OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

MERIT SYSTEMS OVERSIGHT AND EFFECTIVENESS

DALLAS OVERSIGHT DIVISION

CLASSIFICATION APPEAL DECISION

Under section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code

Appellant: [the appellant]

Position: Supervisory Engineering Technician, GS-802-11
[Position Number]

Organization: Maintenance Control Division
Public Works Department
[agency] Air Station
[geographic location]

Decision: Supervisory Engineering Technician, GS-802-11
(Appeal denied)

OPM decision number: C-0802-11-01

Approved by:

/s/ Bonnie J. Brandon
Bonnie J. Brandon
Classification Appeals Officer

5/9/97
Date

Copy of decision sent to:

[appellant]

[name and address of appellant's servicing personnel office]

[name and address of agency personnel office]

[name and adderess of agency personnel office component]

Chief, Classification Branch (CPMS-ASFP)
Field Advisory Services Division
Defense Civilian Personnel Management Service
1400 Key Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22209-2199
[cc's]

INTRODUCTION

The appealed position is assigned to the Maintenance Control Division of the Public Works Department at the [agency]l Air Station in [location]. The appellant's position is classified as Supervisory Engineering Technician, GS-802-11, and serves as the Director of the Maintenance Control Division. The appellant requests that his position be classified as GS-802-12/13. If the position is not found in the General Schedule pay system, then he requests that it be classified as Supervisory Planner and Estimator, WN-4701-07.

As a Supervisory Planner and Estimator (General), WN-4701-07, the appellant initially filed an appeal with the Department of Defense Civilian Personnel Management Service (CPMS), requesting that his position be covered by the General Schedule system. CPMS changed the pay system of the appellant's position to the General Schedule and remanded the case to the agency for classification to the proper title, series, and grade. The agency classified the position as Supervisory Engineering Technician, GS-802-11, and also reclassified four of the appellant's subordinates from the WD pay system to the General Schedule. The appellant then filed his appeal with our office.

This appeal is filed with the Office of Personnel Management under the provisions of chapter 51, title 5 of the United States Code. This is the final administrative decision of the Government, subject to discretionary review only under the conditions and time limits specified in title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations, sections 511.605 and 511.613, and appendix 4 of the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards*.

POSITION INFORMATION

The appellant is Director of the Maintenance Control Division, responsible for directing comprehensive programs for the operation, maintenance, repair, and improvement of the facilities, structures, and land under the control of the [agency] Air Station. Outlying property includes the [installation] Landing Field [location]; [installation] Target Range; [installation] Lodge; and the [installation] Housing Complex. The services provided by the appellant's division cover structural, mechanical, electrical, heating, and air conditioning maintenance; water and sewage treatment and maintenance; and repair and replacement of special purpose equipment. The physical plant consists of over 280 buildings, numerous structures, and over 16,000 acres of real estate. The appellant has eight subordinate positions, including four Engineering Technicians, GS-802-09; one Building Maintenance Inspector, WG-4701-10; one Production Controller, GS-1152-09; one Materials Handler, WG-6907-05; and one Facility Management Clerk, GS-303-05. The appellant's immediate supervisor is the Public Works Officer.

The position description adequately describes the duties and responsibilities of the appellant's position. However, the position description needs to be updated to accurately reflect the subordinate positions under the appellant. Specifically, the statement about the four WD-8 Planners and Estimators should be changed to refer to GS-802 Engineering Technicians.

PAY CATEGORY DETERMINATION

According to the guidance provided in the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards*, if a position requires trade, craft, or manual labor knowledge and experience as a requirement for the performance of its primary duty, and this requirement is paramount, the position is properly classified under a prevailing rate system. If not, the position is subject to the General Schedule.

The primary duty and responsibility of the appellant's position is managing the work of the Maintenance Control Division. The specific work of the division involves processing and tracking all work requests; providing design, development, specifications, and cost estimates of facility support contracts, small purchase contracts, and in-house job orders; requisitioning, organizing, issuing, and warehousing materials necessary to accomplish work requirements; scheduling work to be accomplished by maintenance shop personnel by determining available manpower and work plan summaries; inspecting facilities to assess physical condition and deficiencies; and compiling cost estimates for required or essential maintenance and repair. The appellant directs and prioritizes the work, determines the method for accomplishing the work (through in-house or contract work), estimates and recommends the budget for the division, and reviews the work of subordinates.

The primary function and responsibility of the division is to plan, design, estimate, and schedule the maintenance, repair, and minor construction work at the Naval Air Station. In performing the primary duty of managing the division, the appellant is required to be knowledgeable of planning, estimating, and inspecting techniques; engineering methods and techniques; maintenance and construction techniques; various trades and skills in the electrical, mechanical, and structural areas; Public Works shop operations and Naval Air Station program operations and functions; and financial management techniques. Knowledge of this type is characteristic of work covered by the General Schedule rather than the Federal Wage System. The appellant is not required to have trades knowledge and experience to perform his primary duty. Therefore, the position is covered by the General Schedule pay system.

SERIES AND TITLE DETERMINATION

The GS-802 Engineering Technician Series includes positions performing nonprofessional technical work in functions such as research, development, design, evaluation, construction, inspection, production, application, standardization, test, or operation of engineering facilities, structures, systems, processes, equipment, devices, or materials. The appellant directs programs for the maintenance, repair, and improvement of the facilities, structures, and land under the control of the [installation]. This work is appropriately covered by the GS-802 series.

GRADE LEVEL DETERMINATION

General Schedule Supervisory Guide

The General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG), dated January 1993, is used for determining the grade level of the appellant's position. The GSSG uses a point-factor evaluation approach with six evaluation factors designed specifically for supervisory positions.

The appellant contests the agency's evaluation of factors 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6. He agrees with the agency's evaluation of Factor 4. Since we also agree with that evaluation, this factor will not be discussed further.

Factor 1 - Program Scope and Effect

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

<u>Scope</u>

This element addresses the general complexity and breadth of the program directed; the work directed, the products produced, or the services delivered; and the geographic and organizational coverage of the program within the agency structure.

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

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

The technical work directed by the appellant supports the facilities, structures, and land utilized and maintained by the [installation], tenant activities, and contractors. The areas supported include offsite locations such as [installation] Range, [installation] Ranch,

Relocatable Over the Horizon Radar Sites, and off base housing. Contractor and tenant activities include McDonnell Douglas contractors working for the Training Wing, Defense Commissary Agency, [agency military function] Warfare Group, U.S. Border Patrol, and others. The approximate number of military officers and enlisted personnel, civilians, nonappropriated fund personnel, and contractors on board at the [installation] and surrounding areas is approximately 1830. Considering this, the [agency] Air Station is equivalent to the size and complexity of a military installation described at level 1-2. The scope of the work directed by the appellant meets level 1-2.

The general complexity and breadth of the activities directed by the appellant and the organizational coverage represented in level 1-3 are not met. The services provided by the Maintenance Control Division do not support a large or complex multimission military installation as required at this level. The scope of the division program is not comparable to the illustrations given at level 1-3. These include: (1) directing design, oversight, and related services for the construction of complex facilities at multiple sites for one or more agencies; or (2) directing a comprehensive personnel management, budget, or supply management program that directly supports and affects the operations of a bureau, major military command headquarters, or complex multimission military installation. The complexity and breadth of the appellant's division activities are not equivalent to the comprehensive and complex services characteristic of level 1-3.

Effect

This element addresses the impact of the work, the products, and/or the programs described under scope on the mission and programs of the customer(s), the activity, other activities in or out of government, the agency, other agencies, the general public, or others.

At level 1-2, the services or products support and significantly affect installation level, area office level, or field office operations and objectives, or comparable program segments.

At level 1-3, the activities, functions, or services accomplished directly and significantly impact a wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, the operations of outside interests, or the general public. At the field activity level (involving large, complex, multimission organizations) the work directly involves or substantially impacts the provision of essential support operations to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, and administrative functions.

The services provided by the Maintenance Control Division directly and significantly affect the operation, repair, maintenance, and improvement of facilities, structures, and land at the installation and at offsite areas. This meets level 1-2.

The division activities do not meet the effect described in level 1-3. The division work does not directly and significantly impact a wide range of [agency] activities, the work of other agencies, the operations of outside interests, or the general public.

Both the scope and effect of the appellant's position meet level 1-2.

Factor 2 - Organizational Setting

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

At factor level 2-1, the position is accountable to a position that is two or more levels below the first (i.e., lowest in the chain of command) SES, flag or general officer, or equivalent or higher level position in the direct supervisory chain.

The appellant reports to the Public Works Officer, a [rank]. This person reports to the [agency] Air Station [rank], who reports to the Chief of [agency] Air Training, an [rank] (flag officer). Therefore, the appellant's position is accountable to a position that is two reporting levels below the first flag officer in the direct supervisory chain, as at level 2-1.

Factor 3 - Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised

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

At level 3-2c, the supervisor carries out at least 3 of the first 4, and a total of 6 or more of the following 10 authorities and responsibilities: (1) plans work to be accomplished by subordinates, sets and adjusts short-term priorities, and prepares schedules for completion of work; (2) assigns work to subordinates based on priorities, selective consideration of the difficulty and requirements of assignments, and the capabilities of employees; (3) evaluates work performance of subordinates; (4) gives advice, counsel, or instruction to employees on both work and administrative matters; (5) interviews candidates for positions in the unit and recommends appointment, promotion, or reassignment to such positions; (6) hears and resolves complaints from employees, referring group grievances and more serious unresolved complaints to a higher level supervisor or manager; (7) effects minor disciplinary measures, such as warnings and reprimands, recommending other action in more serious cases; (8) identifies developmental and training needs of employees, providing or arranging for needed development and training; (9) finds ways to improve production or increase the quality of the work directed; and (10) develops performance standards.

At level 3-3b, a position must exercise all or nearly all of the delegated supervisory authorities and responsibilities described at level 3-2c and, in addition, at least 8 of the 15 authorities and responsibilities listed at level 3-3b. The position: (1) uses subordinate supervisors to direct the work; (2) exercises significant responsibilities in dealing with officials of other units or organizations or in advising management officials of higher rank; (3) assures reasonable equity of performance standards and rating techniques developed by subordinates; (4) directs a program or major program segment with significant resources (e.g., one at a multimillion dollar level of annual resources); (5) makes decisions on work problems presented by subordinate supervisors; (6) evaluates performance of subordinate supervisors and serves as the reviewing official on evaluations of nonsupervisory employees rated by subordinate supervisors; (7) makes or approves selections for subordinate nonsupervisory positions; (8) recommends selections for subordinate supervisory positions; (9) hears and resolves group grievances or serious employee complaints; (10) reviews and approves serious disciplinary actions involving nonsupervisory subordinates; (11) makes decisions on nonroutine, costly, or controversial training needs and training requests related to employees of the unit; (12) determines whether contractor performed work meets standards of adequacy necessary for authorization of payment; (13) approves expenses comparable to within-grade increases, extensive overtime, and employee travel; (14) recommends awards or bonuses for nonsupervisory personnel and changes in position classification, subject to approval by higher level officials, supervisors, or others; and (15) finds and implements ways to eliminate or reduce significant bottlenecks and barriers to production, promote team building, or improve business practices.

The appellant's supervisory authorities and responsibilities meet level 3-2c. He exercises most all of the authorities at this level. For example, he plans, assigns, and reviews work; evaluates performance; gives advice, counsel, and instruction; interviews candidates; hears and resolves employee complaints; effects minor disciplinary measures; and identifies development and training needs.

The appellant's position does not meet level 3-3b in that he does not exercise the minimum number of responsibilities required at this level. The appellant’s division does not have the complexity, diversity, or intricacy that requires subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or comparable personnel to accomplish the work of the division. Because of this, the appellant’s position does not meet the intent of responsibilities 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8 of level 3-3b. Also, the appellant’s position does not meet the full intent of 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 15. Therefore, the appellant does not meet at least eight of the responsibilities described at level 3-3b.

Factor 5 - Difficulty of Typical Work Directed

This factor measures the difficulty and complexity of the basic work most typical of the organization(s) directed. The factor considers the highest grade which best

characterizes the nature of the basic (mission oriented) nonsupervisory work performed or overseen by the organization directed and constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload (not positions or employees) of the organization.

The appellant directs the work of five GS-09 employees, four in the GS-802 series and one in the GS-1152 series. Excluding the support position, there are two other positions in the appellant's division, a WG-05 and WG-10. The GS-09 level is the highest graded work that is characteristic of the nature of the basic work performed in the Maintenance Control Division and representative of at least 25 percent of the workload of the division. This meets level 5-5.

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.

At level 6-3, supervision and oversight require coordination, integration, or consolidation of administrative, technical, or complex technician or other support work comparable to GS-09 or GS-10.

At level 6-4, supervision requires substantial coordination and integration of a number of major work assignments, projects, or program segments of professional, scientific, technical, or administrative work comparable in difficulty to the GS-11 grade level.

The appellant's position requires coordination of the GS-09 work carried out in the division. He ensures consistency of division products and consistency in employees' application of policies and requirements. He coordinates the work with various other divisions, such as the Maintenance Division, Contracts Administration Division, and Engineering Division. This meets level 6-3.

The appellant's position does not meet level 6-4 in that he does not coordinate and integrate work equivalent to the GS-11 grade level. The highest level of work directed in the Maintenance Control Division is GS-09. Therefore, this level cannot be credited.

The standard instructs that credit for "Special Situations" may be given for positions meeting levels 6-1 through 6-3. If a position meets three or more of the special situations cited in the standard, a single level is added for this factor. The appellant's position does not fully meet any of the special situations. Therefore, the position is credited with level 6-3.

Summary of Factor Levels

The point total for the six factors is 2650. According to the grade conversion chart on page 31 of the GSSG, this converts to the GS-11 grade level and falls within the point range of 2355 to 2750. The following table summarizes the factor levels credited to the appellant's position.

Factor	Level	Points
Scope and Effect	1-2	350
Organizational Setting	2-1	100
Supervisory Authority	3-2c	450
Personal Contacts		
Nature	4A-2	50
Purpose	4B-2	75
Difficulty of Work Directed	5-5	650
Other Conditions	6-3	975
TOTAL		2650

Application of the GSSG grading criteria determined the appellant's position is equivalent to the GS-11 grade level.

GS-802 Engineering Technician Series

Application of the GS-802 grading criteria does not result in a grade higher than GS-09. Whereas the appellant's position is credited with the GS-11 grade level, as determined by use of the GSSG, we will not discuss further the analysis resulting from the GS-802 standard.

DECISION

The appellant's position is appropriately classified as Supervisory Engineering Technician, GS-802-11.