



**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:** Supervisory Contract Surveillance  
Representative, GS-1101-11

**Organization:** Contracts Management Division  
Public Works Department  
[Naval activity]  
Department of the Navy

**OPM decision:** GS-1101-11  
(Title at agency discretion)

**OPM decision number:** C-1101-11-01

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kathy W. Day  
Classification Appeals Officer

10/16/97

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

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]

Classification Program Manager  
Human Resources Office

Mr. David Neerman  
Director of Classification, Staffing and  
Compensation (OCPM Code C20)  
Office of Civilian Personnel Management  
Department of the navy  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22203-1998

Mr. William Duffy  
Chief, Classification Branch  
Field Advisory Services Division  
Defense Civilian Personnel Management  
Service  
1400 Key Blvd., Suite B200  
Arlington, VA 22209-5144

## **Background**

On July 14, 1997, the Atlanta Oversight Division, Office of Personnel Management, accepted an appeal for the position of Supervisory Contract Surveillance Representative, GS-1101-11, Contracts Management Division, Public Works Department, Naval Support Activity [geographic location], Department of the Navy, [geographic location]. The appellant is requesting that his position be changed to GS-12. The appeal has been accepted and processed under section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code.

## **Sources of Information**

This appeal decision is based on information from the following sources:

1. The appellant's letter received July 14, 1997, appealing the classification of his position.
2. The agency's letter of August 6, 1997, providing position and organizational information.
3. A telephone interview with the appellant on August 18, 1997.
4. A telephone interview with the appellant's immediate supervisor, on September 17, 1997.
5. A telephone interview with the servicing classification specialist, on September 19, 1997.

## **Position Information**

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

The appellant functions as the Director of the Contracts Management Division. The primary purposes of the work performed and supervised by the appellant are to monitor and provide administrative oversight to ensure effective post-award performance of support services and maintenance contracts for the installation. Major contracts include the Multi-Function Facilities Support Services (MFFSS) contract, the Housing Maintenance Contract, and the Base Operating Services (BOS) contract. These contracts are related to new construction, alteration, repair, maintenance, and support services for a variety of installation facilities (e.g., quarters, housing units, training and administrative buildings, and a clinical facility). Also falling under the administrative oversight of the of the appellant and his staff are contracts covering utilities (i.e., electricity, gas, and water), grounds maintenance, asbestos and lead abatement programs, janitorial services, garbage pickup, pest control, and demolition of obsolete/unneeded buildings. The appellant serves as the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative providing the Contracting Officer technical advise and

expertise on issues related to contracts administered by the Division. He also serves as the installation's Transportation Officer with responsibility for assigning and managing government-owned equipment/vehicles assigned to contractors and installation host and tenant organizations. The appellant exercises first-line supervisory authority over a staff of one Secretary (Office Automation), GS-318-04, and one subordinate Supervisory Contract Surveillance Representative, GS-1101-11. Through the subordinate supervisor, he exercises second-line supervisory authority over 10 Contract Surveillance Representatives, GS-1101-09.

Information contained in the appeals packet reveals that the position under appeal was created in May 1, 1996, following the elimination of the military billet/position which had performed the division chief function. Those duties were transferred to this new civilian position by installation management and a proposal for a GS-12 grade level was forwarded to the servicing Human Resources Office (HRO). However, the HRO classified this new position as Supervisory Contract Surveillance Representative, GS-1101-11, and the appellant was transferred into it on September 29, 1996. The appellant disagreed with the GS-11 classification, and appealed to the Department of Defense Civilian Personnel Management Service on the basis that the HRO rated Factors 1 (Scope and Effect), 5 (Difficulty of Typical Work Directed) and 6 (Other Conditions) too low in their General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG) position evaluation summary.

### **Standards Referenced**

OPM Handbook for Occupational Groups and Series, September 1993.  
Position Classification Standard for the Contracting Series, GS-1102, December 1983.  
General Schedule Supervisory Guide, April 1993.

### **Series and Title Determination**

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

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 primary duties of the position are to provide post-award administrative oversight of a variety of contracts providing support services for installation facilities in the areas of construction, alteration, maintenance, repair, etc. The incumbent, through one subordinate supervisor, is responsible for quality assurance; enforcement of warranties for completed construction, repair, and maintenance projects; tracking the progress and quality of contractor performance; certification and verification of contractor invoices; financial tracking of contracts; and final

inspection of completed work prior to payment of contractors. Work of this nature clearly falls within the coverage of the General Business and Industry Series, GS-1101, which includes all positions that advise on, administer, supervise, or perform work pertaining to and requiring a knowledge of business and trade practices. We agree with the agency determination.

There are no titles specified for positions placed in the GS-1101 series. As the position is delegated supervisory responsibilities that meet the minimum criteria for coverage under Factor 3 of the GSSG, the agency may assign the prefix Supervisory to the title, or construct a title in accordance with guidance in the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards.

The appellant's position is properly placed in the GS-1101 occupational series with the title at the discretion of the agency.

### **Grade Determination**

The appellant manages the work of the Contracts Management Division. His responsibilities include a wide range of supervisory and managerial tasks to ensure effective post-award performance of contractors providing facility support services for Naval Support Activity Memphis. The GSSG provides evaluation criteria for determining the General Schedule (GS or GM) grade level of supervisory positions in grades GS-5 through GS-15. It also contains criteria for evaluating managerial responsibilities that may accompany supervisory responsibilities in this range of grades. The GSSG is used to evaluate the appellant's position.

The GSSG uses a point-factor evaluation approach with six evaluation factors specifically designed for supervisory positions. Each factor has several factor level definitions or subfactors which are assigned specific point values. The supervisory and managerial duties of a position are evaluated by comparison with each factor and crediting the points designated for the highest factor level met according to the instructions specific to each factor and level. If two or more levels of a factor are met, credit is given for the highest level met. If one level of a factor is exceeded, but the next higher level is not met, credit is given for the lower level. To determine the final grade of the supervisory work, the points for all six factors are totaled and converted to a grade level using the point-to-grade conversion chart on page 31 of the GSSG.

#### Factor 1 - Program Scope and Effect:

This factor measures the general complexity, breadth, and impact of the program areas and work directed, including its organizational and geographic coverage. It also assesses the impact of the work both within and outside the immediate organization. In applying this factor, the GSSG states that consideration should be given to all program areas, projects,

and work assignments which the supervisor technically and administratively directs, including those accomplished through subordinate civilian employees, military personnel, contractors, volunteers, and others. To assign a factor level, the criteria dealing with both scope and effect must be met. The agency evaluated this factor at Level 1-2. The appellant believes Level 1-3 is correct.

*Subfactor 1a: Scope*

This subfactor addresses the general complexity and breadth of the program (or program segment) directed, 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 included under this subfactor.

At Level 1-2, the program segment or work directed is administrative, technical, complex clerical, or comparable having limited geographic coverage and supporting the majority of the activities typical of an agency field office, an area office, a small to medium military installation, or comparable activities within agency program segments. The direction of budget, staffing, supply, or maintenance services which support a small military installation with no extensive research, development, testing, or comparable missions is illustrative of this level.

At Level 1-3, the work involves direction of a program segment performing technical, administrative, protective, investigative, or professional work where the program segment and work directed encompass a major metropolitan area, a State, or a small region of several States. This level covers situations where the program segment performs the work described above and the area encompassed is equivalent to that of a small city and the majority of the city's taxpayers and businesses are included. This level also includes providing complex administrative, technical, or professional services directly affecting a large or complex multimission military installation.

The GSSG provides two criteria for considering a military base a large multimission military installation. The first is a military base, or group of activities with a total serviced/supported employee-equivalent population of more than 4,000 personnel, and a variety of serviced technical functions. In this situation, Federal civilian and military employees, estimated contractor personnel, volunteers and similar personnel may be used to arrive at the population total. Nonemployed personnel, such as dependents are considered in the population total only if directly impacted by the program segment and the work directed. The second is a complex multimission installation which includes at least four or more of the following: a garrison; a medical center/large hospital and medical laboratory complex; multimillion dollar (annual) construction, civil works, or environmental cleanup projects; a test and evaluation center or moderate size research laboratory; an equipment/product development center; a service school; a major command higher than that in which the servicing position is located or a comparable moderate size tenant activity; a

supply/maintenance depot; or equivalent activities. These activities are individually smaller than the large installation described in the first situation. To receive credit as a large or complex multimission military installation, the installation must meet the criteria for a large military installation or meet the criteria for a complex multimission installation.

Level 1-2 is met. The appellant directs administrative and technical work related to the facilities support mission of contractors for a majority of activities at a medium size military installation. The geographic coverage is limited to an installation that performs no research, development, or testing activities and has a combined military and civilian employee population of approximately 2,500.

Level 1-3 is not met. The position occupied by the appellant is responsible for directing administrative and technical work relating to contracts for facilities support and housing maintenance for Naval Support Activity [location]. At one time, this installation consisted of 900 facilities, a 230 bed hospital, a number of quarters, training, and administrative buildings, and more than 900 military dependent housing units covering an area of approximately 3,400 acres. The installation's primary mission was to support a large enlisted service school training service members in the aviation career field. The Department of Defense's Base Realignment and Closure activities resulted in a realignment of the installation's functions and the relocation of the service school to another naval base. However, the Navy replaced the relocated school with a command headquarters function, the [function]. Currently, only elements of [the function] have been physically relocated to the installation. Information contained in the appeal record indicates that, at the time of the appeal, the installation's employee population is approximately 2,500 (1,500 military and 1,000 civilian) personnel plus approximately 2000 dependents living on base. Information obtained by the agency indicated that, upon completion of the relocation, these figures would be increased by 1,000 military and 1,000 civilian employees for a total of 4,500 employees. It is estimated that the transition will be completed between May and August 1998. During a September 17, 1997, telephone interview, the appellant's immediate supervisor stated that, as a further result of the BRAC process, the installation will be reduced to an area of 2,000 acres containing 650 facilities and 900 dependent housing units. He also stated that the estimated increase in the employee population will be 1,200 military and 1,000 to 1,200 civilian personnel.

The appellant believes the 2000 dependents should be counted toward the serviced or supported employee-equivalent population bringing the total to over 4000 personnel. He contends that this meets the definition of a large multimission military installation and thus, Level 1-3. When evaluating the scope of a program, it is not enough to look merely at the numbers of personnel supported. Scope considers the nature of the services provided, i.e., the population directly and significantly serviced, and not the total population which may have been provided only some degree of service at some point in time. The serviced population is the population that has a major and direct effect on the difficulty and complexity of a supervisor's work. The number of dependents living on base does not have

a major impact on the appellant's responsibility to maintain the 900 housing units, i.e., the units require a certain amount of upkeep and maintenance regardless of the number of dependents in the units. In addition to having a serviced or supported population of over 4000, to meet the definition of a large complex, multimission installation, the installation must also include a variety of serviced technical functions. The facilities supported by the appellant's position are basically limited to administrative/office buildings, one hospital, housing units/barracks, and supporting utilities. The limited complexity of the organizations serviced is not equivalent to the variety of technical components that typically comprise a complex, multimission installation. The the work directed by the appellant does not have the breadth or complexity described at Level 1-3; therefore, Level 1-2 is credited for *Scope*.

*Subfactor 1b: Effect*

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

At Level 1-2, the services or products support and significantly affect installation level, area office level, or field office operations and objectives, or comparable program segments; 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, activities, functions, or services accomplished directly and significantly impact a wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, or the operations of outside interests (e.g., a segment of a regulated industry) or the general public. At the field activity level (involving large, complex, multimission organizations and/or very large serviced populations) the work directly involves or substantially impacts the provision of essential support operations to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, and administrative functions.

Level 1-2 is met. The appellant directs work related to providing administrative oversight of contracts for construction, alteration, repair, and maintenance of facilities and grounds at the Naval Support Activity. The services/products provided by the appellant's work support and significantly affect the operations and mission accomplishment of the installation.

Level 1-3 is not met. The appellant's work activities do not significantly impact the wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, the operations of outside interests, or the general public as envisioned at this level. The work also does not presently impact the provision of essential support operations to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, and administrative functions, such as those of a major military headquarters.

Level 1-2 is credited for both Scope and Effect, for 350 points.



**Factor 2 - Organizational Setting:**

This factor considers the organizational situation of the supervisory position in relation to higher levels of management. The agency evaluated this factor at Level 2-1 (100 points). The appellant does not contest the agency's evaluation of this factor.

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

Level 2-1 is met. The appellant reports to the Business Manager/Assistant Public Works Officer (APWO), GS-1101-13, who reports/is accountable to the Public Works Officer (PWO), an O5 (Lieutenant Commander) naval officer billet. The PWO reports to the Director of Naval Technical Training, a flag officer position. In this instance, the position to which the appellant reports is two full levels below the first flag or general officer in the supervisory chain.

At Level 2-2, the position reports to a position that is one level below the first SES, Flag or general officer, equivalent or higher level position in the direct supervisory chain.

Level 2-2 is not met. The appellant reports to a position that is more than one level below the lowest ranking flag officer in the direct supervisory chain.  
This factor is evaluated at Level 2-1, for 100 points.

**Factor 3: Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised**

This factor covers the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities exercised on a recurring basis. To be credited with a level under this factor, a position must meet the authorities and responsibilities to the extent described for the specific level. 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 evaluated this factor at Level 3-2 (450 points). The appellant does not contest the agency's evaluation of this factor.

At Level 3-2, in addition to exercising the minimum supervisory authorities and responsibilities described at Level 3-1, a position must also meet one of the three criteria described under Level 3-2 a through c of the GSSG. Level 3-2b describes a situation in which work is performed by contractors and the supervisory tasks involve providing technical input and oversight over the work. Additionally, this technical input and oversight provided by the position must be comparable to all or nearly all of five criteria for authority and responsibility described for this level.

Level 3-2 is met. Materials contained in the appeal packet reflect that the appellant exercises the minimum supervisory and managerial authorities described at Level 3-1. These materials also reflect that, during the performance of his duties, the appellant exercises four of the five authorities (2. through 5.) described at Level 3-2b; and all ten of the authorities and responsibilities described at Level 3-2c of the GSSG. The appellant accomplishes the work of the Division through one subordinate Supervisory Contract Surveillance Representative (GS-1101-11) and 10 Contract Surveillance Representatives (GS-1101-09). Through this subordinate staff, he tracks the progress, performance, and quality of the work of contractors to make decisions regarding the acceptability of the work and whether or not contract specifications have been met or if corrections are required. He provides and reviews technical requirements and descriptions of the work to be performed; plans and establishes work schedules, deadlines and standards for acceptable work; and coordinates and integrates contractor work schedules to ensure timely completion of projects. The appellant's decisions can affect whether or not contractors are paid for the work they perform. As a result, the position meets two of the three supervisory situations described for Level 3-2.

At Level 3-3, the supervisor exercises managerial authority over lower organizational units, supervisors, or leaders. At this level, positions are required to meet one of two criteria. The first criteria is that the supervisor be closely involved with high level program officials, or comparable agency level staff personnel, in developing overall goals and objectives for their assigned staff function(s), program(s), or program segment(s). This will typically consist of developing data; providing expertise and insight; securing legal opinions; preparing position papers or legislative proposals, and the execution of comparable activities in support of the development of goals and objectives related to high levels of program management. The second criteria is that the position exercise all or nearly all of the supervisory authorities and responsibilities described at Level 3-2c of this factor and at least eight of the 15 authorities described at Level 3-3b.

This Level is not met. The appellant has no close involvement with high level officials in developing the overall goals and objectives for his assigned function. His responsibility is to ensure that contractor post-award performance is in conformance with contract specifications. Additionally, while he exercises some of the authorities and responsibilities of Level 3-3, he does not exercise the minimum eight that are required in addition to Level 3-2c to credit this level.

This factor is evaluated at Level 3-2, for 450 points.

#### **Factor 4 - Personal Contacts**

This is a two part factor, subfactors A and B, which assesses the nature and purpose of personal contacts related to the 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**

This subfactor covers the organizational relationship, authority or influence level, setting, and difficulty of preparation associated with making personal contacts involved in a position's supervisory and managerial work. To be credited at this level, contacts must contribute to the successful performance of the work, be direct and a recurring requirement, and have a demonstrable impact on the difficulty and responsibility of the position.

At Level 4A-2, frequent recurring contacts are with members of the local business community or the general public, and higher level managers and supervisors, or administrative or program staff of other work units throughout the field activity, installation, or command/major organizational level where the position is located. These contacts may be informal, occur in conferences and meetings, take place through telephone, and may require some nonroutine or special preparation.

Level 4A-2 is met. The appeal file indicates that the appellant's direct and recurring personal contacts are with representatives of local/tenant commands at the installation, local contracting officials, technical support staff, project managers, and owners of facilities management corporations either holding or seeking public works contracts with the installation. The appellant's contacts also include personnel from command level echelons within the naval establishment on issues/matters related to transportation and contracting facilities support. These contacts are normally in person, telephonic, or in meetings or conferences.

At Level 4A-3, frequent recurring contacts are with high ranking military or civilian managers, supervisors, and technical staff at major organizational levels of the agency, or with comparable personnel in other Federal agencies. Regular contacts at this level also include those with key staff of public interest groups having significant political influence, or with congressional committee and subcommittee staff assistants. Contacts at this level include those taking place in meetings and conferences and unplanned contacts resulting from the employee's designation as a point of contact by higher management. They often require extensive preparation of briefing material or up-to-date technical familiarity with complex subject matter.

Level 4A3 is not met. The appellant's frequent contacts are typically with representatives from the local business community; the general public; commanders of tenant organizations; and managers and supervisors of other work units or organizations physically located at the installation. These contacts occur during conferences, meetings, or telephone conversations, and may require some special or nonroutine preparation. The contacts do not typically result from the appellant's designation as a point of contact by higher management, or

require extensive preparation of briefing material, or in-depth familiarity of complex subject matter envisioned at this level.

Level 4A-2, 50 points is credited for this Subfactor.

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

This subfactor covers the purpose of contacts credited in Subfactor 4A, including advisory, representational, negotiating, and commitment making responsibilities related to supervision and management.

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

Level 4B-2 is met. Information contained in the appeal packet and obtained during telephone interviews of the appellant and his immediate supervisor indicate that contacts are primarily made to ensure that accurate and consistent information is provided to outside parties. They are also made to plan and coordinate the work directed by the appellant with that of others outside the organization, and to resolve differences of opinion among managers, supervisors, employees, contractors, or others. His contacts are also for the purpose of clarifying issues and resolving problems related to contracts; advising contractors and customers on contract requirements and on contractor performance in accordance with various contract specifications; discussing the need for further evaluation processes or techniques; devising evaluation criteria; and ensuring that all aspects of the organizational evaluation program are in conformance with contract specifications.

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

Level 4B-3 is not met. Contacts routinely established by the appellant are not for the purpose of justifying, defending, or negotiating as a project representative, or obtaining or committing resources. Significant decisions related to what resources are required and how they will be committed at made at levels above the appellant.

This subfactor is evaluated at Level 4B-2, for 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(s) directed, as well as the other line, staff, or contracted work for which the supervisor has, either directly or through subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or others, technical or oversight responsibility.

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

- a. the work of lower level positions primarily supporting the basic work of **the unit**;
- b. any subordinate work based on supervisory or work leader guides;
- c. work that is graded based on an extraordinary degree of independence from supervision;
- d. and work for which the supervisor or a subordinate does not have responsibility for under Factor 3.

The appellant directly supervises one Supervisory Contract Surveillance Representative, GS-1101-11; one Secretary, GS-318-4; and through the one subordinate supervisor, 10 Contract Surveillance Representatives, GS-1101-9. The GS-11 and GS-04 positions cannot be considered on the basis of exclusions a and b described above. The appellant is responsible for inspection, review, acceptance, or rejection of the work of a large number of contractor positions involved in trades, crafts, and technical work. However, he does not exercise the supervisory responsibilities identified under Factor 3 (e.g., assign work, approve leave, evaluate work performance, interview candidates for positions, hear and resolve employee complaints, effect minor disciplinary measures, etc.). The work performed by these contractor positions does not fully fall under the appellant's supervisory authority and therefore meet exclusion d described above.

The work performed by the 10 GS-1101-09 positions most typically represents the difficulty and complexity of the basic, nonsupervisory work of the Division.

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

### **Factor 6: Other Conditions**

This factor measures the extent to which various conditions contribute to the difficulty and complexity of carrying out supervisory duties, authorities, and responsibilities. Conditions affecting the work for which the supervisor is responsible (whether performed by Federal employees, assigned military personnel, contractors, volunteers, or others) may be

considered if they increase the difficulty of carrying out assigned supervisory or managerial duties and authorities.

The instructions contained in the GSSG require that two steps be used in arriving at the final level of evaluation for this factor. The first is to determine the highest level that the position fully meets. The second is to refer to the Special Situations section to determine how many of the eight situations listed are met by the position if Levels 6-1, 6-2, or 6-3 are selected for the first the first step. A single additional level is added to the level selected in the first step if the position meets three or more of the eight situations listed. The Special Situations section is not to be referenced if the level selected in the first step is 6-3, 6-5, or 6-6. In those instances, the level selected in the first step becomes the level credited for this factor.

At Level 6-3, the supervision and oversight requires the coordination, integration, or consolidation of administrative, technical, or complex technician or other support work comparable to GS-9 or GS-10, or work at the GS-7 or GS-8 level where the supervisor has full and final technical authority over work. The work directed requires the coordination and integration of work efforts within the unit or with those of other units to provide completed work products or services.

This level is met. The appellant is the first level supervisor for one Secretary (Office Automation), GS-318-04, and one Supervisory Contract Surveillance Representative, GS-1101-11. Through the subordinate supervisory, he is the second line supervisor for 10 Contract Surveillance Representatives, GS-1101-09. The appellant 's work requires the coordination and integration of administrative, technical, or support work comparable to the GS-09 or GS-10 to monitor contractors providing facilities support services to the installation.

At level 6-4, the supervisory work requires a substantial degree of coordination and integration of a number of major work assignments, projects, or program segments of professional, scientific, technical, or administrative work comparable to the GS-11 level of difficulty. Work at this level may involve direction of subordinate supervisors or contractors who each direct substantial workloads comparable to the GS-09 or GS-10 level.

This level is not met. The appellant is responsible for directing one subordinate supervisor who directs subordinates performing work at the GS-09 level of difficulty. Although the work supervised by the contractors may exceed the GS-09 or GS-10 level of difficulty and meet the GS-11 level, the appellant has no direct supervisory responsibility for these individuals. Through subordinates, he monitors the quality and acceptability of the work and determines whether or not the final products or service conform with contract specifications.

This factor is evaluated at Level 6-3, for 975 points.

As Level 6-3 was selected for this factor, the Special Situations section was referenced as required by in step two. This section identifies eight complicating situations for supervisory positions. Each of these situations were considered for this position.

### **1. Variety of Work:**

This situation is credited 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 unit. A “kind of work” is typically equivalent to a classification series and require the exercising of technical and administrative responsibility.

The subordinates directed by the appellant are, other than the GS-318, in positions in the GS-1101 series. The contractor employees work in a variety of craft, trade, and technical skill areas. However the appellant exercises no supervisory control over employees. No credit was given for this situation.

### **2. Shift Operations:**

This situation is credited when the position supervises operations a minimum of two fully staffed shifts.

The organization does not use employees working on a shift basis in performing their work. No credit was given for this situation.

### **3. Fluctuating Work Force or Constantly Changing Deadlines:**

This situation is credited when the workforce supervised has large fluctuations in size that impose a substantially greater responsibility on the supervisor to train, adjust assignments, or maintaining a smooth flow of work while absorbing/releasing employees.

There is no evidence that additional responsibility of the magnitude imposed by this situation exists. No credit is given for this special situation.

### **4. Physical Dispersion:**

This situation is credited when the majority of the work supervised is performed at one or more locations physically removed from the main unit under conditions which make day-to-day supervision difficult.

The position’s subordinates carry out their duties in areas scattered throughout the installation where contractors are performing work. However, the supervisory responsibilities are typically performed from one physical location. No credit is given for this special situation.

**5. Special Staffing Situations:**

This situation is credited when a substantial portion of the workforce is regularly involved in special employment programs; require involvement of employee representatives to resolve difficult/complex human resources management problems; require regular and recurring counseling and motivational activities; and job assignments, work conditions/tasks, and training must be customized to fit special circumstances.

There are no indications that any of these conditions exist within this organization. No credit is given for this special situation.

**6. Impact of Specialized Programs:**

This situation is credited when supervisors are responsible for a significant technical or administrative workload in grades above the level of work credited in Factor 5.

The appellant does not supervise work above the level of GS-09 grade level credited in Factor 5. No credit is given for this special situation.

**7. Changing Technology:**

This situation is credited when work procedures/processes vary considerably as a result of the impact of changing technology. This creates a requirement for extensive training and guidance of the subordinate staff.

There are no indications that there are significant variations in work procedures as the result of changing technology requiring this position to provide extensive training and guidance to subordinates. No credit is given for this special situation.

**8. Special Hazard and Safety Conditions:**

This situation is credited when the supervisory position is regularly made more difficult by the necessity to make provisions for significant unsafe or hazardous conditions encountered in performing the organization's work.

The work performed may require the use of normal (i.e. hard hats, steel toed shoes, safety glasses, hearing protection, etc.). However, there are no indications that there is any requirement for this supervisory position to constantly address unsafe or hazardous conditions in accomplishing the work. No credit is given for this special situation.



<b>SUMMARY</b>		
<b>FACTOR</b>	<b>LEVEL</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
1-Scope and Effect	1-2	350
2-Organizational Setting	2-1	100
3-Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised	3-2	450
4-Personal Contacts		
4A-Nature of Contacts	4A-2	50
4B-Purpose of Contacts	4B-2	75
5-Difficulty of Typical Work Directed	5-5	650
6-Other Conditions	6-3	975
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2650</b>

A total of 2650 points falls within the GS-11 range, 2355 to 2750 points, according to the Grade Conversion Table on page 31 of the GSSG.

### **Decision**

This position is properly classified as Supervisory Contract Surveillance Representative, GS-1101-12, with the title at the discretion of the agency. This decision constitutes a classification certificate issued under the authority of section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code. This certificate is mandatory and binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting officials of the Government.