

MEMORANDUM

TO: Files

FROM: Don F. Guyton
Chief Audit Executive

DATE: February 8, 2010

SUBJ: Follow-up Points in Reference to Regent Monty's E-mail to Chancellor Khator and Vice Chancellor Carlucci dated February 5, 2010, entitled "Budget Proposal"

Regent Monty's e-mail to the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor referred to redundancies in the operations of the HR and Police Departments. Attached to the e-mail were Internal Audit Report AR2003-28, University of Houston System Human Resources – All Components; and AR2003-13, University of Houston System Police Departments, Operational Review (UH, UHCL, UHD). Chancellor Khator contacted me this morning and asked me some questions about each of these reports:

1. Human Resources – Is there a good reason to consider consolidating Human Resource Departments? Is there any other university system that has consolidated Human Resource Departments? Does it make any sense to consolidate Human Resource Departments?
2. Police Departments – Is there a centralized Police Department among any of the university systems? Are there any savings potentials by consolidating police operations? Is there a better model for Police Departments in a higher education system?

After discussing these reports with Dr. Khator, I informed her that I would contact Malcolm Davis in the Police Department and Joan Nelson in Human Resources to get an update from them on the status of the actions that had taken place since these reports were issued, and also to try to obtain the answers to Dr. Khator's questions.

Conversation with Joan Nelson, UH/UHS Human Resource Department

I discussed the Human Resources report with Joan Nelson and the actions that had taken place since this report had been issued. In response to the questions asked, Nelson stated that there should be some level of HR support at the institutional level to address campus-specific issues and unique circumstances as they occur. She knew of no other university system that had a consolidated HR department; however, it is becoming more common to have standardized / centralized HR systems. As referenced on page two of the report, with the implementation of version 8.1 of the PeopleSoft HR system during March 2004, many of the redundancies related to forms should be eliminated with the capabilities of self service, work-flow, and applicant-processing. As the additional functionalities continue to be deployed in the PeopleSoft system, there is less and less paper involved in the administration of the HR function. The UH/UHS HR personnel continue to manage more and more of the centralized HR systems, and the entire HR function is becoming more centralized. Nelson indicated that smaller UHS institutions have

begun to realize that their HR administration headcount is becoming more than needed. She indicated that the HR headcount at some of the institutions had increased since this report was issued while UH's has remained relatively stable, with the exception of the addition of the Customer Service Center headcount, as the UHS/UH HR group now has assumed the additional responsibilities. As indicated in appendix B of the report, page 10, UH/UHS is performing more with less, and this continues to be the trend.

Police Departments

I contacted Malcolm Davis, UHS/UH Police Chief, to discuss the police report. Davis and I addressed the Chancellor's questions, and he stated that there are examples of centralized operations such as the University of Texas Police Department at the medical center that serves two of its components (UT Health Science Center and UT MD Anderson Cancer Center). Davis also stated that the University of Texas System also has a police Department which basically functions as in standard setting role. They are involved with employment, training, and standard setting. The Internal Audit Department suggested that a system-wide policy be developed which would provide standards, resulting in a safer environment and more economic use of resources. Although the recommendation in the audit report on page three recommended specific areas that the system-wide policy should address, not all of these areas were addressed. Davis stated that some law enforcement agencies in Harris County had consolidated certain functions; that is, the Constable's Office maintains the same markings on the police cars regardless of the precinct, and also the dispatching system that they use to service multiple precincts. The same holds true for the Houston Police Department and the Sheriff's Department. Each of those entities has a single dispatching system. There should be an opportunity for savings with a centralized dispatching system for all of the university police departments. This could save approximately \$250,000 per dispatching system which relates to hardware and software when these systems need to be upgraded or replaced. It should also result in a savings in FTE if we had one central dispatching staff as opposed to three 24/7 dispatching staffs. Although there could be some fleet savings with respect to procurement of vehicles, this would come in the form of standards as opposed to any purchasing power since purchases are made through state contracts at all three campuses. As noted in appendix D of the report, page 11, some of the campuses are purchasing Jeep Cherokees and Chevy Tahoes, compared to your standard Ford/Chevy police patrol cars. The implementation of more stringent standards would also ensure that the other areas noted in the audit report, such as crime statistics reporting, are more compliant with applicable regulations.

Summary

1. Human Resources – The continuing upgrades to the HR PeopleSoft system, together with the implementation of additional functionalities in the system, inherently results in the consolidation of HR responsibilities within the HR system. This also results in a more paperless system and more economical use of resources.
2. Police Operations – The system-wide policy on police operations was implemented in January 2005, although SAM 01.F.01, Police Standards, addresses many of the areas in the Internal Report it primarily delegates the responsibility to each of the campuses rather than setting specific standards. System-wide there could be some potential savings by implementing a centralized dispatch function and fleet standards. There may also be

some savings by reviewing a mix of peace officer versus security force similar to what UH has already done with UHV.

DFG/jy

Report No. AR 2003-28, University of Houston System Human Resources – All Components

BACKGROUND: There are numerous functions performed by Human Resource Departments such as recruitment, applicant tracking, compensation, benefits, training and employee relations, to name a few. The focus of this review was two significant processes, placing personnel on and off of the payroll (in-processing and out-processing). These processes interfaced with many of the functions enumerated above.

Budget data for fiscal year 2003 for the human resources departments is as follows:

Component	FTE	Salaries & Wages
UH/UHS	26	\$1,029,621
UHCL	9	\$ 378,990
UHD	10	\$ 498,654
UHV	4.5	\$ 130,141

Budget Data for Fiscal Year 2010 for the human resource departments is as follows:

<i>Component</i>	<i>FTE</i>	<i>Salaries & Wages</i>
<i>UH/UHS</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>\$1,472,602</i>
<i>UHCL</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>\$ 431,723</i>
<i>UHD</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>\$ 964,963</i>
<i>UHV</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>\$ 257,145</i>

Source: UH HR

OBJECTIVE: Efficiency / Effectiveness

OVERALL OBSERVATIONS: All campuses have developed their own method for ensuring that all necessary tasks are performed with respect to in-processing and out-processing of personnel. Although some common forms are used for these processes by all campuses, each campus has developed different versions of forms used for the same purpose. The implementation of version 8.1 of the PeopleSoft HR System during March 2004 should eliminate the need for many of these forms when the features and capabilities of self-service, work-flow, and applicant processing are deployed. This represents an **Opportunity for Standardization** which should be explored after the implementation of the new version of the HR software. Appendix D contains a comprehensive listing of these forms.

The HR Department resource levels vary significantly between UH/UHS and the other three campuses. The UH HR Department FTE and budgeted salaries and wages are approximately equal to the amounts of the other three HR departments combined. At the same time, the number of UH current FTE's, and annual new hires, terminations and reclassifications are approximately three times the corresponding combined amounts of UHCL, UHD and UHV, as noted in Appendix B. Although the UH HR Department does not perform some of the functions performed by the other three HR departments such as equal opportunity and affirmative action and certain payroll functions, we believe that an assessment of the resource levels may be warranted at some time in the future.

We noted that the customers (employees of departments using HR services) of the UHCL, UHD and UHV HR departments were overall more satisfied with the services provided by HR than the customers of the UH HR Department. We believe that at least some of the difference can be explained by the "one stop shopping" or customer service center methods used at the smaller campuses. We envision UH HR adopting some form of this method of service delivery in the future. The UH AVC/AVP for HR pointed out that another possible reason for the difference in customer satisfaction might be due to the small size (geographic area and number of buildings and personnel) of the other three campuses when compared to UHS/UH.

Update from UH HR:

Response to Findings:

In response to the findings reported in the 2003 HR –All Component Internal Audit Report, HR has implemented PeopleSoft functionality that has improved process effectiveness by utilizing electronic workflow capabilities within many HR functions, to include:

- Electronic Personal Actions (ePAR)
 - Electronic Position Request Forms (ePRF)
 - Electronic Person of Interest (ePOI)
 - Electronic I-9 (eI-9)
 - Electronic On-Line Job System (OJS)
 - Electronic Time & Labor
 - Electronic Performance Evaluations (currently being developed for UH/UHS, future development for UHV and UHC; a eperformance process is already implemented at UHD)
1. HRMS has partnered with HR component campuses to insure standardization is met for all eSystem processes.
 2. HR has partnered with HRMS to develop on-line training tools and have conducted on-site training classes to assist colleges/divisions to utilize the eSystems that have been put in place.
 3. By utilizing the Workflow process with all of our eSystems, we have eliminated the redundant paper shuffling processes that have been addressed in 2003 audit.

HR Areas to Consider Consolidating:

Although there are areas within HR that must be available at each component campus, the following areas are common areas at the four campuses and should be considered:

1. Benefits processing –
2. Compensation Processing –
3. Training Programs.

APPENDIX B

HUMAN RESOURCES COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

COMPARATIVE DATA

	UH/UHS	UHCL	UHD	UHV
FY03 Budgeted HR FTE	26	9	10	4.5
FY03 Budgeted Campus FTE	5,165	809	821	252
HR S&W FY03 Budget ¹	\$ 1,029,621	\$ 378,990	\$ 498,654	\$ 130,141
FY02 New Hires ²	8,839	1,271	1,064	347
FY02 Terminations	2,817	515	446	125
FY02 Reclassifications	853	162	135	34
Employees Receiving 2002 W-2's	11,583	1,772	1,677	474

RATIOS ³

Per Total HR FY03 Budgeted FTE

• Total Campus FY03 Budgeted FTE	199	90	82	56
• FY02 New Hires	340	141	106	77
• FY02 Terminations	108	57	45	28
• FY02 Reclassifications	33	18	14	8
• Receiving 2002 W-2's	446	197	168	105

Total HR FY03 Budgeted S&W per

• Total Campus FY03 Budgeted FTE	\$ 199	\$ 468	\$ 607	\$ 516
• FY02 New Hires	\$ 116	\$ 298	\$ 469	\$ 375
• FY02 Terminations	\$ 366	\$ 736	\$ 1,118	\$ 1,041
• FY02 Reclassifications	\$ 1,207	\$ 2,339	\$ 3,694	\$ 3,828
• Receiving 2002 W-2's	\$ 89	\$ 214	\$ 297	\$ 275

¹ Source: PeopleSoft Budget for all HR Cost Centers

² Note: The same employee may be included more than once for reappointments and other circumstances

³ Note: The Human Resources Departments for UHCL, UHD, and, UHV perform services in addition to HR services for their respective campuses. For example, the UHCL, UHD and UHV Human Resource Departments are responsible for the affirmative action and payroll functions at their respective campuses.

Human Resources Comparative Analysis

Comparative Data

	UH/UHS	UHCL	UHD	UHV
FY10 Budgeted HR FTE ¹	28	9	18	7
FY10 Budgeted Campus FTE ²	6,508	958	1,114	428
FY10 HR S&W Budget ¹	\$ 1,472,602	\$ 431,723	\$ 964,963	\$ 257,145
FY09 Hires ³	11,373	2,089	3,061	704
FY09 Terminations ³	11,491	2,092	2,974	728
FY09 Job Changes ³	8,117	943	1,539	404
Employees Receiving 2009 W-2's	13,133	1,869	1,795	621

Ratios ⁴

Per total HR FY10 Budgeted FTE	UH/UHS	UHCL	UHD	UHV
Total Campus FY10 Budgeted FTE	235	106	61	66
FY09 Hires	410	232	168	108
FY09 Terminations	414	232	163	112
FY09 Job Changes	293	105	85	62
Receiving 2009 W-2's	473	208	99	96

Total HR FY10 Budgeted S&W per	UH/UHS	UHCL	UHD	UHV
Total Campus FY10 Budgeted FTE	\$ 226	\$ 451	\$ 866	\$ 601
FY09 Hires	\$ 129	\$ 207	\$ 315	\$ 365
FY09 Terminations	\$ 128	\$ 206	\$ 324	\$ 353
FY09 Job Changes	\$ 181	\$ 458	\$ 627	\$ 636
Receiving 2009 W-2's	\$ 112	\$ 231	\$ 538	\$ 414

¹ Data from PeopleSoft Budget (BDM) for all HR cost centers

² Data from Table 5 of FY10 Plan and Budget Presentation to the Board 8/11/2009

³ Employees may be included more than once; Hires includes new hires and reappointments; Job Changes includes promotions, transfers and reclassifications.

⁴ The Human Resources Departments for UHCL, UHD and UHV are responsible for affirmative action and payroll functions in addition to HR services.

Report No. AR 2003-13, University of Houston System Police Departments – Operational Review (UH, UHCL, UHD)

BACKGROUND: The Texas Education Code authorizes governing boards of each state institution of higher education to commission peace officers to enforce the laws within their primary jurisdictions. The UHS Board of Regents has commissioned peace officers at UH, UHD and UHCL. The police departments were established at these institutions many years ago after this legislation was enacted in 1971. Budget data for fiscal year 2003 for these police departments is as follows:

	FTE	Budget FY 2003		
		Salaries & Wages	M&O	Total
UH	60.00	\$ 2,590,737	\$ 309,060	\$ 2,899,797
UHD	26.31	\$ 968,892	\$51,666	\$1,020,558
UHCL	24.16	\$886,119	\$ 89,839	\$ 975,958

Budget data for fiscal year 2010 for these police departments is as follows:

	FTE	Budget FY 2010		
		Salaries & Wages	M&O	Total
UH	130.00	\$ 3,359,485	\$ 279,838	\$ 3,639,323
UHD	26.31	\$ 1,591,200	\$110,286	\$1,701,486
UHCL	28.00	\$1,324,000	\$ 126,000	\$ 1,450,000

ANNUAL CRIME REPORT:

The total incidents reported by each campus with police departments for 2001 is recapped as follows:

	<u>UH</u>	<u>UHCL</u>	<u>UHD</u>
On Campus	73	1	3
Residential Facilities	41	0	N/A
Non-campus bldg. or property	1	0	0
On public property	1	270	0

The total incidents reported by each campus with police departments for 2008 is recapped as follows:

	<u>UH</u>	<u>UHCL</u>	<u>UHD</u>
<i>On Campus</i>	72	1	4
<i>Residential Facilities</i>	27	0	N/A
<i>Non-campus bldg. or property</i>	1	0	0
<i>On public property</i>	6	0	0

OBJECTIVE: Efficiency / Effectiveness

OVERALL OBSERVATIONS:

We determined the following:

1. None of the police departments had specific performance goals or performance measures; however, each department's activities were clearly focused on making their campuses safer.
2. We found no instances where resources were not being applied under an adequate system of controls; however, each campus applied the resources entrusted to its police department using different methodologies.
3. We determined that UHD and UHCL did not comply with federal regulations for the compilation of crime statistics for the Annual Crime Report. (Some incidents occurring outside of locations adjacent to the campus were included in their reports.)
4. We determined that there were opportunities for standardization among all campuses.

Finding: We surveyed each of the police departments, noticing differences in several areas. The differences are analyzed in the enclosed appendices.

<u>Appendix</u>	<u>Description</u>
A	Types of Services Provided
B	Staffing Levels
C	Salary Levels and Incentive Pay
D	Police Vehicle Fleet
E	Sergeant's Position Description

Through our interviews with police management and reviews of documentation, we determined that there were also differences among the police departments in the following areas:

- Crime report completion methodologies (see Annual Crime Report finding below),
- Subject coverage in police department operating manuals,
- Automated Dispatching Systems,
- Police uniforms,
- Method/mix of patrol (foot, bicycle, electric vehicle, auto), and
- Use of security guards.

We noted that the University of Texas System Board of Regents charged their Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs with the responsibilities for reviewing and making recommendations relating to police and security matters within the system. As a result, the University of Texas System established system-wide standards, which addressed the hiring and qualifications of all police officers and the operating practices for all police departments. In addition, the University of Texas System established a police academy to train recruits throughout the UT system.

In our opinion, there are opportunities for standardization among campus police departments which may result in the economizing of resources and safer university environments.

Recommendation (UHS): Management should implement a System Administrative Memorandum (SAM), which addresses minimum standards for police operations at each campus. The standards included in this SAM should address police staff qualifications, police staff resource

allocations, police vehicle fleets, development of policies and procedures that define roles and responsibilities of police departments, use of security guards, and the standards for the preparation and approval of the annual crime report for each campus. Management should also consider authorizing the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance to make recommendations relating to police and security matters within the system.

Recommendation (UHS): The SAM referred to above should address standardized desk procedures for each campus for the purpose of compiling and preparing the annual crime report. These procedures should require that the annual crime report be reviewed and approved by an appropriate level of management.

Recommendation (UHS): The SAM referred to above should address campus patrol boundaries and protocol for use of police resources outside of those boundaries, which are approved by the campus CEO or designee. This campus protocol should also address the appropriate mix of method of patrol (foot, bicycle, vehicle). This SAM should also require a memorandum of understanding between the police departments and other law enforcement agencies or an internal memorandum which has been approved by the campus CEO or designee.

BEST PRACTICES: The UH police department has developed a comprehensive operating manual addressing many subject areas. The UH police department has also developed a comprehensive process for compiling the annual crime report. The UH police department uses security guards rather than uniform police officers in some cases in an effort to leverage resources.

CONCLUSION: In our opinion, the police departments are being managed effectively under an adequate system of internal controls. We noted no matters which we considered significant audit findings. We identified certain opportunities for standardization among the police department operations of all campuses. This includes developing system-wide policies which address certain aspects of police operations which may result in a safer environment and more economical use of resources. We noted certain instances of noncompliance by UHD and UHCL with the regulations for reporting data in the Annual Crime Report. We believe that the system-wide policies should also address the compilation and review of this report. We also recommended that the police patrol boundaries and relationships with other police law enforcement agencies should be formalized and approved by each campus CEO or designee.

Update from UH Police Chief:

Here are some additional items which could provide additional opportunities for savings through standardizing police systems/operations other than records and dispatching. The manner in which the day-to-day police services are conducted is based on institutional size, location and the campus community. The delivery of these functions would NOT be standardized, but left to the discretion of the Chief Law Enforcement Officer working in conjunction with his/her Vice President.

- *Personnel Division: Currently each component Police Department has its own hiring / promotion standards and conducts individual hiring / promotional processes. We could standardize job descriptions, hiring and promotional processes System wide. Since all three UH component institutions who have Police Departments are all in the greater Houston Area we could have combined hiring boards. If we were to change the HR promotional process to include ALL*

component Police Officers as "Internal Candidates" we could do the same with promotional opportunities System wide.

- Training Division: Annual Training for Police Officers is mandated by the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education (TCLEOSE). Part of this annual training is course specific (every officer takes the same training) with the remainder being at the discretion of the department. All three UH component Police Departments provide / manage this training differently. UH does this through a Contract Training Provider Agreement with TCLEOSE. In comparison, all police officers training for the officers employed by the 15 UT System Component Institutions is reported through the UT System Police under a single training agreement through the UT System Police Academy. We could do the same through the UH Downtown Police Academy.
- Policy and Procedures: Currently each component Police Department has its own Policy / Procedure manual, all of which cover virtually the same issues. Some issues should be standardized for all component Police Institutions (Use of Force, Pursuits, etc.) while others are actually Operational Policies which can and should be written to address how police activities are done on the campus level. For example, each component Police Department should have an Operational Policy on how Police Officers are assigned to shifts with the decision on how this is actually being done resting with that component's Chief Law Enforcement Officer (Chief of Police). Here the savings is not in dollars, rather in standardization of operations.
- Investigations Division: Currently each component Police Department either has a full-time Investigative function, or officers assigned to handle complex or high visibility crimes, internal/external investigations and provide dignitary protection as appropriate on their campus. These Investigative functions could be changed to have a single unit under the command of a police administrator staffed with officers from each component Police Department charged with handling these types of investigations and dignitary protection assignments.

I did not include anything regarding department make-up as I have more Police Administrative personnel than UHCL and UHD which allows me to staff all of the above functions on a full-time basis. For example, I have a Lieutenant and Office Assistant assigned full-time to my Personnel Division and a Lieutenant, Sergeant and two Police Officers assigned to the Investigative Division. While each of these two Lieutenants has different areas of responsibility, I use my investigative personnel (sergeant / police officers) to conduct all applicant background investigations. Dignitary protection assignments are assigned to the Investigative Division with my Personnel Division Lieutenant assisting as needed.

APPENDIX A
Types of Services Provided

Services	UH	UHCL	UHD
Police activities with licensed police officers	X	X	X
Police activities with security guards	X		
Vehicle maintenance – Police Department's expense	X		
Fleet management for university campus			X
Parking permit sales and collections		X	X
Locksmith and Electronic access controls		X	X
Campus safety officer			X
Campus institutional compliance office			X
Lost and found	X	X	X
Crime prevention programs	X	X	
Police Department Website	X	X	X

APPENDIX B
Staffing Level Analysis

	UH				UHCL				UHD			
	Total: Fall 2002	Officer total Note 1	Count per officer	Officers/ thou- sand	Total: Fall 2002	Officer total Note 1	Count per officer	Officers/ thou-sand	Total: Fall 2002	Officer total Note 1	Count per officer	Officer s/ thou- sand
Faculty:	1,428				330				356			
Staff:	5,324				680				696			
Students:	34,443				7,754				10,528			
Total	41,195	42	980	1.02	8,764	12.8	685	1.46	11,580	16	724	1.38
Building square footage:	6,365,999	42	151,571	0.007	607,295	12.8	47,445	0.021	945,611	16	59,101	0.017
Parking places:	15,471	42	368	2.71	3,346	12.8	261	3.83	2,610	16	163	6.13
Acreeage	550.9	42	13		530.5	12.8	41.4		19.6	16	1.2	

Note 1: The officer total includes security guards, police officers, corporals, and sergeants.

Budgeted Staffing	UH	UHCL		UHD
	Full-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time
Security Guards	7	0	0	0
Officers	25	6	4 @ .1 FTE	10
Corporals	4	0	0	3
Sergeants	6	6	4 @ .1 FTE	3
Total of non-exempt	42	12	0.8	16
Lieu- tenants	3	1	0	0
Captains	1	0	0	0
Assist Chief of Police	0	0	0	1
Chief of Police	1	1	0	1
Total	47	14	0.8	18

Note: Budget amounts do not include dispatchers or support staff.

APPENDIX C
Salary Ranges and Incentive Pay

Salary Levels

Titles		Pay	UH	UHCL	UHD
Officers	Range:	Minimum	\$24,170	\$27,332	\$29,518
		Maximum	\$46,093	\$34,160	N/A
	Actual:	Average	\$34,269	\$27,832	\$33,826
Corporals	Range:	Minimum	\$27,498	N/A	\$33,501
		Maximum	\$52,437	N/A	N/A
	Actual:	Average	\$34,525	N/A	\$38,596
Sergeants	Range:	Minimum	\$31,429	\$31,654	\$38,804
		Maximum	\$59,946	\$39,568	N/A
	Actual:	Average	\$43,500	\$36,838	\$43,577
Lieutenants	Range:	Minimum	\$36,629	\$35,535	N/A
		Maximum	\$69,867	\$53,303	N/A
	Actual:	Average	\$56,173	\$46,196	N/A

Incentive Pay

Incentives	UH	UHCL	UHD
Hazard Duty (H.D.)	\$7/Mo per year of employment in H.D. position.	\$7/Mo per year of employment in H.D. position.	\$7/Mo per year of employment in H.D. position.
Tenure Pay (UHD Officers below the rank of Chief receive tenure pay instead of merit raises.)	N/A	N/A	0-1.9 \$0/yr 2-4.9 \$1,200/yr 5-9.9 \$2,400/yr 10+ \$3,600/yr
Shift Differential	1st N/A 2nd \$0.15/hr 3rd \$0.40/hr	Day N/A Evening \$0.25/hr Night \$0.40/hr	N/A N/A N/A
Education / Certification Pay	\$0	\$0	\$0
Basic Certification	\$0	\$0	\$0
Intermediate TCLE Certification Associate Degree / 60 College Hours	\$100/Month for EITHER, but not both.	\$100/Month N/A	\$100/Month for EITHER, but not both.
Advanced TCLE Certification Bachelor Degree / 120 College Hours	\$200/Month for EITHER, but not both.	\$200/Month N/A	\$200/Month for EITHER, but not both.
Master TCLE Certification Masters Degree	N/A	\$300/Month N/A	\$250/Month for EITHER, but not both.

**APPENDIX D
Police Vehicle Fleets**

UH

PDV #	Inv #	Year	Make	Model	Cost	Date Purchased	Mileage				
							FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	Average/Day FY 2002	Total
100	312605	01	Ford	CV	\$20,113	7/16/2001	0	165	22,548	62	31,075
101	301447	99	Ford	CV	\$20,238	12/7/1998	12,764	3,908	19,951	54	50,457
102	198726	98	Ford	CV	\$19,689	5/12/1998	10,865	2,187	12,625	35	47,968
103	198607	98	Ford	CV	\$19,689	5/5/1998	3,627	2,760	4,131	11	29,285
104	181086	94	Ford	CV	\$14,698	8/29/1994	2,511	3,904	9,094	25	29,040
105	171521	92	Ford	CV	\$14,237	12/2/1991	3,505	4,215	4,338	12	76,363
106	175594	93	Ford	CV	\$14,030	3/16/1993	1,386	2,136	1,638	5	76,873
107	199096	98	Ford	CV	\$20,181	6/19/1998	23,065	26,859	24,096	68	102,087
108	199094	98	Ford	CV	\$20,181	6/19/1998	22,147	24,136	22,231	61	85,706
109	303084	99	Ford	CV	\$19,612	5/28/1999	15,991	19,437	28,798	79	74,082
110	199095	98	Ford	CV	\$20,181	6/19/1998	28,004	28,681	18,368	50	110,206
111	303008	99	Ford	Explorer	\$26,143	5/13/1998	10,279	13,414	17,937	49	49,734
112*^	199093	98	Ford	CV	\$20,181	6/19/1998	31,577	27,791	8,133	22	108,311
113*	185287	95	Ford	CV	\$16,239	7/21/1995	16,823	14,471	8,399	23	101,303
114*	185288	95	Ford	CV	\$16,239	7/21/1995	13,809	14,554	1,929	5	91,627
115*^	175914	93	Dodge	Van	\$13,946	9/15/1993	3,845	3,866	5,216	14	70,184
116*	163935	89	Ford	CV	\$12,451	1/24/1989	309	672	3,690	10	43,456
117*	151670	90	Ford	CV	\$14,900	11/7/1989	514	665	0	0	66,376
118	313176	01	Ford	Electric	\$7,667	5/10/2002	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
119	313177	01	Ford	Electric	\$7,667	5/10/2002	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

* Indicates vehicle no longer operable - wrecked or too costly to repair.

^ Indicates partial usage in FY 2002.

NOTE: The department has placed an order for nine (9) 2003 Chevy Impalas which are scheduled to arrive around 11/25/02. These vehicles will be dressed out and used to replace the 9 existing patrol vehicles.

UHCL

Inv #	Year	Make	Model	Cost	Date Purchased	Mileage				
						FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	Average/Day FY 2002	Total
27179	1996	Ford	Taurus	\$14,641	Sep-96	1,306	1,705	1,300	4	9,862
27794	1997	Jeep	Cherokee	\$22,226	Aug-97	10,946	7,861	8,420	23	52,857
28611	1998	Jeep	Cherokee	\$21,589	May-98	11,480	12,301	10,158	28	51,130
28625	1998	Jeep	Cherokee	\$21,589	May-98	9,776	12,475	10,114	28	47,024
28626	1998	Jeep	Cherokee	\$21,589	May-98	5,837	10,326	10,966	30	44,363
29788	2000	Ford	CV	\$19,786	Oct-99	8,620	14,310	13,469	37	36,399
	2002	Ford	CV	\$19,758	2-Jan	N/A	N/A	6,975	24	6,975
	2002	Chevy	Tahoe	\$26,400	2-Jan	N/A	N/A	2,978	10	2,978

UHD

Inv #	Year	Make	Model	Cost	Date Purchased	Mileage				
						FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	Average/ Day FY2002	Total
131184	1999	Chevy	Tahoe	\$25,755	1/7/1999	23,837	16,100	4642	13	44,579
132894	2001	Chevy	Impala	\$19,970	6/25/2001	N/A	1,296	11904	33	13,200
132895	2001	Chevy	Impala	\$19,970	6/25/2001	N/A	1,233	9928	27	11,161
132896	2001	Chevy	Impala	\$19,970	6/25/2001	N/A	669	6944	19	7,613

NOTE: Although vehicle replacement plans were in effect at UHCL, UH only recently instituted such a plan, and UHD has not since it just replaced all the vehicles after Tropical Storm Allison.

NOTE: The UHD Chief of Police stated that he wanted the purchase of the police vehicles to be spaced out in order for him to purchase one each year, but the flood of June 2001 required them all to be purchased at one time. Consequently, he does not have any funds set aside for the purchase of any new vehicles very soon.

**Types of Services Provided
2010**

Services	UH	UHCL	UHD
Police activities with licensed police officers	X	X	X
Police activities with security guards	X		X
Vehicle maintenance – Police Department’s expense	X		
Fleet management for university campus	X		X
Parking permit sales and collections	-	X	X
Locksmith and Electronic access (EA) controls	EA	X	X
Campus safety officer	-		
Campus institutional compliance office	-		
Lost and found	X	X	X
Crime prevention programs	X	X	X
Police Department Website	X	X	X

Staffing Level Analysis

	UH				UHCL				UHD			
	Total: Fall 2009	Officer total	Count per officer	Officers/ thou- sand	Total: Fall 2009	Officer total	Count per officer	Officers/ thou- sand	Total: Fall 2009	Officer total	Count per officer	Officer s/ thou- sand
Faculty:	2,011				370				596			
Staff:	4,289				680				467			
Students:	36,104				7,900				12,742			
Total	42,404	45	942	1.06	8,850	17	520	2	13,805	23	600	1.67
Building square footage:	9,673,987	45	214,977	.004	1,000,000	17	58,823	0.017	1,106,742	23	48,119	0.021
Parking places:	18,573	45	413	2.42	3,346	17	196.8	5.08	2,518	23	109	9.17
Acreeage	668.1	45	14.8	67.35	530.5	17	31.2	32	19.6	23	0.86	1162.7

	UH		UHCL		UHD
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time
Budgeted Staffing					
Security Guards	46	8	0	0	6
Officers	29		7	0	16
Corporals	0		2	0	0
Sergeants	7		5	0	3
Total of non- exempt	38		14	0.8	25
Lieu- tenants	7		2	0	3
Captains	0		0	0	0
Assist Chief of Police	1		0	0	0
Chief of Police	1		1	0	1
Total	129	8	17	0.8	29

Note: Budget amounts do not include dispatchers or support staff.

Salary Ranges and Incentive Pay 2010

Salary Levels

Titles		Pay	UH	UHCL	UHD
Officers	Range:	Minimum	\$34,860	\$31,200	\$39,963
		Maximum	\$49,337	\$40,000	N/A
	Actual:	Average	\$41,123	\$33,000	\$43,873
Corporals	Range:	Minimum	N/A	\$37,000	N/A
		Maximum	N/A	\$43,000	N/A
	Actual:	Average	N/A	\$38,000	N/A
Sergeants	Range:	Minimum	\$45,219	\$41,000	\$49,382
		Maximum	\$65,852	\$47,000	N/A
	Actual:	Average	\$50,440	\$43,000	\$57,382
Lieutenants	Range:	Minimum	\$59,820	\$56,000	\$60,944
		Maximum	\$100,152	\$66,000	N/A
	Actual:	Average	\$67,231	\$58,000	\$70,344

Incentive Pay

Incentives	UH	UHCL	UHD
Hazard Duty (H.D.)	\$10/Mo per year of employment in H.D. position.	\$10/Mo per year of employment in H.D. position.	\$10/Mo per year of employment in H.D. position.
Step Plan (UHD Officers below the rank of Chief receive tenure pay instead of merit raises.)	2-4yrs \$100/month 5-9yrs \$200/month 10-14yrs \$300/month 15-19yrs \$400/month 20 plus \$500/month	N/A	After 4 \$2,250/yr After 8 \$4,000/yr After 12 \$5,750/yr After 16 \$7,000/yr After 20 \$8,250/yr
Shift Differential	Shift Stipend 1st N/A 2nd \$26/Month 3rd \$69.33/Month	Day N/A Evening \$0.25/hr Night \$0.40/hr	2p-10p (Hr Employee) \$30/pay period 10p-6a (Hr Employee) \$60/pay period 2p-10p (Mn Employee) \$60/per month 10p-6a (Mn Employee) 120/per month
Education / Certification Pay	\$0	\$0	\$0
Basic Certification	\$0	\$0	\$0
Intermediate TCLE Certification Associate Degree / 60 College Hours	\$100/Month for EITHER, but not both.	\$100/Month N/A	\$1,200
Advanced TCLE Certification Bachelor Degree / 120 College Hours	\$200/Month for EITHER, but not both.	\$200/Month N/A	\$2,400
Master TCLE Certification Masters Degree	\$300	\$300/Month N/A	\$3,000

**Police Vehicle Fleets
2010**

UH

DIVISION	UNIT	BEAT	MAKE	MODEL	LP	Year	Mileage
Administration	PA101	Chief	Ford	Expedition	100-7405	2007	37,685
Investigations	PA103	Inv	Ford	Focus	747-2PT	2007	8,749
Investigations	PA104	Inv	Ford	Focus	746-2PT	2007	7,167
Patrol	PA105	Sgt	Ford	CV		2008	25,759
Patrol	PA106	Trn	Ford	CV		2008	36,661
Patrol	PA107	Trn	Ford	CV		2008	13,456
Fire Marshal	FM111	FM	Chev	S10	765202	2002	41,026
Patrol	PA122	FM	Chev	Impala	765202	2003	85,558
Administration	PA130	Capt	Chevrolet	Impala	X06GXJ	2004	86,595
Investigations	PA131	Inv	Chevrolet	Impala	X07GXJ	2004	46,316
Security	S132	SO	Ford	Crown Victoria	892840	2005	62,417
Security	PA135	SO	Club Car	Transporter	N/A		
Security	PA136	SO	Club Car	Transporter	N/A		
Fire Marshal	PA137	FM	Ford	Expedition	886084	2005	16,856
Security	S138	SO	Chevrolet	Malibu	936BWY	2004	61,544
Administration	PA139	Pool	Chevrolet	Impala	928BWY	2005	42,619
Patrol	PA140	1	Chevrolet	Impala	935BWY	2005	40,785
Patrol	PA142	DWN	Chevrolet	Impala	886088	2005	Down
Patrol	PA146		Chevrolet	Trailblazer	206250	2005	71,119
Patrol	PA147	Ptr	Ford	CV	233666	2006	62,079
Patrol	PA148	3	Ford	CV	233665	2006	60,688
Patrol	PA149	87	Ford	Ranger	233657	2006	37,992
Fire Marshal	PA150	FM	Ford	Ranger	235035	2007	9,830
Parking	PK4		Chev	Colorado		2008	21,812
Parking	PK5		Ford	Ranger		2007	7,454
Parking	PK7		Chev	Colorado		2009	11,197
Parking	PK10		Chev	Silverado		2006	22,252
Parking	PK11		Chev	Colorado		2005	31,098

UHCL

Inv #	Year	Make	Model	Cost	Date Purchased	Mileage				
						FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	Average/Day FY 2002	Total
27179	1996	Ford	Taurus	\$14,641	Sep-96	1,306	1,705	1,300	4	9,862
27794	1997	Jeep	Cherokee	\$22,226	Aug-97	10,946	7,861	8,420	23	52,857
28611	1998	Jeep	Cherokee	\$21,589	May-98	11,480	12,301	10,158	28	51,130
28625	1998	Jeep	Cherokee	\$21,589	May-98	9,776	12,475	10,114	28	47,024
28626	1998	Jeep	Cherokee	\$21,589	May-98	5,837	10,326	10,966	30	44,363
29788	2000	Ford	CV	\$19,786	Oct-99	8,620	14,310	13,469	37	36,399
	2002	Ford	CV	\$19,758	2-Jan	N/A	N/A	6,975	24	6,975
	2002	Chevy	Tahoe	\$26,400	2-Jan	N/A	N/A	2,978	10	2,978
	2002	Chevy	Tahoe	\$26,400	2002					76,000
	2006	Ford	Exp	\$26,000	2006					31,000
	2006	Ford	Exp	\$26,000	2006					31,000
	2008	Ford	CV	\$25,000	2008					19,000
	2008	Ford	CV	\$25,000	2008					21,000
	2008	Ford	CV	\$25,000	2008					22,000
	2009	Ford	CV	\$25,000	2009					9,000
	2010	Ford	Exp	\$25,000	2010					2,000

UHD

Inv #	Unit #	Year	Make	Model	Cost	Date Purchased	Mileage				
							FY 07	FY 08	FY 09	Average/Day FY 2009	Total
131184	101	1999	Chevy	Tahoe	25755	8/19/1999	8647	3652	0	0	12299
132896	111	2001	Chevy	Impala	19970	8/7/2001	9921	7547	2373	6.5	19841
132895	113	2001	Chevy	Impala	19970	8/7/2001	14584	4647	0	0	19231
132897	115	2001	Chevy	Suburban	28396	8/8/2001	9580	8509	9443	25.9	27532
139740	116	2005	Ford	Crown Vic	19290	3/1/2006	8616	16782	2111	5.8	27509
140742	117	2007	Ford	Crown Vic	24725	8/8/2007	704	10494	9818	26.9	21016
142756	118	2008	Ford	Crown Vic	26349	7/14/2008	0	4015	16210	44.4	20225
142769	119	2008	Ford	Crown Vic	20817	11/12/2008	0	0	6242	17.1	6242
142770	120	2009	Ford	Expedition	29982	1/5/2009	0	0	10854	29.7	10854