



John Keel, CPA  
State Auditor

## A Classification Compliance Review Report on the Texas Building and Procurement Commission

October 17, 2006

Members of the Legislative Audit Committee:

Eighty-three percent of the employee positions reviewed at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission (Commission) were appropriately classified within the State's Classification Plan. The Commission has taken appropriate action to address the employee positions that were misclassified.

The Commission has policies and procedures to review and monitor its classification of positions. These policies and procedures include a formal reclassification policy, revised internal job descriptions, and a process to review job classifications prior to the posting of job vacancy notices. This helps to ensure compliance with the State's Classification Plan. We noted, however, that the Commission should update its reclassification policy and finalize and distribute its revised internal job descriptions.

Of the 357 employee positions reviewed, 296 (83 Percent) were classified appropriately.

The 357 employee positions reviewed covered 16 occupational categories and 46 job classification series. To address the 61 employee positions that were misclassified, the Commission chose to:

- Reclassify 58 positions (95 percent) to other job classification series (see the attachment to this letter for additional details).
- Reclassify 3 positions (5 percent) within their same classification series but at job classifications with higher salary groups (see the attachment to this letter for additional details).

As a result of the reclassifications, 10 employees received salary increases. This will cost the Commission approximately \$13,599 annually. Although some positions were reclassified to job classifications in lower salary groups, the reclassifications did not result in any salary decreases.

### Background Information

In fiscal year 2001, the Commission underwent a significant reorganization. Since then, the Commission has continued its efforts to streamline and improve agency operations. It has reduced its full-time equivalent (FTE) employee cap from 811 in fiscal year 2001 to the current FTE cap of 577.90 (a 29 percent reduction), including contracted labor. An FTE is a ratio that represents the equivalent of a 40-hour-a-week employee, and is not the same as an employee headcount.

The reduction in the number of FTEs and the organizational changes have resulted in staffing changes in several areas. These changes have had an effect on the type or level of work that some employees perform.

### Definitions

**Job Classification** - An individual job within a job classification series. Each job classification has a corresponding salary group assignment appropriate for the type and level of work being performed.

**Job Classification Series** - A hierarchical structure of jobs arranged into job classification titles involving work of the same nature but requiring different levels of responsibility.

**Occupational Category** - A broad series of job families also known as job classification series characterized by the nature of the work performed.

**Salary Group** - A specified level within a salary schedule made up of a salary range with a minimum and maximum salary rate. Assignment of salary groups is based on the type and level of work being performed.

**Reclassification** - The act of changing a position from one job classification to another job classification that better reflects the level or type of work being performed.

The largest percentage of misclassifications occurred in the Program Management occupational category.

With 89 employees, the Program Management occupational category has the most employees. This was also the occupational category with the largest percentage of misclassifications (32 misclassifications, or approximately 52 percent of the 61 misclassifications identified).

The Commission should improve certain controls to ensure proper classification.

The Commission should update its reclassification policy to ensure that positions are reviewed on a regular basis in a manner that is consistent with Texas Government Code, Section 654.0155. In addition, the Commission has not formalized its revised internal job descriptions. The Commission should ensure that revised internal job descriptions are approved and formalized within a timely manner and communicated to all employees.

We appreciate the Commission's cooperation during this review, and its responses are included in the attachment to this letter. If you have any questions, please contact Susan Riley, Assistant State Auditor, or me at (512) 936-9500.

Sincerely,

John Keel, CPA  
State Auditor

Attachment

cc: Members of the Texas Building and Procurement Commission

Ms. Brenda Pejovich, Chair  
Mr. Stuart S. Coleman  
Mr. James S. Duncan  
Mr. Bob Jones  
Mr. Victor E. Leal  
Ms. Betty Reinbeck  
Mr. Barkley J. Stuart

Mr. Edward L. Johnson, Executive Director, Texas Building and Procurement Commission

**Importance of Proper Classification of  
Employee Positions**

For the Commission to meet its performance goals with fewer employees, it must recruit and retain a qualified and competent staff. To accomplish this, the Commission must ensure appropriate compensation for the work being performed. One way to do that is by ensuring all employees are appropriately classified.

If an employee is classified in a position at too low of a level for the work the employee performs, he or she could be underpaid. This could affect the employee's morale and lower motivation, thus affecting services the Commission provides. This also could result in higher turnover, which can be costly.

If employees are classified in positions at too high of a level for the work they perform, the Commission could be paying the employees more than their job duties warrant.



This document is not copyrighted. Readers may make additional copies of this report as needed. In addition, most State Auditor's Office reports may be downloaded from our Web site: [www.sao.state.tx.us](http://www.sao.state.tx.us).

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, this document may also be requested in alternative formats. To do so, contact our report request line at (512) 936-9880 (Voice), (512) 936-9400 (FAX), 1-800-RELAY-TX (TDD), or visit the Robert E. Johnson Building, 1501 North Congress Avenue, Suite 4.224, Austin, Texas 78701.

The State Auditor's Office is an equal opportunity employer and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability in employment or in the provision of services, programs, or activities.

To report waste, fraud, or abuse in state government call the SAO Hotline: 1-800-TX-AUDIT.

# Attachment

Part 1

## Positions Reviewed

---

Table 1 presents the occupational categories and job classification series reviewed at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission (Commission), as well as the number of positions that were misclassified.

With 89 employees, the Program Management occupational category has the most employees. This was also the occupational category with the largest percentage of misclassifications (32 misclassifications, or approximately 52 percent of the 61 misclassifications identified).

Table 1

Summary of Employee Positions Reviewed		
Occupational Category/ Job Classification Series	Number of Employee Positions Reviewed	Number of Employee Positions Misclassified
<b>Accounting, Auditing, and Finance</b>		
Accountant	8	0
Accounting Assistant	1	0
Budget Analyst	3	0
Financial Analyst	1	1
Auditor	8	0
Total Accounting, Auditing, and Finance	21	1
<b>Administrative Support</b>		
Clerk	15	1
Administrative Assistant	34	3
Executive Assistant	1	0
Customer Service Representative	3	0
Data Entry Operator	3	0
Total Administrative Support	56	4
<b>Custodial and Domestic</b>		
Custodial Manager	2	0
Custodian	42	0
Groundskeeper	9	0
Total Custodial and Domestic	53	0

Summary of Employee Positions Reviewed		
Occupational Category/ Job Classification Series	Number of Employee Positions Reviewed	Number of Employee Positions Misclassified
<b>Engineering and Design</b>		
Engineering Specialist	1	1
Total Engineering and Design	1	1
<b>Human Resources</b>		
Human Resources Assistant/Specialist	4	0
Training Assistant/Specialist	2	0
Total Human Resources	6	0
<b>Information Technology</b>		
Network Specialist	5	2
Programmer	4	0
Systems Analyst	6	2
Telecommunications Specialist	1	0
Systems Support Specialist	7	7
Total Information Technology	23	11
<b>Inspectors and Investigators</b>		
Inspector	1	0
Total Inspectors and Investigators	1	0
<b>Legal</b>		
General Counsel	1	0
Attorney	1	0
Legal Secretary	1	0
Total Legal	3	0
<b>Library and Archives</b>		
Historian	1	0
Total Library and Archives	1	0
<b>Maintenance</b>		
Vehicle Driver	5	0
HVAC Mechanic	1	0
Maintenance Technician	39	7
Maintenance Supervisor	8	1
Air Conditioning and Boiler Operator	13	0
Motor Vehicle Technician	1	0

Summary of Employee Positions Reviewed		
Occupational Category/ Job Classification Series	Number of Employee Positions Reviewed	Number of Employee Positions Misclassified
Electrician	7	0
Total Maintenance	74	8
<b>Office Services</b>		
Printing Services Technician	2	0
Total Office Services	2	0
<b>Planning, Research, and Statistics</b>		
Planner	4	4
Total Planning, Research, and Statistics	4	4
<b>Procedures and Information</b>		
Information Specialist	2	0
Technical Writer	1	0
Marketing Specialist	1	0
Total Procedures and Information	4	0
<b>Program Management</b>		
Manager	23	9
Director	12	0
Program Supervisor	5	0
Program Specialist	49	23
Total Program Management	89	32
<b>Property Management and Purchasing</b>		
Contract Specialist	2	0
Property Manager	9	0
Purchaser	7	0
Total Property Management/Purchasing	18	0
<b>Safety</b>		
Risk Management Specialist	1	0
Total Safety	1	0
<b>Totals for all positions reviewed</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>61</b>

## Analysis of Misclassified Positions

Tables 2 and 3 below identify the employee positions that were misclassified and how the Commission addressed the misclassifications.

To protect the confidentiality of the employees whose positions were misclassified, each employee was assigned a position number.

Table 2 shows the 58 employee positions that the Commission reclassified into a different job classification series.

### The Commission's Review Process

According to the Commission, reclassifications were made after careful review and discussion with management to determine the job classifications that more closely aligned with the employees' duties.

Table 2

Positions Reclassified into Different Job Classification Series		
Position Number	Current Job Classification Title	Job Classification Title After Reclassification
1	Administrative Assistant III	Purchaser I
2	Administrative Assistant IV	Inventory Coordinator II
3	Administrative Assistant IV	Inventory Coordinator II
4	Clerk III	Accounting Technician I
5	Engineering Specialist V	Inspector VII
6	Financial Analyst II	Management Analyst III
7	Maintenance Supervisor III	Maintenance Technician V
8	Maintenance Technician II	Inventory Coordinator I
9	Maintenance Technician III	Inventory Coordinator I
10	Maintenance Technician III	Inventory Coordinator I
11	Maintenance Technician III	Inventory Coordinator I
12	Maintenance Technician III	Inventory Coordinator I
13	Maintenance Technician III	Inventory Coordinator I
14	Manager II	Program Specialist VI
15	Manager II	Program Specialist VI
16	Manager IV	Program Specialist VII

Positions Reclassified into Different Job Classification Series		
Position Number	Current Job Classification Title	Job Classification Title After Reclassification
17	Manager IV	Program Specialist VII
18	Manager IV	Program Specialist VII
19	Manager IV	Program Specialist VII
20	Manager IV	Program Specialist VII
21	Manager V	Director I
22	Network Specialist I	Systems Support Specialist III
23	Network Specialist I	Systems Support Specialist III
24	Planner II	Contract Specialist IV
25	Planner II	Contract Specialist IV
26	Planner II	Contract Specialist IV
27	Planner II	Contract Specialist IV
28	Program Specialist I	Auditor II
29	Program Specialist I	Auditor II
30	Program Specialist I	Auditor II
31	Program Specialist I	Auditor II
32	Program Specialist I	Auditor II
33	Program Specialist I	Information Specialist III
34	Program Specialist I	Program Supervisor II
35	Program Specialist I	Research Specialist II
36	Program Specialist II	Contract Specialist IV
37	Program Specialist II	Program Supervisor II
38	Program Specialist II	Purchaser IV
39	Program Specialist III	Attorney II
40	Program Specialist III	Contract Specialist IV
41	Program Specialist III	Marketing Specialist IV
42	Program Specialist III	Program Supervisor II



Positions Reclassified into Different Job Classification Series		
Position Number	Current Job Classification Title	Job Classification Title After Reclassification
43	Program Specialist III	Property Manager III
44	Program Specialist IV	Program Supervisor II
45	Program Specialist IV	Program Supervisor II
46	Program Specialist V	Program Supervisor II
47	Program Specialist V	Program Supervisor III
48	Program Specialist VI	Executive Assistant II
49	Program Specialist VI	Program Supervisor III
50	Systems Analyst IV	Electronics Technician II
51	Systems Analyst V	Network Specialist V
52	Systems Support Specialist I	Administrative Assistant III
53	Systems Support Specialist I	Administrative Assistant III
54	Systems Support Specialist I	Administrative Assistant IV
55	Systems Support Specialist II	Electronics Technician I
56	Systems Support Specialist II	Electronics Technician I
57	Systems Support Specialist III	Electronics Technician II
58	Systems Support Specialist III	Electronics Technician II

Table 3 shows the three employee positions the Commission reclassified within the same job classification series but at job classifications with higher salary groups.

Table 3

Positions Reclassified Within Their Same Job Classification Series		
Position Number	Current Job Classification Title	Job Classification Title After Reclassification
59	Maintenance Technician III	Maintenance Technician IV
60	Manager III	Manager IV
61	Program Specialist III	Program Specialist V

# Appendix

Appendix

## **Objective, Scope, and Methodology**

---

### **Objective**

The objective of this classification compliance review was to determine whether the Commission conforms to the State's Classification Plan in ensuring proper classification of positions.

### **Scope**

The scope of this review included all classified employees employed by the Commission.

### **Methodology**

In determining whether positions were appropriately classified, the following was reviewed:

- State job descriptions.
- Surveys completed by employees and verified by their supervisors.
- Internal salary relationships.

The State Auditor's Office's State Classification Office evaluates jobs on a "whole job" basis to determine proper job classifications. These determinations are primarily based on the comparison of duties and responsibilities of the majority of work being performed against the state job description.

When determining proper classification, the State Classification Office does not focus on specific differences between one level and the next in a job classification series (for example, Maintenance Technician I versus Maintenance Technician II). Instead, we consider whether an employee is appropriately classified within broad responsibility levels, such as Staff Maintenance Technician versus Senior Maintenance Technician.

The State Classification Office has an automated job evaluation process. We populated a database with information regarding the employees whose positions were reviewed. Staff in the Commission's human resources department verified the information in the database to ensure that all positions were included. Employees were then asked to complete online surveys describing the work they perform and the percentage of time they spend

performing their duties. Supervisors were asked to review and verify employees' survey responses.

Completed survey results were entered into the automated job evaluation system, which made an initial determination of whether the positions were appropriately classified. The Commission then had the opportunity to review and address potential misclassifications.

We made follow-up calls to determine and validate proper classification of positions and to gather additional information to resolve discrepancies.

### **Project Information**

This review was conducted under the requirements of Texas Government Code, Section 654.036 (3).

The following employees of the State Auditor's staff prepared this report:

- Sharon Schneider, PHR (Project Manager)
- Juliette Torres, CCP, PHR
- J. Scott Killingsworth, CIA (Quality Control Reviewer)
- Susan A. Riley, CPA (Assistant State Auditor)

## Management's Responses

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
Edward L. Johnson



### Texas Building and Procurement Commission

CHAIRMAN  
Brenda Pejovich

COMMISSIONERS  
Stuart S. Coleman  
James S. Duncan  
Bob Jones  
Victor E. Leal  
Betty Reinbeck  
Barkley J. Stuart

October 6, 2006

Ms. Sharon Schneider  
Project Manager  
State Auditor's Office  
P.O. Box 12067  
Austin, TX 78711-2067

Dear Ms. Schneider:

We have reviewed the draft report and concur with the recommendations.

We have reclassified all the positions that were identified as misclassifications based upon your recommendations and our management reviews. The agency is in the process of Human Resources policy review and will update the classification policy to ensure consistency with Government Code, section 654.0155. Additionally, the review and update of internal job descriptions will be completed by December 31, 2006.

We appreciate your office's professional and thoughtful review of the agency position classifications.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Edward L. Johnson".

Edward L. Johnson  
Executive Director

1711 San Jacinto Blvd. ♦ P.O. Box 13047 ♦ Austin, Texas 78711 ♦ (512) 463-6363 ♦ [www.tbpc.state.tx.us](http://www.tbpc.state.tx.us)