

**U.S. Office of Personnel Management  
Office of Merit Systems Oversight and Effectiveness  
Classification Appeals and FLSA Programs**

Dallas Oversight Division  
1100 Commerce Street, Room 4C22  
Dallas, TX 75242

**Classification Appeal Decision  
Under Section 5112 of Title 5, United States Code**

<b>Appellant:</b>	[appellant's name]
<b>Agency classification:</b>	Management Analysis Officer GS-343-14
<b>Organization:</b>	Manpower and Organization Division [name of directorate and command] Department of the Air Force [name of Air Force base]
<b>OPM decision:</b>	Management Analysis Officer GS-343-14
<b>OPM decision number:</b>	C-0343-14-01

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ Bonnie J. Brandon

Bonnie J. Brandon  
Classification Appeals Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
7/7/99

Date

As provided in section 511.612 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, this decision constitutes a certificate that is mandatory and binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting officials of the government. The agency is responsible for reviewing its classification decisions for identical, similar, or related positions to ensure consistency with this decision. There is no right of further appeal. This decision is subject to discretionary review only under conditions and time limits specified in the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards, appendix 4, section G (address provided in appendix 4, section H).

**Decision sent to:**

[appellant's name and address]

Chief, Civilian Personnel Flight  
12 MSS/DPCC  
Air Education and Training Command  
Department of the Air Force  
550 D Street East, Suite 01  
Randolph Air Force Base, TX 78150-4427

Director, Civilian Personnel Operations  
U.S. Department of the Air Force  
AFPC/DPC  
550 C Street West  
Randolph Air Force Base, TX 78150-4759

Director of Civilian Personnel  
HQ USAF/DPCC  
1040 Air Force Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20330-1040

Chief, Classification Branch  
Field Advisory Services Division  
Defense Civilian Personnel Management Service  
1400 Key Boulevard, Suite B-200  
Arlington, VA 22209-5144

## **Introduction**

On March 26, 1999, the Dallas Oversight Division of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management accepted a classification appeal from [the appellant]. His position is currently classified as Management Analysis Officer, GS-343-14. The position is assigned to the Manpower and Organization Division, [name of directorate and command], Department of the Air Force, at [name of Air Force base]. The appellant does not dispute the title and series; however, he believes that the duties performed and the personal impact he has on the job warrant the position being upgraded to GS-343-15. In 1998, the appellant appealed the classification of his position to the Department of Defense Civilian Personnel Management Service (CPMS). On December 10, 1998, CPMS issued its decision, sustaining the current classification of the appellant's position. We have accepted and decided his appeal under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code.

To help decide the appeal, an Oversight Division representative conducted phone audits of the appellant's position on May 25, 1999. The audits included interviews with the appellant and the immediate supervisor. In reaching our classification decision, we have reviewed the audit findings and all information of record furnished by the appellant and the agency.

## **Position information**

The appellant is assigned to position description (PD) number [number]. The appellant, supervisor, and agency have certified to the accuracy of the position description. The PD was found to be adequate for classification evaluation.

The mission of the Manpower and Organization Division is to establish [the command] manpower policies; determine manpower requirements and allocate manpower resources; direct the development of command manpower program; evaluate the economical and effective use of manpower resources; direct the command commercial activities program; and determine the most appropriate and economical mix of the command-wide workforce. The appellant manages the command manpower and management engineering program and serves as the full deputy of the Manpower and Organization Division. His principal duties involve planning, establishing, and directing work related to determining manpower requirements, advising on the most efficient, effective, and economical organizational structures, and related matters.

## **Series, title, and guide determination**

We find that the appellant's position is best covered by the Management and Program Analysis Series, GS-343, and best titled Management Analysis Officer. Positions in this series primarily serve as analysts and advisors to management on the evaluation of the effectiveness of government programs and operations or the productivity and efficiency of the management of Federal agencies or both. These positions require knowledge of the substantive nature of agency programs and activities; agency missions, policies, and objectives; management principles and processes; and the analytical and evaluative methods and techniques for assessing program development or

execution and improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency. The work also requires skill in application of fact-finding and investigative techniques, oral and written communications, and development of presentations and reports. Similarly, the appellant's position involves planning, establishing, and directing work related to determining manpower requirements and advising on the most efficient, effective, and economical organizational structures and related matters. The appellant's position requires knowledge of management and organizational principles and manpower and management engineering functions to develop and manage resources and programs for wide-ranging command missions.

Nonsupervisory positions in the GS-343 series are evaluated by use of the Administrative Analysis Grade Evaluation Guide. Therefore, the appellant's nonsupervisory duties will be compared to criteria in that guide. Since the appellant serves as a full deputy to the division chief, the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG) is used to determine the grade level of that portion of the appellant's position. As indicated in the GSSG, the evaluation criteria are not designed to be applied directly to deputy positions. Consequently, the grade of the appellant's deputy duties must be based on an initial evaluation of the duties and responsibilities of the division chief. The GSSG also states that the grade of a full deputy should normally be set one grade lower than the grade of the supervisory duties of the position to which it reports.

## Grade determination

### ***Evaluation using the Administrative Analysis Grade-Evaluation Guide***

The guide uses the Factor Evaluation System (FES) method which places positions in grades by comparing their duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements with nine factors common to nonsupervisory General Schedule positions. A point value is assigned to each factor based on a comparison of the position's duties with the factor-level descriptions in the guide. The factor point values mark the lower end of the ranges for the indicated levels. For a position factor to warrant a given point value, it must be fully equivalent to the overall intent of the selected factor-level description. If the position fails in any significant aspect to meet a particular factor-level description in the guide, the point value for the next lower factor-level must be assigned, unless the deficiency is balanced by an equally important aspect which meets a higher level. The total points assigned are converted to a grade by use of the grade conversion table in the guide.

The appellant disagrees with the agency's and CPMS's evaluations of Factor 4, Complexity, and Factor 5, Scope and Effect. We have reviewed the other seven factors and concur with the levels currently assigned to those factors. Therefore, our evaluation will address in detail only the two factors with which the appellant disagrees.

### ***Factor 4, Complexity***

This factor covers the nature, number, variety, and intricacy of tasks, steps, processes, or methods in the work performed; the difficulty in identifying what needs to be done; and the difficulty and originality involved in performing the work.

At Level 4-5, the work consists of projects and studies which require analysis of interrelated issues of effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity of substantive mission-oriented programs. Typical assignments require developing detailed plans, goals, and objectives for the long-range implementation and administration of the program or developing criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the program. Decisions about how to proceed in planning, organizing, and conducting studies are complicated by conflicting program goals and objectives which may derive from changes in regulatory guidelines, productivity, or variations in the demand for program services. Assignments are further complicated by the need to deal with subjective concepts such as value judgments. Work is also complicated because the quality and quantity of actions is measurable primarily in predictive terms and findings and conclusions are highly subjective and not readily susceptible to verification through replication of study methods or reevaluation of results.

When developing options, recommendations, and conclusions, the employee at Level 4-5 must take into account and give appropriate weight to uncertainties about data or other variables which affect long-range program performance. For example, the employee may need to consider and assess the relative advantages and disadvantages of centralizing or decentralizing work operations in organizations with several echelons of geographically separated components. In some instances, work is complicated by the need to develop data about workload and program accomplishments which is currently unavailable. Under such circumstances, the employee develops new information about the subject studied and establishes criteria to identify and measure program accomplishments, develops methods to improve the effectiveness with which programs are administered, or develops new approaches to program evaluation which serve as precedents for others.

At Level 4-6, the employee plans, organizes, and carries through to completion analytical studies involving the substance of key agency programs. Studies are of such breadth and intensity that they often require input and assistance from other analysts and subject-matter specialists in fields appropriate to the subject. Where the assistance of other analysts is required, the employee typically serves as the team leader responsible for assigning segments of the study to various participants, coordinating the efforts of the group, and consolidating findings into a completed product (e.g., evaluation report, proposed changes in legislation or regulations, or recommended course of action). At this level, there is extreme difficulty in identifying the nature of the issues or problems to be studied and in planning, organizing, and determining the scope and depth of the study. The nature and scope of the issues are largely undefined. Difficulty is encountered in separating the substantive nature of the programs or issues studied into their administrative, technical, political, economic, fiscal and other components and in determining the nature and magnitude of the interactions. Difficulty is also encountered in discerning the intent of legislation and policy statements and in determining how to translate the intent into program actions. The

work involves efforts to develop and implement programs based upon new or revised legislation requiring consideration of the immediate sequential, and long-range effects, both direct and indirect, or proposed actions on the public, other government programs, and/or private industry.

The appealed position meets Level 4-5 in that the appellant manages a number of [command] manpower and management programs involving Base Realignment and Closure actions, Air Force directed civilian drawdown initiatives, individual base realignments, A-76 outsourcing and privatization activities, and training. Similar to employees at Level 4-5, the appellant develops new program objectives to facilitate achievement of program goals dealing with the command manpower and productivity programs, evaluates accomplishment of programs, and identifies program deficiencies and corrective actions needed. As at Level 4-5, the appellant's work is complicated by the need to analyze and evaluate interrelated issues of effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity for each aspect of the programs, as well as the impact on other [command] installations. Decisions made by the appellant are further characterized by a wide range of issues which must be considered because of the rapidly changing programs and the need to determine the effect on the command mission and other Air Force and Defense programs. The appellant must continually assess the program to determine if changes in policy or precedents are required and to identify issues which may be precedent-setting or involve complex and sensitive issues where there may be need for major restructuring of resources, realignment of organizations, and changes in manpower to meet established requirements, requests, or emergency operations.

The complexity of the appellant's work falls short of Level 4-6 where the work concerns key agency programs [Air Force department-level] and is of such breadth and intensity as to require a multidiscipline approach. In contrast, the appellant's work deals with the analyses and evaluation of manpower and organizational segments for the [command]. As illustrated at Level 4-6, analytical assignments involve efforts to develop and implement broad programs based upon new or revised legislation and are usually without precedent and of long duration. At this level, it is difficult to discern the intent of legislation and policies, and the nature and scope of the issues dealt with are largely undefined. Work at this level typically requires the development of new program objectives or legislative and regulatory initiatives to facilitate achievement of program goals and objectives. Unlike employees at Level 4-6, the appellant is not required to discern the intent of legislation and policy statements and determine how to translate the intent into Air Force-wide program actions. Work as described at Level 4-6 is indicative of work performed at higher echelons throughout the Air Force and Defense.

Level 4-5 and 325 points are credited.

#### *Factor 5, Scope and effect*

This factor covers the relationship between the nature of the work, as measured by the purpose, breadth, and depth of the assignment, and the effect of work products or services both within and outside the organization.

At Level 5-5, the purpose of the work is to analyze and evaluate major administrative aspects of substantive, mission-oriented programs. This may involve the development of long-range program plans, goals, objectives, and milestones or the evaluation of the effectiveness of programs conducted throughout a bureau or service of an independent agency, a regional structure of equivalent scope, or a large complex multimission field activity. The work involves identifying and developing ways to resolve problems or cope with issues which directly affect the accomplishment of principal program goals and objectives (e.g., the delivery of program benefits or services). Some employees develop new ways to resolve major administrative problems or plan the most significant administrative management aspects of professional or scientific programs, some develop administrative regulations or guidelines for the conduct of program operations, and some develop new criteria for measuring program accomplishments (e.g., the level, costs, or intrinsic value of benefits and services provided) and the extent to which program goals and objectives are attained.

At Level 5-5, study reports typically contain findings and recommendations of major significance to top management of the agency, and the reports often serve as the basis for new administrative systems, legislation, regulations, or programs. Typical of work products prepared by employees at this level are complete decision packages, staff studies, and recommendations which upon implementation would significantly change major administrative aspects of missions and programs or substantially affect the quality and quantity of benefits and services provided to the agency's clients.

The purpose of the work at Level 5-6 is to perform very broad and extensive study assignments related to government programs that are of significant interest to the public and Congress. The programs studied typically cut across or strongly influence a number of agencies (e.g., public assistance programs or the effects of international petroleum pricing on national energy policy). In many cases, the study assignments are of major importance to each of several departments and agencies, and, because legislation may be conflicting or unclear, there may be disagreements about which department or agency has primary responsibility for significant aspects of the function studied. Studies frequently involve extensive problems of coordination in fact-finding and in reviewing and testing recommendations in interested agencies or with outside groups.

Recommendations resulting from study assignments at Level 5-6 involve highly significant programs or policy matters and may have an impact on several departments or agencies. Analytical studies often lead to recommendations for the realignment of functional responsibilities, the expansion or contraction of key governmental functions or other equally significant changes in the future direction of programs. Thus, the analyst's findings and recommendations may result in substantial redirection of Federal efforts or policy related to major national issues. Results of work are critical to the mission of the agency or affect large numbers of people on a long-term, continuing basis.

The appealed position meets Level 5-5 in that the work is to perform very broad and extensive manpower and organizational development and design studies and programs that impact all major

[the command] missions, including flying and technical training and Air University programs. The appellant develops means, ways, and procedures to resolve problems which directly affect the accomplishment of principal [command] program goals and objectives. Typical work products contain findings and recommendations of major significance to top management.

The position does not meet Level 5-6 in that the appellant's programs do not cut across or strongly influence a number of agencies (i.e., outside of Air Force and Defense). Instead, the appellant's work concerns manpower and organization assignments which are related and pertain to [the command]. Although results of the appellant's work affect command-wide programs, and in some cases Air Force-wide programs, his work does not regularly result in significant redirection of Federalwide efforts or policy related to national issues as described at Level 5-6.

Level 5-5 and 325 points are credited.

#### *Summary of FES Factors*

In summary, we have evaluated the appellant's nonsupervisory work as follows:

	<b>Factor</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Points</b>
1	Knowledge required by the position	1-8	1550
2	Supervisory controls	2-5	650
3	Guidelines	3-5	650
4	Complexity	4-5	325
5	Scope and effect	5-5	325
6 & 7	Personal contacts and Purpose of contacts	3c	180
8	Physical demands	8-1	5
9	Work environment	9-1	5
<b>Total Points</b>			<b>3690</b>

The appellant's position warrants 3690 points. Therefore, in accordance with the grade conversion table in the guide, the nonsupervisory work is properly graded at GS-14.

#### ***Evaluation using the General Schedule Supervisory Guide***

The position serves as a full deputy. In accordance with GSSG, a deputy serves as an alter ego to a manager of high rank 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 evaluation criteria in this guide are not designed to be applied directly to deputy supervisory positions. The grade of a full deputy as defined in the referenced guide who shares fully in the duties, responsibilities, and authorities of the chief should normally be set one grade lower than the grade of the supervisory position to which it reports. The appellant does not dispute the grade level assigned to the deputy chief work of his position. We agree with the agency's evaluation of the position of the Chief, Manpower and Organization Division (a military position). The summary of our evaluation follows.

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Points</b>
1 Program scope and effect	1-3	550
2 Organizational setting	2-3	350
3 Supervisory and managerial authority	3-4	900
4 Contacts		
4A Nature of contacts	4A3	75
4B Purpose of contacts	4B3	100
5 Difficulty of typical work directed	5-7	930
6 Other conditions	6-5	1225
<b>Total Points</b>		<b>4130</b>

Using the point-to-grade conversion chart in the GSSG, the division chief's position equates to the GS-15 level. Therefore, the deputy portion of the appellant's position is appropriately graded at the GS-14 level.

### ***Impact of the person on the job***

The appellant believes that because of his unique, broad, and extensive experience in all phases of manpower and organization, a higher grade is warranted based on the concept of "impact of the person on the job." As described in the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards*, this concept is based on the premise that the special knowledge, skills, abilities, talents, or achievements of an individual may have an important effect on the duties, responsibilities, and expectations of the job held. The impact of the person on the job is reflected in the classification when the performance of a particular individual makes the job materially different from what is otherwise would be.

In our review of information in the record and during telephone interviews with the appellant and his immediate supervisor, we explored ways in which the appellant may have made the job materially different. The appellant stated that his superiors assigned certain projects to him because of his level of experience and knowledge. He also stated that he spends about a third of

his time talking with visitors who want to discuss manpower and organization issues. During the interview, the supervisor mentioned the following key points to describe how the appellant has significantly changed the job: The command is able to do things faster because of the appellant's experience and knowledge; [the command] is more respected in the "manpower and organization community" as a result of the appellant's expertise; and, if not for the appellant, [the command] may not be as actively involved or included on special projects or studies. These key points are significant only in the effectiveness, efficiency, and level of recognition brought to the organization and may properly be recognized in the appellant's performance evaluation and ratings process and through the incentive awards program. The fact that an individual in a position possesses higher qualifications or stands out from other individuals is not sufficient reason by itself to classify the position to a higher grade. The appellant's assignments and contacts are of the type and level for a position at the GS-14 level. Therefore, we find that the appellant's situation does not meet the intent of the concept of impact of the person on the job.

### **Decision**

The appellant's position is properly classified as Management Analysis Officer, GS-343-14.