



City of Houston

Annise D. Parker
City Controller

Steve Schoonover
City Auditor

Houston Emergency Center

Follow-Up Review

Report No. 2007-15
March 2007



OFFICE OF THE CITY CONTROLLER
CITY OF HOUSTON
TEXAS

ANNISE D. PARKER

March 20, 2007

The Honorable Bill White, Mayor
City of Houston, Texas

SUBJECT: Houston Emergency Center-Follow-Up Review
Report No. 2007-15

Dear Mayor White:

In accordance with the City's contract with Jefferson Wells International (JWI), JWI has completed a follow-up review of the implementation status of the 65 recommendations noted in the Houston Emergency Center (HEC) Performance Review Report (Report No. 05-27) issued to the Mayor and City Council Members on July 5, 2005.

The recommendations covered organizational structure; staffing methods; employee morale and environment; employee evaluation, rewards, and retribution; analysis of call handling activities and staffing levels; operational management; IT infrastructure and support; and facility security and disaster recovery. JWI also conducted a limited scope employee survey to determine if HEC employee perceptions have changed since the original May 2005 survey.

The report, attached for your review, noted that HEC has fully implemented or implemented in an alternative manner approximately 60% of the recommendations and should be commended for this effort. Also, of the \$6.8 million of potential annual cost savings identified in the initial report, actual realized savings to date associated with the recommendations the HEC has chosen to implement approximate \$1.2 million. **The most significant recommendation from the report that remains unaddressed is the adoption of a single unified organizational structure for the HEC. Failure to address this pervasive issue provides the potential for the reemergence of serious morale concerns at the HEC.** Draft copies of the matters contained in the report were provided to HEC management. The views of responsible officials as to actions being taken are appended to the report as Exhibit A.

We enjoyed working with the HEC employees and appreciate their complete cooperation with Jefferson Wells during this review.

Respectfully submitted,

Annise D. Parker
City Controller

xc: City Council Members
Anthony Hall, Chief Administrative Officer
Michael Moore, Chief of Staff, Mayor's Office
Dennis Storemski, Director, Mayor's Office Public Safety and Homeland Security Division
David Cutler, Director, Houston Emergency Center
Judy Gray Johnson, Director, Finance and Administration Department
Rick Flanagan, Assistant Fire Chief, Houston Fire Department

March 8, 2007

Controller Annise D. Parker
City Controller
City of Houston
901 Bagby, 8th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002

Dear Controller Parker:

We have completed our follow-up review of the implementation status of recommendations noted in the Houston Emergency Center (HEC) Performance Review report issued to the Mayor and City Council on July 5, 2005 as outlined in our engagement letter dated August 31, 2006, and in our Additional Authorization for Audit Services dated November 15, 2006, under Contract No. 56545.

Our observations and recommendations noted during the performance of the review are presented in this report. Our procedures, which accomplished the project objectives, were performed through January 17, 2007 and have not been updated since that date. Our observations included in this report are the only matters that came to our attention, based on the procedures performed.

All data used during this review was obtained from representatives of the Houston Emergency Center. Our work does not constitute an audit conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, an examination of internal controls or other attestation or review services in accordance with standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA). Accordingly, we do not express an opinion or any other form of assurance on the reporting or compliance of the Houston Emergency Center.

Jefferson Wells is pleased to have assisted the City Controller, and we appreciate the cooperation received during this engagement from the Houston Emergency Center, as well as your office.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the City, the Houston Emergency Center and the City Controller's Office, and is not intended to be used for any other purpose.



Eric Bruce
Director – Internal Controls

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Objectives and Scope	1
Summary of Key Outstanding Concerns	1
Implementation Status Summary	3
Employee Survey Summary	4

Detail Report

Objectives, Scope, and Background	5
Implementation Status	7
Employee Survey	20
Key Outstanding Concerns	29

Appendix I: Status Determination Definitions

Appendix II: Detail of Original 65 Recommendations with Management's Response

Appendix III: Results of Employee Survey

Exhibit A: Views of Responsible Officials

Executive Summary

Objectives and Scope

Jefferson Wells was retained to perform an independent assessment of the implementation status of recommendations noted in the Houston Emergency Center (HEC) performance review report issued to the Mayor and City Council on July 5, 2005. Our primary objectives included the following:

- Obtaining the implementation status of all 65 recommendations provided in the HEC Performance Review Report No. 05-27. The recommendations covered organizational structure; staffing methods; employee morale and environment; employee evaluation, rewards and retribution; analysis of call handling activities and staffing levels; operational management; IT infrastructure and support; and facility security and disaster recovery.
- Verifying the implementation status of the recommendations.
- Conducting a limited scope employee survey to determine if HEC employee perceptions have changed since the original May 2005 survey.

Summary of Key Outstanding Concerns

The initial performance review report issued in June 2005 grouped the recommendations into eight categories. Of these areas, Organizational Structure; Staffing Methods; and Employee Morale and Environment were determined to have the greatest relative impact on overall Center operations and the actions taken in these areas have not to a large enough extent addressed the key issues. Based on the procedures performed during this follow-up review, the following areas remain as key outstanding concerns.

A. Organizational Structure

The most significant of the 65 recommendations made in the initial Performance Review report that remains unaddressed is the adoption of a single unified organizational structure for the Center. **As of the date of this report, no changes have been made with regard to addressing this significant organizational structure issue.** The Center continues to be comprised of three separate organizations (HEC civilian 9-1-1, HPD and HFD), with unique cultures and management styles, and no single centralized day-to-day authority over all emergency response services at the Center. **Failure to address this pervasive issue provides the potential for the reemergence of serious morale concerns at the Center.**

In May 2006 an attempt was made to transfer the approximately 70 HPD Dispatchers from HPD to HEC control. HPD was willing to provide the funds to the HEC budget to support this transfer, however, HPD was not willing to fund the salary cost of the 21 supervisors required to manage the HPD Dispatchers. As a result, the idea was abandoned and the HPD Dispatchers remain under the direct control of HPD. The HFD noted that their labor contract with the City currently prohibits civilianization of the Fire/EMS dispatch function.

Executive Summary

The lack of addressing the organizational structure issues has permeated throughout the remaining recommendations. In many cases, recommendations as made were to be applied to more than just one of the three distinct groups. However, only one group, most often the HEC civilian group, has addressed the issue. While a particular recommendation may have received an overall determination status of partially implemented, serious issues often remain unaddressed by the other groups who have not addressed the recommendations.

B. Staffing Methods

Implementation of the recommendations related to staffing methods has been mixed. Some of the significant staffing issues that remain are as follows:

- The HEC civilian group has been successful in increasing its call-taking staff, as previously recommended. Despite aggressive campaigning for Senior Police Dispatchers in a variety of venues, HPD has been unsuccessful in increasing its staff size to the authorized level of 92. The actual number of Senior Police Dispatchers as of December 2006 was 67.
- Several other recommendations to address the overtime and drafting issues noted in the initial report have been either partially implemented or not yet implemented by the HEC. These include the cross-training of Police Telecommunicators as Police Dispatchers, consideration of revising the shift schedule to provide for longer individual shifts but fewer shifts per week, addressing FMLA issues, training HPD supervisors on the CAD system, and establishing a Police Dispatcher reserve pool. Full implementation of these recommendations would alleviate some of the mandatory overtime and drafting of personnel.
- One other significant recommendation that has not been implemented is that in order to achieve an improved work/life balance, the HEC should alter the current 4-week scheduling process to a much longer timeframe. We recommended a process of 12 weeks, 12 weeks, 12 weeks, and 16 weeks that would begin in the first two-week payroll period in January each year. During our initial performance review, numerous employees expressed to us that a longer known schedule would alleviate many of the scheduling issues that they currently face on an individual basis and would reduce their need to “call in sick” to attend their previously scheduled personal obligations.

C. Employee Morale and Environment

Management embarked on numerous morale building projects throughout the past year some of which include furnishing of quiet rooms for employee use; new chairs; internet kiosks for employee use; allowing casual wear on weekends and holidays; holiday parties; training pay; use of common notice boards for communications/recognition; improved face-time with management; monthly meetings with supervisors; the addition

Executive Summary

of logos/plaques in prominent locations to enhance unity/ demonstrate pride in mission; and numerous others. However, the results of the follow-up employee survey suggest that classified employee morale issues have not been completely addressed.

Implementation Status Summary

- The following table summarizes status determination categorization of recommendations made in the initial Performance Review report issues in June 2005:

	Number	Percentage
Implemented	28	43 %
Alternative Implemented	11	17 %
Partially Implemented	11	17 %
Intends to Implement	5	8 %
Not Implemented	6	9 %
Management Disagrees	4	6 %
Total	65	100 %

Of the 65 recommendations made in the initial Performance Review report issued in June 2005, the HEC has fully implemented or implemented in an alternative manner approximately 60% of the recommendations and should be commended for this effort. If partially implemented recommendations are included, this number rises to 77%.

However, of these 65 recommendations, the most critical were determined to be those with a risk-categorization of high for either priority or impact. The status determination categorization of the 18 recommendations that met this criteria are summarized as follows:

	Implemented	Alternative Implemented	Partially Implemented	Intends to Implement	Not Implemented	Mgmt Disagrees	Total
Org. Structure	1	1		1	1		4
Staffing Methods	1		3		1		5
Morale/Environ.							0
Eval./Rewards		1	1				2
Call Handling	3					1	4
Op. Mgmt.				1			1
IT		1					1
Facility Security	1						1
Combined	6	3	4	2	2	1	18
Combined %	33%	17%	22%	11%	11%	6%	100%

The above table demonstrates that only 50% of the most critical recommendations have been fully implemented or implemented in an alternative manner.

Executive Summary

- Of the \$6.8 million of potential annual cost savings identified in the initial performance review report, actual realized savings to date associated with the recommendations the HEC has chosen to implement approximate \$1.2 million.

Employee Survey Summary

Based on the responses received, conditions appear to have improved. However, due to the low response rates associated with 5 of the 10 groups surveyed, we believe management should exercise caution in forming an overall conclusion about employee perceptions. The lack of responsiveness from the other 5 groups may have skewed the overall comparison of responses to a more even distribution rather than reflecting a true change in perception. See **Employee Survey** section for details.

All information in this summary, along with details of the above noted issues and other key outstanding concerns can be found in the **Implementation Status**, **Employee Survey**, and **Key Outstanding Concerns** sections to follow.

Objectives, Scope, and Background

Objectives and Scope

Jefferson Wells was retained to perform an independent assessment of the implementation status of recommendations noted in the Houston Emergency Center performance review report issued to the Mayor and City Council on July 5, 2005. Our scope included the following:

- Obtaining the implementation status of all 65 recommendations provided in the HEC Performance Review Report No. 05-27. The recommendations covered organizational structure; staffing methods; employee morale and environment; employee evaluation, rewards and retribution; analysis of call handling activities and staffing levels; operational management; IT infrastructure and support; and facility security and disaster recovery.
- Verifying the implementation status of the recommendations.
- Providing the HEC Center employees with a limited scope and focused follow up survey (December 2006) based on a selection of questions previously presented to employees through the anonymous survey presented to HEC employees in May 2005 to determine if employees of the HEC have perception changes since the 2005 employee survey.

Background

The mission of the Houston Emergency Center is to provide the citizens of Houston with the most efficient, accurate and professional service when processing their life-threatening calls. The City of Houston's Houston Emergency Center, in coordination with the Office of Emergency Management, protects life and property by operating the public safety communications system and by coordinating and managing emergency situations.

Prior to September 2003, Houston had three emergency communications centers for 9-1-1: Neutral Public Safety Answering Point, Police Department Emergency Communications Division, and Fire Department Emergency Communications Operations. Each agency had separate answering centers, computer networks, and technical support. The development of the state-of-the-art Houston Emergency Center (HEC) consolidated all of these efforts.

The HEC was established to improve the delivery of Public Safety services to citizens who live, work, and visit Houston by providing a facility in which calls for emergency services within Houston are received and dispatched to emergency first responders. Other capabilities that allow HEC to have reliable communication is its link to two-way radio communication systems that support the Houston Police, Fire/EMS, and Emergency Management agencies so that dispatchers can communicate with personnel in the field.

Approximately 9,000 emergency calls per day are processed at HEC. The volume of emergency calls can easily double during times of inclement weather or special City

Objectives, Scope, and Background

social/sporting events. Beginning in September 2003, the primary five call handling functions performed by the three previously separately located, but interrelated, emergency response groups were combined within a single call center and on a common call floor. These groups consist of the following:

- Houston Emergency Center (previously the Neutral Public Safety Answering Point, this group is composed of primarily the former management and personnel from 9-1-1 Call Operations, supplemented by former civilian HPD call-takers) – “HEC”
- Houston Police Department (previously the Police Department Emergency Communications Division, this group is composed of classified personnel and supervisory personnel and civilian call dispatchers) – “HPD”
- Houston Fire Department (previously the Fire Department Emergency Communications Operations, this group is composed of all classified personnel) – “HFD”

The acronym HEC is confusingly ambiguous since it is used to refer both to a specific segment of civilian call-takers, their administration and management, and also to the Center as a whole. To differentiate between the two, we have used the following terminology:

- “HEC” – to refer to the call taking functions and personnel up to and including the Director of the Houston Emergency Center
- Emergency Response Center – or “the Center” – to refer to the consolidated emergency response functions as a whole and as a single physical infrastructure

The five primary functions consolidated within the Center are:

- Initial 9-1-1 call taking and routing to either Fire/EMS or Police, performed by civilian 9-1-1 Telecommunicators under their existing (now HEC) management.
- Subsequent Police call taking, performed by civilian Police Telecommunicators (PT), previously civilian HPD employees, who were transferred over to HEC.
- Subsequent Fire/EMS call taking, performed for several years by civilian Fire/EMS Senior 9-1-1 Telecommunicators (ST) under the same 9-1-1 management.
- Police Dispatch, performed by Senior Police Telecommunicators, which are civilian employees of HPD. Briefly, from around September 2003 through April 2004, these Senior Police Telecommunicators were transferred to HEC as HEC employees, consistent with their former Police Telecommunicator colleagues, but were then transferred back to HPD’s payroll and to supervision by classified police officers.
- Fire/EMS Dispatch, performed solely by classified HFD employees.

Implementation Status

Determination of Implementation Status Activities

In accomplishing the assessment of the implementation status of recommendations, we performed the following activities:

- Developed a risk-based categorization of the original 65 recommendations by assigning a risk category of high, medium, or low to both priority and impact of the respective recommendation.
- For each recommendation, requested representatives of the HEC Center to describe actions taken to implement the recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Representatives were requested to provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of the recommendation.
- Selectively performed additional verification procedures to determine the implementation status of the recommendations through inquiry, observation, and review and recalculation of appropriated statistics provided. All items assigned a risk category of high for either priority or impact were included in the additional verification process.
- Assigned a status determination to each of the 65 recommendations classified as follows: Implemented, Alternative Implemented, Partially Implemented, Intends to Implement, Not Implemented, or Management Disagrees. See **Appendix I** for a detailed description of each status determination category.

Implementation Status Summary

The following table summarizes status determination categorization of recommendations made in the initial Performance Review report issues in June 2005:

	Number	Percentage
Implemented	28	43 %
Alternative Implemented	11	17 %
Partially Implemented	11	17 %
Intends to Implement	5	8 %
Not Implemented	6	9 %
Management Disagrees	4	6 %
Total	65	100 %

Of the 65 recommendations made in the initial Performance Review report issued in June 2005, the HEC has fully implemented or implemented in an alternative manner approximately 60% of the recommendations and should be commended for this effort. If partially implemented recommendations are included, this number rises to 77%.

In many cases, recommendations were made that applied to more than just one of the three distinct groups. However, only one group, most often the HEC civilian group, has addressed the issue. While a particular recommendation may have received an overall

Implementation Status

determination status of partially implemented, serious issues often remain unaddressed by the other groups who have not addressed the recommendations.

Of the \$6.8 million of potential annual cost savings identified in the initial performance review report, actual realized savings to date associated with the recommendations the HEC has chosen to implement approximate \$1.2 million.

Implementation Status Matrix

The following matrix provides a detailed summary of each of the original 65 recommendations listed by issue number, category, recommendation summary, priority, impact, potential financial impact, status determination and additional comments. See **Appendix II** for a more detailed description of each finding inclusive of the above as well as management's initial response/comments as of June 16, 2005, management's action status response as of June 16, 2005 and Management's current response and action status.

Issue No.	Category	Recommendation Summary	Priority	Impact	Potential Financial Impact	Status Determination	Comments
1	Organizational Structure	Consider alternative organization structures	High	High	\$1.8 M	Not implemented	(1)
2	Organizational Structure	Address morale issues	High	High	n/a	Implemented	(2)
3	Organizational Structure	Long-term plan and decision on civilianization	High	High	n/a	Alternative Implemented	(3)
4	Organizational Structure	Consider separation and segregation of functions	High	High	n/a	Intends to Implement	(4)
5	Organizational Structure	Committee to study and interview Chicago OEMC	Medium	Medium	n/a	Implemented	(5)
6	Staffing Methods	Immediate recruitment campaign to staff all positions	High	High	n/a	Implemented	(6)
7	Staffing Methods	Cross train Police Tele-communicators as Police Dispatchers	High	High	n/a	Partially Implemented	(7)
8	Staffing Methods	Consider HPD's proposal for 40 hour work week	Medium	Medium	\$489 K	Intends to implement	(8)
9	Staffing Methods	Review FMLA practices (turnaround, 2nd/3rd opinions)	High	High	n/a	Partially Implemented	(9)
10	Staffing Methods	Communicate portions of shifts paid vs. unpaid	Medium	Low	n/a	Implemented	(10)

Implementation Status

Issue No.	Category	Recommendation Summary	Priority	Impact	Potential Financial Impact	Status Determination	Comments
11	Staffing Methods	HPD supervisors trained on CAD system	Medium	Medium	n/a	Intends to implement	(11)
12	Staffing Methods	Revise sick policy to not penalize 64 hours/ begin incentive program	Medium	Medium	n/a	Partially implemented	(12)
13	Staffing Methods	Fully staff multiple call processing functions	High	High	\$1 M	Partially Implemented	(13)
14	Staffing Methods	Scheduling based on 12 wk, 12 wk, 12 wk, 16 wks	High	High	n/a	Not implemented	(14)
15	Staffing Methods	Allow vacation requests more than once per year	Medium	Medium	n/a	Implemented	(15)
16	Staffing Methods	Consider semi-annual shift bidding process	Medium	Medium	n/a	Alternative Implemented	(16)
17	Staffing Methods	Establish Police Dispatcher reserve pool	Medium	Medium	n/a	Intends to implement	(17)
18	Staffing Methods	Clarify policy for drafted employees ability to make alternate personal arrangements (i.e. childcare)	Low	Medium	n/a	Partially Implemented	(18)
19	Morale and Environment	Improve employee "face time" with HEC management	Medium	Medium	n/a	Implemented	(19)
20	Morale and Environment	Utilize common notice board for employee recognition	Medium	Medium	n/a	Implemented	(20)
21	Morale and Environment	Establish one set of common standardized polices	Medium	Medium	n/a	Partially Implemented	(21)
22	Morale and Environment	Ensure appearance and reality of equitable treatment of all personnel	Medium	Medium	n/a	Partially Implemented	(22)
23	Morale and Environment	Evaluation and reward system based more on performance than seniority	Medium	Medium	n/a	Partially Implemented	(23)

Implementation Status

Issue No.	Category	Recommendation Summary	Priority	Impact	Potential Financial Impact	Status Determination	Comments
24	Morale and Environment	Determine whether HPD civilian employees held to same standards as other Center civilian employees	Medium	Medium	n/a	Partially Implemented	(24)
25	Morale and Environment	Similar dress codes to foster team unity	Low	Low	n/a	Alternative Implemented	(25)
26	Morale and Environment	Restrict use of unnecessary televisions	Low	Low	n/a	Alternative Implemented	(26)
27	Morale and Environment	Clarify requirements for roll-call attendance	Medium	Low	n/a	Implemented	(27)
28	Morale and Environment	Discourage practice of Employee Relations Manager advancing personal funds to employees	Low	Low	n/a	Implemented	(28)
29	Morale and Environment	Consider separation and segregation of functions	Medium	Medium	n/a	Alternative Implemented	(29)
30	Morale and Environment	Improve Employee Concerns Review Program	Low	Low	n/a	Implemented	(30)
31	Morale and Environment	Allow employees to take deferred holidays in accordance with City policy	Medium	Medium	n/a	Implemented	(31)
32	Morale and Environment	Communicate action plan regarding previous audit recommendations	Medium	Medium	n/a	Not implemented	(32)
33	Evaluation, rewards	Revise EPE methodology regarding use of vacation, FMLA, sick time	Medium	Medium	n/a	Alternative Implemented	(33)
34	Evaluation, rewards	Split productivity measure into call efficiency and total time logged in	Medium	Medium	n/a	Implemented	(34)
35	Evaluation, rewards	Outgoing supervisors provide EPE ratings before rotating	Medium	High	n/a	Alternative Implemented	(35)

Implementation Status

Issue No.	Category	Recommendation Summary	Priority	Impact	Potential Financial Impact	Status Determination	Comments
36	Evaluation, rewards	Duties of Employee Relations Manager not include disciplinary actions	Low	Medium	n/a	Implemented	(36)
37	Evaluation, rewards	Institute visible employee rewards program	Medium	Medium	n/a	Implemented	(37)
38	Evaluation, rewards	Improve starting compensation for new telecommunicators	High	High	n/a	Partially Implemented	(38)
39	Evaluation, rewards	Use of common notice board for employee recognition	Medium	Medium	n/a	Implemented	(39)
40	Call handling	Establish realistic and achievable long-term DCP and PCP goals	High	High	n/a	Implemented	(40)
41	Call handling	Perform comparative study of data gathering requirements	Low	Low	n/a	Alternative Implemented	(41)
42	Call handling	Management closely monitor actual time on calls or available for calls	Low	Medium	n/a	Implemented	(42)
43	Call handling	Assign Fire/EMS ST's on each shift to handle Police call overflows	High	High	\$405 K	Management Disagrees	(43)
44	Call handling	Evaluate call handling time within context of total response time	Low	Medium	n/a	Not implemented	(44)
45	Call handling	Install IVR for Police 10 digit calls	High	High	\$2M	Implemented	(45)
46	Call handling	Install IVR for Fire and EMS 10 digit calls	Medium	Medium	\$202 K	Management Disagrees	(46)
47	Call handling	Increase the number of Spanish speaking Telecommunicators	High	High	\$375 K	Implemented	(47)
48	Call handling	Assign priority 3 & 4 calls directly to patrol units	Low	Medium	n/a	Not Implemented	(48)
49	Call handling	Improve dispatch queue time by increasing HPD Officers to respond	Medium	Medium	n/a	Not implemented	(49)

Implementation Status

Issue No.	Category	Recommendation Summary	Priority	Impact	Potential Financial Impact	Status Determination	Comments
50	Operational Management	Relocate Teleserve to the HEC from off-site location	Medium	High	\$416 K	Intends to Implement	(50)
51	Operational Management	Place a light at call taker console for communication with Liaison Specialist	Low	Low	n/a	Management Disagrees	(51)
52	Operational Management	Dispatchers be allowed to contact Police/Fire/EMS colleagues directly	Medium	Medium	n/a	Management Disagrees	(52)
53	Operational Management	Telecommunicators spend time in the field with emergency responders	Low	Medium	n/a	Partially Implemented	(53)
54	Information Technology	Establish 24 hour Help Desk	Medium	High	n/a	Alternative Implemented	(54)
55	Information Technology	IT Department have equipment and training to support HEC	Medium	Medium	n/a	Implemented	(55)
56	Information Technology	Consider a vendor contract for critical IT hardware and support	Medium	Medium	n/a	Implemented	(56)
57	Information Technology	Maintain pro-active media communication	Medium	Medium	n/a	Implemented	(57)
58	Information Technology	Establish policies and schedules for preventative maintenance	Medium	Medium	n/a	Alternative Implemented	(58)
59	Information Technology	Establish policies for overtime compensation for IT personnel	Medium	Medium	n/a	Implemented	(59)
60	Information Technology	Coordinate IT support activities with all IT stakeholders	Low	Low	n/a	Implemented	(60)
61	Information Technology	Establish a centralized IT office	Low	Medium	n/a	Alternative Implemented	(61)
62	Information Technology	Evaluate the location and quality of critical infrastructure equipment	Low	Low	n/a	Implemented	(62)
63	Information Technology	Establish career path for IT personnel	Medium	Medium	n/a	Implemented	(63)

Implementation Status

Issue No.	Category	Recommendation Summary	Priority	Impact	Potential Financial Impact	Status Determination	Comments
64	Facility Security	Prepare a formal business disruption/continuity plan	High	High	n/a	Implemented	(64)
65	Facility Security	Implement a no tail gaiting policy	Low	Low	n/a	Implemented	(65)

Comment Notes:

- (1) In May 2006 an attempt was made to transfer the approximately 70 HPD Dispatchers from HPD to HEC control. HPD was willing to provide the funds to HEC's budget to support this transfer, however, HPD was not willing to fund the salary cost of the 21 supervisors (\$1.8M) required to manage the HPD Dispatchers. As a result, the idea was abandoned and the HPD Dispatchers remain under HPD's control.
- (2) HEC has implemented several morale-boosting activities, including such things as parties, quiet rooms, email access, employee recognition programs, and newsletters. HPD has participated and benefited from the HEC activities. HPD also implemented an across the board pay-raise for its Senior Police Dispatchers, and is attempting to have their pay grade raised as well.
- (3) The Center is continuing with partial civilianization.
- (4) n/a
- (5) n/a
- (6) HEC has increased its call taking staff by 29 due to an increase in call volume. HEC is fully staffed, except for routine turnover and promotions. In the 2007 budget they are authorized 191 telecommunicators and have 180 on staff as of December 2006.

HPD has aggressively campaigned for Senior Police Dispatchers in a variety of venues, but has largely been unsuccessful in increasing its staff size to the authorized level of 92. The actual number of Senior Police Dispatchers as of December 2006 was 67. HPD Emergency Communication Division management has been successful in obtaining an across the board pay increase for its Senior Police Dispatchers. Additionally, management has requested the City's Human Resources Department increase the pay grade up two levels, and that they lessen the requirements for the position.

- (7) HEC and HPD provided cross-training for HEC telecommunicators on Senior Police Dispatching positions for a period of time. The telecommunicators were

Implementation Status

trained on the "back channel" "dispatch positions. These two desks typically have the least activity, and do not handle priority one calls. When the Senior Police Dispatchers have seniority or if they are drafted to work additional shifts, they generally are allowed to work these slower back channels. Therefore, when a HEC Telecommunicator was being trained and the back channels were not available to the Senior Police Dispatchers, problems arose. This practice was discontinued in part due to funding issues.

- (8) n/a
- (9) HEC management has reduced FMLA usage by approximately 32%. They have begun requesting 2nd and 3rd doctor opinions in certain cases. HPD has not addressed their issues with FMLA up to this point. Any changes in policy they might make in regards to FMLA will need to be reviewed by HPD legal staff. They also stated that the staffing shortage must be addressed first, and once staffing levels are achieved, then FMLA can be studied.
- (10) n/a
- (11) n/a
- (12) The EPE standards regarding the ratings associated with attendance have not been revised. Management feels it is a fair employee assessment factor. However, management revised the sick leave policy to no longer require employees to provide a doctor's note prior to 64 hours of sick leave use and additional incentives for outstanding attendance have been added.
- (13) The HEC 9-1-1 civilian telecommunicator function has increased its call-taking staff by 29. While HEC's overtime costs for telecommunicators in fiscal year 2005 was \$773,000 compared to \$951,000 for fiscal year 2006, much of this increase was due to a rise in the number of calls caused by the Hurricane Katrina population growth Houston experienced in September/October 2005.
- (14) n/a
- (15) n/a
- (16) n/a
- (17) n/a
- (18) HEC does not have a formalized Draft Policy. HPD does have a written Draft Policy, issued July 5, 2005.
- (19) n/a

Implementation Status

- (20) Observed a common notice board, pictures of events located on internet kiosks, employee recognition activities, and featured stories on HEC social events covered in City periodicals.
- (21) n/a
- (22) n/a
- (23) HEC has implemented an incentive pay program based on a variety of employee performance standards. HPD has submitted a similar incentive pay proposal for its Senior Police Dispatchers to HPD management for review. They have also requested a salary review requesting an increase in pay grade status for the dispatchers. At this time, neither proposal has been approved.
- (24) n/a
- (25) n/a
- (26) n/a
- (27) n/a
- (28) The practice was verbally discussed with the employee, and the activity ceased. There is no written memorandum to support the discussion.
- (29) n/a
- (30) n/a
- (31) HEC issued a policy on November 2, 2006 addressing the deferred holiday issue. Additionally, HEC had a memo read at roll calls for five consecutive days that explained the new policy. HPD has an existing policy in place which explains when a holiday occurs on an employee's regular day off, the employee will be granted Accrued Holiday Time equal to the employee's regular workday. Employees are not compensated for their Accrued/Deferred Holiday time. HFD also has an existing policy. If classified personnel are scheduled to work a City Holiday, that employee will accrue 2 holidays for that day.
- (32) HEC, HPD, and HFD management stated that no formal action plan was distributed to employees. HEC management believes that the employees recognize that the improvements made have been a result of the JW audit.
- (33) n/a
- (34) HEC has implemented these measures for efficiencies. HPD has submitted a similar plan to HPD management for approval.
- (35) n/a

Implementation Status

- (36) n/a
- (37) n/a
- (38) HPD was funded a \$2,000 across the board pay raise for their Senior Police Dispatchers. They currently have a market salary request at HR, and they are hopeful the study will allow for a further increase in pay for the Senior Police dispatchers. In addition, a \$20 bi-weekly pay increase was provided to all telecommunicators who cross-train as a dispatcher.
- (39) n/a
- (40) HEC has implemented call-processing standards and included them in HEC Procedure PSAP 820-0 dated April 30, 2006. HPD has a similar program drafted, and is awaiting approval by HPD management.
- (41) n/a
- (42) n/a
- (43) n/a
- (44) n/a
- (45) Statistics show that the IVR system is able to manage an average of 33% of the 10 digit and 311 transfer calls placed to the emergency call takers at HEC. The IVR system answers these calls and is able to transfer them to the appropriate agency that can handle the citizen's concerns, thereby freeing up the time of an emergency call taker. Based on number of calls answered by the IVR, it is estimated that the time saved is roughly equal to salary savings of \$1,149,514.
- (46) n/a
- (47) Spanish-speaking telecommunicators increased by 58%; senior telecommunicators increased by 75%. HEC has reduced its use of the AT&T Language Line by \$76,428 when comparing fiscal years 2005 to 2006. HPD stated they actively recruit bilingual police dispatchers, however, they were unable to provide any statistics or cost saving calculations regarding this matter.
- (48) n/a
- (49) n/a
- (50) HEC facility is not large enough to provide space for Teleserve function. It will most likely remain at its present location, 62 Riesner.
- (51) n/a
- (52) n/a

Implementation Status

- (53) A ride along program was used for every employee who was promoted to the position of Sr. 911 Telecommunicator (Fire/EMS) and PSAP (Public Safety Answering Point) Supervisor (Fire/EMS). HPD stated that until adequate staffing is achieved, the ride-along program cannot be implemented.
- (54) The number of employees on call has increased from 9 to 14.
- (55) n/a
- (56) Several agreements are in existence with software and hardware providers that provide continuous real time monitoring and repair of the HEC's computer systems. See answer to issue #58.
- (57) n/a
- (58) Per the Chief Technology Officer, the computer systems and software at HEC are monitored and maintained on a 24 hour, 7 day a week basis. The HEC cannot allow the system to become inoperable, therefore, the systems are constantly monitored. In order to support this claim, we were provided current year documentation of the City Ordinance approving a \$17M contract with Northrup Grumman to provide basic software maintenance. We also reviewed various invoices supporting the ongoing computer maintenance.
- (59) n/a
- (60) n/a
- (61) n/a
- (62) n/a
- (63) n/a
- (64) A Continuity of Operations (COOP) Plan has been prepared
- (65) n/a

Implementation Status

The following table summarizes the status determination categorization of the original 65 recommendations by improvement opportunity area:

	Implemented	Alternative Implemented	Partially Implemented	Intends to Implement	Not Implemented	Mgmt Disagrees	Total
Org. Structure	2	1		1	1		5
Staffing Methods	3	1	5	3	1		13
Morale/Environ.	6	3	4		1		14
Eval./Rewards	4	2	1				7
Call Handling	4	1			3	2	10
Op. Mgmt.			1	1		2	4
IT	7	3					10
Facility Security	2						2
Combined	28	11	11	5	6	4	65
Combined %	43%	17%	17%	8%	9%	6%	100%

Of the 65 recommendations made in the initial Performance Review report issues in June 2005, the HEC has fully implemented or implemented in an alternative manner approximately 60% of the recommendations and should be commended for this effort. If partially implemented recommendations are included, this number rises to 77%.

In many cases, recommendations were made that applied to more than just one of the three distinct groups. However, only one group, most often the HEC civilian group, has addressed the issue. While a particular recommendation may have received an overall determination status of partially implemented, serious issues often remain unaddressed by the other groups who have not addressed the recommendations.

The following table provides a summary comparison of the initial Performance Review report identified potential cost savings associated with the recommendations versus realized annual savings:

Implementation Status

Comparison of Initial Performance Review Report Identified Potential Cost Savings Associated with the Recommendations versus Realized Annual Savings			
Issue #	Description *	Potential Annual Savings	Realized Annual Savings
1	Organizational Structure Scenario IV - annual payroll cost savings - Appendix F-1	\$ 1,817,386	\$ -
8	HPD management's proposal for three 12-hour shifts and a single 6 hour shift per week	\$ 489,000	\$ -
13	Fully staff call processing functions to reduce overtime pay premium could aggregate \$1 million per year:		
13	- Fully staff HEC 9-1-1 Telecommunicator, Police Telecommunicator, and Fire/EMS Senior Telecommunicator functions to avoid overtime premium - Appendix I-1	\$ 266,000	\$ -
13	- Reduction of sick time	\$ 67,000	\$ -
13	- Fully staff call processing functions to reduce overtime pay premium - Police Dispatchers Appendix I-4	\$ 336,728	\$ -
13	- Fully staff call processing functions to reduce overtime pay premium - HFD Classified Fire/EMS Dispatch Appendix I-5	\$ 347,252	\$ -
50	Relocation of HPD Teleserve to the Center - Appendix K-1	\$ 416,000	\$ -
43	Potential Savings from Secondary Coding of ST's to Handle Overflow PT Calls - Appendix D-17 Savings of 1 ST per shift	\$ 202,800	\$ -
43	Potential Savings from Secondary Coding of ST's to Handle Overflow PT Calls - Appendix D-17 Savings of 2nd ST per shift	\$ 202,800	\$ -
45	Establish an automated IVR to handle 10-digit Police calls Assuming all callers with non-informational Police needs select 9-1-1 option - Appendix D-18	\$ 1,044,342	\$ 1,150,000
45	Establish an automated IVR to handle 10-digit Police calls Assuming only calls consistent with Police Priority Codes 1-3 are directed to 9-1-1 PT (\$2,061,584 less \$1,044,342 above) - Appendix D-18	\$ 1,017,242	\$ -
46	Establish an automated IVR to handle 10-digit Fire/EMS calls Appendix D-18	\$ 202,137	\$ -
47	Increase the number of bi-lingual Spanish speaking Telecommunicators and Senior Telecommunicators to reduce use of language line - Appendix L-1	\$ 375,000	\$ 76,000
* Note: Appendix references are to initial Performance Review report		<u>\$ 6,783,687</u>	<u>\$ 1,226,000</u>

Employee Survey

Employee Survey Activities

Jefferson Wells conducted a limited scope follow up survey to determine if employees of the HEC have changed perceptions since the 2005 employee survey. Our survey included:

- Coordinating the use of an email survey tool for the distribution of the HEC follow up survey. Due to most Houston Fire Department (HFD) Dispatch personnel not having email accounts, the HFD Dispatcher component of the survey was conducted through use of a paper survey mailed back to Jefferson Wells instead of the electronic survey used by the other HEC Center groups;
- Using 14 of the 70 questions previously presented to the HEC employees from the 2005 survey tool;
- Coordinating with the HEC management the development of the distribution list broken into the following 10 categories by job type or classification:
 1. A – 911 Telecommunicators
 2. B – Police Telecommunicators
 3. C – Police Dispatchers
 4. D – Fire Dispatchers
 5. E – Fire/EMS Telecommunicators
 6. F – HEC Supervisors Floor
 7. G – Police Management
 8. H – Fire Management
 9. I – IT (excluding management)
 10. J – HEC Administration
- Responding to any questions presented by HEC management, and surveyed employees;
- Gathering the anonymous survey responses from both the survey company (“Survey Monkey Online”) and mailed responses;
- Distributing 403 surveys of which 87 were returned (22% return rate). See **Appendix III** for results of the employee survey.

Employee Survey

Employee Survey Summary Results

- Of the 403 surveys distributed (333 via e-mail and 70 via paper), a total of 87 were returned (58 via Survey Monkey and 29 via paper). This equates to a 22% return rate and is a significant decrease from the 47% return rate experienced in the May 2005 survey. The decrease may be attributable to a combination of factors including use of e-mail for the majority of the distribution of the surveys and employee apathy.
- We noted that for the composite of Group A – 911 Telecommunicators, Group B – Police Telecommunicators, Group C – Police Dispatchers, Group E – Fire EMS Telecommunicators, and Group G – Police Management, the total response rate decreased from 118 for the initial May 2005 survey to 10 for the December 2006 survey. This significant change in mix of respondents is illustrated below:

	May 2005	% total	Dec 2006	% total
Group's A, B, C, E and G	118	63%	10	11%
Group's D, F, H, I and J	69	37%	77	89%
	187	100%	87	100%

Due to the significant decrease in response rate for Groups A, B, C, E and G, caution should be taken in evaluating the results of those who did respond, as the lack of responsiveness from the above may have skewed the overall comparison of responses to a more even distribution rather than reflecting a true change in perception.

Employee Survey

Employee Survey Detail Results

As part of this follow-up review, Jefferson Wells conducted a limited scope follow up survey based on a selection of questions previously presented to employees through the anonymous survey presented to HEC employees in mid-2005. Jefferson Wells selected 14 questions (two from each section) previously presented to HEC employees in the May 2005 survey and distributed the surveys to 100% of the employee population (403 identified employees, including the HEC management and both HPD and HFD classified and management personnel).

With the exception of the HFD Dispatchers, distribution of the surveys was accomplished via e-mail notification from Jefferson Wells directly to HEC center employees. The e-mail described the purpose of the survey and provided a link to their respective groups survey questions in the on-line based Survey Monkey. Survey Monkey is a web-based online tool specifically designed to facilitate efficient professional online surveys and allow for participants to respond in a confidential manner. Due to most Houston Fire Department (HFD) Dispatch personnel not having email accounts, the HFD Dispatcher component of the survey was conducted through use of a paper survey mailed back to Jefferson Wells in place of the electronic survey being used by the other groups above.

Similar to the May 2005 survey, HEC Center employees were grouped into one of 10 categories by job type or classification. Of the 403 surveys distributed (333 via e-mail and 70 via paper), a total of 87 were returned (58 via Survey Monkey and 29 via paper).

Total respondents to the May 2005 survey and December 2006 survey are as follows:

	<u>May 2005</u>	<u>Dec 2006</u>
Group A – 911 Telecommunicators	13	4
Group B – Police Telecommunicators	43	3
Group C – Police Dispatchers	30	1
Group D – Fire Dispatchers	27	29
Group E – Fire/EMS Telecommunicators	21	2
Group F – HEC Supervisors Floor	13	16
Group G – Police Management	11	0
Group H – Fire Management	7	4
Group I – IT (excluding management)	14	12
Group J – HEC Administration	8	16
	<u>187</u>	<u>87</u>
Number Distributed	397	403
% Responded	47%	22%

Employee Survey

The decrease in the number of responses to the December 2006 survey versus the initial May 2005 survey may be attributable to a combination of factors including:

- In distributing the initial May 2005 survey, the team conducting the review attended 39 separate roll call sessions to inform employees of upcoming focus groups and the pending employee survey to be distributed. For this review, in order to maximize efficiency and reduce costs, e-mail was used to facilitate distribution of the December 2006 follow-up survey. The exception to this was Group D – the Fire Dispatch personnel which was distributed through use of a paper survey due to the majority of those personnel not having email accounts.
- Although they were informed of the survey during multiple roll calls and notices placed adjacent to the call center floor entrances, a significant number of individuals are not in the habit of using email on a regular basis and may have not been comfortable utilizing a web-based survey process.
- Employee apathy.

A summary of the total responses to each question accumulated for all respondents as a whole follows. See **Appendix III** for detailed results of the employee survey broken out by individual survey group.

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - Overall

Question 1: Overall, there are significant morale problems among the people in my work group.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 8	15	13	10	26	121	1	185
Dec. 2006 # 1	18	17	15	15	21	1	86

Question 2: Recent changes and restructuring of the business have improved my job satisfaction.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 10	102	41	20	13	4	3	180
Dec. 2006 # 2	16	18	19	14	15	5	82

Employee Survey

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - Overall

Question 3: Internal problems in my work area are frequently left unaddressed by management and interfere with my ability to get the job done.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 11	14	26	16	39	90	0	185
Dec. 2006 # 3	16	23	8	20	19	1	86

Question 4: I do not feel that I can speak to my supervisor about serious problems and concerns in the work environment without causing problems for myself.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 18	20	43	17	35	67	3	182
Dec. 2006 # 4	21	24	12	13	17	0	87

Question 5: The company employees believe their work group is effectively providing high quality services.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 22	35	36	29	56	23	3	179
Dec. 2006 # 5	5	11	13	26	31	1	86

Question 6: There are not sufficient resources available to ensure quality care and services for customers served by the company.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 23	13	36	21	45	62	7	177
Dec. 2006 # 6	19	28	8	19	11	2	85

Employee Survey

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - Overall

Question 7: The information flow between my work group and other parts of the company make it difficult to coordinate efforts.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 34	6	18	21	54	84	4	183
Dec. 2006 # 7	11	23	10	22	20	1	86

Question 8: Information about what is happening in the company is not communicated to my department in a timely fashion.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 37	5	13	20	67	74	3	179
Dec. 2006 # 8	11	24	15	18	19	0	87

Question 9: If employees in my work group did an outstanding job they would receive appropriate recognition or rewards.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 46	82	49	22	25	3	5	181
Dec. 2006 # 9	18	14	19	22	14	0	87

Question 10: Confidence in management of my division is high.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 50	91	40	15	19	8	0	173
Dec. 2006 # 10	21	18	18	14	16	0	87

Employee Survey

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - Overall

Question 11: If some employees in my work group performed poorly, they would be subject to corrective action that was appropriate and fair.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 58	52	38	25	51	15	6	181
Dec. 2006 # 11	9	13	14	32	17	2	85

Question 12: My performance ratings do not reflect my actual accomplishments and limitations.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 59	13	34	19	43	65	7	174
Dec. 2006 # 12	12	19	19	16	18	3	84

Question 13: The company does a good job with maintaining an accurate and timely payroll operation.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 63	48	21	23	52	21	21	165
Dec. 2006 # 13	4	6	9	37	29	2	85

Question 14: If someone cuts corners or fails to follow established procedures, management or the audit staff is likely to discover it.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 70	17	15	30	38	16	65	116
Dec. 2006 # 14	9	12	13	30	19	4	83

Employee Survey

For the population of employees that did respond to the survey, several conclusions can be drawn from the above results as follows:

- The distribution of responses to each of the questions is somewhat evenly dispersed among response categories for 6 of the 14 questions.
- Distribution of responses is skewed toward strongly disagree or disagree to the following 3 questions:
 - Question 4: “I do not feel that I can speak to my supervisor about serious problems and concerns in the work environment without causing problems for myself.”
 - Question 6: “There are not sufficient resources available to ensure quality care and services for customers served by the company.”
 - Question 10: “Confidence in management of my division is high.”
- Distribution of responses is skewed toward strongly agree or agree to the following 5 questions:
 - Question 5: “The company employees believe their work group is effectively proving high quality services.”
 - Question 7: “The information flow between my work group and other parts of the company make it difficult to coordinate efforts.”
 - Question 11: “If some employees in my work group performed poorly, they would be subject to corrective action that was appropriate and fair.”
 - Question 13: “The company does a good job with maintaining an accurate and timely payroll operation.”
 - Question 14: “If someone cuts corners or fails to follow established procedures, management or the audit staff is likely to discover it.”
- We noted that for the composite of Group A – 911 Telecommunicators, Group B – Police Telecommunicators, Group C – Police Dispatchers, Group E – Fire EMS Telecommunicators, and Group G – Police Management, the total response rate decreased from 118 for the initial May 2005 survey to 10 for the December 2006 survey. This significant change in mix of respondents is illustrated below:

	<u>May 2005</u>	<u>% total</u>	<u>Dec 2006</u>	<u>% total</u>
Group's A, B, C, E and G	118	63%	10	11%
Group's D, F, H, I and J	69	37%	77	89%
	<u>187</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>100%</u>

Employee Survey

- Due to the significant decrease in response rate for these groups, caution should be taken in evaluating the results of those who did respond, as results will be skewed to the Fire Dispatchers, 911/Police/Fire/EMS Supervisors, HFD Classified Personnel, HEC IT, and HEC Administration.

One example of the impact of the change in mix of response rate is notable in analyzing Question 1: “Overall, there are significant morale problems among the people in my work group.”

- In the May 2005 survey, 104 of the 118 (88%) composite responses of Groups A, B, C, E and G answered agree or strongly agree to this question. For the remaining groups, 43 of the remaining 69 (62%) respondents answered agree or strongly agree to this question.

In the Dec. 2006 survey, 5 of the 10 (50%) composite responses of Groups A, B, C, E and G answered agree or strongly agree to this question and only 1 of 10 (10%) responses from this group was in the disagree or strongly disagree category versus 9 of 118 (8%) in the May 2005 survey.

- Therefore, the majority of the employees who answered agree or strongly agree to this question in the May 2005 survey did not respond to the Dec. 2006 survey.
- The lack of responsiveness from Groups A, B, C, E and G may have skewed the overall comparison of responses to a more even distribution rather than reflecting a true change in perception.

Similar analysis can be performed on other questions using the detailed results of the May 2005 survey and December 2006 survey contained in **Appendix III**.

Key Outstanding Concerns

The initial performance review report issued in June 2005 categorized the recommendations into the following primary categories:

- Organizational Structure
- Staffing Methods
- Employee Morale and Environment
- Employee Evaluation, Rewards and Retribution
- Analysis of Call Handling Activities and Staffing Levels
- Operational Management
- IT Strategy
- Facility Security and Disaster Recovery

Of these areas, Organizational Structure; Staffing Methods; and Employee Morale and Environment were determined to have the greatest relative impact on overall Center operations. Based on the procedures performed during this follow-up review, the following areas remain as key outstanding concerns.

Organizational Structure

In the initial Performance Review report, the most critical issue identified was the existence of three separate organizations (HEC civilian 9-1-1, HPD and HFD), with unique cultures and management styles, and no single centralized day-to-day authority over all emergency response services at the Center. Our initial recommendation was that the City move to a single unified organizational structure for the Center. We outlined several alternative organizational structure scenarios that management should consider to improve conditions at the Center and, given the analysis of activities, staffing, objectives and issues, we recommended a unified structure as our preferred organizational structure. This recommendation provides economies of scale, meets the initial Center consolidation “intent” and plan, and is supported by a proven “better practice” evidenced by the City of Chicago’s Office of Emergency Management Center (“OEMC”) consolidation results.

Under a unified structure, all Center functions could report to a single authority empowered to make all Center related management decisions. All current HEC and HPD employees could be employed by that authority. These personnel should carry their existing seniority / years of service with the City with them for purposes of any seniority determined bidding, vacation etc.

A by-product of the improved organizational structure and operational effectiveness should be a reduction in total personnel related operating costs. Fewer senior ranking HFD and HPD officers (chiefs, captains, lieutenants) or personnel with current level of longevity of service should be required, representing an immediate savings. Salary differentials between qualified civilians (Senior Telecommunicator/Dispatchers and related Supervisors) should reduce related expenses. These savings should be offset in the mid-term by need for some liaison specialists.

Key Outstanding Concerns

In May 2006 an attempt was made to transfer the approximately 70 HPD Dispatchers from HPD to HEC control. HPD was willing to provide the funds to the HEC budget to support this transfer, however, HPD was not willing to fund the salary cost of the 21 supervisors required to manage the HPD dispatchers. As a result, the idea was abandoned and the HPD dispatchers remain under the direct control of HPD.

Additionally, the HFD noted that their labor contract with the City currently prohibits civilianization of the Fire/EMS dispatch function.

As of the date of this report, no additional changes have been made with regard to addressing the organizational structure issues. We continue to believe that this issue should be addressed.

The lack of addressing the organizational structure issues has permeated throughout the remaining recommendations. In many cases, recommendations were made that applied to more than just one of the three distinct groups, however, only one group has addressed the issue. While the HEC Center as a whole received a determination status of partially implemented, serious issues remain unaddressed by the other distinct groups who have not addressed the recommendation.

Staffing Methods

Our initial report found high levels of mandatory overtime and drafting, and related absenteeism. As a result, our report noted a significant risk of insufficient personnel to staff all the critical emergency call response positions on some shifts. Related sick and overtime expenses and low morale can all be traced back to the number of personnel available for staffing purposes and how these employees are deployed, especially on specific shifts.

Implementation of the recommendations related to staffing methods has been mixed. The civilian HEC group has been successful in increasing its call-taking staff, with HEC increasing its call taking staff by 29 due to an increase in call volume. HEC is fully staffed, except for routine turnover and promotions. In the 2007 budget they are authorized 191 telecommunicators and have 180 on staff as of December 2006.

Conversely, while HPD has aggressively campaigned for Senior Police Dispatchers in a variety of venues, it has largely been unsuccessful in increasing its staff size to the authorized level of 92. The actual number of Senior Police Dispatchers at December 2006 is 67.

HPD Emergency Communication Division management has been successful in obtaining an across the board pay increase for its Senior Police Dispatchers. Additionally, management has requested the City's Human Resources Department increase the pay grade up two levels, and that they lessen the requirements for the position.

Several other recommendations to address the overtime and drafting issues noted in the initial report have been either partially implemented or not yet implemented by the HEC.

Key Outstanding Concerns

These include the cross-training of Police Telecommunicators as Police Dispatchers, consideration of revising shift schedule to provide for longer individual shifts but fewer shifts per week, addressing FMLA issues, training HPD supervisors on the CAD system, and establishing a Police Dispatcher reserve pool. Full implementation of these recommendations would alleviate some of the mandatory overtime and drafting of personnel.

One other significant recommendation that has not been implemented is that in order to achieve an improved work/life balance, the HEC should alter the current 4-week scheduling process to a much longer timeframe. We recommended a process of 12 weeks, 12 weeks, 12 weeks, and 16 weeks that would begin in the first two weeks payroll period in January each year. HEC's response to this is as follows:

- Scheduling software did not meet HEC's requirements or expectations. No scheduling software was implemented.
- Employees are currently provided with 4-week schedules (2 weeks in advance when possible). Longer schedules required updating numerous times as manpower/staffing issues arose, causing frustration and morale problems among employees. Elimination and/or reduction of overtime work (via technology improvements) throughout the upcoming year should stabilize employees' work schedules.

We reiterate that during our initial performance review, numerous employees expressed to us during focus group sessions that a longer known schedule would alleviate many of the scheduling issues that they currently face on an individual basis with regard to scheduling doctors appointments, school appointment, personnel "weekend" trips etc. Not knowing their schedule until 1-2 weeks in advance creates many instances of employees needing to "call in sick" to attend their previously scheduled personal obligations.

Employee Morale and Environment

The initial June 2005 report noted that employee morale within the Houston Emergency Center is low and is strained by the organizational structure challenges discussed earlier. In addition to addressing the organizational structure issues, the report identified 14 separate recommendations to improve employee morale in the Center. Management has attempted to address most of these recommendations and received a status determination of implemented, alternative implemented or partially implemented on all but one of the recommendations, the exception being the recommendation that management communicate a formal action plan to employees on how to address the report recommendations.

Management embarked on numerous morale building projects throughout the past year some of which include furnishing of quiet rooms (1 male, 1 female) for employee use, new chairs, internet kiosks for employee use, allowing casual wear on weekends and

Key Outstanding Concerns

holidays, holiday parties, training pay, use of common notice boards for communications/recognition, improved face-time with management, monthly meetings with supervisors, the addition of logos/plaques in prominent locations to enhance unity, demonstrate pride in mission and numerous others. See **Appendix II, Issue Number Two**, for a more detailed list.

However, the results of the follow-up employee survey suggest that employee morale issues have not been completely addressed. As noted in the employee survey conclusions, participation in the follow-up survey decreased from 187 respondents to 87. Specifically, for question one “Overall, there are significant morale problems among the people in my work group,” the majority of the employees who answered agree or strongly agree to this question in the May 2005 survey did not respond to the Dec. 2006 survey. For the employees who did respond to this question in the follow-up survey, the survey results were evenly distributed across all response categories. A similar relationship exists in the responses to question two, “Recent changes and restructuring of the business have improved my job satisfaction.”

Based on these results, management should not assume that employee morale and environment issues have been sufficiently addressed and should continue the progress they have made through the various morale-building projects they have implemented over the past year.

Appendix I

Status Determination Definitions

The following table provides a detailed description of each status determination category:

Status Determination Definitions		
Documentation supports ongoing implementation as recommended	Implemented	Based on managements response provided and any validation procedures performed, documentation supports that recommendation has been implemented.
Documentation supports management's decision to implement recommendation in another manner	Alternative Implemented	Based on managements response provided and any validation procedures performed, documentation supports that management implemented the recommendation in a manner different than the recommendation in the initial report.
Documentation supports a partial implementation as recommended	Partially Implemented	Based on managements responses provided and any validation procedures performed, documentation supports that management initiated the implementation of this recommendation, however, further steps are needed for full implementation.
Documentation supports managements intention to implement	Intends to Implement	Based on managements response provided and any validation procedures performed, documentation supports that management intends to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in a manner different than the recommendation in the initial report.
No documentation to support implementation of recommendation	Not Implemented	Based on managements response provided and any validation procedures performed, no documentation provided to support implementation.
Documentation indicates that management disagrees with recommendation	Management Disagrees	Based on managements response provided and any validation procedures performed, management disagreed with this recommendation and does not intend to implement.

Appendix II

Detail of Original 65 Recommendations with Management's Response

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005
Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section A: Organizational Structure
Issue Number:	1
Priority:	High
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	\$1.8 M

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
The most immediate issue is the existence of three separate organizations, with unique cultures and management styles, and no single centralized day-to-day authority over all emergency response services at the Center.	Report no. 05-27; page 7
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
Management should consider alternative organization structure scenarios to improve conditions at the Center.	Report no. 05-27; pages 7, 82 & 88
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a complicated issue, and before it can be accomplished, there are statutory, civil services and contractual issues that will make implementation of a unified structure a long term goal. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Merger of HPD dispatch function with HEC was initiated in May 2006. HPD decided to keep control of HPD dispatch function. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to the contractual agreement, HPD must have supervisory oversight on the dispatch call floor. HPD decided to keep the dispatch function in lieu of funding additional supervisors. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section A: Organizational Structure
Issue Number:	2
Priority:	High
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	Unknown

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
The most immediate issue is the existence of three separate organizations, with unique cultures and management styles, and no single centralized day-to-day authority over all emergency response services at the Center.	Report no. 05-27; page 7
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
Regardless of the future organizational structure that the City may elect to adopt, the City and the respective HEC, HFD and HPD organizations need to address collectively the significant morale issues pervasive throughout all groups at the Center.	Report no 05-27; Page 87
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC management team agrees that morale is an issue. However, management-labor issues are a change management process that is being worked through and does not happen overnight. It is a lengthy process. These issues are not uncommon when you merge different cultures. In addition to recognizing the problem, a number of programs have been instituted to help employees become empowered to change their outlook and become productive in what changes are implemented. Some of these include Seven Habits training for all supervisory personnel, monthly shift supervisor meetings, existence of an Employees Assistance Program (EAP) office at HEC, scheduling Stress Management classes for all call-taker and dispatch personnel, participation of employees in Safety Committee meetings, and the development of Employee Review Concern Program (ERCP). 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implemented and on-going. All first-line supervisors and management (classified and civilian) completed "Seven Habits" training. First-line civilian supervisors meet monthly to continue team-building process. Diversity and Stress Management training has been provided to all employees, which is ongoing. The management team has on-going meetings with human resources regarding several salary "add-ons" such as performance incentive pay and training pay. 	
Survey Question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC A number of morale-building projects were undertaken throughout the past year. These projects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purchased plaque with Department mission statement, motto, etc. and placed in front lobby Purchased "First, First Responders" plaque and placed at employee entrance to building Created new HEC logo that incorporates all disciplines working at HEC Furnished 2 quiet rooms (1 male, 1 female) for employees' use

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up

Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006



- Purchased new chairs for call center and developed chair replacement schedule
- Designated 4 maternity parking spaces (2 in front of building, 2 in rear of building)
- Constructed supervisors' work area
- Placed 2 Internet kiosks in 2nd floor hallway for employees' use
- Provided employees with email addresses that can be accessed at Internet kiosks
- Installed 34 more men's lockers in male locker room
- Installed 2 ceiling fans and 1 additional television in employee exercise room
- Placed motivational poster(s) in HEC roll call room and call taker training room
- Installed electric blinds in call center windows
- Instituted HEC Awards Committee
- Instituted Employee of the Quarter program
- Instituted HEC Uniform Committee
- Installed meal vending machine in 2nd floor break room (was removed by vendor due to lack of sales)
- Director has "open door" policy
- Director practices Management by Walking Around (MBWA) and is frequently on the call floor
- Managers are required to be on call floor and available to employees
- Instituted HEC annual Labor Day barbeque for employees (provided and served by HEC managers and supervisors)
- Instituted the wearing of costumes on Halloween
- Instituted annual HEC Christmas party
- Allow delivery of flowers and gifts on Valentine's Day
- Allow casual wear on weekends and holidays
- Installed mirrors in women's locker room
- Provided 2 locking restrooms
- Started HEC newsletter
- Refurnished HEC lobby *
- Installed backlit HEC logo sign in lobby
- Provide lunch for employees on 4th of July and Christmas

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up

Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006



- Monthly employee birthday recognition
- Closed-captioning on call floor projectors
- Hired receptionist for front lobby (9 AM – 5 PM, Monday – Friday)
- Implemented monthly meetings with HEC managers and supervisors to discuss HEC operations, policies, problems, etc.
- Revised attendance policy (allows employees 48 hours of emergency leave, employees required to provide doctor's note after 64 hours of sick leave use)
- Implemented HEC MIS to track HEC complaints against employees
- Post daily performance statistics for employees' review
- Hired more Spanish-speaking personnel (Language Line costs reduced by 40%)
- Increased call taker staffing by 29 FTEs
- Instituted training pay for trainers *
- Constructed employee "drop off" parking at entry to HEC complex *
- Numerous terminations and resignations in lieu of termination
- Sick Leave use greatly reduced (37.84% reduction)
- FMLA use greatly reduced (31.60% reduction)
- Dock use greatly reduced (80.60% reduction)
- Employees provided with multiple computer log-ons to allow for the movement of personnel to different positions/duties as needed during work shift *
- Placed a technical person on the call floor
- Implemented police ride-along program for call takers with perfect monthly attendance *

* In progress

HPD

- HPD employees assigned to the HEC building have reaped the benefit of many of the HEC initiated activities. (i.e., quiet room, holiday meals, new chairs, Internet kiosks, additional lockers, allowing casual wear, training pay, new vending machine etc.).

HFD

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section A: Organizational Structure
Issue Number:	3
Priority:	High
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
The most immediate issue is the existence of three separate organizations, with unique cultures and management styles, and no single centralized day-to-day authority over all emergency response services at the Center.	Report no. 05-27; page 7
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
The City should establish, clearly communicate, and adhere to a consistent long-term plan for the Center's role in the provision of citywide emergency response service. One of the most frequent observations from groups at the Center is a desire for a final decision to be made on the potential civilianization (or not) of all call center functions.	Report no. 05-27; Page 7 & 88
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response/comment provided 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC call-taking function is completely civilianized. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to contractual agreement, HPD must have supervisory oversight on the dispatch call floor. The dispatch function will remain civilianized and will be supplemented by classified personnel when needed. All dispatchers have been told that they are to remain under the supervision of HPD. <p>HFD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HFD labor contract with the City currently prohibits civilianization of the fire/EMS dispatch function.

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section A: Organizational Structure
Issue Number:	4
Priority:	High
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
The most immediate issue is the existence of three separate organizations, with unique cultures and management styles, and no single centralized day-to-day authority over all emergency response services at the Center.	Report no. 05-27; page 7
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
Should the city to elect to maintain the current organizational structure... we recommend that City management consider a separation and segregation of the two major functions currently performed by the HEC.	Report no. 05-27; page 7
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response/comment provided 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long-term goal for HEC is to assume day-to-day authority over all emergency response services at HEC. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently HPD is evaluating which long-term goals should be supported in regards to receiving and dispatching police call for service. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section A: Organizational Structure
Issue Number:	5
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
The most immediate issue is the existence of three separate organizations, with unique cultures and management styles, and no single centralized day-to-day authority over all emergency response services at the Center.	Report no. 05-27; page 7
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
The Houston Emergency Center commission a committee to study and interview personnel from the Chicago Office of Emergency Management and Communications (OEMC). This committee should develop case studies for the areas where opportunities for improvement are noted in the report.	Report no. 05-27; page 7
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response/comment provided 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A visit to the Chicago Office of Emergency Management and Communications was made by HEC Operations Assistant Director during preliminary stages of HEC development. HEC Information Technology Assistant Director recently made visit to Chicago OEMC to view video technology used and has visited in the past to review call taking and dispatch procedures. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An Executive Assistant Chief has visited the Chicago Office of Emergency Management and Communications. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section B: Staffing Methods
Issue Number:	6
Priority:	High
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
There is a significant risk of insufficient personnel to staff all critical emergency call response positions on some shifts.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
The City and the respective HEC and HPD management should start an immediate, proactive recruitment program and campaign to staff up all positions operating at sub-optimal levels.	Report no 05-27; page 17 & 87

Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005

- HEC is currently fully staffed in the 9-1-1/Police call taker positions. Three vacant positions exist in the Sr. 911 Telecommunicator (Fire/EMS). This process will continue until all Telecommunications personnel are able to handle emergency calls. HPD has begun an aggressive campaign through newspaper, radio and television advertisements to recruit Police Telecommunicators (Dispatchers). All Police supervisors are being trained to dispatch in the event of staff shortage. HEC is also working with HPD to allow cross training of personnel across the dispatch discipline.

Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005

- In progress.
- All 911/Police Telecommunicator positions are filled. However, the filling of all vacancies may not address the absenteeism that existed prior to consolidation and continues to exist. Currently 62.5% of the overtime that is being paid is directly related to absenteeism. HEC management is working with employees and supervisory personnel to curtail these occurrences on an ongoing basis. The excessive absenteeism, more aggressive handling of intermittent FMLA could potentially improve morale.

Survey Question

Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.

Please provide management response and action status below:

HEC

- HEC is currently fully staffed (less allowances for normal turnover and promotions).
- Numerous terminations for attendance-related issues (numerous resignations in lieu of termination).
- Numerous disciplinary actions for attendance-related issues (counseling to temporary suspensions without pay).
- HEC has undertaken a pro-active FMLA case management program with questionable FMLA claims being sent out for 2nd and 3rd medical opinions. FMLA use has been greatly reduced.
- Call taker staffing increased by 29 call takers due to increase in call volume at HEC

HPD

- HPD has undertaken an aggressive recruiting campaign to hire police dispatchers. HPD has run ads in numerous papers and magazines and on MonsterJob.com. A classified overtime program has been approved which will equate to approximately 400 hours per week in relief for civilian dispatchers which will in turn improve working conditions.

HFD

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section B: Staffing Methods
Issue Number:	7
Priority:	High
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
There is a significant risk of insufficient personnel to staff all critical emergency call response positions on some shifts.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
HEC and HPD management should immediately consider a program where interested and qualified police Telecommunicators could undergo training and then spend a probationary period as HPD Police Dispatchers.	Report no 05-27; pages 17
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC management is working with HPD on a career opportunity for all qualified HEC call center employees to shadow and have an opportunity to qualify as a Senior Police Telecommunicator (Dispatch). 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In progress. Discussion between HPD and HEC was initialized prior to audit. 	
Survey Question	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p> <p>Please provide number of employees who have completed each of the described career advancement opportunities.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC call takers were allowed to work "back channel" dispatch positions on an overtime basis to assist HPD dispatch and to try job out and seek promotion to a police dispatcher position. Practice discontinued by HPD due to funding issues. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several HEC Telecommunicators have promoted to police dispatchers. Several police dispatchers have promoted to PT supervisors. At this time HPD does not have the additional funding to pay overtime for training. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section B: Staffing Methods
Issue Number:	8
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	\$300,000 in overtime savings and \$189,000 savings in hiring and training

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
There is a significant risk of insufficient personnel to staff all critical emergency call response positions on some shifts.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
The City should consider HPD management's proposal for forty hour work week, comprised of three 12 hour shifts and a single 6 hour shift per week.	Report no. 05-27; Page 17 & 89
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently, both HPD and HEC operate under an 8 1/2 hour a day, five day a week work schedule (which includes a 30 minute unpaid lunch). No immediate plans are being considered to deviate from this schedule. It should be noted that dispatchers through a vote, overwhelmingly rejected the 12-hour shift proposal in 2004. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:

HEC

- HEC operations consists of 5 work shifts; Day Shift, Evening Shift, Night Shift, Day Swing Shift, and Night Swing Shift. Day, Evening, and Night Shifts are 8-hour shifts. Day and Night Swing Shifts will be 10-hour shifts starting in January 2007.

HPD

- HPD dispatcher staffing will not allow for the 12-hour shift. Due to safety concerns, we cannot order a dispatcher to work 24 hours straight. This would occur based on our current staffing level. 12-hour shifts will be considered when staffing improves.

HFD

- HFD dispatch currently operates on 12-hour shifts.

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section B: Staffing Methods
Issue Number:	9
Priority:	High
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
There is a significant risk of insufficient personnel to staff all critical emergency call response positions on some shifts.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that the City review its current FMLA policies and practices, including turnaround time and required medical authorization and second opinions, primarily for intermittent FMLA conditions.	Report no. 05-27; page 17 & 91
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management team will take this issue under advisement. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC has undertaken a pro-active FMLA case management program with questionable FMLA claims being sent out for 2nd and 3rd medical opinions. FMLA use has been greatly reduced. Regarding intermittent FMLA approval, employees submit their intermittent FMLA packages at the beginning of the benefit year. Those FMLA packages cannot be approved until time from work is actually missed (employees are advised that their intermittent FMLA paperwork appears to make them FMLA eligible). Intermittent FMLA leave must be approved on an absence-by-absence basis. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD dispatch will move in same direction as HEC. However, HPD legal review will be needed and approved so that HPD can move in the same direction department-wide. The first concern is to supplement with classified overtime and improve staffing levels. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section B: Staffing Methods
Issue Number:	10
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Low
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
There is a significant risk of insufficient personnel to staff all critical emergency call response positions on some shifts.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
To avoid the risk of any potential non-compliance with Department of Labor legislation or related penalties, we recommend that the City clearly communicate which portions of a shift are paid and which represent unpaid time.	Report 05-27; page 17
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response provided 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC has clearly delineated in its policy manual and new hire training which portion of an employee's work shift is paid and which is unpaid. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD ECD has clearly communicated to police dispatchers which portion of an employee's work shift is paid and which is unpaid. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section B: Staffing Methods
Issue Number:	11
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
There is a significant risk of insufficient personnel to staff all critical emergency call response positions on some shifts.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that all HPD personnel assigned to the Center, especially in a supervisory capacity, be fully trained on the CAD system.	Report no. 05-27; page 18 & 94
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All police supervisors at HEC are being trained to work dispatch positions in order to act as dispatchers in the event a shortage occurs. 	
Survey Question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner and provide any relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response required. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The approved pending classified overtime program includes 8 sgts assigned to ECD who will be trained to work the back mics and slow to medium radio traffic patrol mics. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section B: Staffing Methods
Issue Number:	12
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
There is a significant risk of insufficient personnel to staff all critical emergency call response positions on some shifts.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
Management should implement both a revised sick policy, which does not penalize employees for taking up to their statutory (per City of Houston) 64 hours of sick time, and an incentive program for minimal sick time and unscheduled absences.	Report no. 05-27; page 18 & 95
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Per the Mayor's Policy 602.00 & 604.00, employees are expected to work as scheduled. HEC Policy is in compliance with the City Code of Ordinance, Chapter 14 Section 214-227, which states verification may be required prior to the use of 64 hours of sick leave in any instance of potential abuse of sick leave. Sick leave is a benefit. There is no statutory policy that states that an employee can not be disciplined for using 64 hours of sick time. This is a perceived notion. The City has an incentive program in place as dictated in Chapter 14 of the City Code of Ordinances (Section 14-232). Employees under the Compensatory Sick Leave Plan (CSL) receive additional days off if they do not use any sick leave during a benefit year. It is dictated as follows: 0 hours used = 3 personal leave days (24 hours); 1 min - 8 hours = 2 personal leave days (16 hours); 8 hours and 1 min to 16 hours = 1 personal leave day (8 hours). 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised attendance policy (employees required to provide doctor's note after 64 hours of sick leave use). Employees not penalized for using up to and including 64 hours of unscheduled leave each year. In addition to City's incentive plan, HEC employees receiving outstanding attendance ratings on their annual performance evaluations receive a specially-designed HEC lapel pin. HEC is developing a police "ride-along" program for employees exhibiting perfect monthly attendance. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD sick policy mirrors HEC's policy except for the lapel pin and ride along. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section B: Staffing Methods
Issue Number:	13
Priority:	High
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	See Exhibit 1 on page viii (\$266,000+ 67,000+ 336,728+ 347,252=\$1,016,980)

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
There is a significant risk of insufficient personnel to staff all critical emergency call response positions on some shifts.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that the City both empower and require the respective groups' management to fully staff the multiple call processing functions, all of which are currently operating with a less than fully authorized or required complement of personnel. The City's cumulative savings across the five major call processing functions from the avoidance of overtime pay premium could aggregate to almost \$1 million per annum. (See I-Series Appendices).	Report no. 05-27; page 18, 95, & 96
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In any organization there will be retirements and resignations. HEC will continue to fill all vacated positions as they occur. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently HEC 9-1-1 Operations is fully staffed in the 9-1-1/Police call-taker category with the addition of 11 new employees that started on 5/31/05. Training will cover a 3-month period. The new hires will not begin to work independently until approximately 9/1/05. HEC 9-1-1 Operations will work toward the same full compliment in the Fire/EMS call-taker area. To address the noted police dispatcher shortage, HPD has begun an aggressive hiring campaign. 	
Survey Question	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC is currently fully staffed (less allowances for normal turnover and promotions). <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD has undertaken an aggressive recruiting campaign to hire more police dispatchers. A classified member overtime program has been instituted to supplement existing dispatcher staffing. <p>HFD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fire dispatcher position is a Civil Service tested position. HFD will move toward full staffing in FY08.

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section B: Staffing Methods
Issue Number:	14
Priority:	High
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
There is a significant risk of insufficient personnel to staff all critical emergency call response positions on some shifts.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that in order to achieve an improved work/life balance, the HEC should alter the current 4-week scheduling process to a much longer timeframe. We recommend a process of 12 weeks, 12 weeks, 12 weeks, and 16 weeks that would begin in the first two weeks payroll period in January each year.	Report no. 05-27; page 18 & 98
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HEC management has acquired new scheduling software program that will assist in this matter. This will automate the scheduling process and allow us the ability to schedule larger increments at a time. • However, it will not improve the distribution of holidays nor reduce the number of scheduled overtime or unscheduled overtime. • A more equitable distribution of holidays can be accomplished through adjustment of off-days during holiday periods. This option was offered in 2003 to the call-takers and dispatchers and was overwhelmingly rejected. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Software acquired. 	
Survey Question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduling software did not meet HEC's requirements or expectations. No scheduling software was implemented. • Employees are currently provided with 4 week schedules (2 weeks in advance when possible). Longer schedules required updating numerous times as manpower/staffing issues arose, causing frustration and morale problems among employees. Elimination and/or reduction of overtime work (via technology improvements) throughout the upcoming year should stabilize employees' work schedules. <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section B: Staffing Methods
Issue Number:	15
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
There is a significant risk of insufficient personnel to staff all critical emergency call response positions on some shifts.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
The policy for vacation/holiday time off requests could be addressed to potentially minimize "call outs" by providing the opportunity for employees to request vacation more frequently than once a year.	Report no. 05-27; page 18
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response or comments provided 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time off request policy revised. Employees are allowed to request time off throughout the year in addition to the annual vacation and holiday time off pollings. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employees are allowed to request time off throughout the year if there is an opening in the red book. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section B: Staffing Methods
Issue Number:	16
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
There is a significant risk of insufficient personnel to staff all critical emergency call response positions on some shifts.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
The Center should consider implementing a semi-annual shift bidding process.	Report no. 05-27; Page 18
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response or comment provided 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response provided 	
Survey Question	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual shift bidding will remain in place to provide employees with the ability to receive better shifts and/or days off and to maintain those shifts/days off for 1 year. HEC currently has committed 12 FTE equivalent call-taker positions to High School for Law Enforcement students for part-time work. Additionally, HEC makes use of part-time workers from other agencies hired via the City's temporary worker program. This part-time worker program has greatly increased HEC's ability to maintain adequate staffing on an "as-needed" basis. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD will only re-bid a shift when addressing a management concern. To re-bid a shift is disruptive to employees' schedules and lives. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section B: Staffing Methods
Issue Number:	17
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
There is a significant risk of insufficient personnel to staff all critical emergency call response positions on some shifts.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
HEC and HPD management should also consider a program where additional Police Telecommunicators are trained as Police Dispatchers but remain with HEC in a reserve pool. These Police Telecommunicators could receive an additional stipend in recognition of their additional skill level. This pool could then serve as a source of dispatchers both for temporary / emergency staffing shortages and as replacements Senior Police Telecommunicators to cover attrition. Such employees could be required to staff a specific number of Senior Police Telecommunicator shifts per month (probably on slower mike positions) to maintain their skill level.	Report no. 05-27; Page 89
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The skill level of a dispatcher is developed over a period of time. Experience has proven that these skills diminish with lack of use. A reserve pool of outside personnel would not be effective. Call taker employees who have been cross-trained for dispatch could maintain their skills by being assigned to a dispatch on a low traffic position on weekly schedule. Management will take this recommendation under advisement. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the event that HPD's dispatch function is merged with HEC's call-taking function, this recommendation will be implemented. HEC call takers were allowed to work "back channel" dispatch positions on an overtime basis to assist HPD dispatch and to try job out and seek promotion to a police dispatcher position. Practice discontinued by HPD due to funding issues. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD is open to this concept but cannot fund the overtime needed. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section B: Staffing Methods
Issue Number:	18
Priority:	Low
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
There is a significant risk of insufficient personnel to staff all critical emergency call response positions on some shifts.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We also recommend that management clearly define and communicate its policy concerning drafted employees' ability and responsibility to make alternative arrangements for such outside personal commitments as childcare. We noted that HEC management's policy is to allow drafted personnel to return home to secure alternative childcare arrangements, but in practice they are required to do so from the Center.	Report no. 05-27; Page 99
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are in the process of updating the HEC overtime policy. However there is no policy that indicates that employees can go home to secure alternative childcare arrangements. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC management tries to work with drafted employees who have child care issues. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft potential list is posted each day to advise employees of the possibility of being drafted that day. Employees high on that list have ample time to make arrangements during the course of their work day. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section C: Employee Morale and Environment
Issue Number:	19
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on focus group feedback which included all levels of employees, individual interviews to discuss process and procedures, results of the Employee Survey, and our process shadowing, employee morale within the Houston Emergency Center is low and is strained by the organizational structure challenges discussed earlier.	Report no. 05-27; page 34
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
Many focus group attendees observed that they do not know – and would not recognize – certain HEC management staff, including the Director. The team environment could be enhanced if HEC management were to spend additional “face time” with employees, including those on the PSAP floor.	Report No 05-27, page 34 & 92
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC management has spent time in the call center on various occasions during the different shifts. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will continue to do so as schedules permit. 	
Survey question	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Director has “open door” policy and practices Management by Walking Around (MBWA). Director makes daily walk-throughs of the call center floor on Day, Day Swing, and Evening Shifts. Director regularly attends roll calls. Managers are required to walk call floor and regularly attend roll calls. Annual Labor Day barbeque put on by managers and supervisors encourages non-formal interaction between managers/supervisors and employees. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD ECD participates in annual Labor Day Barbeque. Captain and lieutenants attend roll calls and make regular walk-throughs of call center. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section C: Employee Morale and Environment
Issue Number:	20
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on focus group feedback which included all levels of employees, individual interviews to discuss process and procedures, results of the Employee Survey, and our process shadowing, employee morale within the Houston Emergency Center is low and is strained by the organizational structure challenges discussed earlier.	Report no. 05-27; page 34
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
Place pictures of employees on a common notice board when recognized for various achievements. Also, post pictures of key management and supervisory personnel to enable mutual recognition.	Report No 05-27, page 92
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under review with BSD for appropriate location 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewing with BSD an appropriate location for an employee recognition board 	
Survey question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide (if any) applicable documentation that helps demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC events (Labor Day barbeque, Halloween, Christmas Party, etc.) photographed with photos being placed on new bulletin board in employee break room. Photos of events also displayed on HEC Internet kiosks in main hallway. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD ECD participates in HEC events (Labor Day barbeque, Halloween, Christmas Party, etc.) and shares bulletin board and Internet kiosks with HEC. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section C: Employee Morale and Environment
Issue Number:	21
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on focus group feedback, individual interviews, results of the Employee Survey, and our process shadowing, employee morale within the Houston Emergency Center is low and is strained by the organizational structure challenges discussed earlier.	Report no. 05-27; page 34
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that one set of common standardized policies be established for all civilian and classified personnel at the Center and be applied and enforced consistently. One of the singularly most common and egregious issues raised by all groups across the Center is the perceived, and often actual, inconsistent interpretation and application of sometimes multiple and conflicting rules both when applied to different groups in the Center and when applied to management versus employees.	Report No 05-27, page 92
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All employees working at HEC operate under much the same set of rules. Some disparities noted are not necessarily the result of the "different rules for different work groups," but are the result of civil service laws or customs and practices that treat classified and civilian employees differently. The HEC policy manual presents the general policies that apply to all staff assigned to the HEC as well as specific task-oriented guidelines that apply to each component division." 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided. 	
Survey question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some HEC rules relaxed to move toward common enforcement of rules. Attendance at roll calls by HEC Director and managers used to clarify policies and procedures. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD adopts all guidelines initiated by HEC that fit within the management requirements. Management has improved it communication with employees. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section C: Employee Morale and Environment
Issue Number:	22
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on focus group feedback, individual interviews, results of the Employee Survey, and our process shadowing, employee morale within the Houston Emergency Center is low and is strained by the organizational structure challenges discussed earlier.	Report no. 05-27; page 34
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that management ensure the appearance as well as the reality of equal and equitable treatment of all personnel. This should extend to both greater empathy for employees' personal situations, e.g. serious illness or death of close family members and adequate related leave and to the stricter enforcement of rules and prompt imposition of penalties on persistent offenders or abusers.	Report No 05-27, page 92
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC management adheres to the City of Houston policies as it relates funeral leave, vacation, sick leave and disciplinary actions. However, some disparities noted are not necessarily the result of "different rules for different work groups" but are the result of civil service laws or customs and practices that treat classified and civilian employees differently. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided. 	
Survey question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Numerous employees disciplined and terminated for violation of HEC policies. Management has worked with employees experiencing personal situations in their families to help them through those situations. Some disparities noted are not necessarily the result of "different rules for different work groups" but are the result of civil service laws or customs and practices that treat classified and civilian employees differently. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD ECD management has worked with employees experiencing personal situations in their families to help them through those situations (within Departmental guidelines). <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section C: Employee Morale and Environment
Issue Number:	23
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on focus group feedback, individual interviews, results of the Employee Survey, and our process shadowing, employee morale within the Houston Emergency Center is low and is strained by the organizational structure challenges discussed earlier.	Report no. 05-27; page 34
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that all civilian employees at the Center be held to the same measurement standards and conditions. This includes an evaluation and reward system based more on performance than solely on seniority.	Report No 05-27, page 92
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management team concurs 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided. 	
Survey question	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes, job descriptions, evaluation forms, etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC's evaluation and reward system (performance evaluations, merit pay raises, shift/days off selection) is based on performance, not seniority. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD is exploring incentive pay for work attendance. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section C: Employee Morale and Environment
Issue Number:	24
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on focus group feedback, individual interviews, results of the Employee Survey, and our process shadowing, employee morale within the Houston Emergency Center is low and is strained by the organizational structure challenges discussed earlier.	Report no. 05-27; page 34
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We suggest that HPD determine whether its civilian HPD employees are to be held to the same standards and afforded the same benefits as HEC, other City, or other HPD civilian employees, since their current treatment is inconsistent with any one such group.	Report No 05-27, page 92
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All city of Houston employees are expected to adhere to the Mayor's Policy (606.00 - Lunch and Rest Breaks). Each full time employee shall be allowed a lunch break from 30 - 60 minutes and two paid rest breaks of 15 minutes. Employees will not be compensated during their lunch breaks. In either case, the employee shall be expected to work a full eight-hour day. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided. 	
Survey question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No HEC response required. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ECD employees are treated like all other HPD civilians except for working an 8 1/2 hour day and the wearing of HEC uniforms. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section C: Employee Morale and Environment
Issue Number:	25
Priority:	Low
Impact:	Low
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on focus group feedback, individual interviews, results of the Employee Survey, and our process shadowing, employee morale within the Houston Emergency Center is low and is strained by the organizational structure challenges discussed earlier.	Report no. 05-27; page 34
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
In order to foster a stronger sense of a single united team, we recommend that HEC management consider requiring management and especially back office HEC personnel to adopt a similar dress code, i.e. HEC uniform, to that required of personnel in the PSAP.	Report No 05-27, page 93
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative personnel are required to dress business professional every day, which is the standard for the COH dress code for all departments. HEC management does not concur with the suggestions that HEC administrative staff also wear uniforms. HEC does not have sufficient funding to provide uniforms for all employees. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided. 	
Survey question	
<p>Please describe all discussion/action/consideration given to this recommendation. If no further consideration has been given to this recommendation, please document the follow-up accordingly.</p> <p>If applicable, provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC is in the process of purchasing new uniforms for employees. Some parts of these uniforms will be provided to interested supervisors and managers to foster an esprit de corps among HEC employees. <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section C: Employee Morale and Environment
Issue Number:	26
Priority:	Low
Impact:	Low
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on focus group feedback, individual interviews, results of the Employee Survey, and our process shadowing, employee morale within the Houston Emergency Center is low and is strained by the organizational structure challenges discussed earlier.	Report no. 05-27; page 34
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
To ensure uniform application of rules to all personnel in the Center, we recommend that management of all the respective organizations present in the Center prohibit the use – and even placement – of televisions in all personal or common work areas, except for conference rooms.	Report No 05-27, page 93

Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005

- TV comments - In an emergency communication environment, it is critical that newsworthy events that occur are learned about in the quickest format possible. The "TVs" that were observed are required to keep updated on breaking news and not just City Council activities.
- The specific channels that are allowed in the call center are the three major networks (ABC, NBC, & CBS) plus the major national news channels (CNN, Fox), the weather channel and the municipal channel. The tuners, which provide these feeds have no sound or close captioning, which keeps any distraction that a call taker or dispatcher may have to a minimum.
- The ability to see breaking news may be the result of a call that one of the call takers may have handled and this helps to provide closure for them if the call handling process was stressful or difficult. Those areas cited as having TV's on during their work day, are in areas where the employees are required to be in earshot of any breaking news that may affect response required (hurricanes, disasters) or breaking news as a result of a police, fire or emergency ambulance incident.

Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005

- None provided.

Survey question

Please describe all discussion/action/consideration given to this recommendation. If no further consideration has been given to this recommendation, please document the follow-up accordingly. If applicable, provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.

Please provide management response and action status below:

HEC

- Closed captioning placed on call floor monitors.
- Televisions are required in administrative offices to keep abreast of emerging events.

HPD

- Televisions are required in administrative offices to keep abreast of emerging events.

HFD

- Televisions are required in administrative offices to keep abreast of emerging events.

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section C: Employee Morale and Environment
Issue Number:	27
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Low
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on focus group feedback, individual interviews, results of the Employee Survey, and our process shadowing, employee morale within the Houston Emergency Center is low and is strained by the organizational structure challenges discussed earlier.	Report no. 05-27; page 34
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To avoid the risk of any potential non-compliance with Department of Labor legislation or related penalties, we recommend that the City clearly communicate that where employees such as Telecommunicators are required to attend a roll call prior to their shift, that such (30 minutes or less) is specifically paid time and that their 8.5 hours work day includes a 30 minutes unpaid lunch break. 	Report No 05-27, page 93
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The official shift starts with roll call. This information is proved to all employees in the HEC, PSAP Policy 100.11. This information was distributed to all employees in October 2003 and to all new employees during orientation. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided. 	
Survey question	
<p>If further communication has been provided to employees which clarifies policy 100.11, please attach here. If applicable, provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate consideration of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:

HEC

- HEC has clearly delineated in its policy manual and new hire training which portion of an employee's work shift is paid and which is unpaid.

HPD

- HPD has clearly delineated policy on the 8-½ hour workday.

HFD

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section C: Employee Morale and Environment
Issue Number:	28
Priority:	Low
Impact:	Low
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on focus group feedback, individual interviews, results of the Employee Survey, and our process shadowing, employee morale within the Houston Emergency Center is low and is strained by the organizational structure challenges discussed earlier.	Report no. 05-27; page 34
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
The Employee Relations Manager is to be commended for advancing his personal funds to assist employees in times of need; we recommend that HEC management discourage such practices, which might expose the City to accusations of preferential or discriminatory treatment by other, especially disgruntled, employees.	Report No 05-27, page 93
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management team concurs 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Practice discontinued 	
Survey question	
If further action has been taken, please provide documentation. If no further action has been taken or if recommendation is no longer applicable, please state such.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Practice was discontinued. <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section C: Employee Morale and Environment
Issue Number:	29
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on focus group feedback, individual interviews, results of the Employee Survey, and our process shadowing, employee morale within the Houston Emergency Center is low and is strained by the organizational structure challenges discussed earlier.	Report no. 05-27; page 34
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
Should the City elect to maintain the current tri-partite organizational structure, as identified per Scenario 1, we recommend that City management consider a separation and segregation of the two major functions performed by HEC. These are: the management of 9-1-1 Call processing operations (from the receipt of 9-1-1 and 10 digits calls through to their transfer to Fire/EMS or Police Dispatchers or other parties), and the provision of common /shared Center infrastructure and related support services.	Report No 05-27, page 93

Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005

- If the City of Houston chooses to stay with Scenario 1, management concurs that all call taking functions continue to be performed under the direction of HEC.
- Management does not agree that Building Services assume additional responsibilities of conference room scheduling space planning, etc, since this function is not their responsibility in any of the City of Houston facility.
- A committee established by the HEC Advisory Board determined HEC Policies. The responsibilities of the HEC Director were also defined and established by the HEC Advisory Board accordingly and is in the Director's job description:
 - * Oversee, manages, and directs the operations and functions of the Houston Emergency Center.
 - *Manages a workforce of 309+ employees who coordinate, operate and maintain the City's Emergency Communications systems and equipment. Including the technical and support staff responsible for automated systems, maintenance and support.
 - *Directs the activities of two Assistant Directors over 9-1-1 Emergency communications and telecommunications functions
 - *Monitors departmental operations to ensure affective coordination, information flow and policy development
 - *Coordinates with HEC Management Board
- Employees should perform their duties with the highest regard to uphold respect and service to the city and its citizens in spite of the perceived friction.

Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005

- None provided.

Survey question

Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.

Please provide management response and action status below:

- HEC**
- No response.

HPD
HFD

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section C: Employee Morale and Environment
Issue Number:	30
Priority:	Low
Impact:	Low
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on focus group feedback, individual interviews, results of the Employee Survey, and our process shadowing, employee morale within the Houston Emergency Center is low and is strained by the organizational structure challenges discussed earlier.	Report no. 05-27; page 34
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
Ensure that the Employee Concerns Review Program (ECRP) functions as an effective mechanism for employee feedback (i.e. employee representatives are selected by the employees).	Report No 05-27, page 34
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response/comment provided. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided. 	
Survey question	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation. Provide documentation that clarifies the ability of the employees to select the employee representatives. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ECRP remains a vital part of HEC management process. New HEC committees formed; Awards/Morale and Uniform/Dress Code Committees. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD utilizes the ERC process that has been in place for several years. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section C: Employee Morale and Environment
Issue Number:	31
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on focus group feedback, individual interviews, results of the Employee Survey, and our process shadowing, employee morale within the Houston Emergency Center is low and is strained by the organizational structure challenges discussed earlier.	Report no. 05-27; page 34
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that, in accordance with both City and HEC policy, employees be allowed to take their deferred holiday time within 120 calendar days or be paid for these hours worked at the rate of time and a half and in the next available pay period after the holiday.	Report No 05-27, page 34 & 91
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is always preferred that employees be allowed to take their deferred holiday time as prescribed in these policies. HEC Management, with concurrence from the HEC Advisory Board, made a decision to carry an employee's deferred holiday time rather than lose it. Because of the current staffing shortage, often times, the deferred holiday cannot be granted at the time of the employee's request, but can be used in lieu of scheduled vacation. To this date no HEC employee has lost a deferred holiday. According to the city's Code of Ordinances and COH policy, we cannot pay employees for these hours over 120 days. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided. 	
Survey question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employees are allowed to request deferred holiday time within 120 days of deferred holiday accrual. Per City of Houston Ordinance, deferred holidays that are over 120 days are forfeited. HEC is working with City Legal Department to revise concerned City Ordinance (Houston Code of Ordinances Sec. 14-168). <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section C: Employee Morale and Environment
Issue Number:	32
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on focus group feedback, individual interviews, results of the Employee Survey, and our process shadowing, employee morale within the Houston Emergency Center is low and is strained by the organizational structure challenges discussed earlier.	Report no. 05-27; page 34
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
As a result of this study and the level of employee participation, management should prepare and communicate to employees an action plan that acknowledges the issues and sets out the first steps to be taken. This should include a process to provide follow up to the plan and to measure achievement of action plan steps.	Report No 05-27, page 34
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response/comment provided. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided. 	
Survey question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informal process implemented whereby Director attends roll calls, walks call floor, takes notes, and acts on issues brought forth by employees quickly to resolve them. Initial Jefferson-Wells audit reviewed regularly by Director and staff to ensure progress is being made toward implementing the majority of audit recommendations. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD ECD Captain and lieutenants attend roll calls with employees to obtain informal feedback. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section D: Employee Evaluation, Rewards and Retribution
Issue Number:	33
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
The results of focus groups with all levels of employees, individual interviews to discuss process and procedures, and employee surveys indicate that the processes for employee evaluation and recognition need improvement.	Report 05-27; page 40
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
<p>Since an employee's attendance is already assigned equal weighting with seniority and EPE score for purposes of determining the order of employee shift bidding, we recommend that attendance not be included additionally as one of the mandatory factors used to calculate EPE scores. Current EPE methodology allows for an employee to be absent for up to 80 hours of vacation time, 480 hours of FMLA time, and 24 hours of sick time (a total of 584 hours) and still be rated ahead of an employee who misses only 64 hours of sick time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We recommend the hiring of a consultant to analyze the EPE methodology and to establish an evaluation/scoring process that utilizes both objective and subjective factors to provide a consistent and equitable measure of employee performance. - The management team is examining ways to address dubious interim item: FMLA guidelines and the application of such guidelines. - Additionally, HEC has recommended to the Human Resources and the Legal Department the need for a review of the city's interpretation of the FMLA guidelines and the application of such guidelines. (see continuation of this recommendation on issue #34) 	Report 05-27; page 40 & 90
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The management team disagrees with Jefferson Wells' recommendation. • Attendance is very important factor in the performance of any job and the evaluation of that performance. Employees can not be productive if they're absent. Currently 62.5% of the overtime paid is directly related to absenteeism. The management team is examining ways to address dubious interim item: FMLA guidelines and the application of such guidelines. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None provided 	
Survey Question	
Please describe all discussion/action/consideration given to this recommendation. If no further consideration has been given to this recommendation, please document accordingly. If applicable, provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
HEC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HEC has undertaken a pro-active FMLA case management program with questionable FMLA claims being sent out for 2nd and 3rd medical opinions. FMLA use has been greatly reduced. • Attendance is still considered in shift bidding and employee evaluation ratings. Work attendance in an emergency service environment is paramount and should be stressed via mechanisms that reward employees for outstanding attendance.
HPD
HFD

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section D: Employee Evaluation, Rewards and Retribution
Issue Number:	34
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
The results of focus groups with all levels of employees, individual interviews to discuss process and procedures, and employee surveys indicate that the processes for employee evaluation and recognition need improvement.	Report 05-27; page 40
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
(Continued from recommendation # 33) In the interim, we recommend the productivity measure be split into two measures. One measure to calculate call efficiency per hour (utilizing the current methodology) and a second measure based on total time logged in during the year. Alternatively this could be achieved by adding bonus points to the productivity portion of an employee's EPE based on total time logged in during the year. This should reward the employees who spend the most amount of time productively taking calls at the Center.	Report 05-27; page 40 & 90
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC management will take Jefferson Wells' recommendation under advisement. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:

- HEC**
- Total log-in time is considered when completing EPEs. Employees with higher than average log-in times are graded higher.
- HPD**
- HFD**

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section D: Employee Evaluation, Rewards and Retribution
Issue Number:	35
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
The results of focus groups with all levels of employees, individual interviews to discuss process and procedures, and employee surveys indicate that the processes for employee evaluation and recognition need improvement.	Report 05-27; page 40
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that supervisors who are rotating away from the Center be required to provide EPE ratings for all employees they have supervised since the previous EPE period before they are allowed to begin their new assignment.	Report 05-27; page 40 & 91
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HEC supervisors do not rotate out of the Department. Supervisors do change shifts and are required to have completed all documentation on employees prior to their shift change. • HPD Classified supervisory personnel do rotate out of the center. HPD management will be encouraged to complete documentation prior to transfer. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None provided 	
Survey Question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response required. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All EPEs are due in May of every year. Therefore old supervisors consult with (outgoing supervisors) to complete employee's EPE. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section D: Employee Evaluation, Rewards and Retribution
Issue Number:	36
Priority:	Low
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
The results of focus groups with all levels of employees, individual interviews to discuss process and procedures, and employee surveys indicate that the processes for employee evaluation and recognition need improvement.	Report 05-27; page 40
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that the duties of the Employee Relations Manager do not include administering disciplinary actions, including employee suspensions.	Report 05-27; page 40 & 91

Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Employee Relations Manager's responsibilities are to serve both employees and management. The delicate balance of their role is determined by the vast knowledge of City of Houston Policy and Procedures and the manner in which these policies are mandated across the board for HEC and all city departments. The Employee Relations Manager does not perform disciplinary action on any employee. Disciplinary action is initiated by the employee's immediate supervisor and routed to the appropriate administration manager, the Assistant Director to the HEC Director. The ERM assists management and employees on policies and procedures that apply and ensures that they are followed during this process. In the event of a grievance filing, the ERM reviews information and ensures that all documents are properly prepared for processing.

Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided

Survey Question
<p>If further action has been taken, please provide documentation. If no further action has been taken or if recommendation is no longer applicable, please state such. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disciplinary action paperwork originates in the Director's Office and is presented to the concerned employee by his/her shift manager. The Employee Relations Manager is not involved in the discipline process. The Employee Relations Manager's duties have been amended to include activities directed at improving employee morale (i.e., facilitating HEC committees, overseeing purchase and installation of equipment to improve employee's work life). <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section D: Employee Evaluation, Rewards and Retribution
Issue Number:	37
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
The results of focus groups with all levels of employees, individual interviews to discuss process and procedures, and employee surveys indicate that the processes for employee evaluation and recognition need improvement.	Report 05-27; page 40
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that management institute a visible rewards program to publicly recognize employees who have gone "above and beyond" or excelled in some noteworthy capacity.	Report 05-27; page 40 & 91
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several employee recognition programs are in place. These programs are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Extra Milers and SAAVY news letters ○ "Telecommunicator of the Year" and "Silent Hero" ○ Awards that are presented at the annual Texas Emergency Number Association Conference (TENA). ○ Shift bidding based on productivity is a recognition ○ HPD dispatch started an employee recognition program approximately one month ago. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management is considering other avenues of recognition 	
Survey Question	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to City's current employee awards/recognition programs, HEC Awards/Morale Committee was formed to recognize employees' notable achievements via the HEC Director's Award, the HEC Silent Hero Award, the HEC Telecommunicator of the Year Award, and the Employee of the Quarter Award. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HPD ECD will restart its employee recognition program by utilizing a place on the HEC board for a photo of the winning employee. This will be done quarterly. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section D: Employee Evaluation, Rewards and Retribution
Issue Number:	38
Priority:	High
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
The results of focus groups with all levels of employees, individual interviews to discuss process and procedures, and employee surveys indicate that the processes for employee evaluation and recognition need improvement.	Report 05-27; page 40
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
The City should evaluate, and improve as necessary, the current starting pay offered to new Telecommunicators, especially Police Dispatchers, relative to the equivalent compensation package offered by other major cities in Texas.	Report 05-27; page 41 & 91
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management team will take this issue under advisement. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (see backup material) <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Police dispatcher job requirements updated. City Human Resource Department currently doing market survey regarding police dispatcher salary. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section D: Employee Evaluation, Rewards and Retribution
Issue Number:	39
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
The results of focus groups with all levels of employees, individual interviews to discuss process and procedures, and employee surveys indicate that the processes for employee evaluation and recognition need improvement.	Report 05-27; page 40
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that management implement the best practice employed by many call centers of placing pictures of employees on a common notice board when they are recognized for various achievements e.g. employee of the month.	Report 05-27; page 41
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response/comments provided 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC events (Labor Day barbeque, Halloween, Christmas Party, etc.) photographed with photos being placed on new bulletin board in employee break room. Photos of events also displayed on HEC Internet kiosks in main hallway. Photos of committee members and award winners displayed on HEC Internet kiosks in hallway. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD ECD hopes to be able to utilize an area (on the HEC board) to post the dispatcher of the quarter. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section E: Analysis of Call Handling Activities and Staffing Levels
Issue Number:	40
Priority:	High
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Our analysis of call handling activities and staffing levels indicated several opportunities to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Center's ability to deliver the appropriate emergency response to each citizen's call.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that realistic and achievable long-term DCP and PCP goals be established which drive reduced call handling times without sacrificing the integrity (completeness and accuracy) of the information collected.	Report no. 05-27; page 46 & 96 Appendix D
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management will take this issue under advisement. It has been proven that with ongoing training, and expanded quality assurance program and diligent supervision, the current call standards can be met and improved upon. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
<p>Please describe all discussion/action/consideration given to this recommendation. If no further consideration has been given to this recommendation, please document accordingly. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation. See Appendix D-13, D-14, D-15 & D-16.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC DCP/PCP goals revised to allow increased call handling time. Call handling time will be adjusted as new technology is brought on line to assist with call handling. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD will continue to investigate new procedures and the utilization of new software to improve its dispatch times. AVL is projected to be in place by the first of the year and patrol sgts will be required to be more involved with managing calls for service. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section E: Analysis of Call Handling Activities and Staffing Levels
Issue Number:	41
Priority:	Low
Impact:	Low
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Our analysis of call handling activities and staffing levels indicated several opportunities to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Center's ability to deliver the appropriate emergency response to each citizen's call.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that HEC management perform a comparative study of the data gathering requirements, number of fields and keystrokes used, scripting and training provided, to identify areas which may have contributed to shorter Fire/EMS processing times and be transferable to the Police calls.	Report no. 05-27; page 97
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although this has been part of their training, HEC is attempting to obtain grant funding for Police protocol that would eliminate the free-flow data gathering. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC and HPD management has agreed to move toward a similar call processing protocol. HEC management worked with HFD management in the scripting, training and quality assurance process prior to the move into HEC. 	
Survey Question	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Police protocol software implemented to reduce police call handling time and to provide a consistent set of data for each police call type with the correct police call code. <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section E: Analysis of Call Handling Activities and Staffing Levels
Issue Number:	42
Priority:	Low
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Our analysis of call handling activities and staffing levels indicated several opportunities to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Center's ability to deliver the appropriate emergency response to each citizen's call.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that management also closely monitor the actual time physically spent on the phone and either on a call or available to answer a call.	Report no. 05-27; Page 42 & 97
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
1. Management concurs with this observation. The monitoring of the call floor is the responsibility of the 1st line supervisor.	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC has provided 1st line supervisor with the appropriate equipment to monitor this activity and it is now included in EPE work plan. 	
Survey Question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:

- HEC**
- HEC supervisors closely monitor call handling and idle time via computer software linked to the Department's phone switch.
- HPD**
- HFD**

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section E: Analysis of Call Handling Activities and Staffing Levels
Issue Number:	43
Priority:	High
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	\$202,800 + \$202,800 (contingent on number of saved employees)

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Our analysis of call handling activities and staffing levels indicated several opportunities to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Center's ability to deliver the appropriate emergency response to each citizen's call.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that HEC management consider assigning a number of Senior Telecommunicators within the system on each shift to handle both Fire/EMS and, during lulls in Fire/EMS calls, any Police call overflows.	Report no. 05-27; Page 46 & 98
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Management disagrees with this recommendation. 2. Senior Telecommunicators (Fire/EMS) should not be committed to processing non-emergency Police related calls because this will cause a potential delay in Fire/EMS related emergency calls. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None provided 	
Survey Question	
<p>Please describe all discussion/action/consideration given to this recommendation. If no further consideration has been given to this recommendation, please document accordingly. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation. See Appendix D-17.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular-duty Senior Telecommunicators are dedicated to the Fire/EMS call-taking function, though Senior Telecommunicators with police call taking experience are allowed to work overtime as police call takers. <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section E: Analysis of Call Handling Activities and Staffing Levels
Issue Number:	44
Priority:	Low
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Our analysis of call handling activities and staffing levels indicated several opportunities to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Center's ability to deliver the appropriate emergency response to each citizen's call.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that call handling time be evaluated within the context of total response time, i.e. from receipt of the 9-1-1 Call until the first respondent arrives on the scene. While we agree that considerable attention should be paid to minimizing call-handling time, management's primary focus should be to ensure that the completeness and accuracy of the related information gathered is not compromised.	Report no. 05-27; Page 47 & 99-100
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
1. No response/comments provided	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adding call handling time to the Police Department's response time would fall under the purview of the Police Department. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD will continue to use the creation of a call slip to arrival time of the police officer as a measure of police response time to a call for service. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section E: Analysis of Call Handling Activities and Staffing Levels
Issue Number:	45
Priority:	High
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	\$1,044,342 + \$1,017,242 = \$2,061,584

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Our analysis of call handling activities and staffing levels indicated several opportunities to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Center's ability to deliver the appropriate emergency response to each citizen's call.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that HEC management establish an automated self-service interactive voice response mechanism (IVR) to handle the 10-digit Police Calls. These calls currently constitute as much as 45% of all Police calls handled (Appendix D-1).	Report no. 05-27; Page 47 & 100
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
1. The Management team is in the process of exploring the use of IVR technology to handle 10-digit non emergency police calls.	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation. See Appendix D-18	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IVR was installed on Police Department 10-digit, non-emergency line in August 2006. Call volume to that phone line has been reduced by approximately 35%. Total potential costs savings approximately \$1.1 million. HEC is in the process of implementing WEBARM (Web-based Alternate Reporting Mechanism) to allow alarm companies to generate their own alarm call slips without the involvement of HEC call takers (call slips generated by alarm companies would appear on the dispatcher's dispatch screen without call taker intervention). Calls received from alarm companies constitute approximately 10% of all phone calls received by HEC call takers. Total potential cost savings approximately \$315,000 (\$1.1 million/(35/10)). <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section E: Analysis of Call Handling Activities and Staffing Levels
Issue Number:	46
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	\$202,137

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Our analysis of call handling activities and staffing levels indicated several opportunities to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Center's ability to deliver the appropriate emergency response to each citizen's call.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although Fire/EMS 10 digits call volumes are significantly lower than Police call volumes, we recommend that management also consider managing the calls via IVR. 	Report no. 05-27; Page 47 &100
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
1. The Management team disagrees with this recommendation of the use of IVR to handle HFD an HPD 10-digit calls. Unlike HPD, all HFD (911 & 10 digit) calls are to be considered emergencies.	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
<p>Please describe all discussion/action/consideration given to this recommendation. If no further consideration has been given to this recommendation, please document accordingly. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation. See Appendix D-18.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IVRs are not suitable for emergency calls. Emergency lines will continue to be staffed with call takers. <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section E: Analysis of Call Handling Activities and Staffing Levels
Issue Number:	47
Priority:	High
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	\$375,000

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Our analysis of call handling activities and staffing levels indicated several opportunities to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Center's ability to deliver the appropriate emergency response to each citizen's call.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that management increase the number of bilingual Spanish-speaking Telecommunicators and Senior Telecommunicators who interact directly with the public. We suggest that management both reclassify and deploy as bilingual any eligible current Spanish-speaking Telecommunicators as well as actively recruiting bilingual Spanish speakers for all positions	Report no. 05-27; Page 47 &101
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Houston is a culturally diverse city with Spanish as the predominant non-English language spoken. When call-taker positions are posted, bi-lingual candidates are given preference for these positions. Some current employees who speak Spanish or other languages, have chosen not to use their skill as part of their job description. For this reason, HEC management has provided access to a Language Line service to assist with these and other non-English language calls. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation. See Appendix L-1.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spanish-speaking call takers increased by 64.28%. Language line costs reduced by 40.08%. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD ECD actively recruits bilingual police dispatchers. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section E: Analysis of Call Handling Activities and Staffing Levels
Issue Number:	48
Priority:	Low
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Our analysis of call handling activities and staffing levels indicated several opportunities to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Center's ability to deliver the appropriate emergency response to each citizen's call.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that dispatchers assign Priority Code 3 and 4 directly to specific patrol units instead of the current practice of allowing officers to volunteer to dispatched incidences. To assist the call center dispatchers, we recommend that HPD prepare a schedule of the expected time required in the field to resolve each type of call to identify which officers may be available soonest. We further recommend that HPD management consider monitoring the individual officers' general adherence to such time frames in order to help ensure officer availability. Dispatchers and classified HPD shift supervisors in the field should also monitor unit availability to ensure that these calls are answered in the sequence received and on a timely basis	Report no. 05-27; Page 47 &101
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The recommendation to prevent officers from assigning themselves directly to Code 3 and Code 4 calls will be taken under advisement by HPD. 2. The recommendation that the Department prepare a schedule of expected time to handle a police call by type will be taken under advisement by HPD. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None provided 	
Survey Question	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response required. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HPD is still considering alternate methods of managing police calls for service, especially Code 3 and 4 calls. With the addition of AVL, along with engaging the patrol sgts with some of the responsibility to manage calls, HPD hopes to address many of these issues. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section E: Analysis of Call Handling Activities and Staffing Levels
Issue Number:	49
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Our analysis of call handling activities and staffing levels indicated several opportunities to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Center's ability to deliver the appropriate emergency response to each citizen's call.	Report no. 05-27; page 17
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
Although Police patrol unit strength and citywide allocation are not within the scope of this engagement, there is an apparent shortage of officers available to respond on a timely basis to other than Code 1 and Code 2 calls. The most significant and potentially easiest factor to improve is dispatch queue time (the time a call is held in dispatch pending availability of an officer in the field).	Report no. 05-27; Page 47 & 102
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
1. No Response/Comment provided.	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Question	
<p>Please describe all discussion/action/consideration given to this recommendation. If no further consideration has been given to this recommendation, please document accordingly. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation. See Appendix E-1.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response required. <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section F: Operational Management
Issue Number:	50
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	\$416,000

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Our analysis of call handling activities and staffing levels indicated several opportunities to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Center's ability to deliver the appropriate emergency response to each citizen's call.	Report no. 05-27; page 17

JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
HPD management should consider relocating the Teleserve functions to the Center from its current off-site location to leverage economies of scale and drive efficiencies.	Report no. 05-27; page 46 & 89

Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In most centers, civilians in the Police Department's Records Division staff Teleserve. Further review in conjunction with HEC management will need to be conducted to determine if sufficient space, equipment etc. exists at HEC to house this function or if it should be combined with another Department division (e.g., Records Division) to achieve the economies of scale noted in the audit.

Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Survey Question
<p>Please describe all discussion/action/consideration given to this recommendation. If no further consideration has been given to this recommendation, please document the follow-up accordingly.</p> <p>If applicable, provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p> <p>See Appendix K-1</p>

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient space may not exist at HEC to bring Teleserve function on-site. Economies of scale could be achieved by combining this function with the Police Department's Records Division. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD will move function to the Records Division when funding for personnel, office build-out, etc. is located. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section F: Operational Management
Issue Number:	51
Priority:	Low
Impact:	Low
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on our focus groups, individual interviews, process shadowing and employee survey results, operational management lacks consistency and responsiveness to employees.	Report 05-27; page 60
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
Place a light or flag on each console position for use when an agent requires assistance from a Liaison Specialist. Allow direct communication between dispatchers and call-takers under specified conditions without requiring critical time-consuming transmission of such requests through the two respective supervisory layers i.e. to gather / verify specific or additional data on high priority code calls.	Report 05-27; page 60, 94 & 103
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call-takers are required to answer all incoming calls; therefore, it is not uncommon for a call-taker to be involved with another call when a dispatcher determines that they need additional information for the previous call. • If the call taker were interrupted, this would delay the current call that is being processed. Furthermore, a supervisor has the ability to look up the event and listen to the all and answer the supervisor or dispatcher's questions. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response provided 	
Survey Questions	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The preferred method of communication between call takers and dispatchers is via supervisors. This method is preferred in order to minimize disruptions to work in progress and to allow for supervisory oversight and documentation and correction of errors. • The set up of the HEC call center is not conducive to face-to-face interaction between call takers and dispatchers which would be preferable on high priority calls (distance between call takers and dispatchers is considerable). • HEC supervisors are assigned to walk call floor to assist call takers in their duties. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The preferred method of communication between call takers and dispatchers is via supervisors. This method is preferred in order to minimize disruptions to work in progress and to allow for supervisory oversight and documentation and correction of errors. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section F: Operational Management
Issue Number:	52
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on our focus groups, individual interviews, process shadowing and employee survey results, operational management lacks consistency and responsiveness to employees.	Report 05-27; page 60
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that Dispatchers be permitted to contact their Police and Fire/EMS Telecommunicator colleagues directly to confirm critical information, especially on high priority calls.	Report 05-27; page 60 & 94
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response provided 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response provided 	
Survey Questions	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The preferred method of communication between call takers and dispatchers is via supervisors. This method is preferred in order to minimize disruptions to work in progress and to allow for supervisory oversight and documentation and correction of errors. The set up of the HEC call center is not conducive to face-to-face interaction between call takers and dispatchers which would be preferable on high priority calls (distance between call takers and dispatchers is considerable). <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of the high priority calls need to be monitored by ECD sgts. With the addition of the four-day workweek for sgts and participation in the classified overtime program, HPD hopes to retain knowledgeable sgts on the call floor. Also HEC has approved the addition of NICE log at the sgts console, which will give them the ability to review a call immediately. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section F: Operational Management
Issue Number:	53
Priority:	Low
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on our focus groups, individual interviews, process shadowing and employee survey results, operational management lacks consistency and responsiveness to employees.	Report 05-27; page 60
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that as part of their training, Telecommunicators spend some time in the field with respective HPD and HFD emergency responders.	Report 05-27; page 60 & 94
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendation is already a part of the Basic HEC Telecommunicator Training Program. However, we will include this as part of the Continuing Education Training Program. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPD will require that during initial training, dispatchers will be required to spend time in the field to gain a better appreciation of what actually occurs in the field. 	
Survey Questions	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A ride-along program for call takers with police officers and fire/EMS crews is currently part of new hire training and will be part of an on-going reward system for perfect monthly attendance. <p>HPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently HPD ECD does not have the staffing for a ride along program. Once adequate staffing is achieved, the ride along program will be implemented. <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section G: Information Technology and Support
Issue Number:	54
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on our focus groups, individual interviews, and employee survey results, we found that several issues are present with regard to the Information Technology and Support Group (IT) including the following: lack of unified management direction regarding 24 hour 7 days a week on-call functionality; need for 24 hour 7 days a week help desk; lack of equipment; inefficient use of warranty and spare inventories; lack of training; limited career path; system downtime – perception and reality; CAD downtime workaround.	Report No. 05-27; page 69
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
The City should establish a 24 hour 7 days a week Help Desk on site at the Center.	Report No. 05-27; page 69 & 103
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management team has taken this issue under advisement. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided. 	
Survey Questions	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More personnel have been added to the On-Call duty thus reducing the numbers of assignments per year. All equipment issues have been addressed. Appropriate equipment is on location and installed or waiting installation. (Vehicles, PC's, servers, storage, Blackberries and test equipment). Senior mgt. gets called on Priority 1 and 2 calls to gain insight and provide supervision. CAD and Orbacom issues have dramatically decreased. In 2004, the HEC experienced 26 hours of downtime, in 2005, HEC experienced 73 minutes. HEC is exploring the use of a professional answering service to insure no single point of failure. <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section G: Information Technology and Support
Issue Number:	55
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on our focus groups, individual interviews, and employee survey results, we found that several issues are present with regard to the Information Technology and Support Group (IT) including the following: lack of unified management direction regarding 24 hour 7 days a week on-call functionality; need for 24 hour 7 days a week help desk; lack of equipment; inefficient use of warranty and spare inventories; lack of training; limited career path; system downtime – perception and reality; CAD downtime workaround.	Report No. 05-27; page 69
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
Management should ensure that the IT Department has the requisite equipment and technical training to support the Center systems.	Report No. 05-27; page 69 & 104
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not cost effective to send employees out of town for training to do what a vendor has an obligation to provide or is part of the original purchase contract. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to rigorous training requirements HEC will schedule application training as budgets allows. Management will continue to review vendor relationships to determine support responsibilities. 	
Survey Questions	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More personnel have been added to the On-Call duty thus reducing the numbers of assignments per year. All equipment issues have been addressed. Appropriate equipment is on location and installed or waiting installation. (Vehicles, PC's, servers, storage, Blackberries and test equipment). Senior mgt. gets called on Priority 1 and 2 calls to gain insight and provide supervision. CAD and Orbacom issues have dramatically decreased. In 2004, the HEC experienced 26 hours of downtime, in 2005, HEC experienced 73 minutes. HEC is exploring the use of a professional answering service to insure no single point of failure. <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section G: Information Technology and Support
Issue Number:	56
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on our focus groups, individual interviews, and employee survey results, we found that several issues are present with regard to the Information Technology and Support Group (IT) including the following: lack of unified management direction regarding 24 hour 7 days a week on-call functionality; need for 24 hour 7 days a week help desk; lack of equipment; inefficient use of warranty and spare inventories; lack of training; limited career path; system downtime – perception and reality; CAD downtime workaround.	Report No. 05-27; page 69
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
Management should evaluate the cost benefits of maintaining a City or vendor owned inventory of essential spares on site to reduce parts related downtime. The City should implement a service level agreement with vendors to provide for a readily available inventory of the most common and critical spare parts needed to maintain the IT equipment.	Report No. 05-27; page 69 & 103
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support/Maintenance contract has been changed to require vendors to allow these items to be stocked locally. Additional they will place a priority on high use items, and provide a proactive monitoring and alerting capability. HP will put in a monitoring system to ensure earlier alerting of problems and ensure quicker response to problems. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided. 	
Survey Questions	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NGC contract support has been reviewed & improved. New support/maintenance contract with IPC has just been approved. IPC support will be on site. Two HEC technicians have gone to IPC training. <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section G: Information Technology and Support
Issue Number:	57
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on our focus groups, individual interviews, and employee survey results, we found that several issues are present with regard to the Information Technology and Support Group (IT) including the following: lack of unified management direction regarding 24 hour 7 days a week on-call functionality; need for 24 hour 7 days a week help desk; lack of equipment; inefficient use of warranty and spare inventories; lack of training; limited career path; system downtime – perception and reality; CAD downtime workaround.	Report No. 05-27; page 69
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
The City should maintain a pro-active media communications program to ensure that local media receives an accurate and balanced account of any and all downtime.	Report No. 05-27; page 104
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HEC continues to provide accurate information to all levels of media. • Regarding media interest of HEC activities, HEC proactively provide media alerts of scheduled system maintenance and/or upgrades, media releases to summarize particular HEC incidents, and media notification of upcoming HEC news conferences. • In the case HEC information is not available; the media/public is encouraged to submit an Open Records Request for processing. • HEC does not have control of the media/public's portrayal of received information. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None provided 	
Survey Questions	
<p>Please describe all discussion/action/consideration given to this recommendation. If applicable, provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All maintenance windows are announced to the media. <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section G: Information Technology and Support
Issue Number:	58
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on our focus groups, individual interviews, and employee survey results, we found that several issues are present with regard to the Information Technology and Support Group (IT) including the following: lack of unified management direction regarding 24 hour 7 days a week on-call functionality; need for 24 hour 7 days a week help desk; lack of equipment; inefficient use of warranty and spare inventories; lack of training; limited career path; system downtime – perception and reality; CAD downtime workaround.	Report No. 05-27; page 69
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
IT Management should establish clear policies in several areas, including preventative maintenance (see issue 59 for continuation of this recommendation).	Report No. 05-27; page 69 & 104

Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005

- Preventative maintenance is a key part of reliable and highly available system. The HEC system is composed of three public safety applications and one important business application. Preventative measures are underway to significantly improve the uptime and component failure issues in the system. Specifically fall-over and redundancy testing is underway on all four systems and the gaps are currently being addressed. Hardware and operating system monitors are being tested and gradually introduced to the monitoring process. In Q1 of FY 06 an application monitoring process for CAD will be implemented. This comprehensive hardware inventory is being conducted and necessary quick access replacement parts will be staged to rapidly change out faulty hardware components. This will limit replacement time.

Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005

- None provided

Survey Questions

Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.

Please provide management response and action status below:

HEC

- Hardware communications and software components have been audited and replaced.
- CAD down time decreased from 26 hours in 2004 to 73 minutes in 2005.
- The improved trend is maintained through 2006.

HPD

HFD

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section G: Information Technology and Support
Issue Number:	59
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on our focus groups, individual interviews, and employee survey results, we found that several issues are present with regard to the Information Technology and Support Group (IT) including the following: lack of unified management direction regarding 24 hour 7 days a week on-call functionality; need for 24 hour 7 days a week help desk; lack of equipment; inefficient use of warranty and spare inventories; lack of training; limited career path; system downtime – perception and reality; CAD downtime workaround.	Report No. 05-27; page 69
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
IT Management should establish clear policies in several areas, including overtime compensation (see issue 58 for continuation of this recommendation).	Report No. 05-27; page 69 & 104
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overtime compensation policy is under review. The previous policy was subject to questionable employee hourly submission. The CTD will seek advice form HR and present findings to the Director and then to the team in 1st quarter of FY 06. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Questions	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:

HEC

- Overtime is paid per the COH HR policy.
- Improved system uptime means fewer calls and reduced work requirements for on-call personnel.
- April 2005 there were 9 on-call personnel.
- Sept 2006 there are 14 on-call personnel to share the on-call duty.

HPD

HFD

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section G: Information Technology and Support
Issue Number:	60
Priority:	Low
Impact:	Low
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on our focus groups, individual interviews, and employee survey results, we found that several issues are present with regard to the Information Technology and Support Group (IT) including the following: lack of unified management direction regarding 24 hour 7 days a week on-call functionality; need for 24 hour 7 days a week help desk; lack of equipment; inefficient use of warranty and spare inventories; lack of training; limited career path; system downtime – perception and reality; CAD downtime workaround.	Report No. 05-27; page 69
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
The City should coordinate its IT support activities with other parties at the Center, including ensuring immediate 24 hour 7 days a week access to equipment and systems on which the City relies.	Report No. 05-27; page 104
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All equipment does not belong to COH and is not maintained by COH. Equipment provided and managed by GHC, is clearly identified and is sufficiently supported by GHC personnel who provide 24-hour support for the equipment on site. There is no overlapping responsibility to require HEC IT access to these equipment rooms or equipment. GHC does not have access to COH equipment. There is a cooperative effort between GHC and HEC IT technical support staff when coordinating service, maintenance and trouble solving responsibilities. Each organization is a separate governmental entity with separate funding and it responsible for its own equipment. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided. 	
Survey Questions	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> System availability has been improved (see previous follow up). <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section G: Information Technology and Support
Issue Number:	61
Priority:	Low
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on our focus groups, individual interviews, and employee survey results, we found that several issues are present with regard to the Information Technology and Support Group (IT) including the following: lack of unified management direction regarding 24 hour 7 days a week on-call functionality; need for 24 hour 7 days a week help desk; lack of equipment; inefficient use of warranty and spare inventories; lack of training; limited career path; system downtime – perception and reality; CAD downtime workaround.	Report No. 05-27; page 69
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
The City should consider establishing a single centralized IT office empowered with oversight and support responsibilities for all IT systems on which the City relies to deliver any emergency response. We recommend that a dedicated Chief Technology Officer be assigned to direct this consolidated office of IT support over all City Emergency Response Services.	Report No. 05-27; page 70 & 105
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This recommendation will be taken under advisement. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Questions	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The complexity of the system requires on-site staff and management. New complex systems are being added to the HEC further warranting an increase in local support and management. <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section G: Information Technology and Support
Issue Number:	62
Priority:	Low
Impact:	Low
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on our focus groups, individual interviews, and employee survey results, we found that several issues are present with regard to the Information Technology and Support Group (IT) including the following: lack of unified management direction regarding 24 hour 7 days a week on-call functionality; need for 24 hour 7 days a week help desk; lack of equipment; inefficient use of warranty and spare inventories; lack of training; limited career path; system downtime – perception and reality; CAD downtime workaround.	Report No. 05-27; page 69
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
Management should evaluate the location and quality of mission critical infrastructure equipment to ensure there is appropriate back up and system redundancy.	Report No. 05-27; page 70 & 105
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response comment provided. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently being addressed by the ground study team. 	
Survey Questions	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC IT has focused on eliminating all single points of failure in all the public safety systems. Most of the necessary tasks are complete and CAD availability will be further enhanced when the new CAD servers are online in November. <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section G: Information Technology and Support
Issue Number:	63
Priority:	Medium
Impact:	Medium
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on our focus groups, individual interviews, and employee survey results, we found that several issues are present with regard to the Information Technology and Support Group (IT) including the following: lack of unified management direction regarding 24 hour 7 days a week on-call functionality; need for 24 hour 7 days a week help desk; lack of equipment; inefficient use of warranty and spare inventories; lack of training; limited career path; system downtime – perception and reality; CAD downtime workaround.	Report No. 05-27; page 69
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
Management needs to establish a career path for IT personnel and reduce the constant threat of disruptions to their home life. The thin span of technical coverage leaves the Center particularly susceptible to a sudden lack of requisite expertise arising from mass sickness or exodus of personnel.	Report No. 05-27; page 103
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because of the small IT staff within HEC, additional promotional opportunities exist through the City of Houston IT department and across other COH departments. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within the past 12 months 25% of the IT staff has been promoted. 	
Survey Questions	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Career path and promotional opportunities exist in the HEC and COH. Since May of 2005, 8 internal promotions have occurred and 2 personnel were promoted to position in other departments resulting in 10 promotions in a staff of 26. <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section H: Facility Security and Disaster Recovery
Issue Number:	64
Priority:	High
Impact:	High
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on our focus groups, individual interviews, and observations, several potential gaps exist in overall security measures, which may expose the Center to significant adverse risks.	Report No. 05-27; page 76
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that the Center prepare a formal business disruption and continuity plan in the event that the Center becomes disabled for any period of time.	Report No. 05-27; page 76 & 105
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC Management team will work jointly with HPD an HFD to establish a back-up dispatch facility proposal. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None provided 	
Survey Questions	
<p>Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.</p>	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several COOP steps are in place. Request additional funding for a backup site. <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Houston Emergency Center Performance Review Follow Up



Report Initially Submitted: June 2005

Follow Up Survey: October 2006

Improvement Opportunity Category:	Section H: Facility Security and Disaster Recovery
Issue Number:	65
Priority:	Low
Impact:	Low
HEC Responsible Party:	
Potential Financial Impact:	

Improvement Opportunity	Reference Document(s):
Based on our focus groups, individual interviews, and observations, several potential gaps exist in overall security measures, which may expose the Center to significant adverse risks.	Report No. 05-27; page 76
JW Recommendation	Reference Document(s):
We recommend that the Center enforce a "no tailgating" policy for both vehicles entering the facility grounds and for individuals entering the secured areas of the building.	Report No. 05-27; page 76 & 105
Managements Initial Response/Comments as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEC Policy HEC100-03 - Perimeter security is very clear in procedures regarding the facility's security mandate. Specifically: IV - Upon approaching the main entry gate, all person sand vehicles will stop at the entry control point 1 (ECP1) until the security officer authorizes their entry. Persons and vehicles are granted authorization to enter the premises only by the security officer at the entry control point. This allows the security officer to perform other appropriate security tasks (e.g. closer scrutiny of occupants' IDs or vehicle examination). In other words, persons and vehicles should not enter just because their ID has opened the gate or their vehicle is displaying a hangtag. 	
Managements Action Status Response as of June 16, 2005	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stricter enforcement of this policy will be undertaken by security personnel. Persons or vehicles will not piggyback through the gate. All persons, including employees desiring to enter the premises are subject to the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) challenge; (2) leaving official identification with security officer or receptionist; (3) search of person (4) search of vehicle and (5) search of belongings or cargo. Persons who do not wish to comply will not have their persons or property searched. Instead a security officer will immediately escort them from the premises. 	
Survey Questions	
Please describe actions taken to implement this recommendation in the manner suggested or in another manner. Provide all relevant meeting minutes, memos, statistics, policy changes etc. that demonstrate the implementation of this recommendation.	

Please provide management response and action status below:
<p>HEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No tailgating policy enforced by security at front gate. <p>HPD</p> <p>HFD</p>

Appendix III

Results of Employee Survey

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - Overall

Question 1 Overall, there are significant morale problems among the people in my work group.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 8	15	13	10	26	121	1	185
Dec. 2006 # 1	18	17	15	15	21	1	86

Question 2 Recent changes and restructuring of the business have improved my job satisfaction.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 10	102	41	20	13	4	3	180
Dec. 2006 # 2	16	18	19	14	15	5	82

Question 3 Internal problems in my work area are frequently left unaddressed by management and interfere with my ability to get the job done.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 11	14	26	16	39	90	0	185
Dec. 2006 # 3	16	23	8	20	19	1	86

Question 4 I do not feel that I can speak to my supervisor about serious problems and concerns in the work environment without causing problems for myself.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 18	20	43	17	35	67	3	182
Dec. 2006 # 4	21	24	12	13	17	0	87

Question 5 The company employees believe their work group is effectively providing high quality services.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 22	35	36	29	56	23	3	179
Dec. 2006 # 5	5	11	13	26	31	1	86

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - Overall

Question 6 There are not sufficient resources available to ensure quality care and services for customers served by the company.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 23	13	36	21	45	62	7	177
Dec. 2006 # 6	19	28	8	19	11	2	85

Question 7 The information flow between my work group and other parts of the company make it difficult to coordinate efforts.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 34	6	18	21	54	84	4	183
Dec. 2006 # 7	11	23	10	22	20	1	86

Question 8 Information about what is happening in the company is not communicated to my department in a timely fashion.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 37	5	13	20	67	74	3	179
Dec. 2006 # 8	11	24	15	18	19	0	87

Question 9 If employees in my work group did an outstanding job they would receive appropriate recognition or rewards.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 46	82	49	22	25	3	5	181
Dec. 2006 # 9	18	14	19	22	14	0	87

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - Overall

Question 10 Confidence in management of my division is high.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 50	91	40	15	19	8	0	173
Dec. 2006 # 10	21	18	18	14	16	0	87

Question 11 If some employees in my work group performed poorly, they would be subject to corrective action that was appropriate and fair.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 58	52	38	25	51	15	6	181
Dec. 2006 # 11	9	13	14	32	17	2	85

Question 12 My performance ratings do not reflect my actual accomplishments and limitations.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 59	13	34	19	43	65	7	174
Dec. 2006 # 12	12	19	19	16	18	3	84

Question 13 The company does a good job with maintaining an accurate and timely payroll operation.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 63	48	21	23	52	21	21	165
Dec. 2006 # 13	4	6	9	37	29	2	85

Question 14 If someone cuts corners or fails to follow established procedures, management or the audit staff is likely to discover it.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 70	17	15	30	38	16	65	116
Dec. 2006 # 14	9	12	13	30	19	4	83

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - A - 911 Telecommunicators

Question 1 Overall, there are significant morale problems among the people in my work group.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 8	0	2	0	1	10	0	13
Dec. 2006 # 1	0	0	1	2	1	0	4

Question 2 Recent changes and restructuring of the business have improved my job satisfaction.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 10	8	1	2	0	0	1	11
Dec. 2006 # 2	0	1	2	1	0	0	4

Question 3 Internal problems in my work area are frequently left unaddressed by management and interfere with my ability to get the job done.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 11	0	3	2	2	5	0	12
Dec. 2006 # 3	0	0	2	2	0	0	4

Question 4 I do not feel that I can speak to my supervisor about serious problems and concerns in the work environment without causing problems for myself.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 18	1	3	1	2	5	1	12
Dec. 2006 # 4	0	1	1	1	1	0	4

Question 5 The company employees believe their work group is effectively providing high quality services.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 22	4	2	1	4	0	1	11
Dec. 2006 # 5	0	2	0	1	1	0	4

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - A - 911 Telecommunicators

Question 6 There are not sufficient resources available to ensure quality care and services for customers served by the company.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 23	0	4	2	0	5	2	11
Dec. 2006 # 6	0	3	1	0	0	0	4

Question 7 The information flow between my work group and other parts of the company make it difficult to coordinate efforts.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 34	0	0	4	3	6	0	13
Dec. 2006 # 7	0	0	1	3	0	0	4

Question 8 Information about what is happening in the company is not communicated to my department in a timely fashion.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 37	2	1	0	6	4	0	13
Dec. 2006 # 8	0	0	0	4	0	0	4

Question 9 If employees in my work group did an outstanding job they would receive appropriate recognition or rewards.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 46	8	2	1	1	0	1	12
Dec. 2006 # 9	0	2	2	0	0	0	4

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - A - 911 Telecommunicators

Question 10 Confidence in management of my division is high.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 50	8	2	2	0	0	0	12
Dec. 2006 # 10	1	1	1	0	1	0	4

Question 11 If some employees in my work group performed poorly, they would be subject to corrective action that was appropriate and fair.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 58	6	2	2	2	0	1	12
Dec. 2006 # 11	0	1	2	1	0	0	4

Question 12 My performance ratings do not reflect my actual accomplishments and limitations.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 59	1	0	1	3	7	1	12
Dec. 2006 # 12	0	0	1	1	2	0	4

Question 13 The company does a good job with maintaining an accurate and timely payroll operation.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 63	4	2	1	3	2	1	12
Dec. 2006 # 13	0	0	1	2	1	0	4

Question 14 If someone cuts corners or fails to follow established procedures, management or the audit staff is likely to discover it.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 70	1	1	3	3	1	4	9
Dec. 2006 # 14	0	0	2	0	1	1	3

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - B - Police Telecommunicators

Question 1 Overall, there are significant morale problems among the people in my work group.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 8	3	1	1	2	36	0	43
Dec. 2006 # 1	1	0	1	0	1	0	3

Question 2 Recent changes and restructuring of the business have improved my job satisfaction.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 10	32	6	0	1	2	0	41
Dec. 2006 # 2	2	0	1	0	0	0	3

Question 3 Internal problems in my work area are frequently left unaddressed by management and interfere with my ability to get the job done.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 11	3	2	2	6	30	0	43
Dec. 2006 # 3	1	0	0	2	0	0	3

Question 4 I do not feel that I can speak to my supervisor about serious problems and concerns in the work environment without causing problems for myself.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 18	2	5	4	8	24	0	43
Dec. 2006 # 4	1	0	0	1	1	0	3

Question 5 The company employees believe their work group is effectively providing high quality services.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 22	13	8	9	6	4	1	40
Dec. 2006 # 5	0	1	1	0	1	0	3

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - B - Police Telecommunicators

Question 6 There are not sufficient resources available to ensure quality care and services for customers served by the company.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 23	3	6	4	7	19	4	39
Dec. 2006 # 6	1	0	0	2	0	0	3

Question 7 The information flow between my work group and other parts of the company make it difficult to coordinate efforts.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 34	2	2	3	9	26	1	42
Dec. 2006 # 7	0	0	1	0	1	1	2

Question 8 Information about what is happening in the company is not communicated to my department in a timely fashion.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 37	0	1	2	8	28	1	39
Dec. 2006 # 8	0	0	1	0	2	0	3

Question 9 If employees in my work group did an outstanding job they would receive appropriate recognition or rewards.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 46	38	4	0	0	0	1	42
Dec. 2006 # 9	2	0	1	0	0	0	3

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - B - Police Telecommunicators

Question 10 Confidence in management of my division is high.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 50	32	9	0	2	0	0	43
Dec. 2006 # 10	2	0	1	0	0	0	3

Question 11 If some employees in my work group performed poorly, they would be subject to corrective action that was appropriate and fair.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 58	24	5	4	5	3	2	41
Dec. 2006 # 11	1	1	0	0	0	1	2

Question 12 My performance ratings do not reflect my actual accomplishments and limitations.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 59	4	0	5	7	24	1	40
Dec. 2006 # 12	0	0	1	1	1	0	3

Question 13 The company does a good job with maintaining an accurate and timely payroll operation.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 63	12	3	6	8	3	11	32
Dec. 2006 # 13	0	0	2	1	0	0	3

Question 14 If someone cuts corners or fails to follow established procedures, management or the audit staff is likely to discover it.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 70	2	1	5	3	7	24	18
Dec. 2006 # 14	0	0	1	1	1	0	3

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - C - Police Dispatchers

Question 1 Overall, there are significant morale problems among the people in my work group.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 8	2	1	0	2	24	0	29
Dec. 2006 # 1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

Question 2 Recent changes and restructuring of the business have improved my job satisfaction.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 10	23	3	3	0	0	0	29
Dec. 2006 # 2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Question 3 Internal problems in my work area are frequently left unaddressed by management and interfere with my ability to get the job done.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 11	1	1	2	8	18	0	30
Dec. 2006 # 3	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

Question 4 I do not feel that I can speak to my supervisor about serious problems and concerns in the work environment without causing problems for myself.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 18	3	4	3	5	13	0	28
Dec. 2006 # 4	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

Question 5 The company employees believe their work group is effectively providing high quality services.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 22	8	10	2	3	5	0	28
Dec. 2006 # 5	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - C - Police Dispatchers

Question 6 There are not sufficient resources available to ensure quality care and services for customers served by the company.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 23	0	3	2	6	16	0	27
Dec. 2006 # 6	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

Question 7 The information flow between my work group and other parts of the company make it difficult to coordinate efforts.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 34	0	0	1	9	20	0	30
Dec. 2006 # 7	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

Question 8 Information about what is happening in the company is not communicated to my department in a timely fashion.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 37	0	1	0	15	14	0	30
Dec. 2006 # 8	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

Question 9 If employees in my work group did an outstanding job they would receive appropriate recognition or rewards.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 46	13	10	4	3	0	0	30
Dec. 2006 # 9	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - C - Police Dispatchers

Question 10 Confidence in management of my division is high.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 50	19	4	1	0	2	0	26
Dec. 2006 # 10	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Question 11 If some employees in my work group performed poorly, they would be subject to corrective action that was appropriate and fair.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 58	11	5	6	5	1	2	28
Dec. 2006 # 11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Question 12 My performance ratings do not reflect my actual accomplishments and limitations.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 59	2	5	3	11	8	0	29
Dec. 2006 # 12	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

Question 13 The company does a good job with maintaining an accurate and timely payroll operation.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 63	18	3	4	2	1	2	28
Dec. 2006 # 13	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

Question 14 If someone cuts corners or fails to follow established procedures, management or the audit staff is likely to discover it.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 70	5	4	4	6	2	9	21
Dec. 2006 # 14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - D - HFD Dispatchers

Question 1 Overall, there are significant morale problems among the people in my work group.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 8	4	2	4	6	11	0	27
Dec. 2006 # 1	4	6	2	6	10	1	28

Question 2 Recent changes and restructuring of the business have improved my job satisfaction.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 10	9	8	6	3	0	1	26
Dec. 2006 # 2	8	10	6	1	1	3	26

Question 3 Internal problems in my work area are frequently left unaddressed by management and interfere with my ability to get the job done.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 11	1	7	2	6	10	0	26
Dec. 2006 # 3	2	4	2	10	10	1	28

Question 4 I do not feel that I can speak to my supervisor about serious problems and concerns in the work environment without causing problems for myself.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 18	0	11	3	7	5	1	26
Dec. 2006 # 4	6	8	5	4	6	0	29

Question 5 The company employees believe their work group is effectively providing high quality services.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 22	2	2	5	12	6	0	27
Dec. 2006 # 5	3	3	5	9	9	0	29

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - D - HFD Dispatchers

Question 6 There are not sufficient resources available to ensure quality care and services for customers served by the company.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 23	1	6	5	10	5	0	27
Dec. 2006 # 6	1	11	2	7	7	1	28

Question 7 The information flow between my work group and other parts of the company make it difficult to coordinate efforts.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 34	0	6	3	11	4	3	24
Dec. 2006 # 7	1	4	2	13	9	0	29

Question 8 Information about what is happening in the company is not communicated to my department in a timely fashion.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 37	0	2	2	16	5	2	25
Dec. 2006 # 8	1	4	6	8	10	0	29

Question 9 If employees in my work group did an outstanding job they would receive appropriate recognition or rewards.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 46	9	9	4	4	1	0	27
Dec. 2006 # 9	8	6	8	4	3	0	29

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - D - HFD Dispatchers

Question 10 Confidence in management of my division is high.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 50	8	11	4	2	1	0	26
Dec. 2006 # 10	11	7	9	1	1	0	29

Question 11 If some employees in my work group performed poorly, they would be subject to corrective action that was appropriate and fair.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 58	3	7	6	9	2	0	27
Dec. 2006 # 11	4	5	5	12	3	0	29

Question 12 My performance ratings do not reflect my actual accomplishments and limitations.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 59	0	9	1	12	2	2	24
Dec. 2006 # 12	3	7	8	7	3	1	28

Question 13 The company does a good job with maintaining an accurate and timely payroll operation.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 63	5	5	6	7	3	1	26
Dec. 2006 # 13	3	5	3	14	4	0	29

Question 14 If someone cuts corners or fails to follow established procedures, management or the audit staff is likely to discover it.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 70	3	6	8	4	1	5	22
Dec. 2006 # 14	4	4	6	11	3	1	28

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - E - Fire/EMS Telecommunicators

Question 1 Overall, there are significant morale problems among the people in my work group.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 8	0	0	0	3	17	1	20
Dec. 2006 # 1	0	0	2	0	0	0	2

Question 2 Recent changes and restructuring of the business have improved my job satisfaction.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 10	9	6	3	3	0	0	21
Dec. 2006 # 2	0	0	1	1	0	0	2

Question 3 Internal problems in my work area are frequently left unaddressed by management and interfere with my ability to get the job done.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 11	0	2	3	6	10	0	21
Dec. 2006 # 3	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

Question 4 I do not feel that I can speak to my supervisor about serious problems and concerns in the work environment without causing problems for myself.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 18	0	4	1	5	11	0	21
Dec. 2006 # 4	0	1	0	0	1	0	2

Question 5 The company employees believe their work group is effectively providing high quality services.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 22	3	2	3	8	4	1	20
Dec. 2006 # 5	0	0	1	1	0	0	2

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - E - Fire/EMS Telecommunicators

Question 6 There are not sufficient resources available to ensure quality care and services for customers served by the company.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 23	2	4	3	9	3	0	21
Dec. 2006 # 6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2

Question 7 The information flow between my work group and other parts of the company make it difficult to coordinate efforts.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 34	1	1	2	4	13	0	21
Dec. 2006 # 7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2

Question 8 Information about what is happening in the company is not communicated to my department in a timely fashion.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 37	0	2	2	5	12	0	21
Dec. 2006 # 8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2

Question 9 If employees in my work group did an outstanding job they would receive appropriate recognition or rewards.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 46	10	6	2	2	1	0	21
Dec. 2006 # 9	1	0	0	1	0	0	2

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - E - Fire/EMS Telecommunicators

Question 10 Confidence in management of my division is high.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 50	11	4	1	2	1	0	19
Dec. 2006 # 10	1	0	0	1	0	0	2

Question 11 If some employees in my work group performed poorly, they would be subject to corrective action that was appropriate and fair.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 58	6	7	2	6	0	0	21
Dec. 2006 # 11	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

Question 12 My performance ratings do not reflect my actual accomplishments and limitations.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 59	1	5	0	2	11	0	19
Dec. 2006 # 12	0	0	1	0	1	0	2

Question 13 The company does a good job with maintaining an accurate and timely payroll operation.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 63	5	4	4	7	1	0	21
Dec. 2006 # 13	0	0	0	1	1	0	2

Question 14 If someone cuts corners or fails to follow established procedures, management or the audit staff is likely to discover it.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 70	5	1	4	1	1	9	12
Dec. 2006 # 14	1	0	0	1	0	0	2

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - F - 911/Police/Fire/EMS Supervisors

Question 1 Overall, there are significant morale problems among the people in my work group.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 8	0	1	0	2	10	0	13
Dec. 2006 # 1	2	1	5	3	5	0	16

Question 2 Recent changes and restructuring of the business have improved my job satisfaction.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 10	8	4	1	0	0	0	13
Dec. 2006 # 2	5	1	2	3	4	1	15

Question 3 Internal problems in my work area are frequently left unaddressed by management and interfere with my ability to get the job done.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 11	2	0	0	5	6	0	13
Dec. 2006 # 3	3	6	2	1	4	0	16

Question 4 I do not feel that I can speak to my supervisor about serious problems and concerns in the work environment without causing problems for myself.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 18	1	1	2	4	5	0	13
Dec. 2006 # 4	3	5	2	2	4	0	16

Question 5 The company employees believe their work group is effectively providing high quality services.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 22	1	2	4	5	1	0	13
Dec. 2006 # 5	1	2	2	6	5	0	16

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - F - 911/Police/Fire/EMS Supervisors

Question 6 There are not sufficient resources available to ensure quality care and services for customers served by the company.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 23	2	3	0	2	5	1	12
Dec. 2006 # 6	6	5	2	1	1	1	15

Question 7 The information flow between my work group and other parts of the company make it difficult to coordinate efforts.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 34	0	0	3	5	5	0	13
Dec. 2006 # 7	2	7	2	1	4	0	16

Question 8 Information about what is happening in the company is not communicated to my department in a timely fashion.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 37	1	0	1	4	6	0	12
Dec. 2006 # 8	1	9	2	1	3	0	16

Question 9 If employees in my work group did an outstanding job they would receive appropriate recognition or rewards.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 46	2	7	2	0	0	1	11
Dec. 2006 # 9	4	0	2	8	2	0	16

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - F - 911/Police/Fire/EMS Supervisors

Question 10 Confidence in management of my division is high.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 50	6	2	1	1	1	0	11
Dec. 2006 # 10	4	1	4	4	3	0	16

Question 11 If some employees in my work group performed poorly, they would be subject to corrective action that was appropriate and fair.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 58	1	3	1	4	4	0	13
Dec. 2006 # 11	3	0	0	7	5	1	15

Question 12 My performance ratings do not reflect my actual accomplishments and limitations.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 59	1	1	0	3	7	1	12
Dec. 2006 # 12	3	4	1	1	5	2	14

Question 13 The company does a good job with maintaining an accurate and timely payroll operation.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 63	2	1	0	7	1	2	11
Dec. 2006 # 13	1	1	1	5	7	1	15

Question 14 If someone cuts corners or fails to follow established procedures, management or the audit staff is likely to discover it.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 70	1	0	1	2	1	6	5
Dec. 2006 # 14	1	1	1	5	7	1	15

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - G - HPD Classified Personnel

Question 1 Overall, there are significant morale problems among the people in my work group.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 8	0	0	2	3	6	0	11
Dec. 2006 # 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Question 2 Recent changes and restructuring of the business have improved my job satisfaction.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 10	7	2	1	1	0	0	11
Dec. 2006 # 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Question 3 Internal problems in my work area are frequently left unaddressed by management and interfere with my ability to get the job done.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 11	1	4	1	1	4	0	11
Dec. 2006 # 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Question 4 I do not feel that I can speak to my supervisor about serious problems and concerns in the work environment without causing problems for myself.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 18	3	6	2	0	0	0	11
Dec. 2006 # 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Question 5 The company employees believe their work group is effectively providing high quality services.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 22	2	4	1	3	1	0	11
Dec. 2006 # 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - G - HPD Classified Personnel

Question 6 There are not sufficient resources available to ensure quality care and services for customers served by the company.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 23	0	1	0	4	6	0	11
Dec. 2006 # 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Question 7 The information flow between my work group and other parts of the company make it difficult to coordinate efforts.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 34	0	0	2	6	3	0	11
Dec. 2006 # 7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Question 8 Information about what is happening in the company is not communicated to my department in a timely fashion.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 37	0	0	4	5	1	0	10
Dec. 2006 # 8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Question 9 If employees in my work group did an outstanding job they would receive appropriate recognition or rewards.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 46	1	4	2	4	0	0	11
Dec. 2006 # 9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - G - HPD Classified Personnel

Question 10 Confidence in management of my division is high.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 50	2	3	3	2	1	0	11
Dec. 2006 # 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Question 11 If some employees in my work group performed poorly, they would be subject to corrective action that was appropriate and fair.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 58	0	5	0	4	2	0	11
Dec. 2006 # 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Question 12 My performance ratings do not reflect my actual accomplishments and limitations.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 59	1	3	4	1	2	0	11
Dec. 2006 # 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Question 13 The company does a good job with maintaining an accurate and timely payroll operation.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 63	1	0	1	6	1	1	9
Dec. 2006 # 13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Question 14 If someone cuts corners or fails to follow established procedures, management or the audit staff is likely to discover it.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 70	0	2	1	4	1	1	8
Dec. 2006 # 14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - H - HFD Classified Personnel

Question 1 Overall, there are significant morale problems among the people in my work group.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 8	2	1	1	3	0	0	7
Dec. 2006 # 1	0	3	0	1	0	0	4

Question 2 Recent changes and restructuring of the business have improved my job satisfaction.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 10	1	5	1	0	0	0	7
Dec. 2006 # 2	0	1	1	2	0	0	4

Question 3 Internal problems in my work area are frequently left unaddressed by management and interfere with my ability to get the job done.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 11	2	0	1	3	1	0	7
Dec. 2006 # 3	0	1	0	2	1	0	4

Question 4 I do not feel that I can speak to my supervisor about serious problems and concerns in the work environment without causing problems for myself.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 18	4	2	0	0	1	0	7
Dec. 2006 # 4	0	3	0	1	0	0	4

Question 5 The company employees believe their work group is effectively providing high quality services.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 22	0	1	1	3	2	0	7
Dec. 2006 # 5	0	0	0	2	1	1	3

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - H - HFD Classified Personnel

Question 6 There are not sufficient resources available to ensure quality care and services for customers served by the company.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 23	2	3	1	0	1	0	7
Dec. 2006 # 6	0	1	0	3	0	0	4

Question 7 The information flow between my work group and other parts of the company make it difficult to coordinate efforts.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 34	1	2	0	2	2	0	7
Dec. 2006 # 7	0	1	0	2	1	0	4

Question 8 Information about what is happening in the company is not communicated to my department in a timely fashion.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 37	0	2	2	3	0	0	7
Dec. 2006 # 8	0	1	1	2	0	0	4

Question 9 If employees in my work group did an outstanding job they would receive appropriate recognition or rewards.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 46	1	0	1	4	1	0	7
Dec. 2006 # 9	1	1	0	1	1	0	4

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - H - HFD Classified Personnel

Question 10 Confidence in management of my division is high.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 50	1	2	2	1	0	0	6
Dec. 2006 # 10	0	1	1	2	0	0	4

Question 11 If some employees in my work group performed poorly, they would be subject to corrective action that was appropriate and fair.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 58	0	1	0	5	1	0	7
Dec. 2006 # 11	0	2	0	2	0	0	4

Question 12 My performance ratings do not reflect my actual accomplishments and limitations.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 59	0	2	1	1	2	1	6
Dec. 2006 # 12	0	1	0	1	2	0	4

Question 13 The company does a good job with maintaining an accurate and timely payroll operation.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 63	0	3	0	2	1	1	6
Dec. 2006 # 13	0	0	2	1	0	1	3

Question 14 If someone cuts corners or fails to follow established procedures, management or the audit staff is likely to discover it.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 70	0	0	1	4	0	1	5
Dec. 2006 # 14	1	0	1	1	0	1	3

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - I - HEC IT

Question 1 Overall, there are significant morale problems among the people in my work group.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 8	2	2	2	1	7	0	14
Dec. 2006 # 1	4	2	3	2	1	0	12

Question 2 Recent changes and restructuring of the business have improved my job satisfaction.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 10	5	4	2	3	0	0	14
Dec. 2006 # 2	0	4	2	3	2	1	11

Question 3 Internal problems in my work area are frequently left unaddressed by management and interfere with my ability to get the job done.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 11	3	2	3	2	4	0	14
Dec. 2006 # 3	2	5	0	3	2	0	12

Question 4 I do not feel that I can speak to my supervisor about serious problems and concerns in the work environment without causing problems for myself.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 18	2	3	1	4	3	1	13
Dec. 2006 # 4	2	3	2	2	3	0	12

Question 5 The company employees believe their work group is effectively providing high quality services.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 22	2	3	2	7	0	0	14
Dec. 2006 # 5	0	2	3	2	5	0	12

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - I - HEC IT

Question 6 There are not sufficient resources available to ensure quality care and services for customers served by the company.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 23	0	2	4	7	1	0	14
Dec. 2006 # 6	4	3	2	3	0	0	12

Question 7 The information flow between my work group and other parts of the company make it difficult to coordinate efforts.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 34	0	3	2	5	4	0	14
Dec. 2006 # 7	3	4	2	1	2	0	12

Question 8 Information about what is happening in the company is not communicated to my department in a timely fashion.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 37	0	1	6	5	2	0	14
Dec. 2006 # 8	2	5	2	1	2	0	12

Question 9 If employees in my work group did an outstanding job they would receive appropriate recognition or rewards.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 46	0	7	4	3	0	0	14
Dec. 2006 # 9	1	2	3	4	2	0	12

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - I - HEC IT

Question 10 Confidence in management of my division is high.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 50	4	3	1	4	0	0	12
Dec. 2006 # 10	0	6	1	2	3	0	12

Question 11 If some employees in my work group performed poorly, they would be subject to corrective action that was appropriate and fair.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 58	1	3	4	5	0	1	13
Dec. 2006 # 11	1	1	5	3	2	0	12

Question 12 My performance ratings do not reflect my actual accomplishments and limitations.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 59	2	6	1	3	2	0	14
Dec. 2006 # 12	2	2	3	3	2	0	12

Question 13 The company does a good job with maintaining an accurate and timely payroll operation.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 63	1	0	0	7	4	2	12
Dec. 2006 # 13	0	0	0	6	6	0	12

Question 14 If someone cuts corners or fails to follow established procedures, management or the audit staff is likely to discover it.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 70	0	0	2	6	0	6	8
Dec. 2006 # 14	2	3	1	5	1	0	12

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - J - HEC Admin.

Question 1 Overall, there are significant morale problems among the people in my work group.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 8	2	3	0	3	0	0	8
Dec. 2006 # 1	7	5	1	1	2	0	16

Question 2 Recent changes and restructuring of the business have improved my job satisfaction.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 10	0	2	1	2	2	1	7
Dec. 2006 # 2	0	1	4	3	8	0	16

Question 3 Internal problems in my work area are frequently left unaddressed by management and interfere with my ability to get the job done.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 11	1	5	0	0	2	0	8
Dec. 2006 # 3	8	6	0	0	2	0	16

Question 4 I do not feel that I can speak to my supervisor about serious problems and concerns in the work environment without causing problems for myself.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 18	4	4	0	0	0	0	8
Dec. 2006 # 4	9	3	1	2	1	0	16

Question 5 The company employees believe their work group is effectively providing high quality services.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 22	0	2	1	5	0	0	8
Dec. 2006 # 5	0	1	1	5	9	0	16

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - J - HEC Admin.

Question 6 There are not sufficient resources available to ensure quality care and services for customers served by the company.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 23	3	4	0	0	1	0	8
Dec. 2006 # 6	7	4	1	3	1	0	16

Question 7 The information flow between my work group and other parts of the company make it difficult to coordinate efforts.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 34	2	4	1	0	1	0	8
Dec. 2006 # 7	5	7	1	1	2	0	16

Question 8 Information about what is happening in the company is not communicated to my department in a timely fashion.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 37	2	3	1	0	2	0	8
Dec. 2006 # 8	7	4	3	1	1	0	16

Question 9 If employees in my work group did an outstanding job they would receive appropriate recognition or rewards.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 46	0	0	2	4	0	2	6
Dec. 2006 # 9	1	3	3	3	6	0	16

HEC Follow-up - Employee Survey Follow-up Questions - J - HEC Admin.

Question 10 Confidence in management of my division is high.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 50	0	0	0	5	2	0	7
Dec. 2006 # 10	1	2	1	4	8	0	16

Question 11 If some employees in my work group performed poorly, they would be subject to corrective action that was appropriate and fair.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 58	0	0	0	6	2	0	8
Dec. 2006 # 11	0	1	1	7	7	0	16

Question 12 My performance ratings do not reflect my actual accomplishments and limitations.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 59	1	3	3	0	0	1	7
Dec. 2006 # 12	4	5	3	2	2	0	16

Question 13 The company does a good job with maintaining an accurate and timely payroll operation.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 63	0	0	1	3	4	0	8
Dec. 2006 # 13	0	0	0	6	10	0	16

Question 14 If someone cuts corners or fails to follow established procedures, management or the audit staff is likely to discover it.							
Survey Question Number	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Don't Know (6)	Total Responses (1) to (5)
May 2005 # 70	0	0	1	5	2	0	8
Dec. 2006 # 14	0	3	1	6	6	0	16

Exhibit A

Views of Responsible Officials

EXHIBIT A



CITY OF HOUSTON

Houston Emergency Center

Bill White

Mayor

David F. Cutler
Director
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

T. 713-884-4610
F. 713-884-4511

To: Annise D. Parker
City Controller

From: David F. Cutler, Director
Houston Emergency Center

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "DFC".

Date: March 8, 2007

Subject: Jefferson Wells 2005 Houston
Emergency Center Audit Update

In the Spring of 2005, your office contracted Jefferson Wells to conduct a performance review of the Houston Emergency Center. The subsequent audit report made 65 recommendations dealing with cost savings, efficiency improvements and, morale issues. In the Winter of 2006, Jefferson Wells conducted a follow-up audit to determine the implementation status of those 65 recommendations.

Since Jefferson Wells' initial audit report was published in July of 2005, the Houston Emergency Center has implemented a majority of the recommendations made in that audit. As a result, many efficiencies of operation have been achieved, morale has significantly improved, overtime spending has been reduced, and new, money-saving technologies have been implemented within the Houston Emergency Center. One of the difficulties identified in the original report, and again in the follow-up report, was the lack of a unified command structure. As currently configured, three separate departments are involved in emergency communication operations at the Houston Emergency Center (HEC). The call intake section is managed by the HEC "Department". The police dispatch function is managed by the Houston Police Department (HPD) and the fire dispatch function is managed by the Houston Fire Department (HFD). Consequently, referring to the Houston Emergency Center or HEC could mean one of several different things; the consolidated communication operation, HPD dispatch, HFD dispatch, HEC call intake, or the facility, itself. For that reason, use of the term "HEC" in the audit update can be misleading and caution should be used when identifying problem areas/functions at the HEC facility. An example of this is the employee survey. While the follow-up audit indicates that employee morale issues at HEC have not been completely addressed, the attached survey breakdown by department housed at HEC indicates the area where employee morale has improved and the area/function that needs to address employee morale.

Though the Houston Emergency Center has addressed most of the issues brought up by the initial audit that were within the control of that Department, it will continue to work diligently with the Houston Fire Department and Police Department to improve operations and functions that are outside the control of the Houston Emergency Center, but fall within the four walls of the Houston Emergency Center facility and, ultimately, improve emergency service to the citizens of Houston.

**Views of Responsible
Officials**

Council Members: Toni Lawrence Jarvis Johnson Anne Clutterbuck Ada Edwards Addie Wiseman M.J. Khan, P.E. Pam Holm Adrian Garcia
Carol Alvarado Peter Brown Sue Lovell Shelley Sekula-Gibbs, M.D. Ronald C. Green Michael Berry Controller: Annise D. Parker

EXHIBIT A

HEC Employee Surveys by Department (03-08-07)

Question

1 Overall, there are significant morale problems among the people in my work group.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total Responses
HFD	4	9	2	7	10	1	33
HPD					1		1
HEC	14	8	13	8	10		53

2 Recent changes and restructuring of the business have improved my job satisfaction.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total Responses
HFD	8	11	7	3	1	3	33
HPD	1						1
HEC	7	7	12	11	14	2	53

3 Internal problems in my work area are frequently left unaddressed by management and interfere with my ability to get the job done.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total Responses
HFD	2	5	2	12	11	1	33
HPD			1				1
HEC	14	18	5	8	8		53

4 I do not feel I can speak to my supervisor about serious problems and concerns in the work environment without causing problems for myself.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total Responses
HFD	6	11	5	5	6		33
HPD			1				1
HEC	15	13	6	8	11		53

5 The company employees believe their work group is effectively providing high quality services.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total Responses
HFD	3	3	5	11	10	1	33
HPD	1						1
HEC	1	8	8	15	21		53

6 There are not sufficient resources available to ensure quality care and services for customers served by the company.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total Responses
HFD	1	12	2	10	7	1	33
HPD					1		1
HEC	18	16	6	9	3	1	53

Views of Responsible Officials

EXHIBIT A

- 7 The information flow between my work group and other parts of the company make it difficult to coordinate efforts.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total Responses
HFD	1	5	2	15	10		33
HPD					1		1
HEC	10	18	7	8	9	1	53

- 8 Information about what is happening in the company is not communicated to my department in a timely fashion.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total Responses
HFD	1	5	7	10	10		33
HPD					1		1
HEC	10	19	8	8	8		53

- 9 If employees in my work group did an outstanding job they would receive appropriate recognition or rewards.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total Responses
HFD	9	7	8	5	4		33
HPD				1			1
HEC	9	7	11	16	10		53

- 10 Confidence in management of my division is high.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total Responses
HFD	11	8	10	3	1		33
HPD	1						1
HEC	9	10	8	11	15		53

- 11 If some employees in my work group performed poorly, they would be subject to corrective action that was appropriate and fair.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total Responses
HFD	4	7	5	14	3		33
HPD		1					1
HEC	5	5	9	18	14	2	53

- 12 My performance ratings do not reflect my actual accomplishments and limitations.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total Responses
HFD	3	8	8	8	5	1	33
HPD			1				1
HEC	9	11	10	8	13	2	53

Views of Responsible Officials

EXHIBIT A

13 The company does a good job with maintaining an accurate and timely payroll operation.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total Responses
HFD	3	5	5	15	4	1	33
HPD				1			1
HEC	1	1	4	21	25	1	53

14 If someone cuts corners or fails to follow established procedures, management or the audit staff is likely to discover it.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total Responses
HFD	5	4	7	12	3	2	33
HPD		1					1
HEC	4	7	6	18	16	2	53

Views of Responsible Officials