



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

Atlanta Oversight Division  
75 Spring Street, SW., Suite 972  
Atlanta, GA 30303-3109

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

**Appellant:** [appellant]

**Agency Classification:** GS-1101-12  
Quality of Life Director

**Organization:** Naval Air Station

**OPM Decision:** GS-1101-12  
(Title at agency discretion)

**OPM Decision Number:** C-1101-12-01

---

Kathy W. Day  
Classification Appeals Officer

Date July 13, 1998

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

**Decision sent to:**

[Appellant]

[appellant's personnel office]

Director, Plans, Programs, and Diversity  
Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary  
of Navy, Civilian Personnel (CP/EEO)  
Department of the Navy  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22203-1998

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

## **Introduction**

On February 4, 1998, the Atlanta Oversight Division, Office of Personnel Management (OPM), accepted an appeal for the position of Quality of Life Director, GS-1101-12, Naval Air Station (NAS), [city & state]. The appellant is requesting that his position be changed to Quality of Life Director, GS-1101-13.

The appeal has been accepted and processed under section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code. This is the final administrative decision on the classification of the position subject to discretionary review only under the limited conditions and time outlined in part 511, subpart F, of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

## **General Issues**

Information contained in the appeal packet reveals that additional program areas were assigned to the position as a result of a reorganization at NAS. The command requested reclassification of the position to the GS-13 level. However, the position was classified at the GS-12 level by the Command Naval Reserve. The appellant disagrees with the classification decision. He believes that the fluctuating needs and the seasonal programs add to the complexity of his position.

## **Position Information**

The appellant is assigned to [position number]. The appellant, supervisor and the agency have certified the accuracy of the position description.

The appellant's position manages the Common Support Division, Services Division, Business Division, and the Recreational Division for the Quality of Life (QOL) facilities and programs at NAS. He functions as the command program manager, financial manager, and principal expert on all QOL activities. He plans, develops, and implements programs to meet the needs of the divisions and provides technical guidance in the development and overall policies of the programs to the Commanding Officer (CO) and Executive Officer (XO). The majority of the appellant's time is spent on nonsupervisory management duties and program responsibilities. Those duties include (1) coordinating, overseeing, and analyzing budgets that involve both appropriated and nonappropriated funds; (2) analyzing customer needs and satisfaction, as well as trends; and (3) managing effective publicity and marketing programs to inform customers of available services. The appellant reviews and provides input to Navywide draft policies and writes local internal policies as needed. He is responsible for military construction plans, including the repair and maintenance of the department facilities. He has propriety over the nonappropriated fund including signature authority for contracts and checks issued. The appellant functions as the first line supervisor for 1 Secretary, GS-318-5; 1 Supervisory Services Specialist, GS-301-9; 1 Services Manager, GS-1701-9; 1 Business Manager, GS-1101-9; and 1 Supervisory Recreation Specialist, GS-188-11. He has second line supervisory responsibility for approximately 154 employees who are civil service, nonappropriated, military, and contracted personnel.

The appellant reports to the CO via the XO. The appellant is responsible for providing the CO and the XO guidance concerning the overall policy of the facilities and programs he manages. He works independently in planning and carrying out the work assignments and objectives, and he has the freedom to make decisions and changes to the program activities as needed. The work is reviewed in terms of overall results and effectiveness. Unusual or significant problems are reported to the supervisor.

### **Standards Referenced**

Handbook of Occupational Groups and Families, February 1998.

General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG), April 1998.

Administrative Analysis Grade-Evaluation Guide, August 1990.

Budget Analysis Series, GS-560, July 1981.

### **Series**

The appellant does not contest the occupational series or title of his position.

The GS-1100, Business and Industry Group, includes all classes of positions the duties of which are to advise on, administer, supervise, or perform work pertaining to and requiring a knowledge of business and trade practices, characteristics and use of equipment, products, or property, or industrial production methods and processes, including the conduct of investigations and studies; the collection, analysis, and dissemination of information; the establishment and maintenance of contacts with industry and commerce; the provision of advisory services; the examination and appraisal of merchandise or property; and the administration of regulatory provisions and controls.

The agency determined that the appellant's position was properly placed in the General Business and Industry Series, GS-1101, which covers all classes of positions whose duties are to administer, supervise, or perform any combination of work characteristic of two or more series in this group where no one type of work is series controlling and where the combination is not specifically included in another series; or other work properly classified in this group for which no other series has been provided. The purpose of the appellant's work is to manage a diverse group of billeting, messing, recreation, and entertainment programs requiring proficiency in a variety of specialized fields with continuous review of management data, operating procedures, facility improvement, customer relations, safety and sanitation, repair and maintenance, personnel, accounting, and budgets. We agree with the agency's determination.

### **Title**

There are no titles specified for positions placed in the GS-1101 series. The agency should construct a title in accordance with guidance in the Introduction to the Position Classification

Standards. Since the position is delegated supervisory responsibilities that meet the minimum criteria for coverage under Factor 3 of the GSSG, the title should denote these responsibilities.

The appellant's position is properly titled at the discretion of the agency.

### **Grade Determination**

There is no grade level criteria in the GS-1101 series. Supervisory work which meets the criteria in Factor 3 in the GSSG is evaluated by the GSSG. Nonsupervisory work is evaluated by comparison with the appropriate classification standard which has analogous duties, knowledges and qualification requirements.

### ***PROGRAM MANAGEMENT DUTIES***

The appellant performs various administrative/program management duties associated with directing, planning, developing, analyzing, and evaluating the QOL program. Work requires comprehensive knowledge of the mission, goals and objectives of the program, as well as the regulations and policies governing the resources; knowledge of manpower requirements and systems; ability to use a variety of qualitative and quantitative methods and techniques for assessment and evaluation; and skills to plan effective strategies to increase program participation and efficiency. The appellant must also have effective oral and written communication skills to give briefings and presentations to a broad audience, provide insight and direction to resolve problems, or to report on the status of operations.

The Administrative Analysis Grade Evaluation Guide provides grade level criteria for nonsupervisory staff administrative analytical, planning, and evaluative work at grades GS-9 and above. Work covered by the guide is administrative in nature and does not require specialized subject matter knowledges and skills. While such work does not require specialized educational preparation, it does require a high degree of qualitative and/or quantitative analytical skills, the ability to research problems and issues, written and oral communication skills, and the application of mature judgment in problem solving. Although the appellant's position does require proficiency in a variety of specialized program areas, the overriding requirement common to them all is the ability to analyze and evaluate data in order to manage these various business activities. The Administrative Analysis Grade Evaluation Guide is appropriate for evaluating the analytical, communication, and problem-solving skills required by the appellant's position.

In the Administrative Analysis Grade Evaluation Guide, a point value is assigned to each factor based on a comparison of the position's duties with the factor-level descriptions in the standard. The factor point values mark the lower end of the ranges for the indicated factor levels. For a position factor to warrant a given point value, it must be fully equivalent to the overall intent of the selected factor-level description. If the position fails in any significant aspect to meet a particular factor-level description in the standard, the point value for the next lower factor level must be assigned, unless the deficiency is balanced by an equally important aspect which meets

a higher level. The total points assigned are converted to a grade by use of the grade conversion table in the standard.

Under FES, positions which significantly exceed the highest factor level or fail to meet the lowest factor level described in a classification standard must be evaluated by reference to the Primary Standard, contained in Appendix 3 of the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards. The Primary Standard is the “standard-for-standards” for FES.

*Factor 1 - Knowledge Required by the Position:*

This factor measures the nature and extent of information or facts that a worker must understand to do acceptable work, such as the procedures, practices, rules, policies, theories, principles, and concepts; and the nature and extent of the skills needed to apply this knowledge. In order for any knowledge to be used as a basis for selecting a level under this factor, it must be required and applied in the work of the position being evaluated.

At Level 1-7, the position requires knowledge and skill in applying analytical and evaluative methods and techniques to issues or studies concerning the efficiency and effectiveness of program operations carried out by administrative or professional personnel, or substantive administrative support functions (i.e., internal activities or functions such as supply, budget, procurement, or personnel which serve to facilitate line or program operations). This level includes knowledge of pertinent laws, regulations, policies and precedents which affect the use of program and related support resources (people, money, or equipment) in the area studied. Projects and studies typically require knowledge of the major issues, program goals and objectives, work processes, and administrative operations of the organization. Knowledge is used to plan, schedule, and conduct projects and studies to evaluate and recommend ways to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of work operations in a program or support setting. The assignments require knowledge and skill in adapting analytical techniques and evaluation criteria to the measurement and improvement of program effectiveness and/or organizational productivity. Knowledge is applied in developing new or modified work methods, organizational structures, management processes, procedures for administering program services, guidelines, etc.

Level 1-7 is met. Similar to illustration #3 under this factor level, the appellant’s work requires thorough knowledge of service programs, operations, goals, objectives and policies along with a comprehensive knowledge of management and organizational techniques, systems, and procedures as applied in performing a wide variety of analytical studies and projects related to management improvement, productivity improvement, management controls, and long-range planning. His assignments include initiating, planning, and implementing the business functions of the programs. He evaluates customer needs and conducts feasibility studies, cost analysis, and return on investment studies. Based on an analysis of information and a knowledge of pertinent laws and regulations, he directs expansion, renovation, improvements in work processes, corrections to deficiencies, and changes in resources and local program objectives.

At Level 1-8, the employee operates as an expert analyst who has mastered the application of a wide range of qualitative and/or quantitative methods for the assessment and improvement of program effectiveness or the improvement of complex management processes and systems. In addition, this level requires comprehensive knowledge of the range of administrative laws, policies, regulations, and precedents applicable to the administration of one or more important public programs. Typically, this includes knowledge of agency program goals and objectives, the sequence and timing of key program events and milestones, and methods of evaluating the worth of program accomplishments. Work requires knowledge of relationships with other programs and key administrative support functions within the employing agency or in other agencies. Study objectives are to identify and propose solutions to management problems which are characterized by their breadth, importance, and severity, and for which previous studies and established management techniques are frequently inadequate. Also included at this level is skill to plan, organize, and direct team study work and to negotiate effectively with management to accept and implement recommendations, where the proposals involve substantial agency resources, require extensive changes in established procedures, or may be in conflict with the desires of the activity studied.

Level 1-8 is not met. The appellant's work does not involve the analysis or evaluation of a public program or require knowledge of broad agency (i.e., Department of Navy) administrative programs where legislation must be translated into program goals, actions or services. His work involves implementing policy and legislative changes and assessing the impact of these changes on his local program. The results of the appellant's work does not involve substantial agency resources or require extensive changes in established procedures nor does it have direct impact on agency programs or policies.

This factor is credited at Level 1-7, for 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 for carrying out assignments, and how completed work is reviewed.

At Level 2-4, the work is within a framework of priorities, funding and overall project objectives (e.g., cost reduction, improved effectiveness and efficiency, better workload distribution, or implementation of new work methods), and the employee and supervisor develop a mutually acceptable project plan which typically includes identification of the work to be done, the scope of the project, and deadlines for its completion. Within the parameters of the approved project plan, the employee is responsible for planning and organizing the study, estimating costs, coordinating with staff and line management personnel, and conducting all phases of the project. This frequently involves the definitive interpretation of regulations and study procedures, and the initial application of new methods. The employee informs the supervisor of potentially controversial findings, issues, or problems with widespread impact. Completed projects,

evaluations, reports, or recommendations are reviewed by the supervisor for compatibility with organizational goals, guidelines, and effectiveness in achieving intended objectives.

Level 2-4 is exceeded. The appellant is the recognized authority for his program area and works more independently than described at this level.

At Level 2-5, the highest level described in the guide and the Primary Standard, as a recognized authority in the analysis and evaluation of programs and issues, the employee is subject only to administrative and policy direction concerning overall project priorities and objectives. At this level, the employee is typically delegated complete responsibility and authority to plan, schedule, and carry out major projects concerned with the analysis and evaluation of programs or organizational effectiveness. The employee typically exercises discretion and judgment in determining whether to broaden or narrow the scope of projects or studies. Analyses, evaluations, and recommendations developed by the employee are normally reviewed by management officials only for potential influence on broad agency policy objectives and program goals. Findings and recommendations are normally accepted without significant change.

Level 2-5 is met. The appellant is considered by the CO to be the recognized authority of the overall administrative policy of the QOL program. He has been delegated complete responsibility to develop plans and objectives to meet established goals within the budget allocations. The appellant establishes long and short-term program initiatives and priorities. He keeps the chain of command informed of new developments and status of changes. He presents his findings to the supervisor for review. According to the CO, the findings and recommendations are normally accepted without significant changes.

This factor is credited at Level 2-5, for 650 points.

### *Factor 3 - Guidelines:*

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

At Level 3-4, the guidelines consist of general administrative policies and management and organizational theories which require considerable adaptation and/or interpretation for application to issues and problems studied. At this level, administrative policies and precedent studies provide a basic outline of the results desired, but do not go into detail as to the methods used to accomplish the project. Administrative guidelines usually cover program goals and objectives of the employing organization, such as agency controls on size of work force, productivity targets, and similar objectives. Within the context of broad regulatory guidelines, the employee may refine or develop more specific guidelines such as implementing regulations or methods for the measurement and improvement of effectiveness and productivity in the administration of operating programs.

Level 3-4 is met. The appellant is guided by a wide variety of policy directives, instructions, and manuals issued by higher headquarters and precedent decisions by DoD agencies. The guidelines normally require considerable interpretation and adaptation. The appellant develops local policy or guidelines for the QOL program on an as needed basis.

At Level 3-5, guidelines consist of basic administrative policy statements concerning the issue or problem being studied, and may include reference to pertinent legislative history, related court decisions, state and local laws, or policy initiatives of agency management. The employee uses judgment and discretion in determining intent and in interpreting and revising existing policy and regulatory guidance for use by others within or outside the employing organization (e.g., other analysts, line managers, or contractors). Some employees review proposed legislation or regulations which would significantly change the basic character of agency programs, the way the agency conducts its business with the public or with private industry, or which modify important interagency relationships. Other employees develop study formats for use by others on a project team or at subordinate echelons in the organization. At this level, the employees are recognized as experts in the development and/or interpretation of guidance on program planning and evaluation in their area of specialization (e.g., workforce management, contingency/emergency planning, position management, work measurement, or productivity improvement).

Level 3-5 is not met. The appellant is not required to develop policy or regulations or propose legislation or regulations which would significantly change agency (Department of the Navy) programs. He does not have to interpret the intent of vague or broad policy statements.

This factor is credited at Level 3-4, for 450 points.

*Factor 4 - Complexity:*

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

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

reevaluation of results. Options, recommendations, and conclusions developed by the employee take into account and give appropriate weight to uncertainties about the data and other variables which affect long-range program performance. For example, the employee may need to consider and assess the relative advantages and disadvantages of centralizing or decentralizing work operations in organizations with several echelons of geographically separated components. In some instances, work is complicated by the need to develop data about workload and program accomplishments which is currently unavailable. Current measurements of program effectiveness may be ambiguous and susceptible to widely varying interpretations. Under these circumstances the employee develops new information about the subject studied and establishes criteria to identify and measure program accomplishments, develops methods to improve the effectiveness with which programs are administered, or develops new approaches to program evaluation which serve as precedents for others.

Level 4-5 is met. The appellant's work involves the development of plans to implement the initiatives and objectives and major changes that affect and enhance the QOL programs to benefit DoD personnel and their families. The work is complicated by the need to analyze and evaluate interrelated issues of effectiveness, efficiency and productivity for the command, as well as the different kinds of services and activities provided. The appellant must consider a variety of policies and regulations governing program activities for community projects, construction and repair, contracting, child care, nonappropriated funds, etc.

At Level 4-6, the employee plans, organizes, and carries through to completion analytical studies involving the substance of key agency programs. Studies are of such breadth and intensity that they often require input and assistance from other analysts and subject-matter specialists in fields appropriate to the subject. Where the assistance of other analysts is required, the incumbent typically serves as the team leader responsible for assignment segments of the study to various participants, coordinating the efforts of the group, and consolidating findings into a completed product (e.g., evaluation report, proposed changes in legislation or regulations, or recommended course of action). At this level, there is extreme difficulty in identifying the nature of the issues or problems to be studied, and in planning, organizing, and determining the scope and depth of the study. The nature and scope of the issues are largely undefined. Difficulty is encountered in separating the substantive nature of the programs or issues studied into their administrative, technical, political, economic, fiscal and other components, and determining the nature and magnitude of the interactions. Difficulty is also encountered in discerning the intent of legislation and policy statements and determining how to translate the intent into program actions. The work typically involves efforts to develop and implement programs based upon new or revised legislation requiring consideration of the immediate sequential and long-range effects, both direct and indirect, or proposed actions on the public, other Government programs, and/or private industry. The employee doing program evaluation studies is normally faced with the need to develop new ways to measure program accomplishments, results, and effectiveness.

Level 4-6 is not met. The appellant's work does not require the analysis of key agency programs or studies of such breadth and intensity as those described at this level. His work deals with the

analysis and evaluation of a program segment of a major command and the impact of changes upon local operating programs. The nature of the problems he addresses can normally be readily identified. The appellant is not regularly required to develop new methods of assessing program accomplishments, nor does he have to determine at his level the intent of new legislation and how to translate the intent into program actions. Policy guidance on legislative initiatives is provided from a higher level.

This factor is credited at Level 4-5, for 325 points.

*Factor 5 - Scope and Effect:*

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

At Level 5-4, the purpose of work is to assess the productivity, effectiveness, and efficiency of program operations or to analyze and resolve problems in the staffing, effectiveness and efficiency of administrative support and staff activities. Work involves establishing criteria to measure and/or predict the attainment of program or organizational goals and objectives. Work at this level may also include developing related administrative regulations, such as those governing the allocation and distribution of personnel, supplies, equipment, and other resources, or promulgating program guidance for application across organizational lines or in varied geographical locations. Work that involves the evaluation of program effectiveness usually focuses on the delivery of program benefits or services at the operating level. Work contributes to the improvement of productivity, effectiveness, and efficiency in program operations and/or administrative support activities at different echelons and/or geographical locations within the organization. Work affects the plans, goals, and effectiveness of missions and programs at these various echelons or locations. Work may affect the nature of administrative work done in components of other agencies (e.g., in preparation and submission of reports, in gathering and evaluating workload statistics, or in routing and storing official correspondence or files).

Level 5-4 is met. The appellant's work involves the assessment of a variety of operations, policies, procedures, and support activities for different facilities and programs, as well as effective management of manpower and resources. The work affects a number of services provided to personnel at NAS, tenant activities, and military retirees and ultimately affects the morale, productivity, and retention of military personnel.

At Level 5-5, the purpose of the work is to analyze and evaluate major administrative aspects of substantive, mission-oriented programs. This may involve, for example, the development of long-range program plans, goals, objectives, and milestones, or the evaluation of the effectiveness of programs conducted throughout a bureau or service of an independent agency, a regional structure of equivalent scope, or a large complex multi-mission field activity. The work involves identifying and developing ways to resolve problems or cope with issues which

directly affect the accomplishment of principal program goals and objectives (e.g., the delivery of program benefits or services). Some employees develop new ways to resolve major administrative problems or plan the most significant administrative management aspects of professional or scientific programs.

Level 5-5 is not met. At this level, the work has major significance to top managers of the agency (i.e., Department of Navy) and recommendations significantly change major aspects of missions and programs. The appellant's work deals with defined issues and conditions that impact program operations, resources, staff, and policies and affects the quality of services provided within NAS/local population. His work does not have the broad scope or level of impact intended to credit Level 5-5.

This factor is credited at Level 5-4, for 225 points.

*Factor 6 - Personal Contacts and Factor 7 - Purpose of Contacts:*

This measures face-to-face contacts and telephone dialogue with persons not in the supervisory chain and the purpose of those contacts. In General Schedule occupations, the purpose of personal contacts ranges from factual exchanges of information to situations involving significant or controversial issues and differing viewpoints, goals, and objectives. The personal contacts which serve as the basis for the level selected for Factor 6 must be the contacts which are the basis for the level selected for Factor 7.

*Personal Contacts*

At Level 3, personal contacts are with persons outside the agency which may include consultants, contractors, or business executives in a moderately unstructured setting. This level may also include contacts with the head of the employing agency or program officials several managerial levels removed from the employee when such contacts occur on an ad-hoc basis.

Level 3 is met. The appellant's personal contacts are with management officials and employees/military personnel within the command, agency headquarters, tenant activities, contractors, vendors, and some local community officials.

At Level 4, contacts are with high-ranking officials such as other agency heads, top congressional staff officials, state executive or legislative leaders, mayors of major cities, or executives of comparable private sector organizations.

Level 4 is not met. The appellant does not have regular and recurring contacts with persons of the caliber described.

### *Purpose of Contacts*

At Level c, the purpose of contacts is to influence managers and other officials to accept and implement findings and recommendations on organizational improvement or program effectiveness. The employee may encounter resistance due to such issues as organizational conflict, competing objectives, or resource problems.

Level c is met. The appellant represents the organization at meetings and conferences, negotiates agreements, and resolves problems related to the programs he directs.

At Level d, the purpose of contacts is to justify or settle matters involving significant or controversial issues (e.g., recommendations affecting major programs, dealing with substantial expenditures, or significantly changing the nature or scope of organizations).

Level d is not met. There is no evidence in the record that the appellant's typical contacts involve the intense opposition or resistance described at this level. He is not responsible for major agency programs.

This factor is credited at Level 3-c, which converts to 180 points using the chart in the guide.

### *Factor 8 - Physical Demands:*

This factor measures the requirements and physical demands placed on the employee in performing the work assignment, including the agility and dexterity required, and the extent of physical exertion.

At Level 8-1, work is primarily sedentary, although some slight physical effort may be required.

Level 8-1 is met. There are no special physical requirements for the appellant's work.

This factor is evaluated at Level 8-1, for 5 points.

### *Factor 9 - Work Environment:*

This factor considers the risks and discomforts in the employee's physical surroundings, and the safety precautions required.

At Level 9-1, the work is typically performed in an adequately lighted and climate controlled office. Work may require occasional travel.

Level 9-1 is met. The appellant performs work normally in an office environment and is required to perform occasional travel associated with site inspections or to attend briefings, meetings, conferences, or business activities.

This factor is evaluated at Level 9-1, for 5 points.

<b>SUMMARY</b>		
<b>FACTOR</b>	<b>LEVEL</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
1. Knowledge Required by the Position	1-7	1250
2. Supervisory Controls	2-5	650
3. Guidelines	3-4	450
4. Complexity	4-5	325
5. Scope and Effect	5-4	225
6. Personal Contacts	6-3	180
7. Purpose of Contacts	7-c	
8. Physical Demands	8-1	5
9. Work Environment	9-1	5
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3090</b>

A total of 3090 points falls within the range for a GS-12, 2755 to 3150 points, according to the Grade Conversion Table in the Administrative Analysis Grade Evaluation Guide.

### ***SUPERVISORY DUTIES***

The GSSG is used to determine the grade of General Schedule (GS or GM) supervisory positions in grades GS-5 through GS-15. The guide is intended to measure the difficulty, complexity, and responsibility of work involved in the administrative and technical direction of others through the equivalent of an employer/employee relationship. The GSSG employs a factor-point evaluation method that assesses six factors common to all supervisory positions. To grade a position, each factor is evaluated by comparing the position to the factor-level descriptions for that factor and crediting the points designated for the highest factor-level which is fully met, in accordance with the instructions specific to the factor being evaluated. The total points accumulated under all factors are then converted to a grade by using the point-to-grade conversion table in the guide. The appellant specifically contests the agency's determinations for Factors 1, 3, 4A, and 6. This decision will, therefore, provide an analysis of those five factors only. The remaining factor level determinations made by the agency and not contested by the appellant will not be discussed further in this decision since we have reviewed each factor and agree with the accuracy of the agency determination. The position is evaluated as follows:

*Factor 1, Program Scope and Effect:*

This factor assesses the general complexity, breadth, and impact of the program areas and work directed, including the organizational and geographical coverage. It also assesses the impact of the work both within and outside the immediate organization. To credit a particular factor level, the criteria for both scope and effect must be met. The agency credited Level 1-2. The appellant believes Level 1-3 is appropriate.

a. Scope

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

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

At Level 1-3, the position directs a program segment that performs technical, administrative, protective, investigative, or professional work covering 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, comparable to a small city. Providing complex administrative or technical or professional services directly affecting a large, or complex, multi-mission military installation also falls at this level.

The appellant's work is administrative/technical and has limited geographical coverage. The NAS is a 166 acre complex with a total serviced population of approximately 17,000, including over 1,100 active Navy/Marine employees, 220 civilians, and 3,800 drilling reservists, as well as roughly 12,000 retirees and dependents. The appellant provides administrative/technical services related to the QOL programs for the activity. The QOL programs directly affect dependents and retirees, as well as the military personnel and employees. The appellant is the first line supervisor for 5 employees and second line supervisor for approximately 159. Since the appellant's work supports a program segment that impacts over 4000 personnel, it exceeds the small military base or typical field office setting characteristic of Level 1-2. However, the appellant's program coverage does not encompass an area comparable to a State or region of several States or a small city. In deciding whether or not his program services affect a large or complex multi-mission military installation, the definition of multi-mission military installation provided in the GSSG must be examined.

A large complex multi-mission military installation is one which is comparable to one of the two following situations:

- A large military installation (including a military base with only one or a few major missions) or group of activities with a total serviced or supported employee-equivalent population exceeding 4000 personnel, and with a variety of serviced technical functions. These personnel are directly affected by, but not supervised by, the position under evaluation. Federal civilian and military employees, estimated contractor personnel, volunteers, and similar personnel may be used to derive the population total; nonemployed personnel such as dependents are significant only if directly impacted by the program segment and work directed.
- A complex, multi-mission installation or a group of several organizations (directly supported by the position under evaluation) that includes four or more of the following: a garrison; a medical center or large hospital and medical laboratory complex; multimillion dollar (annual) construction, civil works, or environmental cleanup projects; a test and evaluation center or research laboratory of moderate size; an equipment or product development center; a service school; a major command higher than that in which the servicing position is located or a comparable tenant activity of moderate size; a supply or maintenance depot; or equivalent activities. These activities are individually smaller than the large installation described in the preceding paragraph.

While the employee-equivalent population supported and impacted by the appellant's work exceeds the 4000 personnel regarded by the guide as the minimum complement of a large military installation, the program segment (i.e., the QOL program) itself lacks the diversity and complexity of functions found in complex multi-mission installations as described in the first situation. The NAS does not include four or more of the organizations described in the second situation. Consequently, even though the program segment directed by the appellant exceeds Level 1-2, it does not fully meet the complexity and breadth typical of Level 1-3 programs or administrative services.

Level 1-2 is credited for Scope.

b. Effect

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

At Level 1-2, the services or products support and significantly affect installation level, area office level, or field office operations and objectives, or comparable program segments; or provide services to a moderate, local or limited population of clients or users comparable to a major portion of a small city or rural county.

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 (e.g., a segment of a regulated industry), or the general public. At the field activity level (i.e., large, complex multi-mission organizations or very large serviced populations), the work directly involves or substantially impacts the provision of essential support services to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, or administrative functions.

The appellant's work directly impacts the QOL (morale and well-being) services for active duty and reserve Navy personnel and their dependents and retirees. It does not impact a wide range of agency activities, nor does it substantially impact numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, or administrative functions, such as those found at large or complex military installations. Although other organizations may use the facilities at various times, the work performed by the appellant has no direct impact on other agencies or outside interests. Consequently, Level 1-3 is not met and only Level 1-2 applies.

Level 1-2 is credited for Effect.

Both Scope and Effect equate to Level 1-2. Therefore, Factor 1 is credited with Level 1-2, for 350 points.

*Factor 3, Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised:*

This factor covers the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities that are exercised on a recurring basis. To be credited with a level under this factor, a position must carry out the authorities and responsibilities to the extent described for the specific level. Levels under this factor apply equally to the direction of specialized program management organizations, line functions, staff functions, and operating and support activities. The agency credited Level 3-3, and the appellant disagrees with that evaluation.

Level 3-3 describes two situations, either of which meets the level.

In situation a, the position exercises delegated managerial authority to set a series of annual, multi-year, or similar long-range work plans and schedules for in-service or contracted work; assures implementation by subordinate organizational units of program goals and objectives; determines which goals and objectives need additional emphasis; determines the best solution to budget shortages; and plans for long-range staffing needs. Positions in this situation are closely involved with high level program officials or comparable agency staff personnel in developing overall goals and objectives for assigned staff functions or programs. For example, they direct development of data; provision of expertise and insights; securing of legal opinions; preparation of position papers or legislative proposals; and execution of comparable activities which support development of goals and objectives related to high levels of program management and development or formulation.

Situation b covers second level supervisory positions which perform the full range of supervisory functions described at Level 3-2, and at least half of the conditions described at Level 3-3, including such matters as using subordinates to direct or lead work, exercising significant advisory or coordinating responsibilities, assuring equity of performance standards and ratings among subordinate units, directing a program segment with significant resources, making decisions on matters elevated by subordinate supervisors, exercising personnel authority over subordinate supervisors and employees, approving serious disciplinary actions, making nonroutine decisions, and approving the expenditure of funds.

The appellant does not meet Level 3-3a which requires participation in program management, development, and formulation with high level program officials (e.g., at an agency headquarters level). The appellant does not function at such a level. He does meet all of the requirements of Level 3-2c, as well as 12 of the 15 duties described in Level 3-3b (1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 14), for credit at Level 3-3b.

In order to consider criteria at Level 3-4, the position must first meet paragraphs a and b of Level 3-3. Since the appellant meets only Level 3-3b, Level 3-4 cannot be considered.

Level 3-3 is credited for 775 points.

*Factor 4, Personal Contacts:*

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

Subfactor 4A, Nature of Contacts

This subfactor covers the organizational relationships, authority or influence level, setting, and difficulty of preparation associated with making personal contacts involved in supervisory and managerial work. To be credited, the level of contacts must contribute to the successful performance of the work, be a recurring requirement, have a demonstrable impact on the difficulty and responsibility of the position, and require direct contact. The agency credited Level 4A-2. The appellant contests that determination.

At Level 4A-2, frequent contacts are with members of the business community or the general public; higher ranking managers, supervisors, and staff of other units throughout the activity or at levels below bureau or major military command level; representatives of local public interest groups; case workers in Congressional district offices; technical or operating personnel in State and local government; reporters for local or other limited media outlets; or comparable contacts. These contacts may be informal, occur in conferences and meetings, or take place through

telephone, televised, radio, or similar contact, and sometimes require nonroutine or special preparation.

At Level 4A-3, recurring contacts are with high ranking military or civilian managers at bureau and major organizational levels within the agency, with agency administrative personnel, or with comparable personnel in other agencies; key staff of public interest groups with significant political influence or media coverage; journalists representing influential city or county news media; Congressional committee and subcommittee staff assistants; contracting officials and high level technical staff of large industrial firms; or local officers of regional or national trade associations, public action groups or professional organizations; or with State and local government managers. These contacts take place in meetings and conferences and often require extensive preparation.

The appellant's contacts are comparable to Level 4A-2. He has frequent contacts with bureau personnel, local command leaders and managers, county and city officials, local media, contractors, patrons of all ranks and grades, and various advisory boards. Many of the contacts occur in relation to community events taking place at NAS, during the process of assessing patron needs and satisfaction, or while upgrading/expanding facilities and services. These contacts take place in informal situations, as well as formal meetings and are frequently impromptu.

To meet Level 4A-3, not only must the appellant have frequent contacts with high ranking military or civilian managers, supervisors, and technical staff at bureau and major agency organizational levels, but the contacts must require extensive preparation of briefing materials or up-to-date technical familiarity with complex subject matter. The appeal record does not support that the appellant's high level contacts normally require the degree of preparation or technical complexity intended at this level. He does not routinely meet with Congressional staffs or have reason to meet formally with influential politicians or public interest groups. His media contacts are for publicity purposes.

This subfactor is credited with Level 4A-2, for 50 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. To evaluate Factor 6, two steps are used. First, the highest level that a position substantially meets is initially credited. Then, if the level selected is either 6-1, 6-2, or 6-3, the Special Situations listed after the factor level definitions are considered. If a position meets three or more of the situations, then a single level is added to the level selected in Step 1. If the level selected under Step 1 is either 6-4, 6-5, or 6-6, the Special Situations may not be considered in determining whether a higher factor level is creditable. The agency credited Level 6-3, as well as *Variety of Work* and

*Physical Dispersion* under Special Situations. The appellant believes *Shift Operations* and *Fluctuating Work Force* should also be credited under Special Situations.

The GSSG describes two situations, either of which meets Level 6-3. The first situation involves coordination, integration, or consolidation of administrative, technical, or complex technician or other support work comparable to GS-9 or 10, or work at the GS-7 or 8 level where the supervisor has full and final technical authority (i.e., is responsible for all technical determinations arising from the work without technical advice or assistance from others or further review of the work). Directing work at this level requires consolidation or coordination to ensure consistency of product, service, interpretation, or advice; or conformance with the output of other units, with formal standards, or agency policy. This situation also covers direction of analytical, interpretive, judgmental, evaluative, or creative work where the supervisor must resolve conflicts and maintain compatibility of interpretation, judgment, logic, and policy application. The second situation covers positions which direct subordinate supervisors over positions in grades GS-7 or 8 or the equivalent, requiring consolidation or coordination to ensure consistency of product, service, interpretation, or advice; or conformance with the output of other units, with formal standards, or agency policy.

The appellant directs two subordinate supervisors over positions equivalent to grade GS-7. This meets the second situation described at Level 6-3.

## SPECIAL SITUATIONS

### 1. *Variety of Work:*

Credit this situation when more than one kind of work, each kind representing a requirement for a distinctly different additional body of knowledge on the part of the supervisor, is present in the work of the unit. A “kind of work” usually will be the equivalent of a classification series. Each “kind of work” requires substantially full qualification in distinctly separate areas, or full knowledge and understanding of rules, regulations, procedures, and subject matter of a distinctly separate area of work. Additionally, to credit “Variety” (1) both technical and administrative responsibility must be exercised over the work, and (2) the grade level of the work cannot be more than one grade below the base level of work used in Factor 5. The agency credited this situation and we agree.

The appellant is the first-level supervisor over positions in the following series: 1 Secretary, GS-318-5; 1 Supervisory Services Specialist, GS-301-9; 1 Services Manager, GS-1701-9; 1 Business Manager, GS-1101-9; and 1 Supervisory Recreation Specialist, GS-188-11. The appellant supervises a variety of different positions at different grade levels that require him to have full knowledge and understanding of the work performed.

2. *Shift Operations:*

Credit this situation when the position supervises an operation carried out on at least two fully staffed shifts. The agency credited this situation, and we agree.

The appellant supervises several operations which are covered by more than 2 fully staffed shifts.

3. *Fluctuating Workforce or Constantly Changing Deadlines:*

Credit Fluctuating Workforce when the workforce supervised by the position has large fluctuations in size (e.g., when there are significant seasonal variations in staff) and these fluctuations impose on the supervisor a substantially greater responsibility for training, adjusting assignments, or maintaining a smooth flow of work while absorbing and releasing employees.

Credit Constantly Changing Deadlines when frequent, abrupt, and unexpected changes in work assignments, goals, and deadlines require the supervisor constantly to adjust operations under the pressure of continuously changing and unpredictable conditions. This condition is not credited. The appellant contends that seasonal variance in staff for the summer, the turnover in front line employees, and high rotation rates for military personnel is cause for crediting this situation. The appellant makes temporary appointments to accommodate periods of heavy workload, such as seasonal employees to help with the after school program. However, this does not compare to the large fluctuations in staff intended for credit of this situation. Fluctuation occurs on a routine basis from year to year and is predictable. Therefore, the appellant is not required to constantly adjust operations due to frequent, abrupt or unexpected changes in workload or deadlines. Neither situation is met, and this condition cannot be credited.

4. *Physical Dispersion:*

Credit this situation when a substantial portion of the workload for which the supervisor is responsible is regularly carried out at one or more locations which are physically removed from the main unit (as in different buildings or widely dispersed locations in a large warehouse or factory building), under conditions which make day-to-day supervision difficult to administer. The agency credited this situation, however, we disagree.

The appellant is the second level supervisor over a number of first line supervisors who, according to their position descriptions, work very independently because of the nature and location of their work. They receive broad general directions from the appellant who reviews their work for overall results and effectiveness. As subordinate supervisors, they do not receive close daily supervision. More importantly, as a second level supervisor,

the appellant does not make daily onsite visits to monitor or supervise the routine work performed by the employees in the field. Therefore, while the appellant supervises a workload carried out in various locations, this does not impact on the difficulty of his day-to-day supervisory duties. This condition is not credited.

The position meets 2 of the 8 special conditions. Therefore, no additional levels are added, and Level 6-3 is credited, for 975 points.

<b>SUMMARY</b>		
<b>FACTOR</b>	<b>LEVEL</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
1. Program Scope and Effect	1-2	350
2. Organizational Setting	2-2	250
3. Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised	3-3	775
4. Personal Contacts		
A. Nature of Contacts	4A-2	50
B. Purpose of Contacts	4B-2	75
5. Difficulty of Typical Work Directed	5-3	340
6. Other Conditions	6-3	975
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2815</b>

A total of 2815 points equates to GS-12, 2755 to 3150 points, according to the point-to-grade conversion chart of the GSSG.

### ***BUDGET DUTIES***

The Budget Analysis Series, GS-560, includes all positions the paramount duties of which are to perform, advise on, or supervise work in any of the phases or systems of budget administration in use in the Federal service, when such work also primarily requires knowledge and skill in the application of related laws, regulations, policies, precedents, methods and techniques of budgeting. The GS-560 standard indicates that budget analysts provide advice to program managers, agency administrators, and others on matters such as the amounts and types of funding available, the purposes for which money in the budget may legally be used, the time frames within which available budget funds or authority must be used, trends in the obligation and/or expenditure of funds, and the effects of budgetary changes on related activities.

The appellant performs a variety of duties in relation to coordinating and developing annual appropriated and nonappropriated fund operational budgets for QOL programs, requiring knowledge of the related laws, regulations, policies, and methods. He has control and signatory authority for almost 3 million dollars in nonappropriated funds alone.

The Budget Analysis Series, GS-560, standard is written in the FES format.

*Factor 1 - Knowledge Required by the Position:*

This factor measures the nature and extent of information or facts that a worker must understand to do acceptable work, such as the steps, procedures, practices, rules, policies, theories, principles, and concepts; and the nature and extent of the skills needed to apply this knowledge. To be used as a basis for selecting a level under this factor, a knowledge must be required and applied.

At Level 1-7, in addition to those knowledges and skills described at lower levels, the work requires detailed, intensive knowledge of the budgetary policies, precedents, goals, objectives, regulations, and guidelines of the employing component which apply to assigned organizations and programs; the sources, types, and methods of funding for assigned organizations and programs and budgetary and financial relationships between the assigned budget(s) and budgets and programs of other agency components and organizations. This level requires knowledge and skill in the application of methods and techniques for analyzing and evaluating the effects of continuing changes in program plans and funding on the accomplishment of the organization's budget and program milestones (e.g., cost-benefit analysis, planning-programing-budgeting, program evaluation review techniques, management by objectives, decision theory, probability theory, linear programing, and inventory replacement theory). Skill is also required in analyzing budgetary relationships and developing recommendations for budgetary actions (e.g., requesting allotments or reprograming funds among object classes) under conditions of time pressure and uncertainty due to short and rapidly changing program and budgetary deadlines and objectives; gaps and conflicts in program and budgetary information; lack of predictive data; conflicting program and budgetary objectives; and changing guidelines for the work.

Level 1-7 is met. The appellant's work requires knowledge and skill to effectively monitor funding availability and expenditures for both the nonappropriated and appropriated funds. The appellant must be knowledgeable of the policies, procedures, principles, techniques, goals, and concepts related to budget analysis and development. He analyzes and evaluates the effects of continuing changes in program plans and funding. The appellant revises assigned budgets, makes recommendations for future funding due to continuing changes in program plans and funding, and may conduct cost analysis.

At Level 1-8, the work requires mastery of the concepts, principles, practices, laws and regulations which apply to budgeting for substantive national programs and services. Employees with this level of knowledge typically serve as advisors and consultants to top management of

the employing agency or organization on the Federal budget process. It requires comprehensive and detailed knowledge of the process through which budgets are developed, transmitted, presented, examined by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and reviewed by Congress, and how budgetary and program legislation is enacted by Congress. It also involves expert knowledge of the financial and budgetary relationships between the organization's budget and the budgets and programs of other Federal agencies, state and local governments, private industry, and large public organizations.

Level 1-8 is not met. The appellant's work does not require this level of mastery since he is not responsible for national programs and services, nor is he involved in developing legislation or advising top agency officials.

Level 1-7, for 1250 points, is credited for this factor.

*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.

At Level 2-4, the employee is usually assigned long-term, continuing responsibility for independently performing budgetary functions in one or more phases of the budget process (i.e., formulation, presentation, and/or execution for areas of the budget which support the substantive programs of the employing agency or component). This level is distinguished from the preceding level principally by the employee's added responsibility for independently planning and carrying out work on an extended basis, and for making a wide range of technical (budgetary) decisions, commitments, and recommendations as the work proceeds. The supervisor establishes the overall budgetary objectives and policies of the employing organization and indicates the sources and types of funding available to achieve the stated objectives. The employee is responsible for independently planning, performing, coordinating, and scheduling the budgetary financing for new programs and activities of a substantive nature; resolving and interpreting ambiguous and conflicting budgetary policies and regulations; reconciling conflicting budgetary and program objectives; and assessing the long-term effects of new or revised legislation on the organization's budget. The employee selects the methods to be used in estimating funding needs, presenting recommendations, and checking accuracy and reliability of forecasts. Completed work is reviewed for effectiveness in meeting budgetary and program objectives and deadlines, and consistency and agreement of actions.

Level 2-4 is met. The appellant has long-term, continuing responsibility to independently perform budgetary functions for the QOL program. He independently plans and coordinates budgetary financing for the nonappropriated fund programs for which he is responsible including determining new programs and facilities to be financed, how to achieve financial objectives, and determining impact of legislation on funding of his programs. The work is reviewed for effectiveness in meeting program objectives and consistency with Navy policies and objectives.

Level 2-5 describes the kind and level of supervisory control typically exercised over the work of an employee who is responsible for, and expert in, all phases and methods of budgeting for the substantive nationwide programs administered by the employing agency or a component thereof; or of an entire Federal agency with a substantive nationwide mission and programs. The employee is regarded as the sole technical authority for the employing organization on budgetary matters (e.g., interpretation of laws, regulations, policies, and methods) and recommendations made by the employee are usually accepted by the supervisor without change. Due to the extended nature of the budget cycle, the results of recommendations and completed work (e.g., formulation and presentation of annual and multi-year program budgets) are frequently not subject to review and evaluation for periods in excess of one year. Recommendations made by the employee for new or revised budgetary policies, procedures, and controls are evaluated by the supervisor in terms of anticipated impact upon accomplishment of substantive program goals and objectives and national priorities.

Level 2-5 is not met. The appellant does not have responsibility for administering a budget for substantive nationwide programs for the entire agency.

Level 2-4, for 450 points, is credited for this factor.

*Factor 3, Guidelines:*

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

At Level 3-3, guidelines available and regularly used in the work are in the form of budgetary policies, precedents and regulations, specific substantive program goals, production schedules, and work processes. Guidelines are not always applicable to specific budgetary situations. The employee uses judgment in interpreting, adapting, and applying guidelines such as instructions in budget formulation and budget execution to the analysis and development of budget estimates and annual work plans for continuing programs and organizations. The employee independently resolves gaps in specificity or conflicts in guidelines which are in consonance with stated budget and program objectives. At this level, the application of guidelines requires the use of analytical methods and techniques.

Level 3-3 is met. The appellant has a number of DoD policy and procedural guidelines available, as well as Government Accounting Office (GAO) procedures. These guidelines apply to most of what the appellant does. He exercises judgment in interpreting the regulations and policies, particularly those relating to nonappropriated funds, and determines which regulations apply to specific situations and conditions. Some of the programs/facilities managed by the appellant are commercial-type nonappropriated fund activities requiring cost-benefit analysis and profit and loss statements.

At Level 3-4, in addition to those guidelines described at lower levels, guidelines regularly applied at this level consist of broad budgetary guidance such as circulars, directives, and regulations issued by OMB which relate to the division of Federal funds among agency programs; regulations published by the Treasury Department; judicial decisions, Comptroller General decisions, and similar precedents specific to the budget and programs of the employing organization; and broad program goals and objectives of the employing organization. Guidelines provide a general outline of the concepts, methods and goals of budgeting to be followed (e.g., in formulating long-range budget estimates covering the budgets and operations of new or substantially revamped national programs). Where guidelines for performing the work are scarce or of limited use, the employee develops guidelines (e.g., to be followed by budget officers or program managers at subordinate organizational levels). At this level, the employee exercises a great deal of judgment and discretion and has broad latitude in interpreting and applying guidelines, organization wide.

Level 3-4 is not met. The appellant is not responsible for national programs nor for developing guidance for budget officers or program managers at subordinate organizational levels.

Level 3-3, for 275 points, is credited for this factor.

*Factor 4, Complexity:*

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

At Level 4-3, the appellant performs various duties in the budget process which require the application of a series of different and unrelated methods, practices, and techniques of budgeting. As also described at this level, the appellant's duties include developing cost data for alternative work plans, forecasting funding needs, and providing advice on the applicability of regulations.

Organizations, activities, services, and/or accounts budgeted for are relatively stable from one year to the next, and throughout the fiscal year. Funding is from readily identifiable sources. The appellant compiles, analyzes, and summarizes budgetary information pertaining to costs.

Level 4-3 is met. The appellant performs a variety of duties related to the budget process including developing cost data, forecasting funding needs, providing advice on the applicability of regulations and laws, identifying reasons for trends, and reviewing requests for allotments of funds. He works with both appropriated and nonappropriated funds. The appellant makes recommendations based on facts available from various budgetary reports using his knowledge of the program areas and applicable rules and regulations.

At Level 4-4, the work involves the performance of a wide variety of analytical and technical budget administration functions for substantive programs and support activities which are funded through many separate sources (e.g., appropriations, allotments, reimbursable accounts, and/or transfers of funds between organizations). Programs and funding are unstable and may extend

for several years or more, as in the case of a no-year appropriation. The work is complicated by the presence of conflicting program and budgetary data. In identifying the costs involved in accomplishing objectives, the employee also must decide which data to rely upon.

Level 4-4 is not fully met. The appellant researches and analyzes budget trends and makes decisions on funding and program needs or provides information to higher management for appropriated and nonappropriated activities. He does not deal with the wide variety of funding sources described at this level, nor is he normally faced with the kind of conflicting data described here.

Level 4-3, for 150 points, is credited for this factor.

*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.

At Level 5-3, the work involves the application of a wide range of standardized, widely-accepted budgetary regulations, practices, and procedures typical of one or more complete phases of the annual budget process (e.g., budget formulation and execution) for assigned organizations, object classes, locally-based substantive programs, or support activities. Usually, the organizations, programs, or activities budgeted for are further subdivided into (or administered through) branches, sections, or units in field or headquarters locations. Work products, advice and services rendered, and clearances issued affect the amount and timely availability of money to pay for personnel salaries and expenses, equipment, routine maintenance services, and similar administrative and support activities in appropriated or industrially funded organizations. Advice affects the accuracy of budget forecasts and/or compliance with legal and regulatory guides.

Level 5-3 is met. The appellant is responsible for ensuring effective and efficient use of the appropriated and nonappropriated funds annually, and he uses a wide range of budgetary regulations, practices and procedures in compiling and monitoring the budgets for which he has responsibility. His work affects the legal and regulatory compliance of the installation, as well as the amount and availability of money to pay salaries and expenses, purchase equipment and supplies, provide routine maintenance services, and fund administrative support activities.

At Level 5-4, the purpose of the work is to formulate and/or monitor the execution of long-range (e.g., 3 to-5 year) detailed budget forecasts and plans to fund the implementation of substantive programs and projects of the employing component or agency. This level refers to work situations where the employee develops guidance for use in subordinate echelons and components of the employing organization such as civilian bureaus and services, regions, or military commands and installations; works on the administrative budget of an organization with subordinate organizational segments, most of which have their own budget staffs that independently accomplish the formulation and execution of the administrative budget; and

formulates both current and out-year budgets for research, development, test, evaluation, and procurement of components for weapons systems.

Level 5-4 is not met. The appellant is not responsible for developing budgetary guidance for other commands or installations nor for providing guidance to other budget staffs who are responsible for budget formulation.

Level 5-3, for 150 points, is credited for this factor.

*Factor 6, Personal Contacts:*

Factor 6 covers the people and conditions or settings under which contacts are made. It includes face-to-face contacts and telephone and radio dialogue with persons not in the supervisory chain.

At Level 6-2, contacts include persons from outside the immediate employing office or organization but within the same Federal agency or a major component thereof. Typical of this level are contacts with project managers responsible for substantive technical programs or their designated representatives; engineers, chemists, and other technical subject matter specialists; management analysts; personnel management specialists; program analysts; and other budget and financial analysts at various levels within the agency, in field or headquarters locations. This level includes informal telephone and face-to-face contacts with employees of other Federal agencies engaged in budgetary functions which affect the budget of the employing agency, and contacts with representatives of private industry firms (e.g., contractors performing routine services for the government which are paid for out of appropriated funds).

Level 6-2 is met. The appellant routinely deals with the program managers within the installation, as well as with other budget staff at his installation and the bureau personnel; with vendors; with local officials; and occasionally with employees at other agencies. His role is explicit, and he has both telephone and face-to-face contacts.

At Level 6-3, contacts are with individuals from outside the agency who represent the budget and program interests of other Federal agencies, contractors, private business and financial interests, state and local governments, foreign governments, public and private institutions (e.g., colleges and universities), Congressional staff members, or other Federal agencies. Contacts normally take place at formal budget briefings, conferences, hearings, or negotiations which are arranged well in advance. Attendance at Congressional budget hearings as a resource person (i.e., to provide technical information about the budget and programs to agency witnesses) is included at this level.

Level 6-3 is not met. The appellant's work does not typically require resolving problems requiring contacts with high ranking officials such as those described at this level. His contacts within the agency are limited to persons such as managers and administrative support staff. Outside contacts are with county and city officials, vendors, and contractors.

Level 6-2, for 25 points, is credited for this factor.

*Factor 7, Purpose of Contacts:*

Factor 7 covers the reasons for the contacts described in Factor 6.

At Level 7-2, contacts are made for the purpose of resolving budgetary issues and problems and carrying out budgetary transactions to achieve mutually agreed upon financial and program objectives. Typically, the employee has extensive contacts with program managers and personnel in staff support offices for the purpose of consolidating requests of components or segments into one complete budget request covering the organization's plans, programs and personnel.

Level 7-2 is met. Contacts typically are for the purpose of resolving budgetary issues and problems and carrying out budgetary transactions by exchanging and compiling information. The appellant consolidates the budgets from the various components of the QOL program.

At Level 7-3, the purpose of contacts is to persuade program managers and other officials in positions of decision-making authority with widely differing goals and interests to follow a recommended course of action consistent with established budget policies, objectives, and regulations. This level is exemplified by contacts with managers, often in an advisory relationship, for the purpose of persuading them to reduce their levels of spending, program operations, number of employees, or change program plans so that funds may be used to greater benefit in other areas. At this level, persuasion and negotiation are necessary due to the presence of conflicting budgetary and program objectives which must be resolved.

Level 7-3 is not met. While the appellant may need to discuss reducing spending levels with subordinant supervisors, he is not in the position of trying to persuade other program managers to reduce operations. Budgetary and program objectives are not generally in conflict.

Level 7-2, for 50 points, is credited for this factor.

*Factor 8, Physical Demands:*

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

Level 8-1 is met. As is typical of this level, the appellant's work is usually performed in an office setting and is sedentary.

Level 8-1, for 5 points, is credited for this factor.

*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.

Level 9-1 is met. Typical of this level, the appellant's work environment is an office setting which is adequately lighted and climate controlled and requires common-sense safety precautions.

Level 9-1, for 5 points, is credited for this factor.

<b>SUMMARY</b>		
<b>FACTOR</b>	<b>LEVEL</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
1. Knowledge Required by the Position	1-7	1250
2. Supervisory Controls	2-4	450
3. Guidelines	3-3	275
4. Complexity	4-3	150
5. Scope and Effec	5-3	150
6. Personal Contacts	6-2	25
7. Purpose of Contacts	7-2	50
8. Physical Demands	8-1	5
9. Work Environment	9-1	5
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2360</b>

A total of 2360 points falls within the range for a GS-11, 2355-2750 points, according to the Grade Conversion Table in the GS-560 standard.

**Summary**

The appellant's program duties equate to the GS-12 level, the supervisory duties equate to the GS-12 level, and budget responsibilities equate to the GS-11 level. Since the highest grade level of substantive duties and responsibilities is GS-12, that is the proper grade level of the position.

**Decision**

This position is properly classified as GS-1101-12 (Title at the discretion of the agency).