms
   ● Clarify guest policies for events
   ● Remove time restrictions on guests
   ● Make policies easier to find
   ● Implement formal complaint system

23. Additional Comments (text response)
   There were 110 distinct responses to this question. Most comments focused on the following four areas, listed in order of decreasing magnitude:
   ● Dissatisfaction with current guest list policies, ranging from not being able to enter after 12AM, to the lack of consistency between dormitories;
   ● Concern with the placement of security cameras inside dormitories, and recommendations to place cameras outside the dormitory;
   ● Concern with inconsistent application of security policies by Allied Barton security workers.