

SECURITY MANAGEMENT ACROSS MULTI-CAMPUS PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES: PROFESSIONALISM, POLICY GAPS, AND GOVERNANCE IMPLICATIONS IN GHANA THE CASE OF PRESBYTERIAN UNIVERSITY, GHANA

Kingsley Kumi Yeboah^{1*}, Ivy Marian Mensah², Joyce Asantewaa Yeboah², Nancy Ayongo Odoi Opong² & Linda Brago Bonsu³

^{*1,2,2}Presbyterian University, Ghana. P. O. Box 59. Abetifi Kwahu

²University of Environment and Sustainable Development, PMB Somanya

³Abetifi Presbyterian College of Education P. O. Box AT 19. Abetifi Kwahu

Corresponding Author: Kingsley Kumi Yeboah

Presbyterian University, Ghana. P. O. Box 59. Abetifi Kwahu

Article History

Received: 20 / 03 / 2026

Accepted: 22 / 04 / 2026

Published: 06 / 05 / 2026

Abstract: Security management in multi-campus private universities presents unique challenges due to decentralised operations, campus diversification, and the need to balance safety with academic freedom. This paper explores professionalism, policy gaps, and governance implications in security management at Presbyterian University, Ghana (PUG), a multi-campus private institution. Using a qualitative case study design, data were collected through document analysis, semi-structured interviews with campus security staff and administrators, and literature review. Findings reveal significant gaps in formal security policies, inconsistent professional practices, and governance ambiguities across campuses, which undermine security operations and risk management effectiveness. The study recommends standardised security policies, professional training systems, integrated governance structures, and stakeholder engagement mechanisms. These findings have practical implications for administrators, policymakers, and security practitioners in Ghanaian private higher education and similar contexts.

Keywords: Security management, governance, policy gaps, private universities, multi-campus, Ghana.

How to Cite in APA format: Yeboah, K. K., Mensah, I. M., Yeboah, J. A., Opong, N. A. O. & Bonsu, L. B. (2026). SECURITY MANAGEMENT ACROSS MULTI-CAMPUS PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES: PROFESSIONALISM, POLICY GAPS, AND GOVERNANCE IMPLICATIONS IN GHANA THE CASE OF PRESBYTERIAN UNIVERSITY, GHANA. *IRASS Journal of Economics and Business Management*. 3(5), 14-19.

Introduction

The proliferation of private universities in Ghana has created complex security management environments. Multi-campus institutions face challenges in resource distribution, security personnel professionalisation, policy uniformity, and governance coordination (Dinye, 2023 .; Asante & Loglo, 2024 .). Security of students, staff, and property is vital not only for institutional reputation but also for compliance with national regulatory and accreditation requirements. Presbyterian University, Ghana (PUG), chartered in 2022, operates multiple campuses across regions including Abetifi-Okwahu, Kumasi, Tema, and Akuapem. Multi-campus operations increase governance complexity, and decentralised security management can result in inconsistent practices, policy gaps, and risks to people and infrastructure (Duodu, 2024 .).

This study addresses the following research questions:

1. What is the security management structure across PUG campuses?
2. What professional standards govern security personnel, and what are the gaps?
3. How do governance structures affect security management effectiveness?

4. How can policy consistency, professionalism, and governance be enhanced in multi-campus security management?

Literature Review

Security Management in Higher Education

Security management in higher education institutions (HEIs) has evolved into a multidimensional governance function encompassing institutional resilience, risk governance, and crisis preparedness. Effective security management includes systematic risk assessment, policy development, staff training, surveillance and access control, and emergency prevention programmes (Saeed & Abbas, 2022 .). These elements are critical given the open nature of campuses, high population density, and diverse daily activities. Modern research emphasises that campus security extends beyond physical protection to include cybersecurity, intellectual property safeguarding, data privacy, and emergency management for fire outbreaks, health crises, civil unrest, and violence (Adekola et al., 2023 .). The increasing adoption of digital platforms has heightened university vulnerability to cyber attacks, necessitating integrated physical-digital security models. In multi-campus institutions, geographical dispersion, infrastructure differences, and unequal resource access compound security challenges. Lack of coordinated security infrastructure can produce disjointed practices

across campuses, reducing overall effectiveness (Mensah, 2024). For example, a main campus may have advanced surveillance and trained officers while satellite campuses rely on untrained guards and unstructured reporting systems. Effective security management therefore requires harmonised policies, centralised oversight, and context-sensitive implementation. Governance is equally critical. Security policies must align with institutional governance structures, with clearly defined roles, authority, and accountability among administrators, security units, and external agencies. Integrating security management into institutional strategic planning supports safe learning environments, staff productivity, and student retention.

Professionalism in Security Services

Professionalism is a cornerstone of effective campus security. Professional security services are characterised by standardised recruitment and training, ethical behaviour, regulatory compliance, effective communication, and strategic use of security technologies (Nketia, 2023). University security personnel are often the first responders in emergencies; their competence, judgement, and demeanour are therefore critical. Empirical research in African universities identifies poor training, low motivation, inadequate remuneration, and lack of professional standards as causes of ineffective campus security (Owusu & Badu, 2023). Many private universities hire security personnel on temporary or outsourced contracts, limiting professional development and institutional integration. This results in poor security adherence, weak intelligence gathering, and inability to handle complex incidents. Professional security services enhance risk management through proactive threat identification, proper incident response, and effective cooperation with internal and external stakeholders. Professional staff handle sensitive situations involving students, staff, and visitors without escalating tensions, thereby preventing conflict and maintaining institutional harmony. Professionalism also builds stakeholder confidence, as students, staff, parents, and partners perceive the institution as secure and well-managed. In multi-campus environments, professionalism facilitates standardisation and coordination. When security staff across campuses are trained under the same framework with common ethical and operational standards, practices become consistent, reducing disparities and ensuring equitable protection.

Policy Gaps and Regulatory Issues

Despite increased awareness of security management importance, many Ghanaian private universities operate without well-established, standardised security policies, relying instead on informal practices or campus-specific procedures (Dinye, 2023). These ad hoc measures cannot effectively address complex security threats in higher education settings. Common policy gaps include inconsistent emergency response protocols, ineffective incident reporting processes, insufficient guidance on use of force, and failure to integrate security functions into institutional governance (Asante & Loglo, 2024). In multi-campus universities, these gaps are exacerbated by differences in leadership capacity and resource availability across campuses, leading to unequal policy interpretation and application. Regulatory challenges further complicate security governance. National security bodies offer general guidance, but specific regulation for higher education contexts remains weak. Misalignment between institutional security policies and national security frameworks can complicate emergency coordination and create accountability ambiguities

(Mensah, 2024). The absence of formalised, institution-wide security policies exposes universities to legal and reputational damage. Poor documentation and unclear responsibilities undermine institutional responses to incidents, increase liability, and erode stakeholder confidence. Researchers therefore recommend comprehensive, uniform security policies aligned with national laws, embedded in governance mechanisms, and regularly updated to address emerging threats.

Governance Implications

Governance structures critically influence the effectiveness, coherence, and sustainability of security management systems. Good governance clarifies institutional roles, assigns duties, and establishes accountability mechanisms that inform security planning, implementation, and oversight (Duodu, 2024). In multi-campus universities, where security risks and operating conditions vary, governance arrangements must enable coordinated yet context-sensitive responses.

In Ghanaian multi-campus private universities, governance often involves dispersed power centres with minimal coordination. Decentralised decision-making can weaken institutional control over security operations, leading to policy inconsistency and unequal resource distribution. Where campus-level administrators have high autonomy without clear reporting lines or standardised procedures, security management becomes reactive, fragmented, and difficult to evaluate institution-wide. Effective governance systems integrate security management into the broader institutional governance framework. This includes aligning security policies with institutional statutes, professional regulations, and national control procedures, and ensuring security units operate under defined administrative oversight (Owusu & Badu, 2023). Governance systems that establish security committees, reporting lines, and performance standards across campuses improve coordination and accountability. Furthermore, good governance promotes strategic rather than ad hoc approaches to campus security. Embedding security considerations into institutional risk management, strategic planning, and quality assurance processes ensures that leadership prioritises security management as contributing to institutional stability, student welfare, and staff productivity (Adekola et al., 2023). For private universities, where reputational risk and student confidence are key to sustainability, strong security governance is both an operational and strategic imperative.

Security Management Issues in Multi-Campus Environments

Multi-campus security management presents several interconnected challenges. First, decentralised operations often lead to unequal policies and practices across campuses. Access control, emergency response, visitor management, and disciplinary measures may vary, creating vulnerabilities especially when students and staff move between campuses. The absence of a unified institutional security framework increases risk and reduces crisis preparedness (Nketia, 2023). Second, poor training and professionalism of security staff are major problems. Many private universities rely on contract or internally hired personnel lacking qualifications in modern security management. Weaknesses in risk assessment, surveillance technology, conflict management, crowd control, and crisis response limit effective action against evolving threats. New challenges such as cyber-physical threats, student riots, gender-based violence, and mental health emergencies require specialised skills that under-resourced security departments

lack. Minimal investment in training perpetuates reactive rather than proactive risk prevention (Mensah, 2024).

Third, poor integration and coordination between central administration and satellite campuses limit effective security governance. Communication mechanisms are often poorly defined, resulting in delayed reporting and disjointed incident responses. Central administration may not receive timely, accurate information from remote campuses, undermining institution-wide risk assessment and strategic decision-making. This distance reduces accountability and hinders uniform policy adoption (Nketia, 2023). Fourth, budgetary constraints significantly impede security management. Private universities face limited budgets, with priorities directed toward academic facilities, staff remuneration, and programme development. Consequently, security investments suffer, leading to poor physical infrastructure (perimeter fencing, lighting, CCTV, alarm systems). Personnel recruitment, remuneration, and continuous training are also affected, further undermining institutional preparedness (Mensah, 2024).

Fifth, inadequate monitoring, evaluation, and reporting obstruct continuous improvement. Most institutions lack standard procedures for incident documentation, risk profiling, and security unit performance evaluation. Without robust data and systematic review, security planning remains intuitive and reactive rather than evidence-based. Routine audits and feedback systems are absent, preventing institutions from learning from past incidents or adapting to new risks. Adequate monitoring and evaluation are necessary to transform security management from a fragmented operational function into a strategic institutional asset (Nketia, 2023). Together, these challenges underscore the need for unified security governance systems, sustained investment in human and technological capabilities, and enhanced coordination mechanisms. Addressing these issues is essential for improving security management in Ghana's multi-campus private universities, ensuring campus community safety, and facilitating institutional stability and growth.

Methodology

Research Design

A qualitative case study design was adopted to conduct an intensive, context-sensitive investigation of security management practices at Presbyterian University, Ghana (PUG). The case study method is suitable for exploring complex institutional phenomena within real-world contexts where boundaries between context and practice are blurred (Yin, 2023). Security management in a multi-campus university involves multidimensional governance, administrative, and operational aspects not effectively captured by quantitative approaches. The qualitative method enabled understanding of lived experiences, perceptions, and interpretations of key stakeholders. Focusing on one institution with multiple campuses provided in-depth knowledge of centralised policy implementation within a decentralised operating environment. According to Creswell and Poth (2023), qualitative case studies are particularly useful for investigating institutional processes, leadership practices, and policy implementation challenges.

Participants

Purposive sampling was used to select participants based on information-rich cases directly relevant to the research problem.

Inclusion criteria focused on individuals with formal roles or direct involvement in security management at PUG.

Participants included:

- Campus security managers (n = 4) from different campuses, providing strategic and operational insights.
- Central administrative officials involved in security policy (n = 3), offering perspectives on institutional governance and policy formulation.
- Security staff including guards and supervisors (n = 12), directly engaged in day-to-day security operations.

This composition ensured coverage of both governance and operational dimensions.

Data Collection

Multiple data sources enhanced depth, rigour, and triangulation. Semi-structured interviews were conducted using an interview guide aligned with research objectives, covering security governance structures, training and professional standards, campus–central administration interaction, resource constraints, and incident response. Document analysis examined security policies, strategic plans, operational manuals, incident reporting templates, and administrative circulars. Literature triangulation incorporated recent research on security management in African higher education (2022–2025) to contextualise findings.

Data Analysis

Thematic analysis followed Braun and Clarke's (2022) six-step method: familiarisation with data, initial coding, theme searching, theme reviewing, theme definition and naming, and final analytical narrative production. Coding was both inductive and deductive, with deductive codes informed by the conceptual framework and literature, and inductive codes emerging from participant narratives. Key coding categories included professional standards, policy and regulatory gaps, governance frameworks, operational challenges, and improvement strategies.

Trustworthiness and Ethical Considerations

Trustworthiness was ensured through credibility (data triangulation across interviews, documents, and literature), dependability (clear audit trail of procedures and analytical decisions), confirmability (interpretations grounded in direct quotes and documentary evidence), and transferability (thick description of institutional context). Ethical approval was obtained from PUG's relevant authority. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, with guarantees of voluntary participation, right to withdraw, and data confidentiality. Participants were anonymised using codes, and all data were securely stored for academic use only.

Findings

Security Organisational Structures

PUG operates a decentralised security management structure, with each campus maintaining its own security team reporting to local campus management. This arrangement enables campuses to respond promptly to context-specific risks such as local crime patterns, student movement, and campus infrastructure. Respondents noted that campus-based teams understand their physical environments and local dynamics better, enhancing

situational awareness and real-time response. However, this decentralised structure creates major challenges for coordination, standardisation, and policy implementation. The absence of a central security command makes it difficult to enforce uniform procedures across campuses. Differences in staffing levels, operational practices, and reporting lead to fragmented security management. Several interviewees noted minimal inter-campus collaboration, with lessons from incidents at one campus rarely shared institution-wide. Thus, while operationally adaptive, decentralisation undermines strategic coherence and institutional security governance.

Professionalism of Security Personnel

The study found significant variation in professional training and competencies of security staff across campuses. Some personnel had formal security qualifications or law enforcement backgrounds, while others relied entirely on informal, on-the-job training. This gap affected uniformity and quality of security service delivery. Interview responses revealed major training gaps in emergency preparedness, conflict resolution, crowd control, crisis communication, and incident documentation. Refresher training and professional development were sporadic, depending on campus-specific initiatives rather than an organisation-wide programme. One security manager stated: *"There is no standard training programme; each campus does its own thing, so coordination during emergencies becomes problematic. Most staff lack motivation."* The absence of professional training not only weakens operational effectiveness but also undermines student and staff confidence in the university's ability to handle complex security incidents.

Policy Gaps

Document analysis revealed that security policies at PUG are incomplete, disjointed, and not uniformly applied across campuses. While institutional-level security instructions exist, they often lack specificity, coherence, and operational clarity to address the complexities of managing security across geographically dispersed campuses. Policies function more as general pronouncements than as practical tools for daily security operations and strategic risk management. A primary policy gap is the lack of uniform emergency response protocols across campuses. Responses to fire outbreaks, medical emergencies, student riots, theft, or unauthorised intrusions varied significantly. This inconsistency created confusion among personnel and security staff regarding proper procedures, reporting responsibilities, and coordination with external emergency services. During critical incidents, such inconsistencies can delay response, increase risk, and endanger students, staff, and visitors.

A second critical weakness is poor incident reporting and documentation mechanisms. No institution-wide system (digital or manual) exists to store, analyse, and disseminate security-related information across campuses. Incident reports are maintained at campus level with little standardisation in format, content, or follow-up procedures. This fragmented approach limits central management's ability to monitor trends, identify recurring vulnerabilities, or evaluate security intervention effectiveness. Without reliable, integrated data, security management remains reactive, restricting evidence-based decision-making and institutional learning. A third significant deficiency is the lack of clear policies addressing cybersecurity and digital threats. Despite increased use of digital platforms for teaching, learning, student

records, financial management, and communication, most security policies focus almost exclusively on physical safety. Little or no guidance exists on data protection, cyber intrusion response, digital access control, or staff and student digital safety awareness. This policy absence exposes private universities to data breaches, identity theft, system failures, and reputational damage, especially in an era of growing online and hybrid education. Collectively, these policy gaps inhibit proactive risk management and undermine institutional accountability. Without clear, comprehensive, standardised security policies, university leadership cannot enforce compliance, monitor performance, or coordinate responses across campuses. Consequently, private multi-campus universities remain vulnerable to both physical and digital security threats, highlighting the urgent need for institution-wide security policy frameworks that reflect the operational realities of multi-campus higher education in Ghana.

Governance Challenges

Significant governance ambiguities were identified in PUG's security management. Although central administration provides overarching policy guidance, most operational authority resides at campus level. This two-tier system creates unclear responsibilities and inconsistent enforcement of institutional directives. Respondents observed that campus autonomy leads to selective implementation of security measures, particularly where resources are limited. One administrator admitted: *"Central directives are not always realised across campuses because of resource and staffing dissimilarities."* This governance ambiguity undermines accountability mechanisms and limits the effectiveness of centralised planning, monitoring, and evaluation of security operations.

Operational Challenges

Operational issues emerged as key constraints to effective security management. Inadequate staffing led to long working hours, exhaustion, and lack of coverage during peak periods or emergencies. Physical security infrastructure varied across campuses, with some lacking proper perimeter fencing, lighting, or marked access points. Surveillance technologies (CCTV, alarm systems) were inconsistent or entirely absent. Budgetary constraints were repeatedly cited as the primary barrier to infrastructure improvements, equipment procurement, and staff training. Consequently, campuses cannot adopt uniform security practices, exacerbating disparities in safety conditions.

Strategic Implications

The findings demonstrate that lack of professionalism, policy inconsistency, governance ambiguity, and operational capacity deficits compromise effective security management at PUG. These weaknesses negatively affect risk mitigation, crisis preparedness, incident response, and stakeholder trust. This research underscores the need for professionalised, integrated, and well-governed security systems in multi-campus private universities. Strengthened central coordination combined with context-sensitive campus operations, investment in standardised training, and development of comprehensive security policies are essential steps toward enhanced institutional resilience and safe, secure learning environments across all campuses.

Discussion

This study supports existing literature demonstrating that multi-campus private universities face unique security management challenges, primarily driven by decentralised operational frameworks and unequal professionalism (Owusu & Badu, 2023; Dinye, 2023). The PUG case shows that without robust central coordination mechanisms, decentralisation leads to fragmented security practices, governance ambiguity, and variable risk exposure across campuses. While decentralisation enables local responsiveness, it hinders standardisation and institutional learning. Professionalism of security personnel emerged as a critical issue. Consistent with Nketia (2023), the absence of a standardised training system undermines security performance, especially in emergency preparedness, crisis management, and conflict resolution. Disparities in training and competence across campuses exacerbate coordination failures during critical incidents and weaken institutional response capacity. These findings support the view that campus security must be treated as a professional operation, not a routine function. Structured professional development, standardised certification, and regular refresher training are necessary to improve staff confidence, performance, and accountability in multi-campus settings. The study also reveals serious policy gaps that hinder effective security management. Asante and Loglo (2024) argue that the absence of coherent, comprehensive, institution-wide security policies reduces operational effectiveness and increases vulnerability. PUG's lack of cohesive emergency response plans, effective reporting systems, and adequate attention to cybersecurity reflects broader challenges faced by private universities in adapting policy frameworks to evolving threat environments. Centrally coordinated security policies with campus-specific operational guidelines would enable consistency while allowing flexibility for local risk conditions. Regarding governance, the findings highlight the need for a balanced approach combining central oversight with campus-level operational autonomy. Unclear governance arrangements lead to inconsistent policy implementation and weak accountability frameworks (Duodu, 2024; Adekola et al., 2023). At PUG, ambiguous roles, responsibilities, and reporting lines hindered effective central security oversight. A well-defined governance system specifying roles, responsibilities, and communication channels is essential to ensure consistent policy implementation and periodic review across all campuses.

Overall, the discussion indicates that effective security management in multi-campus private universities requires an integrated approach encompassing professionalisation, policy coherence, and governance coordination. These findings have significant implications for higher education administrators and policymakers, who must move beyond ad hoc security arrangements toward institutionalised, system-wide security management frameworks.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and discussion, the following measures are recommended to enhance security management systems in multi-campus private universities in Ghana.

Standardise Security Policies

Private universities should adopt comprehensive, institution-wide security policies that are centrally coordinated and consistently applied across all campuses. These policies must explicitly define emergency management protocols, access control, visitor management, incident reporting, and cybersecurity.

Standardised emergency procedures for fire outbreaks, medical emergencies, student unrest, theft, and unauthorised intrusions are necessary to ensure uniformity, clarity, and swift action. Policies should maintain institutional coherence while permitting campus-specific modifications to address context-specific risks. Regular policy reviews should be institutionalised to keep pace with emerging threats, technology, and national regulatory requirements.

Professionalise Security Personnel

Universities must prioritise professionalisation of security personnel through mandatory training, certification, and continuous capacity-building programmes. Core training should cover risk assessment, emergency response, crowd control, communication, and ethical behaviour. Regular refresher training should be institutionalised. Programmes should also include crisis management, conflict resolution, gender-sensitive security practices, and use of modern surveillance and communication technologies. Where feasible, universities should collaborate with recognised security organisations, police, and professional bodies to ensure training meets national and international quality standards.

Develop Cohesive Security Governance Systems

Clear, integrated governance structures should be established to define roles, responsibilities, reporting lines, and accountability mechanisms for security management. Centralised security units or directorates should be mandated to coordinate, monitor policy compliance, and ensure uniform security practices across campuses. Effective governance mechanisms must ensure timely information sharing between campuses and central administration to inform strategic security planning. Regular security audits, performance assessments, and inter-campus coordination meetings should be institutionalised to promote transparency, accountability, and continuous improvement.

Invest in Security Infrastructure and Technology

Long-term investment in security infrastructure and technology is required to enhance campus safety and preparedness. Priorities include acquisition and maintenance of surveillance systems (CCTV), perimeter fencing, lighting, alarm systems, and access control technologies. Reliable communication systems for rapid emergency coordination are also essential. Security infrastructure should be distributed equitably across campuses to reduce disparities between main and satellite campuses. Investment decisions should be guided by regular risk assessments and incident data. Although financial constraints are real, phased implementation and partnerships with private security or technology firms can provide solutions.

Intensify Stakeholder Engagement and Safety Culture

Universities should institutionalise regular engagement with key stakeholders—students, staff, campus security personnel, and local security agencies. Such engagement fosters collective responsibility for campus safety, enhances trust, communication, and intelligence sharing. Safety awareness programmes, orientation sessions, and regular drills should sensitise campus users on security practices. Formal collaboration with local police, fire, and emergency response agencies should be established through memoranda of understanding to enhance crisis coordination. Feedback mechanisms, including hotlines, online platforms, and

consultative forums, should be provided to enable stakeholders to report concerns and contribute to security improvement efforts. A participatory security management approach will create a positive safety culture and strengthen institutional resilience.

Conclusion

Effective security management in multi-campus private universities requires professionalism, robust policy frameworks, and sound governance structures. The case of Presbyterian University, Ghana, demonstrates that decentralised security arrangements, policy gaps, and failure to adhere to professional norms weaken institutional safety and crisis response capabilities. These challenges can be addressed through standardised policies, professional training, integrated governance systems, and sustained infrastructure investment. Such measures will enhance institutional resilience, reduce security risks, and support the sustainable growth and credibility of private higher education institutions in Ghana

Acknowledgements

I sincerely express my gratitude to the respondent who made this work a reality. I also extend my appreciation to Presbyterian University, Ghana, for providing the necessary resources and an enabling environment for my research. Their contributions have been invaluable to the success of this work

Author contributions

K.K.Y: Contributed to conceptualization, investigation, formal analysis, and data collection. Also involved in reviewing and editing the manuscript

J. A.Y: Led the conceptualization, investigation, formal analysis, data collection, and data analysis. Additionally, contributed to writing the original draft and participated in the review and editing process.

I.M.M, N.A, L. B. B: Contributed to conceptualization, methodology, and supervision.

Funding

Not applicable.

Declarations Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not Applicable

Consent for publication

All authors consent to publication.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Data Availability

Not Applicable

References

1. Adekola, P. O., Agbaeze, E. K., & Onyekwelu, N. P. (2023). Security management and institutional resilience in Nigerian private universities. *African Journal of Criminology and Security Studies*, 16(2), 89–108.
2. Asante, J., & Loglo, M. (2024). Policy gaps in security governance of Ghanaian private universities. *Journal of Educational Policy and Administration*, 12(1), 45–63.
3. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE Publications.
4. Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2023). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
5. Dinye, S. K. (2023). Security challenges in multi-campus university operations in Ghana. *Ghana Journal of Higher Education Management*, 8(2), 112–130.
6. Duodu, E. (2024). Governance and security coordination in Ghana's private universities. *West African Journal of Educational Administration*, 19(1), 76–94.
7. Mensah, I. (2024). Resource constraints and security management in multi-campus institutions. *Journal of Security and Risk Management in Education*, 7(3), 201–220.
8. Nketia, A. B. (2023). Professionalising campus security: A study of private universities in Ghana. *International Journal of Campus Safety and Security*, 5(1), 34–52.
9. Owusu, F., & Badu, E. (2023). Professional standards and training gaps in university security services. *African Security Review*, 32(4), 412–429.
10. Saeed, H., & Abbas, S. (2022). Security management frameworks in higher education institutions: A systematic review. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 44(3), 258–275.
11. Yin, R. K. (2023). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (7th ed.). SAGE Publications.