

Table of Contents

A Salary Parity Study of the State's Human Resources Employees

January 1999

Keypoints

Overview 1

Section 1:

What Should Agency Human Resources Directors Be Paid? 2

Section 2:

Is There Disparity in Human Resources Directors' Current Salaries? 4

Section 3:

What Should Human Resources Staff Members Be Paid? 5

Section 4:

Is There Disparity in Human Resources Staff Members' Current Salaries? 7

Appendices

1 - Objectives, Scope, and Methodology 8

2 - Complexity Level of Agencies' HR Functions 10

3 - Additional Information for Agencies with High- and Medium-Complexity Levels 13

Key Points of Report

A Salary Parity Study of the State's Human Resources Employees

January 1999

Overall Conclusion

We found no significant issues of disparity in how state agencies pay human resources positions performing similar work. Most agencies pay their Human Resources (HR) Directors appropriately and generally classify human resources staff correctly. Of the approximately 1,900 positions reviewed, we found only 6 percent misclassified. The cost to correct these misclassifications is nominal and should be absorbed by the agencies.

State agencies spent about \$11 billion on activities to manage their investment in human resources in fiscal year 1998. Human resources staff represents 1.3 percent of the total state agency workforce, which equates to 1 HR employee for every 78 state employees.

Key Facts and Findings

- Six agencies undervalue their HR Director job and should take steps to increase these positions' salaries. The cost to the State would be approximately \$11,500 per year.
- We found that most HR Director positions at medium and large agencies are currently paid within the recommended salary ranges based on complexity level. In order to be more competitive, agencies can move salaries toward the midpoint of the recommended range for the complexity level. In general, management positions statewide lag the market by more than 10 percent.
- Human resources staff positions are generally properly classified. The current salaries are up to 18 percent behind market. Agencies should use the full range of the designated salary groups for these positions so that the salaries will become more competitive with the private sector. Generally, when salaries are competitive, turnover rates decrease and the number of qualified staff members increases.

Contact

Kelli L. Dan, CCP, PHR, State Classification Officer, (512) 479-4700



Office of the State Auditor

Lawrence F. Alwin, CPA

The State Classification Office conducted the salary studies and developed the findings and recommendations in this report in accordance with the Position Classification Act, Texas Government Code, Chapter 654.

Overview

We found no significant issues of disparity in how state agencies pay human resources positions performing similar work. Most agencies currently pay their Human Resources (HR) Directors appropriately and generally classify human resources staff correctly. We found that only 6 percent of the approximately 1,900 positions reviewed were misclassified. The cost to correct these misclassifications is nominal and should be easily absorbed by the agencies.

For the majority of agencies, current salaries for HR Directors fall within the recommended ranges. The recommended ranges are based on the agencies' complexity. We found that the definition of the HR Director position varied across agencies. The most significant factors used to define the agency complexity level were total number of employees in the agency, workforce complexity, and the executive director's not-to-exceed salary rate.

There are six agencies that have undervalued their HR Director position. The annual cost to the State to adjust salaries for these positions is approximately \$11,500. The cost to the State to reclassify HR staff will be nominal since most positions can be reclassified at a cost that can be easily absorbed by the agencies.

State agency HR Directors' current salaries in highly complex agencies fall about 15 percent behind the private sector. The midpoint of the recommended salary range brings salaries within the recommended 10 percent of the market. HR Directors' current salaries in medium complexity agencies fall about 17 percent behind the market. The medium complexity category encompasses a broader diversity of agencies than the highly complex, and therefore the comparison to the market is not as clearly defined. Generally, salaries of management positions in Texas state employment lag the market by more than 10 percent. This lag can contribute to difficulties in recruitment and retention.

We found that the majority of HR positions performing similar work are consistently classified statewide. We reviewed 1,938 positions and found that about 6 percent should be classified differently. Agencies were sent separate letters specifying the misclassifications and recommendations for correcting them. State agency HR staff is currently paid up to 18 percent behind market. The recommended salary ranges are within 10 percent of market. This range is in line with the State's compensation philosophy. Agencies need to consider bringing current salaries closer to market when awarding merit increases. Salaries that are significantly behind market impact recruitment and retention of qualified staff.

Agencies spent about \$11 billion on activities to manage their investment in human resources. They represent 1.3 percent of the total state agency workforce, which equates to one human resources employee for every 78 state employees.

Small agencies do not have an HR Director position or HR staff comparable to the large and medium agencies. The position that oversees HR functions manages several additional administrative or program functions. Therefore, we could not include them in a comparison of like positions. Agencies should set salaries for these positions

based on the responsibilities of the whole job with consideration for organizational structure and culture.

Section 1:

What Should Agency Human Resources Directors Be Paid?

We believe the salaries in Table 1 are appropriate for HR Directors based on the specific criteria for each complexity level.

Table 1

Recommended Salary Ranges for HR Directors Based on Complexity of Job		
Complexity Level of Agency	Recommended Salary Range ¹	Recommended Job Classifications
High	\$60,000 - \$85,000	Agency-specific manager/director class ²
Medium	\$45,000 - \$65,000	Program Administrator V, HR Specialist V, or Agency-specific manager/director class ²
Low	Not recommended	Staff Services Officer series or other general administrative title

Source: State Classification Office

¹Salary ranges are general and do not equate exactly to Schedule B salary groups.

²If the Legislature approves our Office's recommendation for changes to the Classification Plan, these positions should be classified in the Manager or Director series after September 1, 1999.

See Appendix 2 for our assessment of each agency's HR Director complexity level. Our Office is not recommending specific salaries within the range for individual agencies. It is the agency's responsibility to set the employee's salary. Salary placement within the recommended range should be based on individual performance, agency culture, and organizational structure.

Two agencies identified as having HR functions of medium complexity do not have a full-time HR professional to handle HR strategic and operational duties. An employee responsible for several administrative functions also oversees HR. We believe the Office of Court Administration and the Historical Commission should consider hiring a full-time HR professional due to the complexity of their HR functions.

We looked at HR Director positions at all large and medium agencies to determine appropriate salary levels. We do not believe that all HR Director jobs within the State are equal. To define the complexity in HR Director jobs, we began by evaluating what the job is worth. We reviewed several pieces of information when determining the level of complexity of an HR Director's job, but eventually determined that the primary indicators of differences in HR Director's pay are:

- Number of employees at the agency
- Diversity of the agency's workforce
- The executive director's not-to-exceed salary rate

The complexity of an agency's human resources function is obviously impacted by the number of employees an agency has, which also impacts the size of the HR division. This criterion had such a direct relationship on the complexity of the HR Director's job, and hence the employee's salary, that we used it as our primary indicator. However, other factors influence the HR Director's salary. We also believe that the diversity of the workforce contributes to the complexity of the job. Agencies with many different occupational groups and salary levels will need sophisticated HR programs. While an agency with a highly professional but mostly homogeneous workforce may have some sophisticated HR programs, it will not have as much complexity in the wide variety of programs offered to different types of employees. Finally, the agency executive director's salary does have an impact on the salaries of management positions. When the Legislature caps an executive director's salary, it sets an internal cap and inherent structure for the rest of the agency's management team.

We recommended salary ranges only for those agencies where we believe a full-time HR Director is necessary to compare like jobs accurately. This included 49 large and medium agencies. The remaining 87 smaller agencies are not large enough to break their administrative functions into the traditional sections. Therefore, one or more staff members is usually responsible for multiple administrative functions in these agencies. These positions are usually classified as Staff Services Officers or a similar title to encompass the wide range of duties they perform. Although many of them are responsible for the day-to-day HR activities in their agencies, we could not make a direct comparison of those jobs to HR Directors that perform full-time professional HR work and usually overseeing a sizable staff.

While we believe the salaries recommended are appropriate for HR Directors at this time, in comparison with the State's current salary structure, market analysis does indicate that the State pays less for HR Directors than the private sector. (See Table 2.)

Table 2

Comparison of State HR Director Salaries to Private Sector Salaries					
Complexity Level of Agency	Recommended State Salary Midpoint	Current State Salary (Average)	Market Salary (Average)	Recommended Midpoint to Market Index	Average Current Salary to Market Index
High	\$72,500	\$67,397	\$79,276	.91	.85
Medium	\$55,000	\$54,441	\$65,372	.84	.83
Low	Not recommended	Not Calculated	\$51,468	N/A	N/A

Source: State Classification Office

HR Director current salaries fall 15 to 17 percent behind the market. However, the recommended range would put state HR Director salaries 9 to 16 percent behind the market for agencies with medium and highly complex HR functions. The State does lag the market for most employee salaries, particularly in professional and managerial positions. Therefore, HR Directors are not any worse off than other state employees in relation to the market, but it does point out the gap with average salaries.

Is There Disparity in Human Resources Directors' Current Salaries?

Overall, agencies pay HR Directors within the appropriate salary range based on the complexity of the job, but at the low end of the range. There were three agencies that paid their HR Directors more than our recommended range, but all three of these agencies had unique circumstances where the HR Director, although fully responsible for HR management, also had additional high-level responsibilities. Therefore, we did not consider these salaries inappropriate. Six agencies, however, currently pay their HR Directors lower than the range we recommend, based on the information provided at the time of our review. (See Table 3.)

Table 3

Agencies Whose HR Directors Are Paid Lower Than Recommended Range	
Agency	Action Necessary to Raise Salary to Recommended Minimum
Department of Public Safety	Agency may have to wait until next session since the agency currently has no appropriate agency-specific class to use
Education Agency	Recommended minimum salary falls within the current salary group.
Workers' Compensation Commission	Recommended minimum salary falls within the current salary group
Department of Housing and Community Affairs	Agency plans to fill a higher level position to supervise the current HR Manager position; this position should have a salary that falls within the recommended range.
Agriculture Department	Position now vacant and should be filled with a salary within the recommended range; during review, position was occupied and undervalued.
Animal Health Commission	Recommended minimum salary falls within the current salary group

Source: State Classification Office

We believe these agencies have undervalued these jobs. They should take steps to appropriately value their HR Directors' jobs. The total annual cost to the State to increase these employees' salaries is \$11,460.

Section 3:

What Should Human Resources Staff Members Be Paid?

We believe the salary ranges in Table 4 are appropriate for HR staff based on specific criteria developed by our Office.

Table 4

Recommended Salary Ranges for HR Staff Members Based on Job Category		
Job Category	General Salary Range ¹	Recommended Job Classifications
Assistant HR Director	\$50,000 - \$65,000	HR Specialist V Agency-specific manager/director class ²
HR Section or Regional Supervisor	\$40,000 - \$60,000	HR Specialist IV-V, Training Specialist IV-V, or Program Administrator III-V, or Agency-specific manager/director class ²
HR Senior Professional	\$40,000 - \$55,000	HR Specialist IV-V Training Specialist IV-V
HR Professional	\$30,000 - \$40,000	HR Specialist II-III Training Specialist II-III
HR Para-Professional	\$21,000 - \$30,000	HR Assistant HR Specialist I Training Assistant Training Specialist I
HR Clerk	\$18,000 - \$27,000	HR Clerk I-IV

Source: State Classification Office

¹Salary ranges are general and do not equate exactly to Schedule B salary groups.

²If the Legislature approves our Office's recommendation for changes to the Classification Plan, these positions could be classified in the Manager or Director series after September 1, 1999.

See Appendix 3 for our assessment of each agency's job category breakdown. Again, agencies are encouraged to determine the appropriate salary within the recommended range for their specific positions based on individual performance, agency culture, and organizational structure.

| The criteria in Table 5 were used to determine the category for each position.

Table 5

HR Job Category Criteria	
HR Job Category	Criteria
Assistant HR Director	Position in a large agency that assists the HR Director with managing HR functions and supervises all other HR staff. Assists in creating strategic plans.
HR Section or Regional Supervisor	Position that manages a specific HR functional area in a large agency or manages the HR function for a regional office. Creates or participates in creating strategic plans. Supervises a group of HR staff members.
HR Senior Professional	Position that performs advanced technical HR work under general direction. Position translates strategic plans into operational plans, policies, or procedures. May supervise or lead staff.
HR Professional	Position that performs intermediate technical HR work with an operational focus.
HR Para-Professional	Position that prepares forms and correspondence; maintains data; responds to routine inquiries; and has basic knowledge of a functional area such as benefits, classification, or training.
HR Clerk	Position that performs data entry, verification, and retrieval such as time keeping; produces reports; processes forms and correspondence; and administers basic employment testing.
Non-HR Position	Position assigned to the HR Department but does not perform true HR functions. Examples of these types of positions are Administrative Technician, Systems Analyst, or Receptionist.

Source: State Classification Office

| Table 6 compares recommended midpoint and average current salaries for HR staff with salaries of comparable positions in the private sector. State agency HR staff members are currently paid up to 18 percent behind the market. The recommended salary range is within 10 percent of the market. This range is in line with the State's compensation philosophy. Agencies need to consider moving closer to the recommended range when awarding merit increases. Salaries that are significantly behind market impact recruitment and retention of qualified staff.

Table 6

Comparison of State HR Staff Members' Salaries to Private Sector Salaries					
HR Category	Recommended State Salary Midpoint	Current State Salary (Average)	Market Salary (Average)	Recommended Midpoint to Market Index	Current Average Salary to Market Index
Assistant HR Director	\$ 57,500	\$ 58,695	\$ 53,762	1.07	1.09
HR Section or Regional Supervisor	\$ 50,500	\$ 45,428	\$ 53,188	.94	.85
HR Senior Professional	\$ 47,500	\$ 41,574	\$ 47,851	.99	.87
HR Professional	\$ 35,000	\$ 32,314	\$ 38,924	.90	.83
HR Para-Professional	\$ 25,500	\$ 24,103	\$ 28,306	.90	.85
HR Clerk	\$ 22,500	\$ 18,645	\$ 22,704	.99	.82

Source: State Classification Office

Section 4:

Is There Disparity in Human Resources Staff Members' Current Salaries?

Most agencies appropriately classify their HR staff members at the levels we recommend based on our job categories. We reviewed all HR positions within large and medium state agencies, excluding the Governor's Office, the Senate, and the Historical Commission staff since these job descriptions were not submitted to our Office. The misclassifications identified were mostly cases of agencies using non-occupationally specific series for HR staff or inconsistent classification of similar positions within the agency. There were some cases of agencies classifying at inappropriate levels within the appropriate class series.

Agencies were notified by separate letter of the identified misclassifications with recommendations for correcting them. We found only 6 percent of the 1,938 positions reviewed were misclassified. In most cases, there is little to no fiscal impact to properly classify these positions.

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

Objectives

This review had two objectives:

- Determine if agencies pay HR Directors at a competitive rate based on agency complexity
- Determine if state agencies pay human resources staff appropriately based on job classification with a statewide comparison of positions performing similar work.

This review was the first in a series of parity studies our Office intends to conduct to review occupational group salaries on a statewide basis.

Scope

Our study included HR positions at all large and medium state agencies, including the legislative agencies. We did not review HR jobs at higher education institutions. The Governor's Office and the Historical Commission did not respond to our request for any information, and the Senate did not submit job descriptions. Therefore we were unable to analyze their HR positions.

Methodology

We identified seven categories of HR jobs: HR Director, Assistant HR Director, HR Senior Professional, HR Section or Regional Supervisor, HR Professional, HR Para-Professional, and HR Clerk. We developed criteria for each of these categories, then analyzed all jobs based on data provided by the agencies. We were then able to determine if agencies had properly classified positions and if salaries were in the recommended range. The recommended ranges were based on the salary groups of recommended class titles and market data.

Market data for each of the seven categories was obtained and a comparison of state salaries to market data was conducted to determine the State's relative position in the market for HR jobs. Salary data was gathered and aged appropriately from a variety of surveys, including:

- *Watson Wyatt's 1998/1999 Report on Human Resources Personnel*
- *Compensation CompData's 1998 Compensation Data for Texas*
- *Hay's 1998 Austin Area Compensation and Benefits Survey*
- *Business & Legal Reports' Employee Compensation for September 1998*
- *Central States 1997 Survey*
- *Mercer's 1997 Survey*

Agencies were notified of specific misclassifications and recommendations for proper classification by separate letter.

Other Information

The following members of the State Auditor's staff conducted this review:

- Mary Shearer, SPHR (Project Manager)
- Matthew Levitt, SPHR
- Jeanine Pollard, CCP
- Sharon Schneider, PHR
- Juliette Torres, CCP, PHR
- Frank H. Wagner, Jr., PHR
- Gregory S. Adams, CPA, CGFM (Quality Control Reviewer)
- Kelli Dan, CCP, PHR (Audit Manager)
- Deborah Kerr, Ph.D. (Audit Director)

Appendix 2:

Complexity Level of Agencies' HR Functions

Table 7

High Complexity			
Agency Number	Agency Name	Agency Number	Agency Name
302	Office of the Attorney General	501	Department of Health
303	General Services Commission	530	Protective and Regulatory Services
304	Comptroller of Public Accounts	582	Natural Resource Conservation Commission
320	Texas Workforce Commission	601	Department of Transportation
324	Department of Human Services	655	Department of Mental Health And Mental Retardation
330	Rehabilitation Commission	694	Youth Commission
405	Department of Public Safety	696	Department of Criminal Justice
453	Workers' Compensation Commission	701	Education Agency
454	Department of Insurance	802	Parks and Wildlife Department
455	Railroad Commission		

Source: State Classification Office

Table 8

Medium Complexity			
Agency Number	Agency Name	Agency Number	Agency Name
101	Senate	360	State Office of Administration Hearings
102	House of Representative	362	State Lottery Commission
103	Legislative Council	401	Adjutant General's Department
104	Legislative Budget Board	451	Department of Banking
212	Office of Court Administration	452	Department of Licensing and Regulation
301	Governor's Office	458	Alcoholic Beverage Commission
305	General Land Office	473	Public Utility Commission
306	Library and Archives Commission	480	Department of Economic Development
307	Secretary of State	517	Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse
308	State Auditor's Office	551	Department of Agriculture
313	Department of Information Resources	554	Animal Health Commission
318	Commission for the Blind	580	Water Development Board
323	Teacher Retirement System	771	School for the Blind and Visually Impaired
327	Employees Retirement System	772	School for the Deaf
332	Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs	808	Historical Commission

Source: State Classification Office

Table 9

Low Complexity			
Agency Number	Agency Name	Agency Number	Agency Name
105	Legislative Reference Library	354	Texas Aerospace Commission
116	Sunset Commission	355	Children's Trust Fund of Texas
201	Supreme Court	356	Ethics Commission
203	Board of Law Examiners	359	Office of Public Insurance Counsel
204	Court Reporters Certification Board	364	Health Professors Council
211	Court of Criminal Appeals	367	Telecommunication Infrastructure Fund Board
213	Office of the State Prosecuting Attorney	403	Veterans Commission
221	First Court of Appeals	406	Military Facilities Commission
222	Second Court of Appeals	407	Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education
223	Third Court of Appeals	409	Commission on Jail Standards
224	Fourth Court of Appeals	410	Criminal Justice Policy Council
225	Fifth Court of Appeals	411	Commission of Fire Protection
226	Sixth Court of Appeals	450	Savings and Loan Department
227	Seventh Court of Appeals	456	Board of Plumbing Examiners
228	Eighth Court of Appeals	457	State Board of Public Accountancy
229	Ninth Court of Appeals	459	Board of Architectural Examiners
230	Tenth Court of Appeals	460	Board of Regulation for Professional Engineers
231	Eleventh Court of Appeals	464	Board of Professional Land Surveying
232	Twelfth Court of Appeals	466	Office of Consumer Credit
233	Thirteenth Court of Appeals	467	Board of Private Investigators and Security Agencies
234	Fourteenth Court of Appeals	469	Credit Union Department
241	Comptroller's Judiciary Section	472	Structural Pest Control
242	Commission on Judicial Conduct	474	Polygraph Examiners Board
243	State Law Library	475	Public Utility Counsel
312	Securities Board	476	Racing Commission
325	Fire Fighters' Pension Commissioner	477	Advisory Commission on State Emergency Commission
329	Real Estate Commission	478	Research and Oversight Council on Workers' Compensation
333	Office of State-Federal Relations	479	State Office of Risk Management
335	Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing	502	Board of Barber Examiners
337	Board of Tax Professional Examiners	503	Board of Medical Examiners
338	Pension Review Board	504	Board of Dental Examiners
340	Department of Aging	505	Cosmetology Commission
342	State Aircraft Pooling Board	507	Board of Nurse Examiners
344	Commission on Human Rights	508	Board of Chiropractic Examiners
347	Public Finance Authority	511	Board of Vocational Nurse Examiners
352	Bond Review Board	512	State Board of Podiatric Medical Examiners
353	Incentive and Productivity Commission	513	Funeral Service Commission

Table 9, concluded

Low Complexity			
Agency Number	Agency Name	Agency Number	Agency Name
514	Optometry Board	578	Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners
515	Pharmacy Board	592	Conservation Board
520	Board of Psychologists	665	Juvenile Probation Commission
526	Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Authority	705	State Board of Educator Certification
527	Cancer Council	809	Preservation Board
532	Interagency Council on Early Childhood Intervention	813	Commission on the Arts
533	Executive Council of Physical Therapy and Occupational Therapy Examiners		

Source: State Classification Office

Additional Information for Agencies With High- and Medium-Complexity Levels

Table 10

Breakdown of HR Staff Members by Category For Agencies With High- and Medium-Complexity Levels										
Agency Number and Name		Number of HR Staff Members	HR Staff Members by Category ¹							
			HRD	AHRD	SM	SP	P	PP	C	N
101	Senate	No job descriptions received.								
102	House of Representatives	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	2
103	Legislative Council	5	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	0
104	Legislative Budget Board	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	5
212	Office of Court Administration	3	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
301	Governor's Office	No job descriptions received.								
302	Office of the Attorney General	34	1	1	3	2	6	6	10	5
303	General Services Commission	15	1	0	1	2	3	4	2	2
304	Comptroller of Public Accounts	15	0	0	0	2	7	2	0	4
305	General Land Office	8 ²	1	0	1	2	2	2	0	0
306	Library and Archives Commission	5	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	0
307	Secretary of State	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
308	State Auditor's Office	6	1	0	0	2	2	1	0	0
313	Department of Information Resources	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
318	Commission for the Blind	14	1	0	1	0	5	1	2	4
320	Workforce Commission	87	1	1	8	15	36	9	14	3
323	Teacher Retirement System	10	1	0	0	4	1	3	0	1
324	Department of Human Services	188	1	0	13	7	58	35	51	23
327	Employees Retirement System	5	1	0	0	2	0	1	1	0
330	Rehabilitation Commission	64	1	0	8	13	15	17	3	7
332	Department of Housing and Community Affairs	7	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	1
360	Office of Administrative Hearings	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
362	Lottery Commission	7	1	0	0	1	3	1	1	0
401	Adjutant General	5	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0
405	Department of Public Safety	42	1	1	2	2	9	0	21	6
451	Department of Banking	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
452	Department of Licensing and Regulation	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0

Table 10, concluded

Breakdown of HR Staff Members by Category For Agencies With High- and Medium-Complexity Levels										
Agency Number and Name		Number of HR Staff Members	HR Staff Members by Category ¹							
			HRD	AHRD	SM	SP	P	PP	C	N
453	Workers' Compensation Commission	25	1	0	2	1	11	5	5	0
454	Department of Insurance	24	1	1	2	2	6	2	3	7
455	Railroad Commission	8 ²	1	0	1	1	0	3	1	1
458	Alcoholic Beverage Commission	9	1	0	0	3	2	0	0	3
473	Public Utility Commission	6	1	0	0	2	0	2	1	0
480	Department of Economic Development	4	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0
501	Department of Health	87	1	1	15	13	10	19	19	9
517	Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	1
530	Department of Protective and Regulatory Services	78	1	0	4	4	33	9	15	12
551	Department of Agriculture	6	1	0	0	1	1	3	0	0
554	Animal Health Commission	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
580	Water Development Board	5 ²	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	0
582	Natural Resource Conservation Commission	47 ²	1	0	3	7	17	4	5	6
601	Department of Transportation	225	1	0	8	91	80	28	17	0
655	Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation	408 ²	1	0	33	29	75	104	109	55
694	Youth Commission	95	1	0	3	4	42	20	24	1
696	Department of Criminal Justice	308 ²	1	0	26	16	80	50	58	68
701	Texas Education Agency	10	1	0	1	0	1	3	2	2
771	School for the Blind and Visually Impaired	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	0
772	School for the Deaf	7	1	0	0	1	0	3	2	0
802	Parks and Wildlife Department	23 ²	1	0	4	4	2	6	2	3
808	Historical Commission	No job descriptions received.								
Totals		1,938	45	5	139	237	527	359	378	232

Source: State Classification Office

¹HRD = HR Director SM = Section or Regional HR Supervisor P = HR Professional C = HR Clerk
AHRD = Assistant HR Director SP = Senior HR Professional PP = HR Para-Professional N = Non-HR Position

²Job descriptions for every staff position were not provided. Therefore, the number of HR staff members by category may not equal the total number of HR staff members.

Table 11

Ratio of HR Staff Members Compared to Total Number of Employees For Agencies With High- and Medium-Complexity Levels				
Agency Number	Agency Name	Number of HR Staff Members	Total Number of Employees	HR Staff to Employee Ratio
101	Senate	Not provided	718	Not available
102	House of Representatives	6	771	1:129
103	Legislative Council	5	390	1:78
104	Legislative Budget Board	7	123	1:18
212	Office of Court Administration	3	116	1:39
301	Governor's Office	Not provided	195	Not available
302	Office of the Attorney General	34	3,586	1:106
303	General Services Commission	15	759	1:51
304	Comptroller of Public Accounts	15	2,820	1:188
305	General Land Office	8	675	1:84
306	Library and Archives Commission	5	208	1:42
307	Secretary of State	3	237	1:79
308	State Auditor's Office	6	238	1:40
313	Department of Information Resources	3	106	1:35
318	Commission for the Blind	14	598	1:43
320	Workforce Commission	87	3,717	1:43
323	Teacher Retirement System	10	385	1:39
324	Department of Human Services	188	14,780	1:79
327	Employees Retirement System	5	296	1:59
330	Rehabilitation Commission	64	2,422	1:38
332	Department of Housing and Community Affairs	7	366	1:52
360	Office of Administrative Hearings	3	110	1:37
362	Lottery Commission	7	305	1:44
401	Adjutant General	5	410	1:82
405	Department of Public Safety	42	6,831	1:163
451	Department of Banking	3	128	1:43
452	Department of Licensing and Regulation	2	132	1:66
453	Workers' Compensation Commission	25	1,107	1:44
454	Department of Insurance	24	1,013	1:42

Table 11, concluded

Ratio of HR Staff Members Compared to Total Number of Employees For Agencies With High- and Medium-Complexity Levels				
Agency Number	Agency Name	Number of HR Staff Members	Total Number of Employees	HR Staff to Employee Ratio
455	Railroad Commission	8	859	1:107
458	Alcoholic Beverage Commission	9	490	1:54
473	Public Utility Commission	6	226	1:38
480	Department of Economic Development	4	169	1:42
501	Department of Health	87	5,654	1:65
517	Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse	6	239	1:40
530	Department of Protective and Regulatory Services	78	6,239	1:80
551	Department of Agriculture	6	473	1:79
554	Animal Health Commission	5	213	1:43
580	Water Development Board	5	302	1:60
582	Natural Resource Conservation Commission	47	2,729	1:58
601	Department of Transportation	225	14,399	1:64
655	Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation	408	23,883	1:59
694	Youth Commission	95	4,373	1:46
696	Department of Criminal Justice	308	41,650	1:135
701	Texas Education Agency	10	794	1:79
771	School for the Blind and Visually Impaired	5	506	1:101
772	School for the Deaf	7	476	1:68
802	Parks and Wildlife Department	23	3,149	1:137
808	Historical Commission	Not provided	112	Not available
State Average HR Staff-to-Employee Ratio				1:78

Sources: State Classification Office; Total Number of Employees taken from *Quarterly Report of FTE State Employees for Quarter Ending May 31, 1998*, (SAO Report No. 98-707).