



A Classification Compliance Audit Report on  
**Program Specialist and  
Program Supervisor Positions at the  
Department of Aging and Disability Services**

August 2016  
Report No. 16-705



A Classification Compliance Audit Report on  
*Program Specialist and  
Program Supervisor Positions at the  
Department of Aging and Disability Services*

SAO Report No. 16-705  
August 2016

## Overall Conclusion

A total of 356 (57.7 percent) of 617 employees tested at the Department of Aging and Disability Services (Department) were **misclassified in accordance with the State's Position Classification Plan**. The employees tested were classified within the program specialist and program supervisor job classification series. In previous classification compliance reviews of program specialist positions<sup>1</sup> at other state agencies, 924 (31.4 percent) of 2,938 employees reviewed were misclassified. The Department self-reported the classification information on which this audit focused.

Of the 356 misclassified employees, 315 (88.5 percent) were misclassified because the Department did not use a more appropriate, occupationally specific job classification series. For example, to correct one misclassification that auditors identified, the Department reclassified an employee in the program specialist job classification series to a contract specialist job classification.

The **Health and Human Services Commission's** human resources office reported that the Department will spend \$332,445 annually to properly classify and compensate 119 of the 356 misclassified employees. There was no cost associated with addressing the classification of the remaining misclassified employees. No employees will receive a decrease in salary as a result of this audit.

### Responsibility for Employee Classification

NorthgateArinso (NGA) HHS Employee Service Center is a contractor that provides human resources and payroll assistance to health and human services agencies. NGA, Department supervisors, and the Health and Human Services **Commission's human resources** office share responsibility for ensuring that Department employees are classified in accordance with the **State's Position Classification Plan**, but NGA and Department supervisors have the primary responsibility for proper classification.

Source: The Health and Human Services **Commission's human resources** office.

### Background Information

**The Department of Aging and Disability Services'** (Department) responsibilities include:

- Administering long-term services and support for older individuals and individuals with disabilities.
- Licensing and certifying providers of services and support for older individuals and individuals with disabilities.
- Monitoring compliance with regulatory requirements.
- **Administering the State's guardianship** program, which provides a court-appointed person (guardian) to make decisions on behalf of a person with diminished capacity.
- **Operating the State's residential facilities** for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

As noted in *A Summary Report on Full-time Equivalent State Employees for Fiscal Year 2015* and in *An Annual Report on Classified Employee Turnover for Fiscal Year 2015* (**State Auditor's** Office Report Nos. 16-701 and 16-702, December 2015), in fiscal year 2015, the Department:

- Had an average of 15,527.7 full-time equivalent employees, which accounted for **4.9 percent of the State's workforce**.
- Had the highest turnover rate (32.2 percent) among state agencies with 1,000 or more employees.

Sources: **The Department and the State Auditor's** Office.

<sup>1</sup> The program supervisor job classification series was not included in previous reviews. For this audit, 355 (57.8 percent) of the 614 program specialists were misclassified, a rate that is still higher than the 31.4 percent from previous reviews of that job classification series.

Table 1 summarizes the misclassifications identified during this audit.

Table 1

Summary of Department Employees in Program Specialist and Program Supervisor Positions		
Job Classification Series	Number of Employees Tested	Number of Employees Misclassified
Program Specialist	614	355
Program Supervisor	3	1
Totals	617	356

Table 2 presents a summary of the findings in this report and the related issue rating. (See Appendix 2 for more information about the issue rating classifications and descriptions.)

Table 2

Summary of Chapters and Related Issue Ratings		
Chapter	Title	Issue Rating <sup>a</sup>
1	Analysis of Department Employees Classified in the Program Specialist and Program Supervisor Job Classification Series	Priority

<sup>a</sup> A chapter is rated Priority if the issues identified present risks or effects that if not addressed could critically affect the audited entity's ability to effectively administer the program(s)/function(s) audited. Immediate action is required to address the noted concern and reduce risks to the audited entity.

A chapter is rated High if the issues identified present risks or effects that if not addressed could substantially affect the audited entity's ability to effectively administer the program(s)/function(s) audited. Prompt action is essential to address the noted concern and reduce risks to the audited entity.

A chapter is rated Medium if the issues identified present risks or effects that if not addressed could moderately affect the audited entity's ability to effectively administer program(s)/function(s) audited. Action is needed to address the noted concern and reduce risks to a more desirable level.

A chapter is rated Low if the audit identified strengths that support the audited entity's ability to administer the program(s)/functions(s) audited or the issues identified do not present significant risks or effects that would negatively affect the audited entity's ability to effectively administer the program(s)/function(s) audited.

## Summary of Management's Response

At the end of Chapter 1 in this report, auditors made recommendations to address the issues identified during this audit. The Department agreed with the recommendations in this report.

## Audit Objective and Scope

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

The scope of this audit included 617 employees within the program specialist and program supervisor job classification series at the Department as of October 1, 2015.

# Contents

## *Detailed Results*

---

Chapter 1 Analysis of Department Employees Classified in the Program Specialist and Program Supervisor Job Classification Series.....	1
--	---

## *Appendices*

---

Appendix 1 Objective, Scope, and Methodology.....	7
Appendix 2 Issue Rating Classifications and Descriptions.....	10
Appendix 3 Description of Program Specialist and Program Supervisor Job Classification Series .....	11
Appendix 4 Analysis of Misclassified Employees.....	12

# Detailed Results

Chapter 1

## Analysis of Department Employees Classified in the Program Specialist and Program Supervisor Job Classification Series

Chapter 1  
Rating:  
Priority<sup>2</sup>

A total of 356 (57.7 percent) of 617 employees at the Department of Aging and Disability Services (Department) classified in the program specialist and program supervisor job classification series<sup>3</sup> were misclassified. See Appendix 3 for a description of program specialists and program supervisor positions.

In previous classification compliance reviews of employees classified in program specialist positions<sup>4</sup> at other state agencies, 924 (31.4 percent) of 2,938 employees reviewed were misclassified (see text box for additional details).

### Prior Reviews of Employees Classified as Program Specialists

In July 2009, the State Auditor's Office's State Classification Team conducted a classification compliance review focusing on program specialist positions at small and mid-sized agencies (agencies with fewer than 1,000 employees). That review determined that 82.0 percent of the employees were classified correctly (and 18.0 percent were misclassified). See *A Classification Compliance Review Report on the State's Program Specialist Positions* (State Auditor's Office Report No. 09-706, July 2009) for the results of that review.

In March 2010, the State Auditor's Office's State Classification Team conducted a classification compliance review focusing on program specialist positions at selected public safety and criminal justice agencies. That review determined that 48.1 percent of employees were classified correctly (and 51.9 percent were misclassified). See *A Classification Compliance Review Report on the State's Program Specialist Positions at Selected Public Safety and Criminal Justice Agencies* (State Auditor's Office Report No. 10-705, March 2010) for the results of that review.

In May 2011, the State Auditor's Office's State Classification Team conducted a classification compliance review focusing on program specialist positions at selected natural resources and business and economic development agencies. That review determined that 71.3 percent of employees were classified correctly (and 28.7 percent were misclassified). See *A Classification Compliance Review Report on the State's Program Specialist Positions at Selected Natural Resources Agencies and Selected Business and Economic Development Agencies* (State Auditor's Office Report No. 11-706, May 2011) for the results of that review.

<sup>2</sup> The risks related to the issues discussed in Chapter 1 are rated as priority because they present risks or effects that if not addressed could critically affect the audited entity's ability to effectively administer the program(s)/function(s) audited. Immediate action is required to address the noted concern(s) and reduce risks to the audited entity.

<sup>3</sup> A job classification series is a hierarchical structure of jobs arranged into job classification titles involving the work of the same nature but requiring different levels of responsibility.

<sup>4</sup> The program supervisor job classification series was not included in previous reviews. For this audit, 355 (57.8 percent) of the 614 program specialists were misclassified, a rate that is still higher than the 31.4 percent from previous reviews of that position.

To address the 356 employees who were misclassified, the Health and Human Services Commission’s human resources office reported that the Department chose to:

- Reclassify<sup>5</sup> 315 employees into a different job classification<sup>6</sup> series. For example, it reclassified a program specialist to a contract specialist.
- Reclassify 40 employees within the same job classification series but at a higher salary group.
- Change the job duties of 1 employee so the employee could remain in the current job classification and be properly classified.

Importance of Proper Classification of Employee Positions

Appropriate job classifications are important in determining salary rates that are competitive for the nature of the work performed. Misclassified positions may result in an agency underpaying or overpaying employees for the nature of work being performed.

Of the 356 misclassified employees, 315 (88.5 percent) were misclassified because the Department did not use a more appropriate and occupationally specific job classification series.

Table 3 summarizes the misclassifications identified during this audit. For additional details, see Appendix 4.

Table 3

Summary of Department Employees in Program Specialist and Program Supervisor Positions		
Job Classification Series	Number of Employees Tested	Number of Employees Misclassified
Program Specialist	614	355
Program Supervisor	3	1
Totals	617	356

The Health and Human Services Commission’s human resources office reported that, as a result of reclassifications, 119 employees at the Department will receive annual salary increases ranging from \$12,386 to \$242. As a result, the Health and Human Services Commission’s human resources office reported that the Department will spend \$332,445 annually to properly classify and compensate those employees. There was no cost associated with addressing the misclassifications on the remaining 237

<sup>5</sup> A reclassification is 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.

<sup>6</sup> A job classification is 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.

employees. No employees will receive a reduction in salary as a result of the reclassifications.

The number of Department program specialists increased from 291 in fiscal year 2005 to 656<sup>7</sup> in fiscal year 2015.<sup>8</sup> Although significant increases in the number of employees within a job classification series can indicate new or expanded programs, they can also indicate an increase in misclassifications and weaknesses in internal controls for ensuring appropriate employee classification.

Some Department employees correctly classified as program specialists performed work focusing on:

- Data analysis.
- Protection of human rights.
- Transition assistance services.
- Compliance monitoring.
- Guardianship services.

The State Classification Team will review those types of positions in fiscal year 2016 during the review of the State's Position Classification Plan<sup>9</sup> to determine whether it would be appropriate to recommend the addition of new job classification series, such as data analyst, to the State's Position Classification Plan.

When appropriate, adding new job classification series addresses gaps in the State's Position Classification Plan and provides agencies with new job classifications that more clearly distinguish the work that employees perform. It also helps to ensure that the State's Position Classification Plan adequately meets the needs of state agencies and properly compensates the State's employees.

---

<sup>7</sup> Due to reasons such as employee turnover and employees being out on extended leave, not all of the Department employees in those positions in fiscal year 2015 were within the scope of this classification compliance audit.

<sup>8</sup> The program supervisor job classification series was not implemented until fiscal year 2006 and, therefore, was not used in that comparison.

<sup>9</sup> That review will be conducted in accordance with Texas Government Code, Chapter 654.



## Recommendations

The Department should work with the Health and Human Services Commission's human resources office to:

- Complete all reclassifications, salary adjustments, and job restructuring for employees identified as misclassified during this audit and notify the employees.
- Review employees in the program specialist and program supervisor job classification series who were not within the scope of this audit to ensure that those employees are classified appropriately for their level of responsibilities and the work they perform. That review should include employees who were on extended leave during this audit or employees who were newly hired or promoted to their positions. The Department should use occupationally specific job classifications when appropriate.
- Monitor the use of program specialist and program supervisor job classification series to ensure occupationally specific job classifications are used, when appropriate. That should include closely monitoring job postings to ensure the appropriate job classification title is being used. If the Department determines that a new job classification series may be warranted, it should work with the State Auditor's Office's State Classification Team to determine whether recommendations should be made to the Legislature regarding the creation of new job classification series or additional levels in current job classification series.

## Management's Response

*1. Complete all reclassifications, salary adjustments, and job restructuring for employees identified as misclassified during this audit and notify the employees.*

*The Department of Aging and Disability Services (DADS) received the final report of positions that were identified as misclassified as a result of this audit in June 2016. The audit determinations were shared with DADS executive management and employees impacted by the reclassification of their positions. All reclassifications, salary adjustments where necessary, and job restructuring for employees will be completed with an effective date of July 1, 2016. Reclassifications are being coordinated with HHS human resources and the HHS employee service center. The reclassifications are being completed in a cost neutral manner if the employee's salary was within the new salary group. Employees whose salary was below the minimum of the new salary group will receive a salary increase as a result of reclassification into a job classification with a higher minimum salary.*

*2. Review employees in the program specialist and program supervisor job classification series who were not within the scope of this audit to ensure that those employees are classified appropriately for their level of responsibilities and the work they perform. That review should include employees who were on extended leave during this audit or employees who were newly hired or promoted to their positions. The Department should use occupationally specific job classifications when appropriate.*

*A report of all employees in the program specialist and program supervisor job classification series who were not within the scope of this audit, including employees who were on extended leave during this audit, and positions that were vacant during this audit, was provided to DADS executive management for review. After DADS Executive and Staff Operations reviewed these positions and consulted with HHS human resources, 57 employees and/or vacant positions will be reclassified in accordance with audit determinations of other positions included in the audit with an effective date of July 1, 2016.*

*3. Monitor the use of program specialist and program supervisor job classification series to ensure occupationally specific job classifications are used, when appropriate. That should include closely monitoring job postings to ensure the appropriate job classification title is being used. If the Department determines that a new job classification series may be warranted, it should work with the State Auditor's Office's State Classification Team to determine whether recommendations should be made to the Legislature regarding the creation of new job classification series or additional levels in current job classification series.*

*DADS will, in coordination with the HHS employee service center and HHS human resources, monitor the use of the program specialist and program supervisor job classification series and work to ensure occupationally specific job classifications are used when appropriate. In addition, as a result of this audit, DADS has submitted several recommendations for the creation of new job classification series, as well as a request for additional levels in other current job classification series, to HHS human resources for consideration. It is our understanding these recommendations have been reviewed and submitted to the State Auditor's Office for consideration.*

*Implementation Dates:*

*July 1, 2016 - Reclassifications and salary adjustments*

*Ongoing - Creation of new job classification series and monitoring*

Responsible Persons:

*Lynn Blackmore, DADS Chief Operating Officer*

*Amy Tippie, DADS Director of Executive and Staff Operations*

*Lisa Glenn, HHS Assistant Human Resources Director*

*NorthgateArinso (NGA), HHS Employee Service Center*

# Appendices

## Appendix 1

### *Objective, Scope, and Methodology*

---

#### Objective

The objective of this classification compliance audit was to determine whether the Department of Aging and Disability Services (Department) conforms to the State's Position Classification Plan in ensuring proper classification of positions.

#### Scope

The scope of this review included 617 employees within the program specialist and program supervisor job classification series as of October 1, 2015.

#### Methodology

The audit methodology included collecting information and documentation, reviewing and analyzing surveys completed by Department employees and verified by their supervisors, and conducting interviews with Department management.

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

When determining proper classification, the State Classification Team does not focus on specific differences between one level and the next level in a job classification series (for example, Program Specialist I versus Program Specialist II). Instead, the State Classification Team considers whether an employee is appropriately classified within broad responsibility levels, such as Staff Program Specialist (Program Specialist I, Program Specialist II, and Program Specialist III positions) versus Senior Program Specialist (Program Specialist IV, Program Specialist V, Program Specialist VI, and Program Specialist VII positions).

The State Classification Team used an automated job evaluation process. The State Classification Team populated a database with information regarding the employees whose positions were tested. Staff in the Department verified the information to ensure that all positions within the

audit scope were included. Department 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 an automated job evaluation system, which made an initial determination of whether the positions were appropriately classified. The State Classification Team reviewed all surveys to determine and validate the proper classification of positions. The State Classification Team made follow-up calls or sent clarification emails to gather additional information to determine the proper classification of positions. The Department then had the opportunity to review and address potential misclassifications.

#### Data Reliability and Completeness

Auditors relied on previous State Auditor's Office audit work on the Standardized Payroll Personnel Report System (SPRS) for data completeness and accuracy. Auditors determined that the data was sufficiently reliable for the purposes of this audit. Auditors determined that the data in the Classification Compliance Audit System was reliable for the purposes of this audit.

#### Information collected and reviewed included the following:

- Surveys completed by employees and verified by their supervisors.
- Correspondence from the Health and Human Services Commission human resources office and supervisors at the Department.

#### Procedures and tests conducted included the following:

- Interviewed management at the Health and Human Services Commission's human resources office and the Department regarding the classification of positions.
- Follow-up calls and emails were sent to the Department to validate proper classification of positions and to gather additional information to resolve discrepancies.

#### Criteria used included the following:

- Texas Government Code, Section 654.
- State job descriptions.

## Project Information

Audit fieldwork was conducted from October 2015 through April 2016. We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

The following members of the State Auditor's staff performed the audit:

- Sharon Schneider, CCP, PHR, SHRM-CP (Project Manager)
- Kendra Campbell, MSIS, PHR, SHRM-CP
- Kathy-Ann Moe
- Lara Tai, PHR, SHRM-CP
- Juan Sanchez, MPA, CIA, CGAP
- Dana Musgrave, MBA (Quality Control Reviewer)
- John Young, MPAff (Audit Manager)

## Issue Rating Classifications and Descriptions

---

Auditors used professional judgement and rated the audit findings identified in this report. Those issue ratings are summarized in the report chapters/sub-chapters. The issue ratings were determined based on the degree of risk or effect of the findings in relation to the audit objective(s).

In determining the ratings of audit findings, auditors considered factors such as financial impact; potential failure to meet program/function objectives; noncompliance with state statute(s), rules, regulations, and other requirements or criteria; and the inadequacy of the design and/or operating effectiveness of internal controls. In addition, evidence of potential fraud, waste, or abuse; significant control environment issues; and little to no corrective action for issues previously identified could increase the ratings for audit findings. Auditors also identified and considered other factors when appropriate.

Table 4 provides a description of the issue ratings presented in this report.

Table 4

Summary of Issue Ratings	
Issue Rating	Description of Rating
Low	The audit identified strengths that support the audited entity's ability to administer the program(s)/functions(s) audited <u>or</u> the issues identified do not present significant risks or effects that would negatively affect the audited entity's ability to effectively administer the program(s)/function(s) audited.
Medium	Issues identified present risks or effects that if not addressed could <u>moderately affect</u> the audited entity's ability to effectively administer program(s)/function(s) audited. Action is needed to address the noted concern(s) and reduce risks to a more desirable level.
High	Issues identified present risks or effects that if not addressed could <u>substantially affect</u> the audited entity's ability to effectively administer the program(s)/function(s) audited. Prompt action is essential to address the noted concern(s) and reduce risks to the audited entity.
Priority	Issues identified present risks or effects that if not addressed could <u>critically affect</u> the audited entity's ability to effectively administer the program(s)/function(s) audited. Immediate action is required to address the noted concern(s) and reduce risks to the audited entity.

## Description of Program Specialist and Program Supervisor Job Classification Series

---

The program specialist job classification series in the State's Position Classification Plan was designed to address limited situations in which an occupationally specific job classification did not exist. To be appropriately classified within the program specialist job classification series:

- Employees should provide consultative services and technical assistance work involving planning, developing, and implementing an agency program.
- There should be no occupationally specific job classification available within the State's Position Classification Plan that would be a good fit for the majority of work being performed. Although the program specialist job classification series covers a broad variety of duties and work, state agencies should use occupationally specific job classifications whenever possible. That helps to ensure that employees will gain the benefit of pay decisions and market reviews of positions with similar functions, experience, and skills.
- Employees should not have supervisory responsibilities.

Importance of Proper Classification of Employee Positions

Appropriate job classifications are important in determining salary rates that are competitive for the nature of the work performed. Misclassified positions may result in an agency underpaying or overpaying employees for the nature of work being performed.

The program supervisor job classification series was designed to address employees performing work similar to the program specialist job classification series but who have the additional responsibility of supervising employees working in an agency program or multiple programs.



## Analysis of Misclassified Employees

Tables 5 and 6 summarize the job titles held by Department of Aging and Disability Services (Department) employees who were misclassified and how the Department addressed the misclassifications.

Table 5 summarizes the job titles of the 315 employees whom the Department stated it would reclassify into different job classification series; 98 of those reclassifications will result in salary increases totaling \$281,913 annually.

Table 5

Department Employees to Be Reclassified into Different Job Classification Series		
Job Title Prior to Audit	Job Title After Reclassification	Number of Employees To Be Reclassified
Program Specialist I	Customer Service Representative III	3
Program Specialist I	Food Service Manager IV	1
Program Specialist I	Health Specialist IV	4
Program Specialist I	Health Specialist V	1
Program Specialist I	Inspector V	1
Program Specialist I	Investigator IV	1
Program Specialist I	License and Permit Specialist IV	10
Program Specialist I	Manager I	1
Program Specialist I	Program Supervisor I	5
Program Specialist I	Program Supervisor V	1
Program Specialist I	Quality Assurance Specialist I	1
Program Specialist I	Rehabilitation Therapy Technician IV	1
Program Specialist I	Reimbursement Officer II	1
Program Specialist I	Safety Officer I	1
Program Specialist II	Administrative Assistant IV	2
Program Specialist II	Contract Specialist II	1
Program Specialist II	Contract Specialist III	2
Program Specialist II	Custodial Manager III	1
Program Specialist II	Customer Service Representative IV	1
Program Specialist II	Executive Assistant I	1
Program Specialist II	Laundry Manager III	1
Program Specialist II	License and Permit Specialist IV	8
Program Specialist II	Management Analyst I	1
Program Specialist II	Manager I	1
Program Specialist II	Program Supervisor I	2
Program Specialist II	Program Supervisor II	2

Department Employees to Be Reclassified into Different Job Classification Series		
Job Title Prior to Audit	Job Title After Reclassification	Number of Employees To Be Reclassified
Program Specialist II	Program Supervisor IV	6
Program Specialist II	Program Supervisor V	14
Program Specialist II	Protective Services Intake Specialist IV	1
Program Specialist II	Protective Services Intake Specialist V	18
Program Specialist II	Reimbursement Officer III	2
Program Specialist II	Research Specialist IV	1
Program Specialist II	Volunteer Services Coordinator IV	7
Program Specialist III	Business Analyst I	1
Program Specialist III	Contract Specialist III	1
Program Specialist III	Executive Assistant I	1
Program Specialist III	Food Service Manager IV	2
Program Specialist III	Health Specialist IV	3
Program Specialist III	Human Resources Specialist IV	2
Program Specialist III	Inspector VI	1
Program Specialist III	License and Permit Specialist IV	3
Program Specialist III	Maintenance Supervisor IV	1
Program Specialist III	Manager I	6
Program Specialist III	Program Supervisor II	1
Program Specialist III	Program Supervisor III	4
Program Specialist III	Program Supervisor IV	1
Program Specialist III	Program Supervisor V	5
Program Specialist III	Quality Assurance Specialist III	5
Program Specialist III	Systems Administrator III	1
Program Specialist III	Volunteer Services Coordinator IV	3
Program Specialist IV	Accountant III	1
Program Specialist IV	Administrative Assistant IV	1
Program Specialist IV	Contract Specialist III	3
Program Specialist IV	Contract Specialist IV	11
Program Specialist IV	Education Specialist III	7
Program Specialist IV	Education Specialist IV	1
Program Specialist IV	Health and Human Services Program Coordinator II	1
Program Specialist IV	Health Specialist IV	1
Program Specialist IV	Human Resources Specialist IV	1
Program Specialist IV	Information Specialist IV	1
Program Specialist IV	Maintenance Supervisor V	1
Program Specialist IV	Management Analyst III	1
Program Specialist IV	Manager I	31

Department Employees to Be Reclassified into Different Job Classification Series		
Job Title Prior to Audit	Job Title After Reclassification	Number of Employees To Be Reclassified
Program Specialist IV	Nurse III	1
Program Specialist IV	Ombudsman III	14
Program Specialist IV	Program Supervisor IV	1
Program Specialist IV	Program Supervisor V	4
Program Specialist IV	Project Manager I	1
Program Specialist IV	Quality Assurance Specialist III	3
Program Specialist IV	Social Worker III	1
Program Specialist IV	Systems Administrator II	1
Program Specialist IV	Training Specialist V	9
Program Specialist V	Budget Analyst IV	1
Program Specialist V	Contract Specialist IV	5
Program Specialist V	Education Specialist IV	1
Program Specialist V	Geographic Information Specialist III	1
Program Specialist V	Human Resources Specialist IV	1
Program Specialist V	Management Analyst III	2
Program Specialist V	Manager I	11
Program Specialist V	Manager II	3
Program Specialist V	Ombudsman IV	2
Program Specialist V	Program Supervisor V	7
Program Specialist V	Quality Assurance Specialist IV	9
Program Specialist V	Systems Administrator IV	2
Program Specialist V	Systems Analyst III	1
Program Specialist V	Technical Writer II	1
Program Specialist VI	Business Analyst III	4
Program Specialist VI	Contract Specialist V	2
Program Specialist VI	Data Base Administrator IV	1
Program Specialist VI	Information Specialist V	2
Program Specialist VI	Management Analyst IV	1
Program Specialist VI	Privacy Analyst II	1
Program Specialist VI	Program Supervisor II	1
Program Specialist VI	Program Supervisor III	1
Program Specialist VI	Program Supervisor VI	7
Program Specialist VI	Project Manager III	1
Program Specialist VI	Qualified Intellectual Disability Professional IV	1
Program Specialist VII	Data Base Administrator V	1
Program Specialist VII	Human Resources Specialist VI	1
Program Specialist VII	Manager IV	1

Department Employees to Be Reclassified into Different Job Classification Series		
Job Title Prior to Audit	Job Title After Reclassification	Number of Employees To Be Reclassified
Program Specialist VII	Management Analyst V	1
Program Specialist VII	Program Supervisor VII	1

**Table 6 summarizes the 40 employees whom the Department stated it would reclassify within the same job classification series; 21 of those reclassifications will result in salary increases totaling \$50,532 annually.**

Table 6

Department Employees To Be Reclassified Within the Same Classification Series		
Job Title Prior to Audit	Job Title After Reclassification	Number of Employees To Be Reclassified
Program Specialist I	Program Specialist IV	1
Program Specialist I	Program Specialist V	1
Program Specialist II	Program Specialist III	2
Program Specialist II	Program Specialist IV	9
Program Specialist III	Program Specialist IV	22
Program Specialist III	Program Specialist V	4
Program Supervisor IV	Program Supervisor V	1

**The Department also changed the job duties of one employee classified as a Program Specialist V so that the employee could remain in the current job classification title and be appropriately classified with no changes to the employee's salary.**

Copies of this report have been distributed to the following:

### Legislative Audit Committee

The Honorable Dan Patrick, Lieutenant Governor, Joint Chair

The Honorable Joe Straus III, Speaker of the House, Joint Chair

The Honorable Jane Nelson, Senate Finance Committee

The Honorable Robert Nichols, Member, Texas Senate

The Honorable John Otto, House Appropriations Committee

The Honorable Dennis Bonnen, House Ways and Means Committee

### Office of the Governor

The Honorable Greg Abbott, Governor

### Health and Human Services Commission

Mr. Charles Smith, Executive Commissioner

### Department of Aging and Disability Services

Mr. Jon Weizenbaum, Commissioner



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.texas.gov](http://www.sao.texas.gov).

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) 936-9500 (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.