

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

Washington Oversight Division  
1900 E Street, NW., Room 7675  
Washington, DC 20415-6000

**Classification Appeal Decision  
Under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code**

**Appellant:** [name]

**Agency classification:** Financial Management Administrator  
GS-501-12

**Organization:** [division]  
[directorate]  
[area support group]  
Department of the Army  
[city and country]

**OPM decision:** GS-501-12 (“Supervisory” prefix)  
(title discretionary)

**OPM decision number:** C-0501-12-01

/s/

\_\_\_\_\_  
Linda Kazinetz  
Classification Appeals Officer

May 31, 2001\_\_\_\_\_

Date

As provided in section 511.612 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, this decision constitutes a classification 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 title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, sections 511.605, 511.613, and 511.614, as cited in the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards*, appendix 4, section G (address provided in appendix 4, section H).

### **Decision sent to:**

**Appellant:**

[name]

**Agency:**

[servicing personnel officer]

Ms. Janice W. Cooper  
Chief, Classification Appeals  
Adjudication Section  
Department of Defense  
Civilian Personnel Management Service  
1400 Key Boulevard  
Arlington, Virginia 22209-5144

Ms. Alice Ward  
Chief, Policy Management Division  
Civilian Personnel Directorate  
Headquarters, United States Army, Europe,  
and Seventh Army  
Unit 29351  
APO AE 09014

Mr. David Snyder  
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
Civilian Personnel Policy/Civilian Personnel  
Director for Army  
U. S. Department of the Army  
Room 23681, Pentagon  
Washington, D.C. 20310-0300

## **Introduction**

On December 11, 2000, the Washington Oversight Division of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a position classification appeal from [appellant], who is employed as a Financial Management Administrator, GS-501-12, in the [division], [directorate], [area support group] (ASG), Department of the Army, in [city and country]. [Appellant] requested that his position be classified as GS-501-13. This appeal was accepted and decided under the provisions of section 5112 of title 5, United States Code.

A telephone interview was conducted by a Washington Oversight Division representative on April 6, 2001. This appeal was decided by considering the audit findings and all information of record furnished by the appellant and his agency, including his official position description, [number], classified by the servicing personnel office as Financial Management Administrator, GS-501-12, on January 16, 1995.

## **Position Information**

The appellant is the chief of the [division], which provides budget and financial services for all morale, welfare, and recreation (MWR) operating activities serving the [three cities] military communities. These activities include 45 facilities (e.g., post libraries, theaters, bowling centers, campgrounds, child development centers, community centers, etc.) staffed by over 400 employees. The functions supervised by the appellant include budget formulation and execution, the Utilities Tax Exemption Program (UTEF), property management, and automation. The appellant is designated as the fund manager for both the [ASG number] MWR Fund and the [ASG number] Lodging Fund. These consist of about \$9 million in nonappropriated funds (the money taken in by the facilities on a yearly basis), supplemented by about \$3-5 million in annual appropriated funds. The appellant's position description and other supporting material submitted with the appeal contain more detailed information regarding his duties.

## **Series Determination**

The appellant's position is properly assigned to the Financial Administration and Program Series, GS-501, which includes positions involving work classifiable in more than one series in the GS-500 Accounting and Budget Group, when no one series dominates the work. Neither the appellant nor the agency disagrees.

## **Title Determination**

Since there are no titles prescribed for the GS-501 series, the position may be titled at the agency's discretion. However, since the position meets the minimum requirements for coverage by the General Schedule Supervisory Guide, the prefix "Supervisory" must be added to the title.

## **Grade Determination**

### ***Evaluation Using the GS-500 Job Family Standard***

The Job Family Standard for Professional and Administrative Work in the Accounting and Budget Group, GS-500, dated December 2000, provides grading criteria for two-grade interval series in the GS-500 group. It replaces the previous occupation-specific standards for those series, including the standard for the Budget Analysis Series, GS-560, dated July 1981.

This standard is written in the Factor Evaluation System (FES) format, under which factor levels and accompanying point values are to be assigned for each of the following nine factors, with the total then being converted to a grade level by use of the grade conversion table provided in the standard. The factor point values mark the lower end of the ranges for the indicated factor levels. For a position 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, the point value for the next lower factor level must be assigned, unless the deficiency is balanced by an equally important aspect that meets a higher level.

#### ***Factor 1, Knowledge Required by the Position***

This factor measures the nature and extent of information an employee must understand in order to do the work, and the skills needed to apply that knowledge.

The knowledge required by the appellant's position meets Level 1-7. At that level, work requires intensive knowledge of the policies, regulations, and objectives of a functional area such as financial oversight or budget formulation and execution, sufficient to analyze and evaluate changes in program plans and funding and their effect on financial and budget program milestones, and to develop recommendations for budgetary actions where there are such complicating features as gaps in program and budgetary information, lack of predictive data, or conflicting program and budgetary objectives. This is the highest level for salary and expense budgeting of a support nature in a Federal agency.

The appellant's position requires a thorough command of Federal and DoD budget policies, regulations, guidelines, and processes in order to evaluate changes in program requirements and determine how they affect both the obligation and expenditure of current funds and future year budgetary requests; to identify potential funding deficiencies based on observation of trends; and to analyze funding decreases for impact on program operations and recommend ways to balance deficiencies. Consistent with this level, the appellant budgets for salaries and operating expenses rather than for substantive (i.e., mission-oriented) programs, missions, or operations.

The position does not meet Level 1-8. At that level, work requires mastery of budgetary concepts, principles, practices, laws, and regulations, and the relationship between subordinate and most senior levels of budgeting within the employing entity, sufficient to perform such duties as analyzing *national level programs* or exceptionally large and complex programs (e.g., multi-million dollar research grants); developing, recommending, and implementing budgetary *policies*; and interpreting and assessing the impact of new and revised *legislation* on budget formulation and execution.

The appellant manages the operating budget and provides financial services for MWR facilities at three field activities rather than for a national-level program. Further, he does not occupy a staff-level position involving the development of budget policies or the interpretation of legislation for impact on the agency budget process or financial operations. Guidance of this nature is prepared at higher organizational levels within the Department of the Army.

Level 1-7 is credited.

1250 points

### *Factor 2, Supervisory Controls*

This factor covers the nature and extent of direct or indirect controls exercised by the supervisor, the employee's responsibility, and the review of completed work.

The level of responsibility under which the appellant works is comparable to Level 2-4. At that level, the supervisor outlines overall objectives and available resources and discusses with the employee time frames, scope, and possible approaches. At this level, the employee is fully experienced in applying concepts and methodologies and is considered a technical authority with responsibility for planning and carrying out the work, directing other functional specialists, resolving most conflicts that arise, coordinating with others, and interpreting policy and regulations. The employee keeps the supervisor informed of progress and potential controversies, such as the need for supplemental appropriations and inability to meet key budget deadlines. Completed work is reviewed for soundness of overall approach, effectiveness in meeting requirements or expected results, and feasibility of recommendations.

In his capacity as the fund manager of the [ASG number] MWR and Lodging Funds, the appellant functions in effect as the technical authority on budgetary and financial matters for the activities. He works independently in planning and directing the work of other staff members, resolving technical problems as they arise, coordinating with activity managers, interpreting policy and regulations, and keeping the supervisor informed of potential funding deficiencies or sensitive issues. His work is reviewed only from an overall standpoint in terms of his effectiveness in meeting budgetary deadlines and in managing the organization's finances such that deficiencies are promptly identified and funds are obligated and expended in a timely manner.

The position does not meet Level 2-5. At that level, the supervisor provides *administrative and policy* direction in terms of *broadly defined missions* or functions. The employee is responsible for a *significant program or function*; defines objectives and interprets policy promulgated by

authorities *senior to the immediate supervisor*; independently plans, designs, and carries out the work to be done; and is a technical authority. The supervisor reviews the work for fulfillment of objectives and the effect of the employee's advice and decisions on the overall program, and evaluates the employee's recommendations for new systems, methods, projects, or program emphasis in terms of availability of funds and resources. The supervisor rarely makes significant changes to the employee's work.

This level covers positions with program management authority to define the overall objectives, parameters, and activities of a significant program. Positions at this level are located at high levels in the organization, in effect the first level below the policy promulgation level, without benefit of intervening levels that develop interpretive guidance. The appellant does not have the types of managerial responsibilities intended by the standard at this level. He supervises operating-level budgetary and financial services of a support nature for three small activities, at multiple levels below the policy promulgation level in the agency.

Level 2-4 is credited.

450 points

### *Factor 3, Guidelines*

This factor covers the nature of the guidelines used and the judgment needed to apply them.

The guidelines used by the appellant match Level 3-3. At that level, guidelines typically provide preferred approaches or describe generally accepted standards rather than precisely delineating requirements. An example would be agency handbooks developed at higher echelons covering a range of budget operations and procedures that the employee must either implement or consider in establishing local office practices. The employee must use judgment to adapt the guidelines to specific cases or problems and to interpret a large number of varied policies and regulations.

The appellant administers budgetary and financial services for field-level activities, for which there is ample guidance issued by higher-level budgetary authorities within the agency on the procedures that must be followed in requesting and managing funds and the basic systems and processes that must be employed.

The position does not meet Level 3-4. At that level, the employee works in situations where guidelines and policies are scarce, very general, or conflicting, and where documentation of earlier work is unavailable or inapplicable. The employee routinely develops specific objectives and devises new methods and criteria for identifying trends and patterns; acquiring information and analyzing data; and developing solutions and presenting findings. The employee may interpret available guidance for employees at the same or subordinate levels.

Since the appellant works at the basic operating level in terms of budget and financial administration, guidelines and policies for carrying out the work are readily available. In addition, since expenses are limited to salaries and other operating expenditures and the activities are relatively stable, precedent budget documentation and submissions would be generally applicable.

Level 3-3 is credited.

275 points

*Factor 4, Complexity*

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

The complexity of the appellant's work is comparable to Level 4-3. At that level, the work consists of performing varied duties by applying different and unrelated, but established methods, practices, and techniques where the organizations and activities budgeted for are relatively stable; funding is from readily identifiable sources such as allotments and reimbursements; information may pertain to past, present, and future cost of basic administrative programs and services; programs and services involve such items as salaries and wages of employees, office supplies, equipment, and travel; and the timing of financial transactions may involve the acquisition, distribution, and transfer of funds. The employee compiles, analyzes, and summarizes budgetary information; translates organizational needs and objectives into budget dollars; and may recommend the approval or disapproval of requests for allotment of funds. The employee bases decisions on the amount of funds in an account; deadlines integral to the budget cycle; and local controls over and regulations pertaining to spending.

This basically characterizes the appellant's position in that he budgets for and administers funds representing the operating expenses for MWR activities at three field locations. These expenses include salaries, supplies, equipment, travel, printing, and other administrative expenses. The activities are relatively stable in terms of their staffing and administrative needs, and funding is derived from readily identifiable sources, i.e., appropriated and nonappropriated funds. The appellant's responsibility as fund manager is covered by the criteria at this level, where employees recommend the approval or disapproval of funding requests.

The position does not meet Level 4-4. At that level, work consists of performing a variety of analytical, technical, and administrative work for *substantive programs* and support activities funded through a number of sources such as appropriations, allotments, reimbursable accounts, and transfers of funds between organizations. Programs and funding are unstable, requiring frequent adjustments to budget estimates or conducting partial re-budgeting during the fiscal year. Program funding may extend for several years or more. The budget typically includes a wide range of object classes and line items for one or a few substantive programs and organizations, or fewer object classes and accounts through which a wide range of programs is funded.

The appellant's work involves funding for support activities rather than for substantive programs. The funding is not as complex and varied as expected at this level, and the activities are stable in the sense that their annual funding needs do not vary significantly from year to year.

Level 4-3 is credited.

150 points

*Factor 5, Scope and Effect*

This factor covers the relationship between the nature of the work, and the effect of the work products or services both within and outside the organization.

The scope and effect of the appellant's work match Level 5-3. At that level, work involves conducting a variety of tasks in limited functional areas. Examples of scope at this level include applying specific budgetary rules and regulations related to segments of the budget for assigned support activities, or using conventional accounting methods to reconcile payroll data and to analyze internal controls over accounts receivable overpayments. The work affects the operation of systems or programs, information on the amount, timeliness, and availability of funds, the economic well-being of people, and/or the availability of accounting data.

Correspondingly, the appellant's responsibilities encompass conventional budget development and execution work and accounting clerical functions. The work affects the operation of the activities funded through the development of budget requests and ongoing financial management, and defrays energy expenses for military personnel in the field locations through the administration of the UTEP program.

The position does not meet Level 5-4. At that level, the work involves executing modifications to systems, programs, or operations, or establishing criteria to assess, investigate, or analyze a variety of unusual problems and conditions, where the work involves a *wide range of agency activities*. For example, the employee may formulate and monitor the execution of long-range (3-5 years or longer) detailed budget forecasts and plans to fund the implementation of substantive agency programs and projects.

The scope of the appellant's work is limited to three field activities rather than agencywide activities and does not involve budgeting for substantive programs.

Level 5-3 is credited.

150 points

*Factor 6, Personal Contacts*

*and*

*Factor 7, Purpose of Contacts*

These factors include face-to-face and telephone contacts with persons not in the supervisory chain, and the purpose of the contacts. The relationship between Factors 6 and 7 presumes that the same contacts will be evaluated under both factors.

Under *Personal Contacts*, the appellant's position meets Level 3, where contacts are with various levels of agency management, executives and officials of outside organizations and businesses, and representatives of State and local governments. This covers the appellant's contacts with higher level agency management, local government officials, and executives of local utility companies. Level 4 is not met, where contacts are with high-ranking officials from



outside the agency at *national or international levels*. The appellant has no contacts of this nature.

Under *Purpose of Contacts*, the appellant's position meets Level C, where contacts are to influence or persuade others when there is wide disagreement on the merits of a proposed action. This credits the appellant's responsibility for negotiating contracts with local utility companies. Level D is not met, where contacts are to justify, defend, negotiate, or settle matters involving significant or controversial issues. Examples include defending alternative methods of financing *substantive program operations* or the redistribution of funds and programs among components *immediately below agency level*, or negotiating and resolving controversial financial and program issues of considerable significance which are not susceptible to resolution at lower echelons in government. Positions with this level of contacts would be located at much higher levels in the agency than the field level operations for which the appellant is responsible.

Level 3C is credited.

180 points

#### *Factor 8, Physical Demands*

This factor covers the requirements and physical demands placed on the employee by the work situation.

The position matches Level 8-1, which covers sedentary work.

Level 8-1 is credited.

5 points

#### *Factor 9, Work Environment*

This factor considers the risks and discomforts in the employee's physical surroundings or the nature of the work assigned and the safety regulations required.

The position matches Level 9-1, which describes a typical office environment.

Level 9-1 is credited.

5 points

### *Summary*

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Level</u>	<u>Points</u>
Knowledge Required	1-7	1250
Supervisory Controls	2-4	450
Guidelines	3-3	275
Complexity	4-3	150
Scope and Effect	5-3	150
Personal Contacts/ Purpose of Contacts	3C	180
Physical Demands	8-1	5
Work Environment	9-1	<u>5</u>
Total		2465

The total of 2465 points falls within the GS-11 range (2355-2750) on the grade conversion table provided in the standard.

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

The General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG) is a cross-series guide used to determine the grade level of supervisory positions in the General Schedule. The GSSG has six evaluation factors, each with several factor level definitions and corresponding point values. Positions are evaluated by crediting the points designated for the highest level met under each factor, and converting the total to a grade by using the grade conversion table provided in the guide.

#### *Factor 1, Program Scope and Effect*

The element *Scope* addresses the complexity and breadth of the program directed and the services delivered. The geographic and organizational coverage of the program within the agency structure is included under this element.

Under *Scope*, the position meets Level 1-2 in terms of the complexity of the work directed (i.e., administrative, technical, complex clerical, or comparable work), since the appellant supervises employees engaged in a variety of administrative and complex clerical work, including budget analysts, computer specialists, and accounting technicians. Level 1-2 is likewise met in terms of the organizational coverage of the work within the agency structure (e.g., a typical agency field office or area office), in that the appellant provides budgetary and financial services for three field activities.

Level 1-3 is not met because the organizational coverage within the agency structure does not encompass a small region, nor does it involve the provision of complex administrative, technical,

or professional services *directly* affecting a large or complex multimission military installation (e.g., a large installation with a total serviced population exceeding 4000 personnel, or a multimission installation including a combination of such facilities as a garrison, medical center, research laboratory, service school, supply or maintenance depot, or equivalent activities.) In the appellant's case, organizational coverage of the administrative (as opposed to clerical) work supervised is limited to MWR facilities at three field sites.

The element *Effect* addresses the external impact of the program.

Under *Effect*, the position matches Level 1-2, where services affect area office level or field office operations, rather than Level 1-3, where services directly and significantly impact a *wide range of agency activities* or the work of other agencies. The appellant's work affects field level operations rather than agencywide programs or activities.

The appellant's position generally matches a Level 1-2 illustration provided in the guide where the supervisor "directs budget, management, staffing, supply, maintenance, protective, library, payroll, or similar services which support a small Army, Navy, or Air Force base . . . a typical national park, a hospital, or a nondefense field office of moderate size and limited complexity. The services provided directly or significantly impact other functions and activities throughout the organizations supported and/or a small population of visitors or users." (A small population of users is defined as being comparable to a major portion of a small city or rural county.)

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's immediate supervisor is the Director, [directorate], (GS-14), his second-line supervisor is the Deputy Community Commander (GS-14), and his third-line supervisor is the Community Commander (full Colonel). Thus, his position is more than two levels below the first SES, flag or general officer position in the direct supervisory chain, consistent with Level 2-1. (Flag or general officer is defined in the GSSG as any of the various ranks of Admiral or General.)

Level 2-1 is credited.

100 points

### *Factor 3, Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised*

This factor covers the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities exercised on a recurring basis.

The appellant's delegated supervisory authorities and responsibilities fully meet Level 3-3b, which describes second-level supervisory functions. Level 3-4 is not met as it applies either to

managerial positions at higher organizational levels with significant program planning and policy development authority, or to positions that exercise *final authority* for the full range of personnel actions and organization design proposals recommended by subordinate supervisors.

Level 3-3 is credited.

775 points

#### *Factor 4, Personal Contacts*

This is a two-part factor which assesses the nature and purpose of the personal contacts related to supervisory and managerial responsibilities. The nature of the contacts, credited under subfactor 4A, and the purpose of those contacts, credited under subfactor 4B, must be based on the same contacts.

##### *Subfactor 4A, Nature of Contacts*

The appellant's contacts meet Level 4A-2, where contacts are with higher ranking managers and staff throughout the field activity, command (below major command level), or major organization level of the agency; representatives of local public interest groups; technical or operating level employees of State and local governments; and members of the business community. Level 4A-3 is not met, where contacts are with, for example, high ranking military or civilian managers at bureau and major organization levels of the agency; key staff of public interest groups with significant political influence or media coverage; and contracting officials and high level technical staff of large industrial firms. The appellant has no contacts of this nature.

Level 4A-2 is credited.

50 points

##### *Subfactor 4B, Purpose of Contacts*

The purpose of the appellant's contacts are consistent with Level 4B-2, (i.e., planning and coordinating work, resolving differences of opinion), rather than Level 4B-3, where the primary purpose of the contacts is managerial in nature, to include representing the organizational unit in negotiations, in obtaining or committing resources, *and* in gaining compliance with policies, regulations, or contracts. At Level 4B-3, the contacts usually involve active participation in conferences, meetings, and hearings involving problems or issues of considerable consequence or importance to the program. The [division] as an entity does not have a mission that would support contacts of this nature.

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. It

involves determining the highest grade of basic (mission-oriented) nonsupervisory work performed that constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload of the organization. Excluded from consideration are the work of lower level positions that primarily support or facilitate the basic work of the organization; work that is graded based on supervisory duties; work that is graded based on extraordinary independence from supervision; and work for which the supervisor does not have the minimum supervisory and managerial authorities defined under Factor 3 (including such technical supervisory functions as assigning and reviewing work and assuring that production and accuracy requirements are met.) The work of non-General Schedule employees is *included*, but the work must be assessed to derive the appropriate GS equivalent grade.

The appellant supervises a subordinate staff of eight General Schedule employees and 12 non-General Schedule (mostly Non-Appropriated Fund, or NAF) employees. One position, an Administrative Assistant, NF-303-3, was excluded from base level consideration as a support position. Another position, classified as Community Activities Technical Services Coordinator, GS-301-9 (target grade GS-11), was excluded in that it was established as a division chief position in [city and country], but retained the same position description after that division was absorbed into the [city] division. It is assumed that the grade is based on the remaining supervisory duties. (Three other positions were reported as supervisory and are indicated as such on the division's organizational chart, but are not identified as supervisory in the position descriptions. Therefore, these positions were not excluded because it is assumed that the grades are not based on supervisory responsibilities.) Also under the appellant's purview but excluded from consideration was one contract veterinarian position, over which the appellant provides only general financial oversight.

Effective last October, direction over the staff of two temporary lodging facilities was assigned to the appellant. This includes the Lodging Manager, NF-4, and a large subordinate staff of about 96 lodging (NAF) employees. These positions were not included in the base level consideration because this is likewise primarily a financial oversight arrangement. The appellant's supervisor stated that the appellant does not have any significant programmatic control or oversight of these facilities, that operational supervision over lodging programs comes directly from the Department of the Army and USAREUR. The appellant indicated that although he is designated as reviewing official for the lodging staff's performance appraisals, he has no involvement in their actual supervision. Further, most of these positions are low-level jobs (desk clerks, hotel aides, maintenance aides) graded mostly at NF-1 and NF-2. If they were included, they would depress the base level considerably by virtue of their numbers, although they involve the performance of work unrelated to the division's primary financial management mission.

The remaining 18 subordinate positions which were included in the base level determination are listed below, at their full performance levels:

- (1) Computer Specialist, NF-334-4 (GS-11 equivalent)
- (2) Budget Analysts, GS-560-11
- (1) Computer Specialist, GS-334-9
- (1) Computer Specialist, NF-334-3 (GS-9 equivalent)

- (1) Budget Analyst, GS-560-9
- (1) Management Analyst, GS-343-9
- (1) General Supply Specialist, GS-2001-9
- (1) Assistant Tax Relief Officer, NF-303-3
- (1) Administrative Support Assistant, GS-303-6
- (1) Automation Technician, NF-335-3
- (2) Accounting Technicians, NF-525-3
- (1) Administrative Assistant, NF-303-3
- (1) Budget Assistant, NF-561-3
- (1) Supply Clerk, XZ-2005-5
- (2) Administrative Assistants, NF-303-2

The GS equivalencies for the two Computer Specialist positions are based solely on our review of the position descriptions and other information provided by the appellant. We did not identify GS equivalencies for the remaining NAF positions. Those positions are all classified to one-grade interval series which do not normally support work higher than the GS-7 level. Therefore, they would not represent the highest level of nonsupervisory work supervised.

The highest level of nonsupervisory work supervised by the appellant that represents at least 25 percent of the overall nonsupervisory workload of the division is GS-9, as there are eight positions out of the total of 18 at that grade level or higher. There are only three GS-11 positions, representing about 15 percent of the total staff. Two of those positions supervise one or two employees, and thus do not spend all of their time on the performance of nonsupervisory work. Given these considerations, it would not be reasonable to conclude that these three positions could account for 25 percent of the division's total nonsupervisory workload.

The GSSG provides an alternative method for determining the grade of second (and higher) level supervisors over large workloads, where there is a heavy supervisory or managerial workload related to work above the base level identified. It permits crediting the highest grade of nonsupervisory work directed which requires at least 50 percent of the duty time of the supervisory position. The appellant supervises a total staff of 20 employees, with only three positions above the GS-9 base level. This is not a large overall workload, nor a heavy workload above the base, such that the appellant would spend at least half his time supervising the GS-11 work alone (especially considering that one of the GS-11 positions is a Computer Specialist whose work is not subject to technical review by the appellant.)

Level 5-5 is credited.

650 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 difficulty of work is measured primarily by the level of work credited under Factor 5. Complexity is measured by the level of coordination required, and increases as the base level increases.

The appellant's position meets Level 6-3, where supervision involves coordinating, integrating, or consolidating administrative, technical, or complex technician work comparable to GS-9 or 10. The work places significant demands on the supervisor to resolve conflicts and maintain compatibility of interpretation, judgment, and policy interpretation, because circumstances often vary substantially; guidelines are incomplete; or differences in decisions or recommendations can have consequences or impact the work of other subordinates. The appellant directly supervises, as the first-line supervisor, a GS-9 base level of nonsupervisory work which requires coordination sufficient to resolve conflicts, ensure that deadlines are met, and maintain consistency of treatment.

The position does not meet Level 6-4, where supervision involves *substantial* coordination and integration of a number of major work assignments, projects, or program segments of professional, scientific, technical, or administrative work comparable to GS-11, or directing subordinate supervisors who *each* direct *substantial* workloads comparable to GS-9 or 10. With less than three staff years devoted to nonsupervisory GS-11 work, the appellant's position cannot be credited with substantial coordination of work at this level. Likewise, there is insufficient work at the GS-9 level in the division to permit the crediting of each subordinate supervisory position with supervising substantial workloads with a GS-9 base level. (Two of the subordinate supervisors supervise one and two GS-9 employees, respectively, whereas the other two supervise one-grade interval work classifiable at no higher than GS-7.)

The GSSG allows for additional credit under this factor if the supervisory work is complicated by three or more special situations. Since the appellant's position meets only one of the conditions described (variety of work), this provision does not apply.

Level 6-3 is credited. 975 points

*Summary*

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Level</u>	<u>Points</u>
Program Scope and Effect	1-2	350
Organizational Setting	2-1	100
Supervisory/Managerial Authority	3-3	775
Personal Contacts		
Nature of Contacts	4A-2	50
Purpose of Contacts	4B-2	75
Difficulty of Work Directed	5-5	650
Other Conditions	6-3	<u>975</u>
Total		2975

The total of 2975 points falls within the GS-12 range (2755-3150) on the grade conversion chart provided in the GSSG.

**Decision**

The appellant's nonsupervisory work supports no higher than the GS-11 level, but his supervisory duties and responsibilities are evaluated at the GS-12 level and are grade-controlling.

The appealed position is properly classified as GS-501-12 (title discretionary with "Supervisory" prefix.)