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

Washington Oversight Division
1900 E Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20415

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

Appellant:	[name]
Agency classification:	Supervisory Budget Analyst GS-560-12
Organization:	[office] [division] [agency] [city and state]
OPM decision:	Supervisory Budget Analyst GS-560-12
OPM decision number:	C-0560-12-01

Linda Kazinetz
Classification Appeals Officer

January 24, 2001
Date

As provided in section 511.612 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, this decision constitutes a classification certificate that is mandatory and binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting officials of the Government. The agency is responsible for reviewing its classification decisions for identical, similar, or related positions to ensure consistency with this decision. There is no right of further appeal. This decision is subject to discretionary review only under the conditions and time limits specified in title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, sections 511.605, 511.613, and 511.614, as cited in the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards, appendix 4, section G (address provided in appendix 4, section H).

Decision sent to:

[appellant]

[servicing personnel officer]

Ms. Janice W. Cooper
Chief, Classification Branch
Field Advisory Services Division
Department of Defense
Civilian Personnel Management Service
1400 Key Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22209-5144

Introduction

On September 5, 2000, the Washington Oversight Division of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a position classification appeal from [appellant], who is employed as a Supervisory Budget Analyst, GS-560-12, in the [office] of the [division], [agency], in [city and state]. [Appellant] requested that her position be classified as Supervisory Budget Analyst, GS-560-13. This appeal was accepted and decided under the provisions of section 5112 of title 5, United States Code.

An on-site position audit was conducted by a Washington Oversight Division representative on January 8, 2001, including an interview with the appellant's supervisor, [name]. This appeal was decided by considering the audit findings and all information of record furnished by the appellant and her agency, including her official position description, [number], classified by the servicing personnel office as Supervisory Budget Analyst, GS-560-12, on December 8, 1999.

Position Information

The appellant performs and supervises work related to the formulation and execution of the operating budget for [agency component]. This includes reviewing budget estimates and justifications submitted by work centers for completeness and accuracy of documentation and conformance with budgetary policies and guidelines; preparing the consolidated budget request for submission to higher-level fiscal authorities; analyzing the effect of budget marks on operations and preparing reclamas; monitoring the expenditure of funds to ensure that money is being obligated and spent in a timely manner; and projecting funding shortfalls and preparing requests for reprogramming or deficiency funding. The annual budget for the headquarters office is about $113 million and includes civilian salaries and expenses, travel, supplies and services, publications and printing, computer hardware and software, and other miscellaneous office administration expenses. The appellant is also responsible for several other associated fiscal functions, including inputting time and attendance data for all headquarters employees; issuing travel cards and monitoring purchases for conformance with regulations; and preparing, coordinating, and negotiating interservice support agreements with other DoD components for the provision of support services.

The appellant is identified in her position description as the Deputy Fiscal Officer, reporting directly to the Fiscal Officer, which has traditionally been a military position. However, she does not operate as a full deputy as that term is defined in the General Schedule Supervisory Guide, i.e., serving as an alter ego to the manager of the organization and sharing with the manager the direction of all phases of the organization's program and work, where the deputy's opinion or direction is treated as if given by the chief. There is a clear division of responsibilities between the appellant and the Fiscal Officer. The appellant supervises day-to-day operations and has technical responsibility for administering the budget, whereas the Fiscal Officer concentrates on external issues and special initiatives. Although the appellant may attend meetings for the Fiscal Officer in his absence, she is not delegated the authority to speak for him or make commitments on his behalf for those matters that are otherwise under his direct purview.

Series Determination

The appellant's position is properly assigned to the Budget Analysis Series, GS-560, which includes positions the duties of which are to perform or supervise work in any of the phases or systems of budget administration in the Federal service. Neither the appellant nor the agency disagrees.

Title Determination

The authorized title for positions in this series that involve analytical, technical, and administrative duties in one or more phases of the budgetary process is Budget Analyst. The appellant's position is titled Supervisory Budget Analyst since it meets the criteria for evaluation as a supervisor under the General Schedule Supervisory Guide. Neither the appellant nor the agency disagrees.

Grade Determination

Evaluation Using the GS-500 Job Family Standard

The appellant's nonsupervisory duties were evaluated by applying the criteria in the Job Family Standard for Professional and Administrative Work in the Accounting and Budget Group, GS-500. This is a new standard released in January 2001 for governmentwide application. It covers a range of occupational series in the GS-500 group and replaces the previous occupation-specific standards for those series, including the standard for the Budget Analysis Series, GS-560, dated July 1981.

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

Factor 1, Knowledge Required by the Position

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

The knowledge required by the appellant's position meets Level 1-7. At that level, work requires intensive knowledge of budgetary policies, regulations, and objectives sufficient to analyze and evaluate changes in program plans and funding and their effect on financial and budget milestones, and to develop recommendations for budgetary actions where there are such complicating features

as gaps in program and budgetary information, lack of predictive data, or conflicting program and budgetary objectives. This is the highest level for salary and expense budgeting of a support nature in a Federal agency.

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

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

The appellant administers the operating budget for the headquarters office, i.e., the salaries and administrative expenses incurred by headquarters employees, rather than the budget of a national-level program involving the obligation, distribution, and expenditure of funds for program activities throughout the agency's field establishment. Further, although she may develop instructions for headquarters staff to assist them in preparing budget requests, she does not occupy a staff-level position involving the development of budget policies or the interpretation of legislation for impact on the budget process. Guidance of this nature is prepared at higher organizational levels within DoD.

Level 1-7 is credited. 1250 points

Factor 2, Supervisory Controls

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

The level of responsibility under which the appellant works is comparable to Level 2-4. At that level, the supervisor outlines overall objectives and available resources and discusses with the employee time frames, scope, and possible approaches. At this level, the employee is fully experienced in applying concepts and methodologies and is considered a technical authority with responsibility for planning and carrying out the work, directing other functional specialists, resolving most conflicts that arise, coordinating with others, and interpreting policy and regulations. The employee keeps the supervisor informed of progress and potential controversies, such as the

need for supplemental appropriations and inability to meet key budget deadlines. Completed work is reviewed for soundness of overall approach, effectiveness in meeting requirements or expected results, and feasibility of recommendations.

Since the Fiscal Officer position is a military billet usually filled by individuals without background or training in budgeting, the appellant must function in effect as the technical authority on budget matters for the headquarters office. She works independently in planning and directing the work of other staff members, resolving technical problems as they arise, coordinating with work center managers, interpreting policy and regulations, and keeping the supervisor informed of potential funding deficiencies or sensitive issues. Her work is reviewed only from an overall standpoint in terms of her effectiveness in meeting budget deadlines and in administering the organization's budget such that deficiencies are promptly identified and funds are obligated and expended in a timely manner.

The position does not meet Level 2-5. At that level, the supervisor provides *administrative and policy* direction in terms of *broadly defined missions* or functions. The employee is responsible for a *significant program or function*; defines objectives and interprets policy promulgated by authorities *senior to the immediate supervisor*; and independently plans, designs, and carries out the work to be done. The supervisor reviews the work for fulfillment of objectives and the effect of the employee's advice and decisions on the overall program, and evaluates the employee's recommendations for new systems, methods, projects, or program emphasis in terms of availability of funds and resources. The supervisor rarely makes significant changes to the employee's work.

This level covers positions with program management authority to define overall objectives, where the work is subject to administrative review by a higher-level management official (i.e., budget controls and policy considerations) rather than a more technical review by a higher-graded budget official. It also applies to budget specialist positions at higher organizational levels, in effect the first level below the policy promulgation level, who must operate without benefit of intervening levels that develop interpretive guidance. The appellant does not have the types of managerial responsibilities intended by the standard at this level, and she reports to the Fiscal Officer rather than to a high-level program official. Further, budget policies for the agency do not originate at the appellant's division level (i.e., the level senior to her immediate supervisor).

Level 2-4 is credited. 450 points

Factor 3, Guidelines

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

The guidelines used by the appellant match Level 3-3. At that level, guidelines typically provide preferred approaches or describe generally accepted standards rather than precisely delineating requirements. An example would be agency handbooks developed at higher echelons covering a range of budget operations and procedures that the employee must either implement or consider

in establishing local office practices. The employee must use judgment to adapt the guidelines to specific cases or problems and to interpret a large number of varied policies and regulations.

The appellant is in effect administering a budget comparable to a small field office operation, and there is ample guidance issued by higher-level budget authorities within DoD on the procedures that must be followed in requesting funds and the basic systems and processes that must be employed in monitoring expenditures.

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

Since the appellant works at the basic operating level in terms of budget administration, guidelines and policies for carrying out the work are readily available. In addition, since the budget items are limited to salaries and other administrative expenses, and the headquarters workforce does not fluctuate significantly, precedent budget documentation and submissions would be generally applicable.

Level 3-3 is credited. 275 points

Factor 4, Complexity

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

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

This basically characterizes the appellant's position in that she budgets for salaries and other basic administrative expenses, such as travel, printing, and supplies. The organization (the headquarters office) is relatively stable in terms of its staffing and administrative needs, and funding is derived primarily from allotments and reimbursements.

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

The appellant's work is limited to salary and expense budgeting, whereas Level 4-4 requires budgeting for substantive (i.e., direct mission-related) programs as a basic requirement.

Level 4-3 is credited. 150 points

Factor 5, Scope and Effect

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

The scope and effect of the appellant's work match Level 5-3. At that level, work involves conducting a variety of tasks in limited functional areas, such as applying budget rules, regulations, and procedures associated with all phases of budget formulation and execution related to segments of the budget for assigned support activities. The work affects the amount, timeliness, and availability of funds for personnel salaries and expenses, routine maintenance, and similar administrative support activities.

This covers the appellant's responsibilities in all phases of budget formulation and execution for salaries and expenses incurred by headquarters office staff (i.e., a budget segment in the sense that direct program or mission-related expenses are not included).

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

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

Level 5-3 is credited. 150 points

Factor 6, Personal Contacts
and
Factor 7, Purpose of Contacts

This factor includes face-to-face and telephone contacts with persons not in the supervisory chain. The relationship between Factors 6 and 7 presumes that the same contacts will be evaluated under both factors.

Under *Personal Contacts*, the appellant's position meets Level 3, where contacts include representatives of other Federal agencies in moderately unstructured settings. The appellant has contacts with counterparts in other DoD components. Level 4 is not met, where contacts are with high-ranking officials from outside the agency at national and international levels. The appellant has no contacts of this nature.

Under *Personal Contacts*, the appellant's position meets Level B, where contacts are to plan and coordinate work efforts or to resolve operating problems by persuading people who are working toward mutual goals and have basically cooperative attitudes. This characterizes the nature of the appellant's contacts with headquarters staff in coordinating the preparation and submission of budget requests and resolving problems related to funding status, and with other DoD staff in administering interservice support agreements. Level C is not met, where contacts are to influence or persuade others with *widely differing goals and interests* or where there is *wide disagreement* on the merits of a proposed action. The appellant would not be involved in persuading headquarters managers with competing goals and interests to accept her recommendations on budget matters affecting the relative funding of different program activities.
Level 3B is credited. 110 points

Factor 8, Physical Demands

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

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

Level 8-1 is credited. 5 points

Factor 9, Work Environment

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

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

Level 9-1 is credited. 5 points

Summary

Factors	Level	Points
Knowledge Required	1-7	1250
Supervisory Controls	2-4	450
Guidelines	3-3	275
Complexity	4-3	150
Scope and Effect	5-3	150
Personal Contacts/ Purpose of Contacts	3B	110
Physical Demands	8-1	5
Work Environment	9-1	5
Total		2395

The total of 2395 points falls within the GS-11 range (2355-2750) on the grade conversion table provided in the standard.

Evaluation Using the General Schedule Supervisory Guide

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

Factor 1, Program Scope and Effect

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

Under *Scope*, the position meets Level 1-2 in terms of the complexity of the work directed (i.e., administrative, technical, complex clerical, or comparable work), since the appellant supervises

four subordinate budget analysts and one management analyst. Likewise, Level 1-2 is met in terms of organizational coverage of the work (e.g., a typical agency field office or area office), in that the appellant provides budget services for the [agency] headquarters office. This matches a Level 1-2 illustration provided in the guide where the supervisor "directs operating program segment activities . . . at higher organizational levels in the agency, for example, the section or branch level of a bureau." Level 1-3 is not met because the organizational coverage does not encompass a small region or a large or complex multimission military installation (e.g., a large installation with a total serviced population exceeding 4000 personnel, or a multimission installation including a combination of such facilities as a garrison, medical center, research laboratory, service school, supply or maintenance depot, or equivalent activities). In the appellant's case, organizational coverage is limited to the [agency] headquarters office, with a serviced population of only 860 personnel.

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

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

Level 1-2 is credited. 350 points

Factor 2, Organizational Setting

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

The appellant's immediate supervisor is two levels below the first SES position in the chain of command, consistent with Level 2-1.

Level 2-1 is credited. 100 points

Factor 3, Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised

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

The appellant's delegated supervisory authorities and responsibilities fully meet Level 3-2c in its description of various first-level supervisory functions, such as planning, assigning, and evaluating work; interviewing candidates for positions; effecting minor disciplinary measures; and providing for training and developmental needs. Level 3-3 is not met as it applies either to managerial positions with significant program authority or to second-level or higher supervisors.

Level 3-2 is credited. 450 points

Factor 4, Personal Contacts

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

Subfactor 4A, Nature of Contacts

The appellant's contacts meet Level 4A-3, where contacts are with high ranking military or civilian managers or technical staff at bureau level or with agency headquarters administrative staff. Level 4A-4 is not met, where contacts are with, for example, SES or flag officer levels of other Federal agencies, executive level officials of major defense contractors, or key staff of congressional committees. The appellant has no contacts of this nature.

Level 4A-3 is credited. 75 points

Subfactor 4B, Purpose of Contacts

The purposes of the appellant's contacts are consistent with Level 4B-2, (i.e., planning and coordinating work, resolving differences of opinion), rather than Level 4B-3, where the primary purpose of the contacts is managerial in nature, such as representing the organizational unit in negotiations, in obtaining or committing resources, *and* in gaining compliance with policies, regulations, or contracts. At Level 4B-3, the contacts usually involve active participation in conferences, meetings, and hearings involving problems or issues of considerable consequence or importance to the program. The Fiscal Office as an entity does not have a mission that would support contacts of this nature (e.g., it does not commit resources or enforce regulations.) Further, any representational responsibilities with external parties on issues of this magnitude would be handled by the Fiscal Officer or a higher-level management official.

Level 4B-2 is credited. 75 points

Factor 5, Difficulty of Typical Work Directed

This factor measures the difficulty and complexity of the basic work most typical of the organization directed, that constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload of the organization.

The appellant supervises one GS-12 management analyst, two GS-11 budget analysts, and two GS-9 budget analysts (one position pending recruitment). Given the above grade-level analysis under the GS-500 job family standard, GS-11 is considered the highest level of nonsupervisory work performed in the office and constitutes at least 50 percent of the office workload.

Level 5-6 is credited. 800 points

Factor 6, Other Conditions

This factor measures the extent to which various conditions contribute to the difficulty and complexity of carrying out supervisory duties, authorities, and responsibilities.

The appellant's position meets Level 6-4, which involves coordinating and integrating professional, technical, or administrative work comparable in difficulty to the GS-11 level.

Level 6-4 is credited. 1120 points

Summary

Factors	Level	Points
Program Scope and Effect	1-2	350
Organizational Setting	2-1	100
Supervisory/Managerial Authority	3-2	450
Personal Contacts		
Nature of Contacts	4A-3	75
Purpose of Contacts	4B-2	75
Difficulty of Work Directed	5-6	800
Other Conditions	6-4	1120
Total		2970

The total of 2970 points falls within the GS-12 range (2755-3150) on the grade conversion chart provided in the GSSG.

Decision

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

The appealed position is properly classified as Supervisory Budget Analyst, GS-560-12.