

**The Bill Blackwood  
Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas**

**THE ASSESSMENT CENTER FOR PROMOTION OF POLICE OFFICERS:  
CAN IT BE IMPROVED**

**A POLICY RESEARCH PROJECT  
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Professional Designation  
Graduate, Management Institute**

by  
Jeffery L. McMillin

Houston Independent School District  
Police Department  
Houston, Texas  
February 1999

## **ABSTRACT**

The use of an assessment center for promotion is not really a new issue. The idea of testing for a specific behavior, attitudes and skills is routinely used by private industry. Law enforcement as a group, consistently remains behind the learning curve in such areas.

Assessment centers use a simulation approach. Their advantage is the powerful learning experience they provide for both participants and assessors alike. The process is expensive and time consuming. It is important that all who are to be assessed, be trained in the process. Having an outside assessment team handle the process offers a great deal to the organization. There is very little question about fairness if operated by the standards set up for assessment centers. Criterion is established prior to the assessment process. The dimensions assessed are clear and measurable. Each employee has an opportunity to ask questions about his/her performance after the assessment.

The assessment center will never be used by every agency. By far the majority of 122 agencies who responded to a survey used in this study indicated that assessment centers are too expensive to operate for the number of promotions they make. The administration must take responsibility by making the final decision from among two or more finalist. All indications are, however, that the assessment center process is far superior to traditional methods of personnel selection for promotions.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract

Introduction 1

Historical, Legal or Theoretical Context 2

Review of Literature or Practice 5

Discussion of Relevant Issues 7

Conclusion/Recommendations 10

Bibliography

Appendices

A. Assessment Centers for Promotion, A Survey Questionnaire

B. Police Survey Returns for Assessment Centers

C. List of Surveys Returned

D. List of Surveys List of Surveys not returned or came in late

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this research paper is to evaluate the assessment center as a tool for selection of personnel in promotions. A weak policy in this area will ultimately create disillusionment, division and distrust. Organizations pay a high price for grievances filed when accused of bias decisions in the promotional process. Police administrators across the nation emphasize that employees are more demanding in terms of opportunities for career advancement. What was once accepted as the "system" is no longer satisfactory (Buracker 12). This research examines the role of the assessment center in identifying candidates most likely to succeed when promoted to positions of authority. There is clearly a difference between using an "Assessment Center" and in use of the assessment center process or methodology. An assessment center is not a place, but a method (Michelson 25)

At issue here is how to assure the selection of the most qualified candidate and is the use of an assessment center the most reliable tool? In researching this issue, a survey of Texas police agencies reveals that less than ten percent of police organizations utilizes the pure "Assessment Center" to conduct assessments. Approximately five percent of all agencies who reported using an assessment center process, no longer use this process. Many reorganized their program to reflect the qualities of the assessment center methodology and conducted their own assessments. Most often in-house promotions are based solely on interviews and written test. The use of the "good

ole' boy" system has proven to be not only an ethical dilemma but often racist and sexist, if not unlawful. Are assessment centers a panacea or a costly, complicated ploy to circumvent fairness?

The intended audience includes supervisors and department heads of municipal police agencies, county Sheriff and Constable departments, college and university police and school district police. Primarily, departments from very small to those of two-hundred-fifty sworn officers.

Books, articles and professional journals, internet material and research conducted for this and other projects is cited in this paper. A survey mailed out to 234 Texas police agencies resulted in 122 responses from all segments of the law enforcement society for comparison and contrast.

The intended outcome of this Policy Research Paper will evaluate the assessment center process and to make recommendations on the potential for revised or improved procedures by the Houston School District Police Department. The process must be fair, ethical and professional.

## **HISTORICAL, LEGAL OR THEORETICAL CONTEXT**

The German command experimented with assessment centers prior to World War I in screening candidates for use on intelligence assignments. The German assessment usually lasted two or three days and the assessors consisted of a minimum of two officers, a medical physician, and a psychologist. Written assessment reports on each candidate were forwarded to the high command for review. The Germans based their measurements on a holistic or

total character and were the first to use multiple assessors in measuring responses or characteristics (Guidelines 1).

The British developed the War Office Selection Boards to meet the need of identifying good British officers during the Second World War. They too patterned their assessment after that of the Germans and developed group exercises, physical and psychological testing, interviews, leaderless group exercises and others.

The United States contributed to the study of assessment centers when, during World War II, assessment centers were used by the Office of Strategic Services, (OSS), forerunner of the CIA, to select spies (Guidelines 1). The OSS surmised that there had to be a relationship between testing and job performance (Thornton 39). An American Telephone and Telegraph (AT&T), study in 1956 caused private industry to enter the field. The study firmly established work-simulated testing as the ultimate gauge for accurately predicting a person's performance in an actual work situation (Coleman 5).

Litigation concerns demand that the administration promptly address those issues previously considered a matter of "administrative decision." Such cost must be measured beyond financial boundaries. It is measured in man hours locating and researching lost data subpoenaed by attorneys. Most of all it is measured by reduced productivity and low morale among staff

In today's "sue-prone" society, a police organization can more effectively defend promotions based on an objective standardized assessment process (Coleman 7). The United States Supreme Court in *Washington v. Davis* stated:

"It appears beyond doubt that there is no single method of appropriately validating employment tests for relationship to job performance." (Wilmes 26)

This issue relates to the concept of "adverse impact," set out in the Uniform Guidelines from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). Organizations are expected to provide documented evidence validating the fairness in both hiring and promotion situations. In 1976 *Berry v. City of Omaha*, the first assessment center was challenged in court. The suit was based upon questions raised about assessor competency and the general administration of the program. The standards of Ethical Consideration for Assessment Centers (Task Force, 1975; revised 1978) were established as a result of this case. This document set forth minimum professional standards for assessment centers. The guidelines were updated and expanded in 1979 and again in 1989 by the Seventeenth International Congress on the Assessment Center Method. The 1989 revision, however, renamed the document as the *Guidelines and Ethical Considerations for Assessment Center Operations (Guidelines)*. The *Guidelines* define an assessment center as follows: An Assessment Center consists of a standardized evaluation of behavior based on multiple inputs. Multiple trained observers and techniques are used. Judgments about behavior are pooled in a meeting among the assessors or by a statistical integration process. In an integration discussion, comprehensive accounts of behavior, and often ratings of it, are pooled. The discussion result in evaluations of the performance of the assesses on the dimensions or other variables that the assessment center is designed to measure. Statistical

combination methods should be validated in accord with professionally accepted guidelines (Guidelines 2).

The overwhelming majority of police exams test primarily for cognitive abilities. This translates into an officer eligibility list rich in "book-smart" candidates, but lacking in an adequate number of qualified "street-smart" applicants. Likewise, it produces "book-smart" candidates who, with little "street-smart" knowledge will be promoted and for the same reason. It is this disparity that must be overcome in the promotional process by use of better assessment of candidates for promotion (Laser 157).

## **DISCUSSION OF RELEVANT ISSUES**

In its truest form, the "Assessment Center," is restricted to a very narrow format that must meet specific criteria. Special training is mandated by those operating an "Assessment Center." Assessment Centers are conducted by outside contractors or consultants. Organizations may operate an assessment process patterned after the "Assessment Center" model for the purpose of promoting supervisors. These too are costly considering the need for constant renewal of material and require considerable coordination and significant training for both the assessors and the assesses.

Alternatives to the assessment center process include traditional methods of hiring by interviews, resumes, recommendations and committees. These traditional methods have proven not to have the validity of the assessment center, and lack case law to support them in the event assesses contest the fairness, testing methods, assessor competence, content or evaluation



procedures used in the process. Regardless of the process used, it is vital that the process be fair and up-front. Some of the issues important to the person being assessed are:

- To develop a training program, informing officers what to expect in an assessment center;
- To make an announcement within an appropriate time frame that notifies all eligible parties of the examination; and
- To review scores with all participants following the process.

Departments have struggled for years with the issue of promoting from within as opposed to filling position from outside the organization. In this situation, the issue is to determine who is the best suited for an advertised position. In some instances a person may be hired from the outside. There are re-occurring discussions about what it will take for police officers, as a group, to be accepted by the public as professionals. All agree that pay is an issue but one likely to be dependent on professionalism first. Some suggest that criteria be standardized for police positions of Sergeant, Lieutenant, Captain, etc. This would allow organizations to recruit individuals known to be certified in a designated position. Dr. Dorothy H. Bracey, Ph.D., from the John Jay College of Criminal Justice, discussed this issue during a lecture to members of the Bill Blackwood Law Enforcement Management Institute in Denton, Texas. She noted that it allows for a direct transfer between organizations with rank intact, much as a registered nurse, an airline pilot or an attorney who changes organizations. It would not eliminate the possibility of departments appointing

from within the organization. It would, however, remove the right to promote any person who did not possess the appropriate certificate of training in the rank to which one was being promoted. Only the Texas Commission would be in a position to implement such a system and it would take a number of years to be fully operable. Clearly this would impact promotions in-house if an officer could only be assigned a rank through a state mandated certification process beforehand. No doubt unions, local governments and especially the civil service commissions play a major role in such undertakings. Professional policing in the new millennium will need such drastic changes.

The cost of assessing one's ability to perform is clearly high depending on perspective. The law enforcement community is among the last to accept responsibility that it, like the corporate world must accept changing technology and life styles. Private corporations have for many years routinely accepted human resource departments as partners and understood that they are equipped to do a better job of matching employees with duties. They consider the cost a saving in the long run. Law enforcement agencies hold onto a belief that only the police can effectively manage police officers, but it is the drain of litigation cost that is changing this perspective.

## **REVIEW OF LITERATURE OR PRACTICE**

A review of literature indicates that the assessment center process is used in the private sector and esteemed by such law enforcement agencies as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but police agencies continue using the traditional interview process for promotions (Buracker13). Police Officer

experience is often the major consideration for assignment to a management position(Earle). In 1974, W.J. Bopp concluded that promotions up the police ladder remain largely based on the "good ole boy" system, the "longevity" system, and the "good police officer-good supervisor" system (Boop). This may not totally characterize law enforcement today, but there is a perception that too often appears true: to "screw up" bad enough assures of a promotion to where one can do the least amount of damage.

Walter S. Booth, Ph.D., writes in Law and Order magazine that, "research has shown that assessment centers are better predictors of supervisory and managerial success, as well as leadership, decision making, interpersonal skills, and common sense than written test or interviews (Booth 87).

Agencies listed in a survey conducted for this research in appendix 2 represent categories of law enforcement agencies across the State. One-hundred-twenty-two agencies responded. A consideration not taken into account in this survey is the influence of civil service, primarily in large cities and county agencies. Clearly, according to the survey, promotions to Lieutenant and Captain represent by far the greatest use of the assessment center process. Approximately one forth of all agencies responding to the survey reported using an assessment center process in making promotional decisions with near ten percent of those who responded bringing in an outside paid consultant. Twenty-two percent of all agencies reported the use of some form of assessment center. Departments that number over one-hundred-fifty members reported only 9.76% participation in an assessment center process. The exercises used most

frequently in assessments were: the Group Discussion, the In-Basket Exercise, a Written Problem, the Interview Simulation and the Oral Presentation.

The Houston ISD Police Department has, over the past four years began using the assessment center process. All assessors are trained in the assessment process, though all are not professional consultants. No member of the HISD police department serves as an assessor for an in-house promotion. Exercises used routinely in HISD promotions have been: the leaderless group, the written problem and the oral presentation. All written exercises are graded by an outside professional for grammar, punctuation and content. Participants are not, however, given formal training about how the system works or what to expect prior to being evaluated by assessors. Little or no feed back is provided to officers after being assessed.

The number of promotions in any given year is potentially small even with a department of one-hundred-eighty-five sworn police officers such as HISD. Ranking officers tend to remain longer before moving to other departments except in the case of Chief and Assistant Chief who are in demand. Civil service and department policies throughout Texas frequently restrict the transfer of ranking officers to equal or higher positions in other departments. This limits the opportunity by officers within the department to move up the command ladder.

High on the list of reasons for not using the assessment center process is the required planning, coordination and training that must take place prior to conducting assessments. Few municipalities will opt for their use as many do not consider human resource management to be at the top of their priority

budgets. This is said with the profound feeling that most departments are simply not ready, nor willing to put into selection systems, the money necessary for an individually constructed, administered, documented and validated Assessment Center (Ellis 3). No doubt, an in-house assessment process is much less costly in the short term. The cost of a reputable contractor to handle assessment is dependent on the number of persons assessed, the level of position being filled and if the location is affected by travel or lodging.

### **CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS**

The purpose of this research is to determine the validity of the assessment center as a tool in identifying the most qualified candidate for promotions within a police organization. A secondary, yet equally important goal is to determine the feasibility for use of the assessment center for the Houston ISD Police Department. If the answer is yes, which route is most cost effective yet conforms to established criteria, the paid consultant or the in-house assessment center?

The promotional process is disruptive by nature for police agencies. The assessment center is however, structured to overcome these weaknesses of traditional selection methods such as written test and interviews. This process is designed to select candidates who excel in pre-determined fields or "dimensions" of expertise.

A selection of the best candidate would appear at first glimpse to be a rather simple task. The solution is often not so tangible in the police organizational structure. Beyond the issue of individual fairness of the

assessment, the organization is at risk of unnecessary litigation and internal turmoil if the process is fundamentally flawed or perceived to be bias.

In conclusion, use of a private assessment center contractor, or one of the assessment center process (philosophy) using skilled assessors to measure all the necessary dimensions, far exceed other promotional processes for reliability. Use of respected outside assessors increases credibility to the assessment process. The time expended and financial cost, compared to traditional methods of evaluation is among the most commonly cited reasons to reject the assessment process. Additional complaints are that outsiders have no knowledge of past individual histories or circumstances in my department. Perceived or real, the lack of control by departmental leadership often further limits the use of the assessment center process within law enforcement organizations.

The use of the assessment center process is recommended for use within the Houston Independent School District Police Department. The administration must create the right climate by setting substantially high qualifications, thus reducing the number of assessments not only to numbers but to the most likely choices. Recommended suggestions for use in the early process of elimination are:

- use of an officer's annual performance evaluation;
- use of personnel file with complaints or accolades;
- education and recent specialized training;
- physical agility test;

- writing skills test;
- seniority (tenure) and/or ranking with the Texas Commission; and,
- pre-test over material related to the function of the position.

Following the guidelines set for promotions, and after the above listed criterion is met, the assessment center evaluates the remaining candidates. Promotions to the rank of Sergeant would be promoted by an assessment center process operated in-house while using outside assessors. For promotions to Lieutenant and above, it is recommended that a consultant and professional assessors be hired. In each case an officer must participate in training prior to the assessment center. Each applicant is to be debriefed with reference to his/her skills by the same assessors who earlier conducted the assessment center.

In the promotion process for Sergeant, a recommendation is made directly to the Chief in writing following the assessment. Except in rare incidents, it is expected that the decision of the committee will be final. In consideration of positions of Lieutenant and above the committee will deliver, in writing, names of the top two contenders to the Chief of Police. They are to clearly indicate the final score of each candidate along with a recommendation of the committee. The Chief of Police will make the final selection. It is expected that the Chief of Police will approve in advance, any position of this rank, adding credibility to both that of the position and the department.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Buracker, Carroll D., The Assessment Center: Is it the Answer?, FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. February 1980.
- Booth, Walter S. PH.D, Ten Complaints About Assessment Centers, Law and Order. 1997.
- Boop, William, Wisenand, Paul, Police Personnel Administration, 2nd. Ed. Boston; Allyn and Bacon. Inc. Quoted in research paper of Geraldine Stewart, Assessment Center: A Different Approach To Personnel Promotions, 1993
- Coleman, J.L. Police Assessment Testing: An assessment Center Handbook for Law Enforcement Personnel, Spring Field. Ill: Thomas 1987.
- Ellis, Don, On Becoming Assessment Center Friendly." A career Development Seminar sponsored by the Police Association of the Pasadena Police Department. Pasadena, Texas, 1995
- Guidelines and Ethical Considerations for Assessment Center Operations. Introduction of Assessment Center Exercise Examinations <http://www.pass.prep.com/overveiw.ethical.htm>, 6/23/98.
- Laser, Stephen A. , "Common Sense, can it be measured by police test?" The Police Chief, April 1997.
- Michelson, Richard, "Tools for Success; Preparing for Assessment Centers, Law and Order, May, 1990.
- Thornton III, George C., Byham, William C., "Assessment Centers and Managerial Performance," New York: Academic Press, 1982.
- Wilmes, K.W., Overcoming An Assessment Center, Law Enforcement News, April, 1993.



**AGENCIES INCLUDED IN ASSESSMENT CENTER SURVEY  
GRADUATE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE 1998**

1 of 7

DEPT. NAME	DEPT. TYPE	RETURNED	CITY
1. Alvin Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Alvin
2. Angleton Police Dept.	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Angleton
3. Athens Police Dept.	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Athens
4. Austin College Police Dept.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Sherman
5. Austin Police Dept.	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Austin
6. Bandera Co. Sheriffs Dept.	Sherff Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Bandera
7. Baylor University Police Dept.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Waco
8. Baytown Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Baytown
9. Beaumont Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Beaumont
10. Bellaire Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Bellaire
11. Blinn Junior College P.D.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Brenham
12. Brazos Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Bryan
13. Bryan Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Bryan
14. Chambers Co. Constable Pct. 6	Constable Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Baytown
15. College of the Mainland P.D.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Texas City
16. Conroe Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Conroe
17. Dallas Co. Constable Pct. 1	Constable Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Dallas
18. Dallas Co. Constable Pct. 2	Constable Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Irving
19. Dallas Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Dallas
20. Dallas I.S.D. Police Department	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Dallas
21. Dallas Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Dallas
22. Deer Park Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Deer Park
23. Dickinson Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Dickinson
24. Edgewood I.S.D. PD	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	San Antonio
25. El Paso Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	El Paso
26. Farmers Branch Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Farmers Branch
27. Fort Bend Co. Constable Pct. 1	Constable Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Richmond
28. Fort Bend Co. Constable Pct. 4	Constable Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Sugarland
29. Fort Worth Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Fort Worth
30. Friendswood Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Friendswood
31. Galena Park Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Galena Park
32. Galveston Co. Constable Pct. 1	Constable Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Galveston
33. Galveston Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Galveston
34. Grand Prairie Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Grand Prairie

**AGENCIES INCLUDED IN ASSESSMENT CENTER SURVEY  
GRADUATE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE 1998**

2 of 7

DEPT. NAME	DEPT. TYPE	RETURNED	CITY
35. Gregg County Constable Pct. 1	Constable Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Longview
36. Harris County Constable Pct. 4	Constable Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Spring
37. Harris Co. Sheriffs Dept.	Sherff Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
38. Houston Community College P.D.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
39. Humble Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Humble
40. Huntsville Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Huntsville
41. Jacksonville Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Jacksonville
42. Jersey Village Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
43. La Marque Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	La Marque
44. La Porte Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	La Porte
45. League City Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	League City
46. Lubbock Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Lubbock
47. Lubbock I.S.D. Police Dept.	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Lubbock
48. Lubbock Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Lubbock
49. Matagorda County Pct. 3	Constable Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Palacios
50. Midland Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Midland
51. Missouri City Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Missouri City
52. Morris Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Daingerfield
53. Nacogdoches County Pct. 2	Constable Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Nacogdoches
54. Nacogdoches I.S.D. Police Dept.	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Nacogdoches
55. Odessa College Police Dept.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Odessa
56. Pasadena Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Pasadena
57. Praire View A&M Police Dept.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Praire View
58. Richland College Police Dept.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Dallas
59. Richmond Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Richmond
60. Rockport Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Rockport
61. Roman Forest Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	New Caney
62. Sam Houston State Police Dept.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Huntsville
63. San Angelo I.S.D. Police Dept.	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	San Angelo
64. San Angelo Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	San Angelo
65. San Marcos Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	San Marcos
66. Sugarland Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Sugarland
67. Tarrant Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Fort Worth
68. T.S.U. Police Department	College/Univ. Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Houston

**AGENCIES INCLUDED IN ASSESSMENT CENTER SURVEY  
GRADUATE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE 1998**

3 of 7

DEPT. NAME	DEPT. TYPE	RETURNED	CITY
69. Tomball Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Tomball
70. U. of H. Police Dept. - DOWNTOWN	College/Univ. Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
71. U. of H. Police Department	College/Univ. Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
72. Walker Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Huntsville
73. Webster Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Webster
74. West University Place Police Dept.	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
75. Whitehouse Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Whitehouse
76. Wichita Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Wichita Falls
77. Aldine I.S.D. P. D.	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
78. Alvin I.S.D. P. D.	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Alvin
79. Amarillo College Police Dept.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Amarillo
80. Brenham Police Dept.	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Brenham
81. Center I.S.D. P. D.	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Center
82. Conroe I.S.D. P. D.	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Conroe
83. Corpus Christi I.S.D. P. D.	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Corpus Christi
84. Crockett Co. Sheriff's Dept.	Sherff Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Ozona
85. Denison Police Dept.	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Dension
86. Dept. of Public Safety	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Austin
87. Ector Co. I.S.D. P. D.	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Odessa
88. El Paso I.S.D. Police Department	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	El Paso
89. El Paso Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	El Paso
90. Fort Bend I.S.D. Police Department	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Stafford
91. Galveston I.S.D. Police Department	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Galveston
92. Harlandale I.S.D. Police Dept.	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	San Antonio
93. Irving Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Irving
94. Jacinto City Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Jacinto City
95. Katy I.S.D. Police Department	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Katy
96. Katy Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Katy
97. Killeen I.S.D. Police Department	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Killeen
98. Longview Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Longview
99. Lufkin Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Lufkin
100. McAllen I.S.D. Police Department	ISD Police Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	McAllen
101. Midland College Police Dept.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Midland
102. Montgomery Co. Sheriffs Dept.	Sherff Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Conroe

**AGENCIES INCLUDED IN ASSESSMENT CENTER SURVEY  
GRADUATE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE 1998**

4 of 7

DEPT. NAME	DEPT. TYPE	RETURNED	CITY
103. New Caney I.S.D. Police Dept	ISD Police Dept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	New Caney
104. N. Texas State University P.D.	College/Univ. Dept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Denton
105. Northside I.S.D. Police Department	ISD Police Dept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	San Antonio
106. Odessa Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Odessa
107. Palestine Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Palestine
108. Pampa Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Pampa
109. Panola College Campus Police	College/Univ. Dept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Carthage
110. Port Arthur Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Port Arthur
111. Rice University Police Department	College/Univ. Dept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
112. Robstown Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Robstown
113. Rosenberg Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Rosenberg
114. Round Rock Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Round Rock
115. San Antonio I.S.D. Police Dept	ISD Police Dept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	San Antonio
116. Texarkana I.S.D. Police Dept	ISD Police Dept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Texarkana
117. Texas A & M Univ. Police Dept	College/Univ. Dept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	College Station
118. Texas City I.S.D. Police Dept	ISD Police Dept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Texas City
119. Trinity Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Groveton
120. Kingwood College Police Dept	College/Univ. Dept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Kingwood
121. Klien ISD Police Department	ISD Police Dept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Klein
122. Houston ISD Police Department	ISD Police Dept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
123. Alvin Comm. College Police Dept	College/Univ. Dept	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Alvin
124. Angelina Co. Sheriffs Dept	Sherff Dept	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Lufkin
125. Angleton I.S.D. Police Dept	ISD Police Dept	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Angleton
126. Austin Co. Sheriff's Dept	Sherff Dept	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Austin
127. Austin Community College	College/Univ. Dept	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Austin
128. Austin I.S.D. P.D.	ISD Police Dept	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Austin
129. Bexar Co. Constable Pct 3	Constable Dept	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	San Antonio
130. Bexar Co. Constable Pct 5	Constable Dept	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	San Antonio
131. Brazoria Co. Constable Pct. 1	Constable Dept	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Freeport
132. Brazoria Co. Sheriff's Department	Sherff Dept	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Angleton
133. Brazos Co. Constable Pct. 3	Constable Dept	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Bryan
134. Brazos Co. Constable Pct. 5	Constable Dept	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Bryan
135. Dayton Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Dayton
136. Denton Co. Constable Pct. 4	Constable Dept	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Roanoke



**AGENCIES INCLUDED IN ASSESSMENT CENTER SURVEY  
GRADUATE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE 1998**

5 of 7

DEPT. NAME	DEPT. TYPE	RETURNED	CITY
137. Ector Co. Constable Pct. 1	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Odessa
138. Ector Co. Constable Pct. 2	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Odessa
139. Ellis Co. Constable Pct. 4	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Waxahachie
140. Fort Bend Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Richmond
141. Freeport Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Freeport
142. Galveston Co. Constable Pct. 4	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Santa Fe
143. Galveston Co. Constable Pct. 9	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Port Boliver
144. Garland Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Garland
145. Giddings Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Giddings
146. Harris County Pct. 1	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
147. Harris County Pct. 2	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Pasadena
148. Harris County Pct. 3	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Baytown
149. Harris County Pct. 5	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
150. Harris County Pct. 6	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
151. Harris County Pct. 7	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
152. Harris County Pct. 8	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Pasadena
153. Haskell C.I.S.D. Police Dept.	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Haskell
154. Haskell Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Haskell
155. Jefferson Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Beaumont
156. Keene Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Keene
157. Killgore College Police Dept.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Kilgore
158. Killeen Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Killeen
159. La Porte I.S.D. Police Dept.	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	La Porte
160. Lamar University Police Dept.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Beaumont
161. Liberty County Pct. 5	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Cleveland
162. Lubbock County Pct. 3	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Idalou
163. Metro Transit Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
164. North Forest I.S.D. Police Dept.	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
165. No. Harris Montgomery College P.D.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
166. Nueces County Pct. 5	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Robstown
167. Oak Ridge North Police Dept.	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Conroe
168. Orange County Pct. 3	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Orange
169. Patton Village Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Splendora
170. Pearland Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Pearland

**AGENCIES INCLUDED IN ASSESSMENT CENTER SURVEY  
GRADUATE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE 1998**

6 of 7

DEPT. NAME	DEPT. TYPE	RETURNED	CITY
171. Praire View Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Praire View
172. San Jacinto College Police Dept	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
173. Smith County Pct. 1	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Tyler
174. Smith County Pct. 2	Constable Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Tyler
175. South Houston Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	South Houston
176. Southside Place Police Dept.	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
177. Tarrant Co. Jr. College Police Dept.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Fort Worth
178. Taylor Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Abilene
179. T.W.U. Police Department	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Denton
180. Travis Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Austin
181. TSTC Campus Police Department	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Amarillo
182. T.C.U. Campus Police Department	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Fort Worth
183. Tyler Jr. College Police Dept.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Tyler
184. Abilene Christian Univ. P.D.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Abilene
185. Aransas Co. I.S.D. P.D.	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Rockport
186. Athens I.S.D. P.D.	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Athens
187. Bay City I.S.D. P.D.	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Bay City
188. Baylor Co. Sheriffs Dept.	Sherff Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Seymour
189. Brown Co. Sheriffs Dept.	Sherff Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Brownwood
190. Childress Co. Sheriffs Dept.	Sherff Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Childress
191. Clear Lake Shores Police Dept.	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Clear Lake
192. Cleburne Police Dept.	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Cleburne
193. College Station Police Dept.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	College Station
194. Collingsworth co. Sheriff Dept.	Sherff Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Wellington
195. Corrigan Police Dept.	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Corrigan
196. Corsicana I.S.D. P.D.	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Corsicana
197. Dayton I.S.D. P.D.	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Dayton
198. Eastfield College Police Dept.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Mesquite
199. Fayette Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	La Grange
200. Gainsville I.S.D. Police Department	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Gainsville
201. Gray Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Pampa
202. Grimes Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Anderson
203. Hedwig Village Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
204. Humble I.S.D. Police Department	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Humble

**AGENCIES INCLUDED IN ASSESSMENT CENTER SURVEY  
GRADUATE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE 1998**

7 of 7

DEPT. NAME	DEPT. TYPE	RETURNED	CITY
205. Huntsville I.S.D. Police Department	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Huntsville
206. Incarnate Word College Police Dept.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	San Antonio
207. Johnson Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Cleburne
208. Kilgore Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Kilgore
209. Leon Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Centerville
210. Lubbock Christian College P.D.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Lubbock
211. Matagorda Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Bay City
212. Pasadena I.S.D. Police Department	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Pasadena
213. Polk Co. Sheriffs Department	Sherff Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Livingston
214. San Antonio Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	San Antonio
215. Seabrook Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Seabrook
216. Sealy I.S.D. Police Department	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Sealy
217. Sherman Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Sherman
218. Snyder Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Snyder
219. Socorra I.S.D. Police Department	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	El Paso
220. S. San Antonio I.S.D. Police Dept.	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	San Antonio
221. Southside I.S.D. Police Dept.	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	San Antonio
222. Spring Branch I.S.D. Police Dept.	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
223. Spring I.S.D. Police Department	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Houston
224. Stephen F. Austin Univ. Police Dept.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Nacogdoches
225. TSTI Dept. of Public Safety	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Sweetwater
226. Texarkana Comm. College P.D.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Texarkana
227. Univ. Texas Pan American P.D.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Edinburg
228. Tx A & M International Univ. P.D.	College/Univ. Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Laredo
229. Tyler Park Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Tyler
230. Tyler Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Tyler
231. Waco I.S.D. Police Department	ISD Police Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Waco
232. Waco Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Waco
233. Wichita Falls Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Wichita Falls
234. Wylie Police Department	Municipal P.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Wylie

## POLICE SURVEY RETURNS FOR ASSESSMENT CENTER

### (1) Agency Affiliation

Municipal police agency	53	43.4%
County (Sheriff or Constable)	25	20.5%
College / University	19	15.6%
School Dist. Police Dept.	25	20.5%
<b>TOTAL NO. OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>122</b>	

	Group Total		Municipal Police		County Gov.		College University		ISD Police	
<b>(2) Agency size (Sworn Personnel)</b>										
0 - 25	55	45.1%	12	22.6%	12	48.0%	14	73.7%	17	68.0%
26 - 50	30	24.6%	17	32.1%	3	12.0%	4	21.1%	6	24.0%
51 - 100	11	9.0%	8	15.1%	1	4.0%	1	5.3%	1	4.0%
101 - 150	5	4.1%	5	9.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
151 - 200	4	3.3%	3	5.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.0%
More Than 200 Officers	17	13.9%	8	15.1%	9	36.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>TOTAL OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>122</b>		<b>53</b>		<b>25</b>		<b>19</b>		<b>25</b>	

### (3) Form of Government

Dept. Head Elected	24	19.7%	0	0.0%	24	96.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dept. Head Appointed	98	80.3%	53	100.0%	1	4.0%	19	100.0%	25	100.0%
<b>TOTAL OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>122</b>									

### (4) The "Assessment Center" is used in my agency for promotion to the following positions:

Chief of Police	9	7.4%	6	11.3%	0	0.0%	3	15.8%	0	0.0%
Asst. Chief of Police	4	3.3%	2	3.8%	1	4.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.0%
Captain	13	10.7%	9	17.0%	2	8.0%	0	0.0%	2	8.0%
Lieutenant	26	21.3%	19	35.8%	2	8.0%	3	15.8%	2	8.0%
Sergeant	27	22.1%	17	32.1%	4	16.0%	3	15.8%	3	12.0%
Corporal	11	9.0%	5	9.4%	4	16.0%	1	5.3%	1	4.0%
None of the above	88	72.1%	31	58.5%	21	84.0%	14	73.7%	22	88.0%

**TOTALS MORE THAN 100% DUE TO MULTIPLE RESPONSES IN SOME CATAGORIES**



## POLICE SURVEY RETURNS FOR ASSESSMENT CENTER

### (5) The Assessment Center Process in my agency is:

	Group Total		Municipal Police		County Gov.		College University		ISD Police	
Used for promotion but not for hiring.	27	22.1%	20	37.7%	2	8.0%	3	15.8%	2	8.0%
Used for hiring but not for promotion.	1	0.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.0%
Used for both hiring and promotions.	4	3.3%	1	1.9%	2	8.0%	1	5.3%	0	0.0%
The Assessment Center not used in my department.	90	73.8%	32	60.4%	21	84.0%	15	78.9%	22	88.0%
<b>TOTAL OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>122</b>		<b>53</b>		<b>25</b>		<b>19</b>		<b>25</b>	

### (6) PROMOTION BASED ON:

Interviews only	13	11%	1	1.9%	2	8.0%	4	21.1%	6	24.0%
Written exam only	12	10%	12	22.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Written exam and interviews	19	16%	11	20.8%	5	20.0%	1	5.3%	2	8.0%
Ass. Ctr. Methodology	15	12%	11	20.8%	1	4.0%	1	5.3%	2	8.0%
Decision made by Chief etc.	27	22%	4	7.5%	9	36.0%	5	26.3%	9	36.0%
Chief decides from pool selected	47	39%	21	39.6%	10	40.0%	9	47.4%	7	28.0%
Other: Please specify	11	9%	6	11.3%	1	4.0%	1	5.3%	3	12.0%

**TOTALS MORE THAN 100% DUE TO MULTIPLE RESPONSES IN SOME CATAGORIES**

### (7) YES or NO RESPONSES

	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO. YES	% YES	NO. YES	% YES	NO. YES	% YES	NO. YES	% YES
Agency uses Assessment Ctr.	12	110	9.8%	90.2%	10	18.9%	0	0.0%	2	11%	0	0.0%
Uses A.C. Methodology	20	102	16.4%	83.6%	11	20.8%	4	16.0%	2	11%	3	12.0%
Dept. trains assessors	15	107	12.3%	87.7%	11	20.8%	2	8.0%	0	0%	2	8.0%
A.C. not used but planning to:	16	106	13.1%	86.9%	6	11.3%	2	8.0%	2	11%	6	24.0%
Dept. DOES NOT use Ctr.	89	33	73.0%	27.0%	30	56.6%	21	84.0%	15	79%	23	92.0%
Dept. Trains Officers in Ctr.	17	105	13.9%	86.1%	15	28.3%	0	0.0%	1	5%	1	4.0%
Dept. No Longer Uses Ctr.	5	117	4.1%	95.9%	3	5.7%	1	4.0%	0	0%	1	4.0%

**TOTALS MORE THAN 100% DUE TO MULTIPLE RESPONSES IN SOME CATAGORIES**

## POLICE SURVEY RETURNS FOR ASSESSMENT CENTER

	Group Total		Municipal Police		County Gov.		College University		ISD Police	
<b>(8) SELECT WHICH BEST FITS</b>										
Unreliable results	1	0.8%	1	1.9%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Too costly to operate	4	3.3%	3	5.7%	0	0%	0	0.0%	1	4.0%
Too costly to maintain integrity	2	1.6%	2	3.8%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unpopular with officers and staff	4	3.3%	3	5.7%	1	4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Removes adm. decision making	9	7.4%	4	7.5%	1	4%	3	15.8%	1	4.0%
Too few promotions to use	83	68.0%	29	54.7%	20	80%	15	78.9%	19	76.0%
N/A	19	15.6%	11	20.8%	3	12%	1	5.3%	4	16.0%
<b>TOTAL OF RESPONSES</b>	<b>122</b>		<b>53</b>		<b>25</b>		<b>19</b>		<b>25</b>	

### (9) EXERCISES USED BY ASSESSMENT CENTERS

Group Discussion	25	20.5%	20	37.7%	2	8.0%	2	10.5%	3	12.0%
In-Basket exercise	22	18.0%	19	35.8%	2	8.0%	2	10.5%	0	0.0%
The written problem	22	18.0%	19	35.8%	1	4.0%	2	10.5%	2	8.0%
Interview simulation	27	22.1%	19	35.8%	3	12.0%	3	15.8%	4	16.0%
Background Interview	13	10.7%	5	9.4%	4	16.0%	2	10.5%	3	12.0%
Oral Presentation	29	23.8%	22	41.5%	2	8.0%	4	21.1%	2	8.0%
Training Exercise	6	4.9%	2	3.8%	1	4.0%	2	10.5%	1	4.0%
Testing Center	7	5.7%	5	9.4%	1	4.0%	1	5.3%	0	0.0%
Fact finding exercise	16	13.1%	11	20.8%	3	12.0%	1	5.3%	2	8.0%
Situation analysis/cooperation	18	14.8%	12	22.6%	4	16.0%	1	5.3%	2	8.0%
None Applicable N/A	80	65.6%	12	22.6%	19	76.0%	14	73.7%	21	84.0%
Other:	6	4.9%	5	9.4%	1	4.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

**TOTALS MORE THAN 100% DUE TO MULTIPLE RESPONSES IN SOME CATAGORIES**

## **ASSESSMENT CENTERS FOR PROMOTION**

### **Agency affiliation *(Please choose one)***

- ☐ Municipal Police Agency
- ☐ County Law Enforcement (Sheriff or Constable)
- ☐ College / University Police Department
- ☐ School District Police Department

### **Agency size (Sworn Personnel)**

- ☐ 0 - 25 Police Officers
- ☐ 26 - 50 Police Officers
- ☐ 51 - 100 Police Officers
- ☐ 101 - 150 Police Officers
- ☐ 151 - 200 Police Officers
- ☐ More than 200 Police Officers

### **Form of Government**

- ☐ My Department Head / Chief of Police / Sheriff or Constable is elected by the voters.
- ☐ My Department Head / Chief / Sheriff or Constable is appointed by the Mayor / City Manager / Superintendent of Schools / President of College or University.

### **The Assessment Center is used in my agency for promotion to the following positions:**

- ☐ Chief of Police
- ☐ Assistant Chief of Police
- ☐ Captain
- ☐ Lieutenant
- ☐ Sergeant
- ☐ Corporal
- ☐ None

### **The Assessment Center Process in my agency is:**

- ☐ Used for promotion but not hiring
- ☐ Used for hiring but not promotion
- ☐ Used for both hiring and promotions
- ☐ Not used by my department

**ASSESSMENT CENTERS FOR PROMOTION**

**The Promotion Process in my agency is based on:**  
**(mark those which best fit)**

- ☐ Interviews only
- ☐ Written exam only
- ☐ Written Examination and Interview Combination
- ☐ Assessment Center or Assessment Center Methodology
- ☐ Decision is made by ranking official, Chief of Police, Constable, Sheriff, School Superintendent, President of College or University
- ☐ One or more of the above is used, with the ranking official determining the final selection from the top finishers according to the process
- ☐ Other (Please Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**(YES or NO)**

- ☐ ☐ My agency is currently using the Assessment Center as prescribed in the Guidelines & Ethical Considerations for Assessment Center Operations and meet all the essential criteria listed as an "Assessment Center." **This process, in it's truest form, is usually operated by a contracted firm from the outside and is very costly.**
- ☐ ☐ My agency uses the "Assessment Center Methodology" for promotional purposes but alters it to conform to departmental needs. **This is the "do it yourself format," usually operated by management with or without outside assessors but following closely the "Assessment Center Philosophy."**
- ☐ ☐ My department has sent one or more persons to the assessor training course to aid in supporting and/or administering the promotion process within the department.
- ☐ ☐ My department has never used the Assessment Center process but is studying its use for future promotional considerations.
- ☐ ☐ My department **"DOES NOT"** use the Assessment Center in any form for the promotion of police officers.
- ☐ ☐ My department assists officers in understanding and improving on the assessment style exams by conducting training and orientation classes for officers and staff in the art of assessment center objectives and handling prior to promotional exams.
- ☐ ☐ My agency has used the Assessment Center in the past but no longer uses this method for promoting qualified candidates.

**ASSESSMENT CENTERS FOR PROMOTION****REASONS FOR MY AGENCY NOT USING OR DISCONTINUING THE USE OF THE "ASSESSMENT CENTER" METHODOLOGY FOR PROMOTIONS IS:*****Choose the one that best fits***

- ☐ Unreliable results (PERCIEVED OR EXPERIENCED)
- ☐ Too costly and time consuming for results derived
- ☐ Too costly to maintain integrity and change after each promotion
- ☐ Unpopular with the rank and file within the organization
- ☐ Removes or restricts local control and decision making
- ☐ Department size and number of promotions annually do not warrant the cost and difficulty of proper implementation of an assessments center

**Exercises routinely used in the Assessment Center for my agency are:*****(SELECT ITEMS WHICH BEST FIT)***

- ☐ Group discussion (leaderless group)
- ☐ In-Basket exercise
- ☐ The written problem
- ☐ Interview simulation
- ☐ Background interview
- ☐ Oral Presentation
- ☐ Training exercise
- ☐ Testing center
- ☐ Fact finding and decision making exercise
- ☐ Situation analysis/cooperation discussion
- ☐ None Applicable N/A
- ☐ Other (Please Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**Please print clearly *(name and data of person completing survey)***

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Rank or position: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City, State: \_\_\_\_\_

Zip: \_\_\_\_\_



## HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT POLICE DEPARTMENT

2922 PLUM CREEK  
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77087  
TEL (713) 641-7428 • FAX (713) 641-7432

BRUCE P. MARQUIS  
Chief of Police

ROD PAIGE  
Superintendent of Schools

JOHN B. BLACKBURN  
Assistant Chief

November 13, 1998

### Law Enforcement Official:

Please allow me a few minutes of your time to explain the attached questionnaire. I am currently enrolled in the Graduate Management Institute (GMI) associated with Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas. I have chosen for my research topic, the use of "Assessment Centers" for the purpose of "promotions" within small to medium sized police agencies. The information requested should in no way infringe on the policies of your department and will take only minutes to complete. A self-addressed stamped envelope is included for your convenience in returning this survey.

Following its completion, I will return the result of my findings to those who participated in the study. My goal is to have a return of approximately 100 responses from agencies of between twenty-five and 200 sworn personnel. Responses from departments of more than 200 sworn officers will be counted as one group.

I would like to thank you in advance for your participation in this endeavor. If you are interested in this topic for your own research or for your own department, try the Internet address: [www.pass-prep.com/overview/introduction.htm](http://www.pass-prep.com/overview/introduction.htm). If you have questions regarding my request, I can be reached by calling the Houston ISD Police Department at (713) 641-7428. My pager is (713) 708-9581 for those in the Houston area.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jeffery L. McMillin".

Jeff McMillin, Captain  
Special Operations Division

JM/ew.gradmgmt.doc