

**OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
WASHINGTON OVERSIGHT DIVISION
WASHINGTON, DC 20415**

**CLASSIFICATION APPEAL DECISION
Under Section 5112(b) of Title 5, United States Code**

Appellant: [Appellant]
Position: Human Resources Officer
GS-301-13
Position Number
Organization: [Organizational location]
Department of State
Decision: Supervisory Personnel Management Specialist
GS-201-13
(Appeal denied, series and title changed)

OPM decision number: C-0201-13-01

Linda Kazinetz
Classification Appeals Officer
Washington Oversight Division

Date (December 13, 1996)

Copy of decision transmitted to:

INTRODUCTION

On August 30, 1996, the Washington Oversight Division accepted a position classification appeal from [appellant], who is employed as a Human Resources Officer, GS-301-13, in the [organizational location], Department of State. The [appellant] requested that her position be classified as Human Resources Officer, GS-301-14. Her initial appeal to the Department of State was denied and her position certified as GS-301-13 on December 12, 1995.

This is the final administrative decision of the Government, subject to discretionary review only under the conditions and time limits specified in Part 511, subpart F, of title 5, U.S. Code of Federal Regulations.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

In deciding this appeal, we considered information obtained from the following sources:

1. The appellant's letter of appeal dated August 21, 1996, with attachments.
2. The information submitted by the servicing personnel office at the Department of State on September 23, 1996.
3. The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) desk audit of the appellant's position on October 29, 1996, and an interview with the immediate supervisor, on November 19, 1996.
4. Additional written materials and work samples furnished by the appellant during the OPM review.

POSITION INFORMATION

The appellant's duties and responsibilities are described in position description [number] which was classified as Human Resources Officer, GS-301-13, by the Department of State on September 21, 1995.

The appellant is responsible for providing a variety of personnel management services to FBO supervisors and staff located either in the facility or at Foreign Service posts worldwide. The FBO work force includes over 600 domestic positions stationed at the facility (of these, about 325 are Civil Service and 80 Foreign Service, with 270 personal service contractors), and an additional 175 Foreign Service personnel and over 80 personal service contractors (PSC's) stationed abroad. The domestic work force represents a fairly wide spectrum of occupations including but not limited to architects and engineers, contract specialists, safety and occupational health specialists, fire safety specialists, interior designers, area managers, realty specialists, and the various administrative occupations, whereas the positions posted abroad are limited to the categories of facility maintenance specialists, construction engineers and architects, and construction security managers. The appellant supervises a current staff of seven specialists (classified as Human Resources Specialists, GS-301,

with career ladders to GS-12), two assistants, and one secretary. An additional PSC position has been vacant for over one year.

The type and depth of personnel management services provided by the appellant vary among the different appointment categories. For PSC's, the appellant has basically full delegated authority to carry out those actions associated with the recruitment, staffing, and classification of positions, the administration of an awards program, the termination of contracts for cause, plus certain other "employee management" services such as reviewing and approving/disapproving requests for home leave, education and separate maintenance allowances; ensuring that medical clearances and citizenship requirements are met; arranging for medical and death-in-service evacuations; and coordinating the agency's actions in regard to workers' compensation and unemployment compensation. For Civil Service employees, on October 1, 1996, the FBO was delegated full personnel authority up to the GS-13 level for recruitment and staffing, classification, employee relations and benefits, performance management, and other associated "employee management" responsibilities. The Foreign Service personnel system is administered centrally at the Department level and thus the appellant has very limited involvement and virtually no actual authority related to the assignment, classification, pay, discipline, or other actions involving Foreign Service employees.

The appellant's position description is accurate and adequate for classification purposes.

SERIES AND TITLE DETERMINATION

Series

The Department of State, in its appeal decision on the appellant's position, presented a cogent argument for classifying the position to the Personnel Management Series, GS-201, citing the discussion in that series standard of the varying levels of personnel authority that may be delegated to positions in that series and noting that full delegation of all authorities is not a prerequisite for classification to the series. The decision then, however, stated that the Department has chosen as a matter of policy to classify positions of this nature (i.e., operating-level personnel positions organizationally assigned to the Department's line program components) to the Miscellaneous Administration and Program Series, GS-301. In the interim, the appellant has been delegated further personnel responsibilities for the organization's Civil Service work force. Classification standards established by OPM under the authority of chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code, are the primary means for placing positions in their appropriate classes (i.e., series) and grades. In those instances where internal agency guidelines and OPM classification standards conflict, the OPM standards are to prevail. Thus, the appellant's position is properly classified to the GS-201 series.

The position does not, however, meet the criteria for titling as Personnel Officer and subsequent evaluation by application of Part I of the GS-201 series standard. Specifically, the standard notes on page 3 that Personnel Officer positions include "responsibility for directing or assisting in directing a total personnel management program, whether it be at the agency, intermediate echelon or installation level." Personnel Management Specialists, on the other hand, combine work included in two or more specialized personnel series but "do not involve supervision or direction of the total personnel management program for the organization served." Later on page 14, the standard

identifies the five major functions carried out by most personnel programs (placement and staffing; position classification and/or salary and wage administration; employee relations; labor relations; and employee development and training), and prescribes that "as a minimum, at least three of the technical functions, plus the related clerical and administrative functions, must be present at a personnel management rather than purely clerical level of responsibility, to support identification of the position as a personnel officer."

The FBO personnel program, with the recent delegation of authority for Civil Service positions up to the GS-13 level, includes performance of the technical and related clerical and administrative functions for staffing, classification, and employee relations. However, there are certain restrictions on the appellant's position such that she does not have full responsibility for directing the total personnel management program for the organization. Specifically, the Director, Resource Management Office, has retained signature authority for certain personnel actions, such as position classification (as the certifying official on position descriptions) and major disciplinary actions (e.g., proposal letters for suspensions and removals and some lesser actions such as written reprimands). This involvement of higher-level management in routine personnel operations detracts from the appellant's authority level and, while not affecting the technical difficulty of her position, precludes crediting the position with overall personnel program direction. For this reason, the position cannot be treated as a personnel officer position for titling or classification purposes.

Title

The authorized title for supervisory positions in this series that include the performance of work typical of three or more specialized personnel functions is Supervisory Personnel Management Specialist.

GRADE DETERMINATION

General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG)

The General Schedule Supervisory Guide is used to evaluate supervisory work that requires the accomplishment of work through combined technical and administrative direction of others. This guide uses a factor-point evaluation method that assesses six factors common to all supervisory positions. To grade a position, each factor is evaluated by comparing the position to the factor level definitions for that factor and crediting the points designated for the highest factor level which is met in accordance with the instructions specific to the factor being evaluated. The total points accumulated under all factors are then converted to a grade by using the point-to-grade conversion table in the guide.

Factor 1 - Program Scope and Effect

This factor assesses the general complexity, breadth, and impact of the program areas and work directed, including the organizational and geographic coverage. It also assesses the impact of the work both within and outside the immediate organization. To credit a particular factor level, the criteria for both scope and effect must be met.

a. Scope

This element addresses the general complexity and breadth of: (1) the program (or program segment) directed; and (2) the work directed, the products produced, or the services delivered. The geographic and organizational coverage of the program (or program segment) within the agency structure is considered under Scope.

At Level 1-2, the program segment or work directed is administrative, technical, complex clerical, or comparable in nature. The services provided have limited geographic coverage and support most of the activities comprising a typical agency field office, an area office, a small to medium military installation, or comparable activities within agency program segments.

At Level 1-3, the supervisor directs a program segment that performs technical, administrative, protective, investigative, or professional work. The program segment and work directed typically have coverage which encompasses a major metropolitan area, a State, or a small region of several States; or, when most of an area's taxpayers or businesses are involved, coverage comparable to a small city. Providing complex administrative, technical, or professional services directly affecting a large or complex multimission military installation is also creditable at this level.

A large military installation is defined in the GSSG as a military base with one or a few missions or a group of activities with a total serviced or supported employee-equivalent population exceeding 4,000 personnel, and with a variety of serviced technical functions. These personnel are directly affected by the position under evaluation. Federal civilian and military employees, estimated contractor personnel, volunteers, and similar personnel may be used to derive the population total.

A complex, multimission installation includes four or more of the following: a garrison; a medical center or large hospital and medical laboratory complex; multimillion dollar (annual) construction, civil works, or environmental cleanup projects; a test and evaluation center or research laboratory of moderate size; an equipment or product development center; a service school; a major command higher than that in which the servicing position is located or comparable tenant activity of moderate size; a supply or maintenance depot; or equivalent activities.

The appellant directs administrative activities comparable to Level 1-2 in scope. The actual serviced population totals only about 680 positions (which excludes the over 250 Foreign Service employees assigned to FBO who receive personnel servicing from the Department). This is more comparable in size to the types of organizations cited at Level 1-2 than to those at Level 1-3. The population directly serviced by the appellant's position (i.e., Civil Service employees and personal service contractors assigned to FBO) does not meet the definitions for a large or complex multimission military installation. It does not approach those examples either in terms of their magnitude (i.e., over 4,000 employees) or their complexity (i.e., a number of major organizational components with disparate missions and functions.) The FBO is a comparatively small organization with only one basic mission (the construction, maintenance, and rental of Foreign Service facilities abroad.)

b. Effect

This element addresses the impact of the work, the products, and/or the programs described under "Scope" on the mission and programs of the customer(s), the activity, other activities in or outside of the Federal Government, the agency, other agencies, the general public, or other entities.

At Level 1-2, the services or products support and significantly affect installation-level, area office-level, or field office operations and objectives, or comparable program segments; or provide services to a moderate, local, or limited population of clients or users comparable to a major portion of a small city or rural county. An example of this kind of effect would be directing budget, staffing, supply, protective, library, payroll, or similar services which support a small Army, Navy, or Air Force base with no extensive research, development, testing, or comparable missions, a typical national park, a hospital, or a nondefense agency field office of moderate size and limited complexity.

At Level 1-3, activities, functions, or services accomplished directly and significantly impact a wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, the operations of outside interests, or the general public. At the field activity level (involving large, complex, multimission organizations and/or very large serviced populations), the work directly involves or substantially impacts the provision of essential support operations to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, and administrative functions. An example of this kind of effect could include the level of support provided by the chief personnel or budget officer for a bureau or major military command headquarters, a large or complex multimission military installation, or an organization of similar magnitude.

An agency is defined in the GSSG as an Executive or military department which has primary authority and responsibility for the administration of substantive national programs enacted by Congress or a comparable independent agency, for example, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Agriculture, the General Services Administration, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The effect of the appellant's position meets but does not exceed Level 1-2. Hers is an administrative position whose direct effect is internal to the organization. In this sense, the services provided are comparable to the installation-level or area office-level operations cited at Level 1-2. The services provided do not directly and significantly impact a wide range of agency activities (FBO being a subdivision of the Department of State, which represents the agency level), the work of other agencies, the operations of outside interests, or the general public as expected at Level 1-3. In that Level 1-3 is the highest level at which administrative work may be credited, it represents the broadest and most difficult work situations of that nature. For example, at the field activity level, Level 1-3 would be represented by the director of an entire personnel management program, budget administration program, or supply operation for a bureau, major military command headquarters, or large or complex multimission military installation. In contrast, the appellant's work products do not directly support or substantially impact the provision of essential support operations to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, and administrative functions of the scope and complexity that would typically exist at a large, complex, multimission organization as defined under Scope above.

The appellant noted that other supervisory positions within FBO have been credited with Level 1-3 under this factor. However, it is assumed that many of these other positions are directly responsible for accomplishment of the mission-oriented work of the organization. By way of contrast, the appellant supervises administrative functions that support the externally-oriented, line program operations that FBO was established to carry out. Thus, those other positions may be credited with a scope and effect that extends beyond the confines of the FBO organization itself to the broader Department of State community.

Since both Scope and Effect are evaluated at Level 1-2, Factor 1 is correctly evaluated at that level.

Level 1-2 is credited.

350 points

Factor 2 - Organizational Setting

This factor considers the organizational situation of the supervisory position in relation to higher levels of management.

The appellant reports to the Chief of the Administrative Management Division, who in turn reports to an SES position. Thus, the appellant's position meets Level 2-2, in that it is accountable to a position that is one reporting level below the first SES-level position in the direct supervisory chain.

The appellant argues that since the Division Chief's position description designates her as Deputy Director of the Resource Management Office (RMO), that the appellant's position should be credited as reporting directly to the Director in accordance with instructions provided in the GSSG.

A deputy position is defined in the GSSG as a position that serves as an alter ego to a manager of high rank or level and either fully shares with the manager the direction of all phases of the organization's program and work, or is assigned continuing responsibility for managing a major part of the manager's program when the total authority and responsibility for the organization is equally divided between the manager and the deputy. A deputy's opinion or direction is treated as if given by the chief.

The Chief of the Administrative Management Division reported that for the past two years (during the tenure of the current Director, RMO), she has not served as deputy in any capacity. Even before that time, she served as "deputy" only in the absence of the Director. She did not otherwise occupy an ongoing position in the supervisory line such that she would have fully shared in directing all phases of the organization's work, where her direction would have been accepted as if given by the chief. Further, given that the Administrative Management Division is one of four divisions under the Resource Management Office, responsibility for managing the overall Resource Management Office was not equally divided between her and the Director. Thus, her position does not meet the definition of "deputy" as provided in the GSSG and cannot be regarded as such in evaluating the appellant's position.

Level 2-2 is credited.

250 points

Factor 3 - Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised

This factor covers the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities that are exercised on a recurring basis. To be credited with a level under this factor, a position must meet the authorities and responsibilities to the extent described for the specific level.

The appellant's supervisory duties match Level 3-2c, in that she exercises all of the delegated supervisory authorities and responsibilities described for that level, including the full range of first-level supervisory duties such as planning, assigning, and evaluating work, interviewing candidates for positions, hearing and resolving employee complaints, effecting minor disciplinary measures, and providing for training and development.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 3-3a. At that level, a position must exercise delegated managerial authority to set a series of annual, multiyear, or similar types of long-range work plans and schedules for in-service or contracted work. Level 3-3a presupposes the direction of a sizable organization, in additionally requiring that the position "assure implementation (by lower and subordinate organizational units or others) of the goals and objectives" for the program overseen. A position at that level must plan for long-range staffing needs, including such matters as whether to contract out work, and determine the best approach for resolving budget shortages. The employee is expected to be closely involved with high level program officials in developing overall goals and objectives, providing expertise and insights, preparing position papers or legislative proposals, and comparable activities related to high levels of program management and development or formulation.

The appellant is not delegated this degree of managerial authority, nor do the size and scope of the organization directed support the performance of this level of management activity. Any annual or long-range work plans developed by the appellant that include projects or undertakings outside the normal functional activities of the Branch (e.g., attendance at out-of-town job fairs or targeted recruitment efforts, the development of new automated personnel systems) require approval by the Division Chief or higher prior to initiation. In that the appellant's Branch represents an operating-level program, there are no subordinate organizational components (e.g., field offices) for which the appellant exercises oversight responsibility. With a subordinate staff of only seven encumbered specialist positions, planning for long-range staffing needs is not a significant requirement, and budget shortages that affect the staffing of Branch positions are largely dealt with by the Division Chief through the redistribution of Division funds or FTE's. Lastly, the appellant's dealings with high-level program officials are to discuss and resolve operating problems rather than to address the types of management issues typified by this level.

Likewise, the appellant's position does not meet the requirements described at Level 3-3b. In order to credit this level, at least eight of the fifteen supervisory authorities listed in the GSSG at Level 3-3b must be met. Their applicability to the appellant's position is as follows:

1. Not applicable. The appellant has no subordinate supervisors or team leaders.
2. Not applicable. The appellant's responsibilities in dealing with officials of other units (i.e., the various FBO components serviced by her Branch) involve primarily coordinating technical functions

related to the accomplishment of individual personnel transactions. More significant matters related to broader personnel concerns (such as the level of personnel services to be provided, the degree of authority to be delegated to operating officials, the overall policies governing how the various functional areas are to be administered) are addressed largely at the Division or Office levels. Although the Department credited this element on the basis of the appellant "advising the Deputy Assistant Secretary (DAS) on strength figures," this is an infrequent occurrence (normally a few times a year) and is largely a reporting requirement rather than the type of substantive advisory function intended at this level. Although the appellant may offer her opinion on what positions can be eliminated based on such considerations as how long they have been vacant and how actively the managers have been trying to fill them, she does not otherwise occupy a regular, ongoing role in advising the DAS on more significant personnel matters related to, for example, broad policy implementation, relationships with other organizations and agencies (e.g., servicing agreements), disciplinary actions or awards involving high-level managers, or the overall funds to be devoted to particular functions (e.g., training).

3. Not applicable. The appellant develops performance standards for her subordinates and evaluates their performance as the rating official. There is thus no opportunity for her to ensure equity of standards and rating techniques developed by others (i.e., subordinate supervisors or team leaders.) Correspondingly, with only one PSC position in her Branch, and that having been vacant for over a year, and no work otherwise being contracted out by the Branch, her subordinates would not be called upon on a regular basis to assess contractor capabilities or performance.

4. Not applicable. The funding level of the appellant's Branch does not approach the multimillion dollar level.

5 and 6. Not applicable. There are no subordinate supervisors or team leaders.

7. Applicable. The appellant makes selections for subordinate nonsupervisory positions.

8. Not applicable. There are no subordinate supervisory or team leader positions.

9. Not applicable. Regardless of whether the appellant may be theoretically delegated responsibility for hearing and resolving group grievances or serious employee complaints, with a staff of only ten employees the occasion to exercise this responsibility is negligible.

10. Not applicable. Approval authority for serious disciplinary actions involving the appellant's staff resides with the Division Chief.

11. Not applicable. The appellant would not be authorized to approve nonroutine, costly, or controversial training for her subordinates, should such proposals even arise, without receiving clearance from the Division Chief.

12. Not applicable. With only one authorized PSC position in her Branch, now vacant for the past year, there is limited opportunity to assess and authorize payment for contractor-performed work.

13. Not applicable. The appellant approves within-grade increases for her employees. However, the limited travel done by her staff (mostly to occasional job fairs) must be cleared by the Division Chief, and overtime can only be approved within pre-determined limits.

14. Applicable. The appellant recommends awards and promotions for her staff, subject to higher-level approval.

15. Not applicable. There is no evidence of the types of office re-engineering or team-building addressed in this element, and limited opportunity for such given the small size of the staff.

Since only two (rather than eight) of the above supervisory authorities are present in the appellant's position, Level 3-3b is not creditable.

Level 3-2 is credited.

450 points

Factor 4 - Personal Contacts

This is a two-part factor which assesses the nature and the purpose of personal contacts related to supervisory and managerial responsibilities. The same contacts that serve as the basis for the level credited under Subfactor 4A must be used to determine the correct level under Subfactor 4B.

Subfactor 4A - Nature of Contacts

This subfactor covers the organizational relationships, authority or influence level, setting, and difficulty of preparation associated with making personal contacts involved in supervisory and managerial work. To be credited, the level of contacts must contribute to the successful performance of the work, be a recurring requirement, have a demonstrable impact on the difficulty and responsibility of the position, and require direct contact.

At Level 4A-2, there are frequent contacts with higher-ranking managers, supervisors, and staff of program, administrative, and other work units throughout the field activity, installation, command (below major command level) or major organization level of the agency. These contacts may be informal, occur in conferences and meetings or over the telephone, and sometimes require special preparation.

At Level 4A-3, there are frequent contacts with high-ranking managers, supervisors, and technical staff at bureau and major organization levels of the agency, with agency headquarters administrative support staff, or with comparable personnel in other Federal agencies. These contacts include those which take place in meetings and conferences and unplanned contacts for which the employee is designated as the contact point by higher management. They often require extensive preparation of briefing materials or up-to-date technical familiarity with complex subject matter.

A major organization is defined in the GSSG as an organizational level next below bureau level, the head of which reports directly to the bureau director. At agency headquarters, major organizations include the offices of the heads of major staff functions at the agency level (e.g., agency personnel,

budget, or administrative services directorates), and major line organizations, the heads of which report directly to an Assistant Secretary or other office next below the Secretary of the agency.

A bureau is defined in the GSSG as an organizational unit next below the agency level, headed by an appointed executive who reports to the agency director.

The appellant's personal contacts, which are primarily with managers and staff throughout FBO, match Level 4A-2. The FBO is a component of the Bureau of Administration, which is itself an additional level below agency level (i.e., the Bureau head does not report directly to the agency director.) It is, however, headed by a Deputy Assistant Secretary who reports directly to an Assistant Secretary. Thus, FBO may be regarded as meeting the definition for "major organization" as defined above. The appellant does not have frequent contacts with high-ranking managers and technical staff at the bureau level, or with comparable personnel in other Federal agencies, as expected at Level 4A-3. Her contacts at other bureaus within the Department are primarily with her counterparts in other personnel offices and with working-level (rather than high-ranking) technical staff in the legal office, OIG, medical office, and transportation office. Her most frequent contacts outside the Department are with technical staff, rather than high-level program officials, at OPM and occasionally OMB. Further, although the appellant's contacts with managers and supervisors and any of these other individuals may sometimes require the preparation of background materials to discuss operating problems related to the functions supervised, they would seldom require the kind of extensive preparation of briefing materials for formal presentations expected at Level 4A-3.

Level 4A-2 is credited.

50 points

Subfactor 4B - Purpose of Contacts

This subfactor covers the purpose of the personal contacts credited in Subfactor 4A, including the advisory, representational, negotiating, and commitment-making responsibilities related to supervision and management.

The purpose of the appellant's contacts matches Level 4B-2. Consistent with this level, the appellant's contacts with the individuals identified under Subfactor 4A are for the purposes of planning and coordinating the provision of personnel services and resolving differences between her subordinates and clients related to procedural and regulatory requirements.

The purposes of the appellant's contacts do not meet Level 4B-3. At that level, the purpose of the contacts is to justify, defend, or negotiate in representing the program or unit, in obtaining or committing resources, and in gaining compliance with established policies, regulations, or contracts. Level 4B-3 requires the necessary level of authority to be able to commit resources and gain compliance with established policies of the organization. In order to represent the organization in program defense or negotiations, a supervisor must necessarily have the requisite control over resources and the authority necessary to gain support and compliance on policy matters. The appellant does not have this level of authority. Although she is required to justify her staffing requirements, she does not engage in contacts to obtain financial resources for her unit. Since the personnel services she provides are established, provided equally to all serviced units, and are reactive

to the needs of the organization, she is neither called upon, nor would she have the authority, to negotiate the commitment of resources for particular projects. For example, if another agency were to request personnel servicing from FBO, she would not have the authority to commit the organization to such an arrangement or cooperative agreement. Further, in those cases where a higher-level manager challenges the interpretation or application of established policies or regulations related to the personnel services provided, these matters are generally elevated to the appellant's first-level (or higher) supervisor, who plays a major role in defending the actions taken and negotiating to gain compliance.

Level 4B-2 is credited.

75 points

Factor 5 - Difficulty of Typical Work Directed

This factor measures the difficulty and complexity of the basic work most typical of the organization directed, as well as other line, staff, or contracted work for which the supervisor has technical or oversight responsibility, either directly or through subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or others.

Under the GSSG, the base level of work supervised by first level supervisors is the highest grade which: (1) best characterizes the nature of the basic (mission-oriented) nonsupervisory work performed or overseen by the organization directed, and (2) constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload or duty time of the organization. Excluded from consideration in determining the base level are supervisory positions whose grades are based on the supervisory duties performed, and lower-level positions that primarily support the basic work of the unit.

There are a total of ten encumbered positions in the Human Resources Branch, seven of which are classified at or on career ladders to the GS-12 level. Assuming that these positions are properly graded, given the recent delegation of personnel authorities to the FBO that thus increases the technical difficulty of the work performed, GS-12 is identified as the base level of work supervised.

According to the chart provided in the GSSG, if the highest level of base work is GS-12, the factor level to be credited is Level 5-7.

Level 5-7 is credited.

930 points

Factor 6 - Other Conditions

This factor measures the extent to which various conditions contribute to the difficulty and complexity of carrying out supervisory duties, authorities, and responsibilities.

The appellant's position fully meets and partially exceeds Level 6-4. At this level, first-level supervision requires substantial coordination and integration of a number of major work assignments or projects of professional, scientific, technical, or administrative work comparable in difficulty to the GS-11 level. Such coordination may involve integrating the work of a group or team where each member contributes a portion of the analyses, information, proposed actions, or recommendations, and/or ensuring compatibility and consistency of interpretation, judgment, logic, and application of

policy. By comparison, the appellant must ensure that actions taken by her subordinates are consistent not only with formal policies and regulations but with established internal practices and precedents, and that individual personnel issues involving similar circumstances are treated in like manner. Further, there are occasional projects requiring participation by all or most of the Branch staff, such as major reorganizations and the annual performance review, where the appellant must coordinate and integrate the separate components to complete the overall product. This level is exceeded only in the respect that the work supervised is classified at the GS-12 rather than the GS-11 level.

Level 6-5, however, is not met. At that level, first-level supervision requires significant and extensive coordination and integration of a number of important projects or program segments of professional, scientific, technical, managerial, or administrative work comparable in difficulty to the GS-12 level. Supervision at that level involves major recommendations that have a direct and substantial effect on the organization and projects managed. For example, the supervisor would make major recommendations in at least three of the areas listed below:

1. Significant internal and external program and policy issues affecting the overall organization, such as those involving political, social, technological, and economic conditions - Not applicable. Personnel policy responsibility resides at the Department level.
2. Restructuring, reorienting, recasting immediate and long range goals, objectives, plans, and schedules to meet substantial changes in legislation, program authority, and/or funding - Not applicable. The nature of the ongoing work performed, i.e., the provision of required personnel services, is not particularly amenable to this type of manipulation in terms of objectives, plans, and scheduling. The work is basically reactive rather than self-generated and is largely driven by management requests and expectations or required time frames. While changes in regulations or delegations of authority may increase or decrease the workload, and changes in funding levels may affect the resources available to carry out the assigned functions, these do not significantly alter the fundamental goals and objectives of the work.
3. Determinations of projects or program segments to be initiated, dropped, or curtailed - Not applicable. The functions carried out by the appellant's Branch are established and are necessary to the operation of the organization.
4. Changes in organizational structure - Not applicable. The small size of the appellant's Branch, with no subordinate units, does not lend it itself to any significant changes in structure.
5. The optimum mix of reduced operating costs and assurance of program effectiveness, including introduction of labor saving devices, automated processes, and similar methods - Not applicable. The operating costs of the Branch are stable with limited introduction of technological improvements to reduce manpower needs. Although the appellant has developed or adopted a few automated systems to facilitate certain personnel processes, these have not been of a magnitude or scope sufficient to affect the Branch's staffing requirements.

6. The resources to devote to particular programs (when staff years and a significant portion of an organization's budget are involved) - Not applicable. The appellant's subordinates are each assigned designated organizational components for which they provide the range of personnel services. There would be no requirement for the appellant to reassign staff internally for long periods of time to carry out other projects outside the realm of their regular operating assignments.

7. Policy formulation and long range planning in connection with prospective changes in functions and programs - Not applicable. As noted previously, personnel policy is promulgated at the Department level.

Since none of these elements is applicable to the appellant's position, Level 6-5 cannot be assigned.

Level 6-4 is credited.

1120 points

Summary of Factors

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Level</u>	<u>Points</u>
1. Program Scope and Effect	1-2	350
2. Organizational Setting	2-2	250
3. Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised	3-2	450
4. Personal Contacts		
4A. Nature of Contacts	4A-2	50
4B. Purpose of Contacts	4B-2	75
5. Difficulty of Technical Work Directed	5-7	930
6. Other Condition	6-4	<u>1120</u>
TOTAL POINTS		3225

The total of 3225 points falls within the GS-13 range (3155-3600 points) on the point-to-grade conversion chart provided in the GSSG.

Personnel Management Series Standard, GS-201, Part II

This standard can be used to assess the grade value of any nonsupervisory work that may be performed by the appellant. It would not, however, yield a higher grade than that derived through application of the GSSG above. The standard only provides grade-level criteria to the GS-13 level. Operating-level personnel work, which constitutes the basic activities of the appellant's Branch, is not described beyond the GS-12 level. The appellant does not have any responsibilities in program evaluation or development to provide comparison to GS-13 level criteria.

DECISION

The appealed position is properly classified as Supervisory Personnel Management Specialist, GS-201-13.

This decision constitutes a classification certificate issued under the authority of section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code. This decision is mandatory and binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting officials of the Government. In accordance with section 511.702 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, this decision must be implemented no earlier than the date of the decision and not later than the beginning of the sixth pay period following the date of the decision.