

**CLASSIFICATION APPEAL DECISION
U.S. OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
CHICAGO OVERSIGHT DIVISION**

INCUMBENT: **[Appellant]**

POSITION NUMBER: 20950

AGENCY CLASSIFICATION: Supervisory Computer Specialist
GS-334-12

POSITION LOCATION: Department of the Army
Corps of Engineers
[installation]
Automation Support Branch
[installation]

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT **Supervisory Computer Specialist**
DECISION: **GS-334-12**

OPM decision number: C-0334-12-01

This appellate decision constitutes a certificate that is mandatory and binding on administrative, certifying, payroll, and accounting offices of the Government. It is the final administrative decision on the classification of the position, not subject to further appeal. It is 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.

FREDERICK J. BOLAND
CLASSIFICATION APPEALS OFFICER

4/12/96

DATE

INFORMATION CONSIDERED

- ▶ Appellant's letter of appeal dated December 11, 1995, and its enclosures.
- ▶ Agency letter of January 9, 1996, and its enclosures.
- ▶ Copy of the official description of the appellant's position, number 20950, and classifier's evaluation of those duties.
- ▶ Copy of the appellant's supervisor's position description.
- ▶ Copies of the appellant's subordinates' position descriptions.
- ▶ Copy of the appellant's performance standards.
- ▶ Telephone interview with the appellant on February 21, 1996, and with his supervisor on April 4, 1996.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

- ▶ OPM *Computer Specialist, GS-334, Series* position classification standard, dated July 1991.
- ▶ OPM's *General Schedule Supervisory Guide*, dated April 1993.

INTRODUCTION

The appellant contests the classification of his position, number 20950, as Supervisory Computer Specialist, GS-334-12. The position is located in the Automation Support Branch, Information Management Office, [installation] District, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, [the installation]. He agrees that his official position description accurately reflects his major duties, but believes his work warrants higher credit based upon its scope and effect and the level of supervisory and managerial authority exercised (Factors 1 and 3 of the *General Schedule Supervisory Guide*).

In support of his appeal, he also cites the position's classification at the GS-13 level prior to a reorganization. By law, positions are classified based upon their duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements compared to the criteria specified in the appropriate OPM classification standard or guide. Other methods of evaluation, including comparison to former positions and how they may have functioned at one time, are not permitted. Agencies are, however, required to apply classification standards and OPM decisions consistently to ensure equal pay for equal work. OPM will require an agency to conduct a consistency review upon showing that differently graded positions have identical duties, should an appellant specifically identify such a position similar to his own.

JOB INFORMATION

As Chief of the Automation Support Branch, the appellant provides professional guidance to the District regarding computer systems and equipment analysis as well as computer programming and operation. He supervises a staff of about ten, which includes nine Computer Specialists and one Computer Operator. In addition, he oversees the computer repair and maintenance work performed by two contract personnel. The Automation Support Branch provides computer support services to the [installation] District including its engineering planning and design, finance and accounting, personnel, real estate, and logistics components. Among the Branch's responsibilities are implementing and supporting the District's use of various computer information systems, integrating these systems across various hardware platforms, developing local applications, training District and field office staff on the use of systems, and overseeing the technical aspects of the District's roughly three million dollar annual budget for the acquisition, development, maintenance, and upgrading of computer hardware and software. Supervisory duties demand about 65 percent of the appellant's time. Computer Specialist work that he personally performs demands the remainder of his time.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Series and Title Determination

The Computer Specialist, GS-334, series covers positions, like the appellant's, whose primary requirement is knowledge of information processing methodology and technology, computer capabilities, and processing techniques. The prescribed title for supervisory positions in this series is *Supervisory Computer Specialist*.

Grade Determination

The appellant's supervisory and non-supervisory work must be evaluated separately because the same classification criteria do not apply to both. The overall grade of the position is the higher level of either supervisory or non-supervisory work. Work demanding less than a substantial (at least 25 percent) amount of time is not considered in classifying a position. The General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG) is used to evaluate supervisory and managerial responsibilities. The Computer Specialist, GS-334, series standard is used to evaluate automated data processing work that the appellant personally performs. His personally performed work cannot be higher graded than the GS-12 level already assigned to his supervisory duties unless it requires mastery of a computer field and entails the application of new developments to computer problems unresolvable by accepted methods, or an equivalent level of expertise. As it does not, his personally performed work is not further examined in this decision.

The GSSG uses a point-factor evaluation approach where the points assigned under each factor must be fully equivalent to the factor-level described in the guide. If a factor is not equivalent in all respects to the overall intent of a particular level described in the guide, a lower level point value must be assigned, unless the deficiency is balanced by an equally important aspect that meets a higher level.

Factor 1: Program Scope and Effect

This factor measures the general complexity, breadth, and impact of the program areas and work directed, including its organizational and geographic coverage. It also assesses the effect of the work both within and outside the immediate organization. All work for which the supervisor is both technically and administratively responsible, including work accomplished through subordinates or contractors, is considered. To receive credit for a given level, the separate criteria specified for both scope and effect must be met at that factor level.

Subfactor 1A: Scope

Scope addresses complexity and breadth of the program or work directed, including the geographic and organizational coverage within the agency structure. It has two elements: (a) the program (or program segment) directed and (b) the work directed, the products produced, or the services delivered. Scope includes the geographic and organizational coverage of the program or program segment.

Level 1-2 of the guide covers the direction of administrative, technical, complex clerical, or comparable work that has limited geographic coverage and supports most of the activities of a typical agency field office, a small to medium sized military installation, or comparable activities within agency program segments. *Directing budget, supply, or payroll services that support a small military base is typical of this level.*

Level 1-3 covers the direction of a program segment performing administrative, technical, or professional work where the program segment and work directed encompass a major metropolitan area, a state, or a small region of several states; or when most of an area's taxpayers or businesses are covered, coverage comparable to a small city. *Providing complex administrative or professional services directly affecting a large or complex multimission military installation, or of an organization of similar magnitude, is also characteristic of this level.*

The appellant believes Level 1-3 is appropriate because the geographical area of the civil works and military programs that he supports resembles a small region and because sizable military installations within this area, like [installation] and [installation] and the Whiteman and McConnell Air Force Bases, are supported by the District's engineers. He indicates that the District's civil works program encompasses portions of four states--Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and Iowa--and that its military works program encompasses all of the two states--Missouri and Kansas. He also points out that his organization provides automation support to the five employees of the Army's Regional Environmental Office, which services the aforementioned states and Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana and New Mexico.

In drawing these comparisons, the appellant confuses the Automation Support Branch's mission with the District's engineering mission. The work that he directs supports, but is not equivalent in scope to, the District's engineering mission. The Automation Support Branch's work is considerably

narrower in scope than the line programs, functions, and activities that the Corps is authorized and funded by statute to accomplish directly or on behalf of other agencies. Whether an engineering project originates within the Corps or is requested by a military installation like [installation], the Branch's primary responsibility remains essentially the same, i.e., to ably support the *District's* staff in their automation needs. The appellant is not charged with supporting the automation needs of other agencies or installations like [installation] (even though he may need to interact with their personnel in order to support the District's needs), which have within their own agencies personnel charged with that responsibility. Though the volume of the appellant's work may be affected by the number or kinds of projects undertaken by the District's engineering components, the scope of his work remains virtually unchanged.

The work directed by the appellant exceeds the small military base or typical field office setting characteristic of Level 1-2, since it supports a District having about 1100 personnel and spanning a geographic area comprised of portions of several states. However, the organizational breadth and complexity of the appellant's work are otherwise clearly unlike the work examples given for Level 1-3.

Level 1-3 criteria are specific only to the geographic coverage of program scope. To determine whether other aspects of Level 1-3 scope, like organizational coverage, are also met, the appellant's work must be further evaluated against the three illustrations on pages 11 and 12 of the guide. The first illustration pertains to managing substantive projects throughout a region, such as the civil works projects engineering organizations might carry out. The second pertains to furnishing a significant portion of an agency's line program directly to the general public. The third pertains to providing administrative services (personnel, supply management, budget, facilities management, or the like) to an organization or group of organizations like large or complex multimission military installations. Of the three, only the third is directly relevant to the appellant's work because it alone describes a similar situation, i.e., providing support services to an organization or group of organizations. It indicates that Level 1-3 scope is met if the services support and directly affect the operations of a bureau, a major military command headquarters, a large or complex multimission military installation, or an organization or group of organizations of comparable complexity and size.

The Automation Support Branch directly supports neither a bureau nor a major military command headquarters. Rather, it supports a District Office with a staff far smaller than the 4,000 personnel regarded by the guide as the minimum complement of a large military installation. The District itself lacks the diversity and complexity of functions found in complex, multimission installations as defined by the guide. (It has multimillion dollar annual construction, civil works, or environmental cleanup projects, but not the other specified features, e.g., a medical center, research laboratory, and a supply depot.) Consequently, even though the program segment directed by the appellant exceeds Level 1-2, it does not enjoy the full complexity and breadth typical of Level 1-3 programs or administrative services.

Support of the Army's Regional Environmental Office extends the scope of the Branch's work beyond its normal boundaries. However, pairing the Environmental Office and its five employees

with the District still does not yield a group of organizations similar in magnitude to a bureau, a major military command headquarters, or a large or complex military installation, for the same reasons as noted above (i.e., the Army Regional Environmental Office does introduce the additional complexities of support that a medical center, research laboratory, and a supply depot might.) Hence, the Branch's work does not fully meet Level 1-3 criteria for Scope.

We evaluate Scope at Level 1-2.

Subfactor 1B: Effect

Effect addresses impact of programs, products, or correctly performed work both within and outside the agency.

At Level 1-2, services support and significantly affect installation level, area office level, or field office operations and objectives; 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. (Directing budget, supply, protective, or similar services for a small base without extensive research, testing, or similar missions meets this level.)

At Level 1-3, activities, functions, or services directly and significantly affect 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 services or products to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, or administrative functions.

The appellant claims impact on large population centers and the work of other agencies, such as the Air Force, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Southwest Power Administration. He states that his organization provides network connectivity to civil works field offices that in turn provide flood control and hydroelectric power to large population centers and agricultural areas. His organization also provides network support to the District's military construction program at Army and Air Force installations. Although the Automation Support Branch may have some indirect impact outside the Corps, its work directly and significantly affects the District alone, as its mission is to support the District's automation needs rather than the Air Force, Bureau of Reclamation, or the Southwest Power Administration. The Branch's direct impact does not extend beyond the District to a wide range of Army activities, nor (for the reasons noted earlier) does it substantially impact numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, or administrative functions, such as found at large or complex military installations. Consequently, only Level 1-2 Effect applies.

We evaluate Effect at Level 1-2.

Both the scope and effect of the appellant's work equate to Level 1-2. Therefore, we evaluate Factor 1 at Level 1-2 and credit 350 points.

Factor 2: Organizational Setting

This factor considers the organizational position of the supervisor in relation to higher levels of management (the rank of the person to whom the supervisor reports for direction and appraisal).

Under this factor, if the position being classified reports directly to a Senior Executive, flag officer, or the equivalent, it receives Level 2-3 credit. If not, but the second-level supervisor of the position being classified is a Senior Executive, flag officer, or the equivalent, it receives Level 2-2 credit. In all other cases, the position being classified receives minimum credit, Level 2-1. Full deputies are treated as being at the same level as the deputy's chief for this factor.

The appellant reports to the Chief Information Management Office, a GS-13, who in turn reports to the Deputy District Engineer. The Deputy District Engineer shares full authority and responsibility with the District Engineer. Under the guide, the appellant is therefore credited the same as if his supervisor reports to the District Engineer, a Colonel. The Colonel does not hold a flag officer's position, nor does he direct a substantial GS-15 workload; however, he does direct District work through several GS-15 level subordinate supervisors. (According to the guide, a position that directs a substantial GS-15 or equivalent workload, or a position that directs work through GS-15 or equivalent level subordinate supervisors, officers, contractors, or others, is considered equivalent to the SES level.) The several positions include the Chiefs of the Engineering and Planning Division, the Construction Operations Division, the Programs and Project Management Division, and the District Counsel.

We evaluate this factor at Level 2-2 and credit 250 points.

Factor 3: Supervisory and Managerial Authority

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

At Level 3-2, supervisors function at the first line level and are delegated broad authority to direct the operations of their work units on a basis free from close review and oversight by higher echelons. The GSSG provides three alternative sets of criteria under which Level 3-2 credit is possible. The third of these options (cited in paragraph 3-2c of the guide) specifies ten authorities and responsibilities characteristic of supervisors functioning at this Level. The appellant exercises all ten in overseeing his work unit and thereby meets Level 3-2.

At Level 3-3, supervisors typically exercise managerial authorities over lower organizational units and subordinate supervisors or leaders, or have equivalent second level type authority and responsibility. The GSSG specifies two methods through which a position can meet this level. The first of these, Level 3-3a, essentially concerns managerial positions closely involved with high level program officials in the development of overall goals and objectives. Managers at this level typically direct the development of data to track program goals, secure legal opinions, prepare position papers or

legislative proposals, and execute comparable activities. The appellant lacks significant responsibility in Level 3-3a areas. Such responsibilities belong to higher level positions than his own. He claims, however, to have sufficient authority to fully satisfy Level 3-3b criteria, which describe 15 supervisory authorities that exceed in complexity and responsibility the ten depicted under paragraph 3-2c. Under this alternate provision, a position can be credited at Level 3-3b if, *in addition to* exercising all or nearly all the Level 3-2c authorities, it also exercises at least 8 of the 15 supervisory authorities specified at Level 3-3b.

The appellant's claims are based largely upon his belief that two subordinates function as team leaders or chiefs, his use of two contractors to accomplish repairs and maintenance, and his responsibilities associated with the District's consolidated automation budget, as described below. While he exercises some of Level 3-3b's authorities, he does not exercise the required majority. Among those he does not significantly exercise are the following nine.

- Authority 1 credits work *requiring* the use of multiple supervisors, team chiefs, or comparable personnel to direct, coordinate, or otherwise oversee work; and/or providing similar oversight of contractors. The appellant is already credited with oversight and coordination of the work that his own staff of about nine employees accomplishes. He desires additional credit based upon his belief that two of his subordinates function as team leaders, claiming that this includes one GS-12 lead specialist and one GS-11 specialist heading the District's Help Desk. He notes that the GS-11 schedules Help Desk support staff and prepares all reports related to the Help Desk. Using subordinates to help in the preparation of work schedules or other such tasks may relieve him of some routine supervisory duties. However, while his subordinates necessarily coordinate their work efforts with others, they do not both regularly assign and review group work, set and adjust group work priorities, assure group members meet timeliness, form, procedure, accuracy, quality, and quantity standards, instruct group members on work and administrative matters, etc., as *bona fide* supervisors or team leaders might. (The GS-12 specialist's position description indicates more responsibility in this area than the GS-11's, including approving leave for short periods. Otherwise, the duties portrayed are consistent with the manner in which more experienced staff guide less experienced staff.) The supervisory responsibilities that he suggests his subordinates exercise are credited to the appellant himself in establishing that he satisfies Level 3-2's requirements. Level 3-2 also credits the appellant with personally performing a wide range of technical input and oversight tasks for contracted work, such as analyzing costs/benefits, preparing technical requirements, establishing work schedules, deadlines, and standards, monitoring progress and quality, etc. Such tasks are not regularly performed by his subordinates nor would they demand a substantial amount of their time when performed, given the small amount of contractor work to oversee.

Even if both the subordinate positions in question were officially designated as supervisory or lead positions, the appellant's organization would still lack sufficient intricacy and complexity to justify more than Level 3-2 credit. Factor 3-3b credits the greater difficulty

of supervision stemming from the need for subordinate supervisors to help ensure plans are carried out, policies understood, objectives accomplished, discipline maintained, etc. The appellant's organization, however, lacks highly complex operations, an unusual rate of change, extraordinary difficulties in training subordinates or assessing their work accomplishments, and similar attributes that would suggest a narrow span of control and additional supervisors are required despite its size. Consequently, the designation of one or more subordinates as supervisors or team leaders would add to its structure, but little to the difficulty of supervision exercised by the appellant.

- Authorities 3, 6, 8, and 10 are not exercised by the appellant. The first three concern oversight of subordinate supervisory type positions on performance evaluation matters while the last involves approval of serious disciplinary actions against subordinates, an authority reserved to higher echelons. The appellant claims only authority 8, again based upon his belief that two of his subordinates function as team leaders, which, as already noted, is unsupported by our findings.
- Authority 4 concerns the direction of a program or major program segment with multimillion dollar funding. The appellant cites the District's three million dollar automation budget to support his claim. However, these funds are not the Automation Support Branch's funds, but the District's funds. The appellant shares in the central administration of these funds, just as Contract or Budget Officers share oversight responsibility for expenditures outside their immediate work units. However, he does not solely decide their allocation nor is he free to reprogram the funds, except in a limited fashion and in accordance with pre-approved conditions. The funds are largely expended to support other organizations, rather than his own or organizations subordinate to his own. Consequently, for the purposes of the guide, they are not funds under his direction. Rather, they are more properly attributed to the direction of higher management officials, who make the significant determinations regarding funding priorities and allocations.
- Authority 5 deals with making decisions on work problems surfaced by subordinate supervisors, contractors, or similar personnel. The appellant states that he resolves work problems originating from team leaders and contractors, again based upon his belief that two of his subordinates function as team leaders. However, these individuals do not both regularly function as *bona fide* supervisors or team leaders, nor does his organization possess the intricacy and complexity that would permit significant exercise of such authority, as already noted.
- Authority 9 concerns hearing and resolving group grievances or serious employee complaints, an authority reserved to higher levels than the appellant's and one neither claimed nor exercised by him.
- Authority 11 speaks of decisions involving nonroutine, costly, or controversial training needs and requests. The appellant claims such authority but supports it by reference

instead to routine and unscheduled training he has approved. He indicates that changing technology and software require him to decide which training will be the most beneficial to his staff and that Computer Specialist training is normally very expensive. However, he does not regularly approve training that would be regarded as controversial for Computer Specialists to attend, nonroutine for their line of work, or unduly costly for the subject matter.

Since the appellant does not fully exercise Level 3-3a or a majority of Level 3-3b authorities, only Level 3-2 credit applies.

We evaluate this factor at Level 3-2 and credit 450 points.

Factor 4: Nature and Purpose of Contacts

This is a two-part factor that assesses the nature and purpose of personal contacts related to supervisory and managerial responsibilities. The contacts used to determine credit level under one subfactor must be the same used to determine credit under the other subfactor.

Subfactor 4A: Nature of Contacts

This subfactor covers the organizational relationships, authority or influence level, setting, and preparation difficulty involved in the supervisor's work. To be credited, contacts must be direct and recurring, contribute to the successful performance of the work, and have a demonstrable impact on the difficulty and responsibility of the position.

At Level 4A-2, contacts are with members of the business community, the general public, higher ranking managers, supervisors, or staff of program, administrative, or other work units and activities throughout the installation. These contacts sometimes require special preparation.

At Level 4A-3, frequent contacts are made with high ranking managers, supervisors, and technical staff at major organization levels of the agency, with agency headquarters administrative support staff, or comparable personnel in other agencies and often require extensive preparation or up-to-date technical familiarity with complex subject matter.

As at Level 4A-2, the appellant has frequent contact with staff in the rest of the District and with higher ranking managers and supervisors of other work units. These contacts sometimes require special preparation in order to explain operations, problems, and available options. Unlike Level 4A-3, these contacts do not often require extensive preparation of briefing materials nor are they frequently with higher ranking managers, supervisors, and technical staff at bureau and major organizational levels of the agency (Army) or comparable personnel.

We evaluate this subfactor at Level 4A-2 and credit 50 points.

Subfactor 4B: Purpose of Contacts

This subfactor includes the advisory, representational, negotiating, and commitment responsibilities related to the supervisor's contacts credited under the previous subfactor.

At Level 4B-2, the purpose of contacts is to ensure that information provided to outside parties is accurate and consistent, to plan and coordinate the work directed with that of others outside the subordinate organization, and/or to resolve differences of opinion among managers, supervisors, employees, contractors, or others.

At Level 4B-3, the purpose of contacts is to justify, defend, or negotiate in representing the project, program segment(s), or organizational unit(s) directed, in obtaining or committing resources, *and* in gaining compliance with established policies, regulations, or contracts. Contacts at this level usually involve active participation in conferences, meetings, hearings, or presentations involving problems or issues of considerable consequence or importance to the program or program segment(s) managed.

As at Level 4B-2, the purpose of the appellant's contacts is to plan and coordinate his branch's work with that of others and to advise others on automation. Unlike Level 4B-3, the appellant's contacts are not typically to justify, defend, or negotiate his sections' work, to obtain or commit resources, *and* to gain compliance.

We evaluate this subfactor at Level 4B-2 and credit 75 points

Factor 5: Difficulty of Typical Work Directed

This factor covers 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).

The level credited for this factor normally must constitute at least 25 percent of the workload of the organization supervised. Excluded from consideration are:

- work of lower level positions that primarily support the basic work of the unit,
- work that is graded based upon the supervisory or leader guides,
- work that is graded higher than normal because of extraordinary independence from supervision, and
- work not fully under the supervisor's authority and responsibility as defined under Factor 3.

The appellant has technical responsibility for the work of about nine specialists, one operator, and two contractor personnel. None of the work is excluded from consideration. According to the agency workload analysis, all of the specialists perform GS-11 work at least half of the time. None of the specialists perform higher graded work, except for one who performs GS-12 level work half of the time. Regardless of the grade level equivalent of contractor performed work, then, GS-11 is the highest graded component representing at least 25 percent of the organization's workload. A GS-11 base level of work equates to Factor Level 5-6, according to the conversion table on page 24 of the guide.

We evaluate this factor at Level 5-6 and credit 800 points.

Factor 6: Other Conditions

This factor measures the extent to which various conditions add to the difficulty of supervision. For credit, the condition must be present and dealt with on a regular basis. Positions at Level 6-3 or below are boosted one level if they also meet at least three of the eight special situations described in the guide.

Level 6-4 of the guide addresses complications arising from the supervision of work comparable in difficulty to the GS-11 level *and* requiring substantial coordination and integration of a number of major assignments or projects. (Managing work through subordinate supervisors who each direct substantial GS-9 or 10 workloads also meets Level 6-4.) Level 6-5 addresses complications arising from the supervision of work comparable in difficulty to the GS-12 level *and* requiring significant and extensive coordination and integration. (Managing work through subordinate supervisors who each direct substantial GS-11 level workloads may also meet Level 6-5, as might directing GS-13 work in some situations.)

None of the provisions of Level 6-5 apply to the appellant's position. As determined under Factor 5, GS-11 best characterizes the grade level of the work he supervises. To support Level 6-4, the degree of coordination and integration must be comparable to that involved in any of the following examples:

1. Identifying and integrating internal and external program issues affecting the immediate organization, such as those involving technical, financial, organizational, and administrative factors.
2. Integrating the work of a team or group where each member contributes a portion of the analyses, facts, information, proposed actions, or recommendations; and/or ensuring compatibility and consistency of interpretation, judgment, logic, and application of policy.
3. Recommending resources to devote to particular projects or to allocate among program segments.

4. Leadership in developing, implementing, evaluating, and improving processes and procedures to monitor the effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity of the program segment and/or organization directed.
5. Reviewing and approving the substance of reports, decisions, case documents, contracts, or other action documents to assure that they accurately reflect the policies and position of the organization and the views of the agency.

The appellant is expected to demonstrate leadership in improving the District's use of automation in its various divisions and branches. His performance standards assess his innovation and initiative in enhancing automated business processes and warrant crediting the position with meeting the difficulty of work and coordination requirements specified for Level 6-4, , as in the fourth example above.

We evaluate this factor at Level 6-4a and credit 1120 points.

FACTOR LEVEL POINT SUMMARY

Factor	Level	Points
1	1-2	350
2	2-2	250
3	3-2	450
4A	4A-2	50
4B	4B-2	75
5	5-6	800
6	6-4	1120
	Total:	3095

The above table summarizes our evaluation of the appellant's work. As shown on page 31 of the guide, a total of 3095 points converts to grade GS-12 (2755-3150).

DECISION

As explained in the foregoing analysis, the proper classification of the appellant's position is Supervisory Computer Specialist, GS-344-12.