

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Jalisa Broussard](#)
Subject: FW: Sunset Review on Texas Workforce Commission
Date: Friday, June 19, 2026 8:11:19 AM

From: Joseph Stolarski < >
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 7:36 PM
To: Sunset Advisory Commission <Sunset@sunset.texas.gov>
Subject: Re: Sunset Review on Texas Workforce Commission

Thank you,

This report vindicates the issues I raised while working in the IT department at TWC.

I believe my termination resulted from investigating those serious issues and the EEO complaint I filed, not from the mischaracterizations of my protected activity, whistleblowing and other allegations they used to "justify" my termination.

I asked for a name clearing hearing to remove the false claims from my public personnel file and they refused, which is illegal, by the way. Gov employees have a right to a name-clearing hearing.

I had hoped they would finally acknowledge the exculpatory evidence I provided regarding the claims they made about me and bring me back under different leadership, but they are stonewalling.

I'm not sure that the OGC and IT leadership is even being honest with the commissioners about my case. I can't imagine the commissioners wouldn't act to solve this issue if they knew all the facts.

Now it's going to end up being a public relations nightmare as my only recourse appears to be the media and litigation.

Joseph Stolarski

On Thu, Jun 18, 2026 at 6:02 PM Sunset Commission <Sunset@sunset.texas.gov> wrote:

June 18, 2026

Dear Recipient:

The Sunset Staff Report on the Texas Workforce Commission, Texas Workforce Investment Council, and Purchasing from People with Disabilities Program, as submitted to the Sunset Advisory Commission, is available for your review on our website, [sunset.texas.gov](https://www.sunset.texas.gov). To request a hard copy, contact our office at 512-463-1300 or sunset@sunset.texas.gov. The Sunset Commission has scheduled a public hearing on this report for August 12, 2026. At that time, public testimony will be taken. An agenda specifying the hearing date, time, location, and order of agencies scheduled for testimony will be available on our website as soon as the hearing is posted. You may follow announcements by the Sunset Commission on social media and our website.

If you would like to comment on this report, the Sunset Commission would appreciate hearing from you. Your feedback will be most helpful if it includes the following:

- Your position in support or opposition for each recommendation in the staff report.
- A clear, brief statement of suggested changes, if any, to these recommendations.
- A clear, concise summary of any new issues or recommendations not included in the report that you would like the Sunset Commission to consider.

If you submit your response by Thursday, July 2, 2026, we can provide this information to the Sunset Commission before the public hearing. Comments received in response to a staff report are considered public records and will be posted on the Sunset website and released to the public upon request.

Thank you for your assistance with the Sunset review process.

Eric Beverly
Executive Director
Sunset Advisory Commission

Sunset Advisory Commission
PO Box 13066
Austin, TX 78711
Phone: (512) 463-1300
Fax: (512) 463-0705
email address: sunset@sunset.texas.gov

This email is the property of the Sunset Advisory Commission and may contain material that is confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under state law. If you have received this message in error, please notify us by replying to the message and then deleting it.

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Jalisa Broussard](#)
Subject: FW: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Private/Before Publication)
Date: Wednesday, August 12, 2026 11:47:01 AM

From: sunset.website@brightleafgroup.com <sunset.website@brightleafgroup.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2026 11:13 AM
To: Sunset Advisory Commission <sunset@sunset.texas.gov>
Subject: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Private/Before Publication)

Submitted on Wed, 08/12/2026 - 10:05

Submitted by: Visitor

Submitted values are:

Choose the agency that you would like to provide input about
[Texas Workforce Commission](#)

Public Comments

1

First Name

Joseph

Last Name

Stolarski

City

Waco

State

Texas

Your Comments or Concerns

I believe my comments that went back before the staff report have been supported by the staff report as well as concerns expressed by members of the sunset advisory

committee during the staff report meeting.

Joseph Stolarski

Dec 11, 2025, 3:05 PM

to employerinfo, Office, laborinfo, joe.esparza, brent.connett, alberto.trevino,
brian.harrison, Info, bcc: auditor, bcc: sunset

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This memorandum serves as a formal report regarding the retaliatory termination of my employment on July 21, 2025. While administratively categorized as a policy violation for "misuse of position," the evidence demonstrates that this reason was pretextual, a false justification used to remove an employee for exercising his duty to report fraud, waste, abuse, and discrimination.

The Real Reason: I was terminated in retaliation for investigating external and internal fraud, irregularities with our IT contracts (unusual hiring practices, indications that several contractors were masking their location and were not working within the USA or Texas, PII going offshore and security breach potential), violation of the Texas Public Information Act, filing a protected EEO/ADA complaint and requesting reasonable accommodations.

The Strategy: Agency leadership seized upon an external complaint from UT Austin regarding my First Amendment petitioning as a pretext to launch a "fishing expedition" into my history. Their goal was to manufacture a reason to remove a whistleblower who was actively scrutinizing their activities, contracts and challenging their discriminatory practices just as Sunset Commission auditors were scheduled to review the agency.

II. THE REAL MOTIVES (VIOLATIONS OF LAW & POLICY)

Before the UT issue arose, I had engaged in three distinct forms of protected activity that exposed the agency to significant liability.

Motive A: Suppression of Fraud Investigation (Whistleblower Act)

The Activity: I was investigating a local business for Unemployment Insurance (UI) Tax Evasion (paying employees "under the table"). This investigation exposed lapses in

TWC's enforcement.

The Evidence: The Pre-Termination Notice explicitly cites my emails verifying "1099s/W2s" and "UI... fees" as "abuse of your position" and "misuse of one's position".

The Pretext: TWC categorized my brief investigation into UI payment avoidance as "conducting personal business".

Legislative Intent & Suspicious Timing: My investigation aligned with the legislative intent of HB 3700 (89th Legislature), which prioritizes the detection of this exact type of fraud. Crucially, I was fired on July 21, 2025—after this bill was signed (May 29) but weeks before it took effect (Sept 1). This timing suggests a preemptive strike to remove a whistleblower before enhanced statutory protections became active. By firing me for "conducting personal business" (detecting tax evasion), the agency penalized me for performing a function so critical that the Legislature has moved to mandate it. Labeling the detection of state fund theft as "personal business" creates an absurd catch-22 that violates public policy.

Legal Violation: Terminating an employee for reporting a violation of law (Felony Tax Evasion) to a law enforcement or regulatory authority is a direct violation of the Texas Whistleblower Act (Texas Government Code § 554.002). Additionally, firing an employee for performing a duty mandated by the Legislature (HB 3700) constitutes a termination in violation of public policy.

Motive B: Retaliation for EEO/ADA Complaint (Chapter 21)

The Activity: I requested accommodations for my disabilities and filed a complaint about religious and disability discrimination. This included asserting my right to observe an Official Optional State Holiday, for which I was mocked by staff and verbally berated ("yelled at") by my supervisor (documented via screenshots/text/email).

The Conflict: My chain of command, including Thomas Beckley, had mishandled the discrimination complaint and accommodation request, as indicated by a formal finding by legal.

The Retaliation: Thomas Beckley, the very director implicated in my discrimination complaint, was the official who signed my termination letter.

Legal Violation: Allowing the subject of an EEO complaint to fire the complainant is a

flagrant conflict of interest and evidence of retaliatory animus.

Motive C: Exposure of Severe Security Violations (Contractor Fraud & Data Sovereignty)

The Activity: I investigated credible indicators suggesting that third-party contractors were actively obscuring their physical locations to simulate presence within the State of Texas or the United States. It is my belief that these individuals were operating from foreign jurisdictions while accessing state government systems. This concern is elevated by the fact that these contractors potentially possessed access to high-impact Personally Identifiable Information (PII), specifically Social Security Numbers and potentially tax related information.

The Legal Liability: My investigation and findings could have exposed the agency to potential liability under five categories:

Governor's Executive Order GA-48 (Nov 2024): Explicitly mandates state agencies to "harden" systems against foreign access and vet contractors to protect personal information.

Texas Policy: Violations of Texas DIR Security Controls and "Data Residency" clauses prohibiting offshore access.

State Law: Potential violation of the Identity Theft Enforcement and Protection Act (unauthorized acquisition of data by foreign nationals).

Federal Policy: Violations of NIST SP 800-53 (Control AC-17) and IRS Publication 1075 (protection of Federal Tax Information).

Contract Fraud: Contractors billing for US-based work while utilizing cheaper, unauthorized offshore labor ("Ghost Employees").

III. THE EXCUSE (MANUFACTURING CAUSE)

When UT Legal Affairs complained about my First Amendment petitioning (regarding my son), TWC used it as a smokescreen to execute the termination they already wanted.

1. The "Fishing Expedition" The Pre-Termination Notice claims their investigation into me started only after UT complained. Once they had this "excuse", they scoured my email history to find anything they could label as a violation.

2. Criminalizing Compliance

Whistleblowing became "Misuse": My investigation into tax fraud was labeled "personal business".

Civil Rights Advocacy became "Unethical": My emails assisting my wife with her Age Discrimination claim ("We are not closing the matter on our end") were labeled "inappropriate".

Reporting a Crime became "Unauthorized Use of Government Time": My login to gather EEO materials and report UT to the District Attorney was labeled "unauthorized use of government time".

3. The Retroactive Policy Fix Proof that my actions were not actually fireable offenses at the time lies in the fact that 8 days after firing me (July 29, 2025), the Commission voted to amend the Ethics Policy (Section 1.10.2.2) to "expressly prohibit" access to systems for non-TWC purposes. Other, similar policy changes were made, such as the "role" one, that is in conflict with law when it regards investigating and reporting fraud.

Admission of Vagueness: By admitting they needed to update the policy to "expressly prohibit" these actions, the Office of General Counsel effectively admitted that the policy in place on July 21 was either vague or did not cover my conduct. You cannot fire an employee for violating a rule that you had to rewrite a week later to make enforceable.

Incidental Use: The standard allowance for "incidental use" of agency resources covers my handful of alleged "personal" emails over four years. Firing a whistleblower for minimal usage while ignoring similar usage by other employees is evidence of pretext.

IV. REBUTTAL TO SPECIFIC CHARGES

Below is the rebuttal to the specific claims made by TWC to justify the termination:

TWC Claim: "Misrepresented Authority to UT"

The Reality: I explicitly identified myself as acting as a "concerned parent" in a private capacity in contemporaneous emails. This qualifying language clarified the context of my communication and legally negates the claim that I was misrepresenting a personal family grievance as an official agency investigation. Finally, citing one's employment for identification purposes is common practice; terminating me for a truthful statement of

identity is a disparate application of policy designed solely to target a whistleblower. Moreover, I neither received, expected nor requested any additional benefit other than what any member of the public would receive.

Legal Protection: First Amendment (Petition Clause) and protected participation in an EEO matter.

TWC Claim: "Personal Business" (Tax Fraud)

The Reality: I was verifying felony tax evasion against the TWC, a duty prioritized by the Legislature under HB 3700.

Legal Protection: Texas Whistleblower Act (Statutory protection supersedes internal "job role" restrictions).

TWC Claim: "Inappropriate" Spousal Email

The Reality: I was advocating for my wife in an Age Discrimination case. I used the word "We" to refer to myself and my wife, and my emails were a direct response to communications she was already engaged in. TWC deliberately mischaracterized this as an attempt to assert agency authority to manufacture a violation.

Legal Protection: Texas Labor Code § 21.055 (Opposing Discrimination).

TWC Claim: "Unauthorized Use of Government Time" (Login while on Leave)

The Reality: I logged in while on leave to retrieve misdirected emails sent to my work email regarding my EEO complaint, my own EEO files and emails, email my concerns about the EEO violations, pay stubs and report a crime to the DA.

Crucially, regarding this specific timeframe: Alleged Fraud was committed by Suzanne Hays, who contacted me about entering work hours for that period. I explicitly insisted in the phone call that I was not working and instructed her not to put that time on my timesheet. I followed up with an email sent to her and Thomas Beckley, repeating my insistence not to add work hours. Despite this, my hours were entered and authorized by management against my protests and without my timesheet certification. This falsification of government records appears to have been calculated to justify my termination (by claiming I was "working" while on leave) and to intentionally interfere with my disability insurance eligibility.

Legal Protection: Texas Penal Code § 36.06 (Obstruction or Retaliation); Texas Labor Code § 21.055 (Protected Participation in EEO Process); Texas Whistleblower Act; and Texas Penal Code § 37.10 (Tampering with Governmental Record).

CONCLUSION

This termination was a calculated act of retaliation designed to purge a whistleblower immediately prior to the arrival of SAO auditors, thereby concealing the violations the Legislature and Governor have ordered agencies to address. Furthermore, it served as direct retribution for my protected EEO complaints, evidenced by the fact that the termination letter was signed by Thomas Beckley, the specific director implicated in my discrimination grievance.

On Sun, Nov 30, 2025 at 2:55 PM Joseph Stolarski wrote:
Dear Chairman Esparza, Commissioner Connett, and Commissioner Treviño:

I am writing to formally place the Commission on notice regarding the retaliatory nature of my termination on July 21, 2025, and to report specific violations of state law that agency leadership attempted to suppress.

While my termination was administratively categorized as a policy violation for "working outside my role" or "system misuse," and other false claims, the evidence demonstrates that this reason was pretextual—a false justification used to remove me for exercising my duty to report fraud, waste, and abuse as well as discrimination.

1. The "Policy" Was Retroactive (Evidence of Bad Faith) I was terminated on July 21, 2025. Eight days later, on July 29, 2025, the Commission voted to amend the TWC Ethics Policy (Section 1.10.2.2) to "expressly prohibit" access to TWC systems for non-TWC purposes and to make it a violation to act outside one's job role. The fact that the Office of General Counsel required retroactive policy changes to validate my termination confirms that my actions were not clearly prohibited at the time. You cannot fire an employee for violating a rule that you had to rewrite a week later to make enforceable.

2. State Law Supersedes Internal "Role" Restrictions The agency has taken the position that it is "unethical" for an employee to investigate fraud and other illegal activities if it falls outside their specific job description. This stance is legally invalid and violates Texas Public Policy.

Texas Government Code § 554.002 (Texas Whistleblower Act): Protects public employees who report violations of law in "good faith." The statute does not restrict this protection to employees whose specific job description is "investigator."

Legal Precedence: Internal administrative policies (such as "chain of command" or "job role restrictions") cannot supersede a public employee's statutory right and duty to report criminal activity. Retaliating against an employee for looking into as well as filing complaints regarding illegal activities is a violation of the Texas Penal Code Chapter 36 (Retaliation).

Legislative Intent (HB 3700): The 89th Legislature passed HB 3700 to specifically mandate the detection of the exact fraud I identified. Firing an employee for performing the specific duty that the Legislature mandated the agency to prioritize is a "termination in violation of public policy."

My termination was clearly an act of retaliation as well as an effort to cover up irregularities.

I am requesting that the Commission review this termination not as a "personnel matter," but as a confirmed act of whistleblower retaliation designed to hide the fraud and other violations that the Legislature has now ordered you to fix.

Respectfully,

Joseph Stolarski

Joseph Stolarski
Thu, Jan 8, 3:27 PM
to sunset

SUNSET ADVISORY COMMISSION — PUBLIC INPUT SUBMISSION PACKET
Agency Under Review: Texas Workforce Commission (TWC) — 2026–2027 Review Cycle
Submission Type: Confidential Governance-Risk Assessment (Non-Personnel) Date:
January 8, 2026

Submitter: Joseph Stolarski

Confidentiality: This submission contains sensitive information provided in good faith for

the Sunset Commission's evaluation of systemic governance risks. I request that my identity remain confidential during the staff review process pursuant to Texas Government Code Chapter 325.

Purpose of Submission: To provide the Sunset Advisory Commission with a structured, evidence-based assessment of internal-control weaknesses, policy-governance vulnerabilities, records-management risks, federal-compliance concerns, and process-accessibility failures within the Texas Workforce Commission. This submission focuses exclusively on system-level governance issues, not personnel disputes.

Availability: I am available to provide supporting documentation upon request.

CONTEXT SUMMARY

This submission identifies a series of systemic governance vulnerabilities within the Texas Workforce Commission, including retroactive policy changes, internal-control weaknesses in timekeeping, records-retention risks, inconsistent enforcement of standards, and insufficient safeguards for employees who raise compliance concerns. The report also documents continuity-of-operations failures in which critical internal processes continued during a documented medical crisis without pause or accommodation, raising concerns about procedural fairness and accessibility. These issues are presented not as personnel matters, but as structural risks affecting transparency, accountability, and compliance with state and federal requirements. The intent is to support the Sunset Advisory Commission's mandate to evaluate agency effectiveness, governance integrity, and operational reliability.

FULL GOVERNANCE-RISK REPORT

I. Purpose of Submission

This report provides the Sunset Advisory Commission with a structured, evidence-based assessment of governance risks, internal-control weaknesses, and compliance vulnerabilities within the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC). These issues are not isolated personnel matters; they reflect broader structural concerns affecting the agency's ability to:

Maintain effective internal controls

Ensure consistent policy enforcement

Safeguard sensitive data and records

Comply with federal grant and documentation requirements (Uniform Guidance)

Protect employees who raise compliance concerns

Maintain transparency and public trust

This submission is made in good faith to support Sunset's statutory mandate.

II. Executive Summary of Governance Concerns

The following systemic governance risks were identified through documented events, statutory requirements, and publicly available policy frameworks:

Retroactive policy changes used to justify disciplinary actions

Timekeeping irregularities affecting federal grant reporting accuracy

Leadership recusal concerns in internal decision-making

Inconsistent enforcement of standards among similarly situated employees

Whistleblower-related governance risks

Duty-of-care failures during a documented medical crisis

Records-retention vulnerabilities, including 30-day auto-deletion of Teams chats

Transparency failures, specifically the 99-day delay in releasing OAG-ordered records

These issues collectively indicate structural vulnerabilities appropriate for Sunset review.

III. Internal Control Failures

A. Retroactive Policy Change (Governance Risk) TWC enforced disciplinary actions under an Ethics Policy that was amended eight days later to "expressly prohibit" the conduct used as the basis for those actions.

The Fact Pattern: The original Ethics Policy remained in effect throughout employment until July 29, 2025.

The Amendment: On July 29, 2025, the Commission voted to amend Ethics Policy 1.10.2.2 to add explicit prohibitions regarding “misrepresentation of one’s role” and “accessing systems for non-TWC business.”

The Pretext: These prohibitions did not exist in the prior version under which the termination occurred on July 21, 2025.

Governance Impact: The timing of the policy amendment raises concerns about policy-governance controls, prospective clarity, and the integrity of enforcement processes.

B. Timekeeping Irregularities and Federal Grant Compliance TWC operates primarily on federal funding (WIOA, UI Administration), which requires strict adherence to Uniform Guidance (2 CFR 200.430) for time-and-effort reporting. The issues documented reflect both a specific falsification incident and a broader pattern of internal-control weaknesses.

1. Manual Falsification of Records (Specific Incident)

The Violation: A manual entry of five (5) “work hours” was added to the employee’s official CAPPS timesheet by Manager Suzanne Hays for the June 2025 pay period (June 23–24).

The Objection: This entry was made despite both verbal and written objections. On July 13, 2025, the employee wrote: “I did not ask nor want them added as work hours. I specifically said in our phone call that I wasn’t working.”

Governance Impact: Entering hours over written objection compromises the integrity of the agency’s official labor records and creates exposure under federal grant rules requiring accurate, auditable time-and-effort reporting. It also undermines the reliability of CAPPS as the system of record, which is essential for federal audits, Single Audit Act compliance, and cost-allocation accuracy.

2. Unrecorded Liabilities and Off-the-Books Practices (Systemic Pattern)

The Practice: Leadership (Director Thomas Beckley) issued recurring directives to use informal “flex time” instead of recording actual hours worked.

The Risk: This practice results in unrecorded liabilities, inaccurate labor distribution, and potential mischarging of federal grants.

Federal Compliance Impact: Uniform Guidance requires that labor costs charged to federal awards be supported by records that accurately reflect the work performed. Informal flex-time practices undermine this requirement and create exposure for questioned costs, audit findings, and potential repayment obligations. Such practices also impair the agency's ability to demonstrate compliance during federal monitoring visits and Single Audit reviews.

Governance Impact: These practices indicate systemic internal-control weaknesses and a lack of oversight in federal grant management. They also raise concerns about whether TWC's timekeeping culture aligns with federal cost principles and internal audit expectations.

C. Records-Retention and Transparency Risks TWC's policy permanently deletes all Microsoft Teams chats after 30 days and instructs employees to manually save any content that constitutes a state record. This creates multiple governance vulnerabilities involving state records law, transparency, and legal-hold compliance.

The Policy: The "Microsoft Teams Retention Policy" was implemented on May 8, 2024, and applies to 1:1 chats, group chats, and meeting chats. All content is permanently deleted after 30 days unless manually preserved.

The Structural Flaw: The policy places the burden of state-records preservation on individual employees rather than a system-level retention mechanism. Microsoft does not retain deleted Teams chats unless retention or compliance policies are configured in the Microsoft 365 Compliance Center.

Risk to State Records Compliance (TSLAC): State agencies must classify records before destruction. A 30-day auto-purge deletes content before classification can occur. Transient communications often contain decision-making context or supervisory directives that qualify as state records.

Risk to Public Information Act (PIA) Compliance: Agencies must preserve responsive records once a PIA request is received. A 30-day auto-deletion policy risks destroying responsive Teams messages before they can be identified or preserved.

Risk to Legal Holds: When an agency becomes aware of a complaint, grievance, or potential litigation, it must preserve all relevant records. A 30-day auto-purge system deletes content unless a legal hold is configured. TWC's policy does not reference any legal-hold mechanism for Teams chats.

Governance Impact: The 30-day auto-deletion of Teams chats, combined with reliance on employees to manually preserve state records, presents significant records-management vulnerabilities. It undermines TSLAC compliance, risks inadvertent destruction of PIA-responsive material, and creates legal-hold exposure.

IV. Leadership Accountability and Decision-Making Controls

A. Leadership Recusal Concerns Supervisors who were the subjects of internal complaints participated directly in disciplinary and termination decisions affecting the complainant. This raises structural concerns about impartiality and the absence of conflict-mitigation safeguards.

The Conflict: Complaints were filed against Director Thomas Beckley, Manager Suzanne Hays, and CIO Heather Hall.

The Action:

July 10, 2025 (12:12 PM): CIO Hall denied the EEO complaint appeal.

July 10, 2025 (Afternoon): Director Beckley issued the Pre-Termination Notice.

July 11, 2025: Director Beckley denied the FMLA extension request.

Governance Impact: When individuals who are subjects of complaints also serve as decision-makers in related disciplinary actions, it creates a conflict-of-interest risk. The absence of recusal standards or structural safeguards undermines confidence in the impartiality of internal processes and exposes the agency to governance vulnerabilities. Most state agencies maintain recusal protocols to prevent decision-making by individuals with a direct personal stake in the outcome. The lack of such safeguards at TWC raises concerns about governance maturity and internal accountability structures.

B. Supervisory-Control Weaknesses Documented supervisory actions include not allowing meeting recordings, failing to document ADA accommodation requests, and altering timekeeping entries. These issues indicate potential gaps in supervisory training, policy adherence, and internal oversight. These supervisory actions also indicate a lack of standardized documentation practices, which are essential for ensuring consistency, transparency, and accountability across the agency. It suggests gaps in training, oversight, and internal audit mechanisms. Such inconsistencies increase the risk of uneven enforcement, miscommunication, and noncompliance with state and federal

requirements.

V. Additional Governance Risks Relevant to Sunset Review

A. Inconsistent Enforcement Among Similarly Situated Employees Findings issued on June 24, 2025, confirmed that a coworker made “inappropriate medical inquiries” in violation of ADA confidentiality standards. That employee received a Merit Increase in October 2025. By contrast, the employee who raised compliance concerns faced adverse actions, including termination.

Governance Impact: Disparate treatment between similarly situated employees reflects internal-control inconsistencies and fairness-in-enforcement concerns. It also indicates a lack of standardized enforcement protocols, which increases the risk of selective or uneven application of agency standards. Because ADA confidentiality is a federal requirement, inconsistent enforcement also raises compliance concerns that extend beyond internal policy.

B. Whistleblower-Related Governance Risks Documented protected activities include reporting timekeeping irregularities, reporting record inaccuracies, raising compliance concerns, and filing Open Records Requests.

Governance Impact: The proximity between protected reporting activity (June 2025) and subsequent adverse actions (July 2025) raises governance-level concerns about the effectiveness of internal reporting systems. When adverse actions closely follow protected activity, it suggests structural weaknesses in safeguards designed to protect employees who raise compliance issues. Internal reporting systems exist to surface risks early; when those systems appear to correlate with adverse outcomes, it signals a governance failure rather than a personnel dispute.

C. Duty-of-Care and Continuity-of-Operations Failures During a documented medical crisis:

Pre-termination and grievance deadlines continued to run, and extension requests were denied by Director Beckley on July 11.

Substantive work was required during incapacity and active FMLA coverage.

Governance Impact: The continuation of disciplinary processes during a documented medical crisis, without pause or accommodation, raises continuity-of-operations and procedural-fairness concerns.

D. Transparency Failure: OAG Ruling Notification Delay

The Ruling: The Office of the Attorney General issued Ruling OR2025-034676 on September 29, 2025.

The Delay: The individual was not notified of this ruling until January 6, 2026—a 99-day delay, and only after asking about the status of the OAG ruling.

The Misrepresentation: During this period, the TWC GovQA portal falsely listed the status as “Waiting for AG Response.”

Governance Impact: A 3-month delay in complying with an AG ruling reflects a breakdown in PIA workflow controls and a lack of transparency.

VI. Summary of Requested Sunset Review Actions

The Sunset Advisory Commission is respectfully asked to evaluate:

Policy Governance: The practice of amending policies retroactively to justify prior discipline.

Internal Controls: The integrity of timekeeping for federal grant reporting (WIOA/UI).

Records Management: The risks of the 30-day Teams deletion policy.

Leadership Accountability: Recusal standards for managers named in grievances.

Whistleblower Protections: The safeguards for employees reporting internal compliance failures.

VII. Closing Statement

This submission is intended to support the Sunset Advisory Commission’s statutory mandate to evaluate efficiency, effectiveness, accountability, and governance. All statements are made in good faith and grounded in documented events, statutory requirements, and publicly available policy frameworks.

Additional documentation, timelines, and records can be provided upon request.

Joseph Stolarski

Thu, Jan 29, 9:40 AM

to robert.black, larry.mcmanus, Stephen.Davis, Hilary.Aguirre, bcc: sao, bcc: sunset

Hello,

I used to work for the TWC. While there, I noticed some unusual hiring practices.

Many highly qualified citizens applied for the posted positions, yet they never even received an interview for these roles.

I noticed that these positions were consistently filled via contracting companies, many under the same parent holding company. Almost all hires came from the same country.

So, the TWC IT Department was hiring contractors, who were not citizens, for roles that had or could have had access to sensitive data. Again, many qualified citizens applied for these positions but did not even receive an interview. This was a red flag for me.

Beyond the potential for contract fraud (kickbacks) occurring, there was also a security concern. I had strong reasons to believe that some of these contractors were hiding their location, and were potentially working outside the US borders.

In addition, I believe we paid these contractors more than we would have paid internal personnel who applied for these roles (considering fees to the contracting companies). I need to clarify: these roles were posted as internal positions, not for contract work. I mention this because these were not temporary jobs for projects needing a "surge" hiring via contractors.

For this to occur, some people in the agency had to ignore the "qualified citizen" requirement and falsely claim they could not find internal applicants to hire; in order to justify hiring contractors. Now, why would someone do that?

Eventually, after expressing my concerns and being ignored, I filed several open records requests. I found out something very disturbing. The agency did not track contractor citizenship status. Again, these contractors had access to sensitive and potentially dangerous state and national security data.

After I started investigating this and after my open records request, I received what I perceived to be an attempted bribe from a representative of the holding (umbrella) corporation that owned the contracting companies we were using. I received this message via LinkedIn.

I don't recall the company name or the sender's name now, but somewhere in the TWC's email system is an anonymous email I sent to Ed Serna, showing the screenshot of this bribery attempt. I sent it from a protonmail email address. Unless it was "removed," it should still be in the system. I did this anonymously because I had no idea what I was getting into. I have a family to support and a son in college. I couldn't afford to lose my job.

Well, guess what, after I opened the records request I was denied a raise and then reorganized into a toxic group. I requested a transfer repeatedly. I applied for other roles in the agency. Nothing came of any of it.

Since the environment was affecting my health, I filed a formal ADA accommodation request to be moved out of the hostile group I was placed in. No help. Nothing. I believe this was an attempt to push me out. I believe it was because I did indeed find out something very dangerous. Fraud.

I went on medical leave due to the relentless hostility directed my way. During my FMLA-protected leave, I received a pre-termination letter on July 10, 2025, and then a termination letter shortly after. This was clearly illegal FMLA Interference (demanding work while on FMLA to defend my job), but that didn't matter to my director, legal, HR, nor leadership. They wanted me out badly.

Many other adverse employment actions were taken against me. Many false and mischaracterized accusations were put in my file. I remain unemployed to this day and will likely never regain employment because of the stain they put on me, in a publicly accessible file.

In addition, my son, Benjamin Stolarski (former Governor's office intern), was persecuted at UT Austin, with direct TWC involvement. I have factual proof, in my pre-termination letter itself, that UT and the TWC were coordinating. Ben left UT after I was terminated from the TWC. So, they got me fired and pushed my son out of UT Austin, tainting him as they did to me, and greatly harming his desired future in government service.

Now imagine, why would TWC leaders risk breaking employment and other laws? I can only think that the alternative was far worse, that they were protecting far greater crimes.

I saw the Governor (who I am a supporter of), issued an h1-b notification this week. It aligns exactly with what I was investigating. But, the TWC is the entity authorized to

decide exceptions...

Given my experience, the TWC is the last agency that should vet H-1Bs or offshore staff.

Sorry for the length of this email, but I gave the essential details. I could write a book on what I found out and what occurred at the TWC. This long email is actually the brief version.

Could you please get this to the governor or more likely, the appropriate staff members?

FYI, I am emailing this to the email addresses I have access to in the Governor's office. My son interned for the Governor his freshman year at UT Austin.

Joseph Stolarski

Your Proposed Solution

Restructure the agency completely. Change leadership in IT, the OGC leadership (and staff), and FCDM

My Comments Will Be Made Public

Yes