

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



Dallas Oversight Division
1100 Commerce Street, Room 4C22
Dallas, TX 75242

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

Appellant: [The Appellant]

Agency classification: Supervisory Personnel Management Specialist
GS-201-13

Organization: Civilian Personnel Proponent and
Data Systems Divisions
U.S. Army Medical Department Center
and School
Department of the Army
[a large military installation]

OPM decision: Supervisory Personnel Management Specialist
GS-201-13

OPM decision number: C-0201-13-02

/s/ _____

Bonnie J. Brandon
Classification Appeals Officer

6/18/98 _____

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's name and address]

Chief
Position Management and Classification Division
Southwest Civilian Personnel Operations Center
Office of the Assistant Secretary (Manpower and Reserve
Affairs)
Department of the Army
301 Marshall Avenue
Fort Riley, KS 66442-5004

Director of Civilian Personnel
Department of the Army
Room 23681, Pentagon
Washington, DC 20310-0300

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

Chief, Position Management and Classification Branch
Office of the Assistant Secretary (Manpower and Reserve
Affairs)
Department of the Army
Attn: SAMR-CPP-MP
Hoffman Building II
200 Stovall Street, Suite 5N35
Alexandria, VA 22332-0340

Director
U.S. Army Civilian Personnel Evaluation Agency
Department of the Army
Crystal Mall 4, Suite 918
1941 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22202-4508

Introduction

On March 30, 1998, the Dallas Oversight Division of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a classification appeal from [the appellant]. His position is currently classified as Supervisory Personnel Management Specialist, GS-201-13. He believes that his position is properly classified as Personnel Officer, GS-201-14, or Personnel Proponent Officer, GS-301-14. The appellant serves as the Chief of the Civilian Personnel Proponent and Data Systems Divisions, U.S. Army Medical Department Center and School, Department of the Army, at [an Army installation]. Prior to submitting his appeal to OPM, the appellant appealed the classification of his position to the Defense Civilian Personnel Management Service (CPMS). The CPMS sustained the classification as Supervisory Personnel Management Specialist, GS-201-13. We have accepted and decided this appeal under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code.

In reaching our classification decision, we reviewed the information of record furnished by the appellant and his agency, including his official position description 21736.

Position information

As Chief of the Civilian Personnel Proponent and Data Systems Divisions, the appellant supervises the civilian personnel proponent program and the related database/computer support for three career fields in the Army Medical Department. He exercises programmatic and administrative responsibility over these two divisions, and he reports to the Director, Army Medical Department Personnel Proponent Directorate, Army Medical Department Center and School. He also serves in a representative capacity on various committees and boards concerning Army Medical Command civilian proponent and related information technology issues. In this capacity, he advises senior management on various aspects of proponent program operations, resource needs, and policies.

The purpose of the Civilian Personnel Proponent Division is to develop and operate civilian personnel proponent functions for more than 65 occupations in three medical and medical-related career fields. Proponent functions include the review, analysis, and evaluation of the Army Medical Department's civilian professional development initiatives; preparation of standardized, automated core personnel documents (COREDOC); development of training and education plans, e.g, Army Civilian Training Education and Development System (ACTEDS); analysis of workforce structure and personnel inventories; and making recommendations (based on analysis performed) to Army Medical Command management.

The Data Systems Division provides information necessary to plan, coordinate, and analyze proponent civilian personnel management issues related to the three career fields within the Army Medical Command. To provide needed information, the division utilizes and maintains computer hardware and specialized computer programs and software.

Series determination

The appellant states in his appeal that he believes his position may be appropriately classified in the GS-301 Miscellaneous Administration and Program Series. However, we find the GS-301 series to

be inappropriate for his position. The GS-301 series is used to classify positions the duties of which are to perform, supervise, or manage nonprofessional, two-grade interval work for which no other series is appropriate. The appellant supervises personnel management work and automated data system work that supports personnel management work. A professional knowledge of two or more personnel management functions (placement and staffing, position classification, and employee development) is paramount to the appellant's position. The appellant's work and required knowledge fit within the GS-201 series, which includes duties performed in support of a personnel management program or program segments. Accordingly, we find that his position is properly classified in the GS-201 Personnel Management Specialist Series.

Title determination

The appellant believes that his position is properly titled Personnel Officer. However, we find that his position does not meet the criteria for titling as Personnel Officer as described in the position classification standard for the GS-201 Personnel Management Specialist Series. Part I of the GS-201 standard states that Personnel Officer positions must include responsibility for directing, or assisting in directing, a *total personnel management program*. The standard prescribes that, at a minimum, three of five technical personnel management functions (placement and staffing, position classification and salary/wage administration, employee relations, labor relations, and employee development and training) must be fully present, plus the related clerical and administrative functions, in order for a position to be properly titled as Personnel Officer.

The appellant does not direct a total personnel management program as described in the GS-201 standard. The purpose of his position is to supervise the work of two divisions: the Civilian Personnel Proponent Division and the Data Systems Division. The work of these divisions does not fully encompass the requisite three technical personnel management and related administrative/clerical functions. Rather, these two divisions perform analytical work in support of managing the career fields of a large group of medical and medical-related occupations, with an emphasis on maintaining systems necessary to identify and classify knowledges, skills, and abilities for inclusion in COREDOC's; to identify long-term professional development and training requirements; and to identify workforce structuring needs for personnel in those career fields. Although the work of these divisions may impact managerial decisions regarding a fuller range of personnel issues for employees in these career fields (e.g., the need for additional recruiting in some occupations, the need for position restructuring in some occupations, etc.), the appellant is not responsible for administering a *total* personnel management program that provides *functional* services to an installation, agency, or intermediate echelon, as described in Part 1 of the GS-201 standard.

Since the appellant's position is properly classified in the GS-201 series and because the appellant supervises the work of employees involving two or more personnel management specialties, his position is properly titled Supervisory Personnel Management Specialist.

Standard determination

Since the appellant's position does not meet the titling criteria for Personnel Officer, the application of the grade-evaluation criteria in Part I of the GS-201 standard is inappropriate. Since 25 percent or more of his time is spent supervising the work of his organization, the grade of the appellant's position is properly determined by applying the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG).

Grade determination

The GSSG uses six factors to determine the grade of a supervisory position. To grade a position, each factor is evaluated by comparing the position to the factor level definitions for that factor and crediting point values designated for the highest factor level which is met. The total number of points accumulated under all factors is then converted to a grade by using the GSSG's point-to-grade conversion table.

Factor 1, Program scope and effect

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

Scope

The appellant's position meets Level 1-3. At this level, the supervisor directs work that is technical, administrative, or professional in nature. The scope of the work directed is comparable to a major metropolitan area, a small region of several states, or a large or complex multi-mission military organization. Level 1-3 is comparable to the appellant's position since the position involves supervising administrative and program support work for a complex organization (the Army Medical Department) which includes two major commands and seven Health Services Support Activities.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 1-4. At this level, the supervisor directs professional, highly technical, or complex administrative work (e.g., personnel management activities conducted throughout, or covering the operations of, the agency's headquarters or most of its field establishment). The program directed involves the development of major aspects of key agency scientific, medical, legal, administrative, regulatory, policy development or comparable, highly technical programs.

In his appeal, the appellant describes work that he believes to be both unusually complicated and of agency-wide and even department-wide scope. However, the appellant's position does not meet Level 1-4 since the administrative work directed is neither highly complex nor applicable to an entire agency, e.g, the entire Department of the Army. The work he directs is substantive, but the mission and operations of his organization do not constitute work that could be accurately described as highly

complex, e.g., work that directly and substantially impacts a large, complex aerospace, undersea, or multi-mission research and development center or major medical centers of national interest. The work he directs supports a part of the Army's civilian personnel management program and is directly applicable only to the medical and medical-related career fields.

Effect

The appellant's position meets Level 1-3. At this level, the functions or services accomplished directly and significantly impact a wide range of activities. The work accomplished involves essential support operations to numerous and varied administrative functions. Comparable to Level 1-3, the appellant supervises work that directly supports the management of three medical and medical-related career fields in the Army Medical Department. The work supervised affects the long-term training and development plans of more than 18,000 civilian personnel in those career fields, workforce acquisition requirements, and the utilization of civilian medical personnel.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 1-4. At Level 1-4, the supervisor directs work that impacts an agency's headquarters operations, several bureau-wide programs, or most of an agency's entire field establishment; or facilitates the agency's accomplishment of its primary mission or programs of national significance. The work of the Civilian Personnel Proponent and Data Systems Divisions does not directly affect Army headquarters, several Army commands, or most the Army's field establishment. The work performed in support of the Army Medical Department career fields does not facilitate the Army's primary mission or nationally prominent programs.

For *Factor 1, Program scope and effect*, we assign Level 1-3 (550 points).

Factor 2, Organizational setting

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

The appellant's position meets Level 2-2. At this level, the supervisor is accountable to a position that is one reporting level below the first Senior Executive Service, flag or general officer in the direct supervisory chain. Level 2-2 is appropriate since the appellant reports to the Director of the Army Personnel Proponent Directorate, who reports to the Commanding General of the Army Medical Department Center and School.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 2-3. At this level, the supervisor reports directly to a position that is Senior Executive Service, flag or general officer military rank.

For *Factor 2, Organizational setting*, we assign Level 2-2 (250 points).

Factor 3, Supervisory and managerial authority exercised

This factor measures 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 meet the authorities and responsibilities to the full extent described for the specific level.

The appellant's position meets Level 3-2c. At this level, the supervisor exercises most of the usual authorities associated with first-level supervision. Consistent with the factor-level description, the appellant has authority to plan work to be accomplished by subordinates; assign work to subordinates; evaluate work of subordinates; advise on administrative matters; interview candidates for positions within the organizational unit; resolve complaints from subordinates; effect minor disciplinary measures; identify developmental needs of subordinates; effect measures to improve work productivity and quality; and develop performance standards.

The appellant's position does not fully meet Level 3-3. At this level, the supervisor must meet one of two conditions. To meet the first condition (Level 3-3a), the supervisor must exercise delegated *managerial* authority to set a series of annual, multiyear, or similar types of long-range work plans and schedules for in-service or contracted work. Level 3-3a presupposes the direction of a *sizeable* organization and requires that the position assures implementation of the goals and objectives of the program overseen by lower and subordinate organizational units or others. A position at this level must plan for long-range staffing needs of the organization directed, e.g., whether or not to contract out work or determine the best approach for resolving budget shortages. The supervisor is expected to be closely involved with high-level program officials in developing overall goals related to high levels of program management, directing the development of data, providing expertise and insights, securing legal opinions, and preparing position papers or legislative proposals.

Although the appellant directs a program segment that involves the development of personnel-related data for three career fields and advises senior management on long-range civilian personnel proponent issues, his position does not meet the managerial scope of Level 3-3a. The organization he directs does not involve the degree of sizeable, multiyear work planning described for this level. He is not so closely associated with high-level management officials that he is typically involved in high-level program management, e.g., obtaining legal opinions, preparing position papers or legislative proposals, or directing the development of data for the entire civilian personnel proponent program.

To meet the second condition (Level 3-3b), the supervisor, in addition to exercising the authorities and responsibilities described at Level 3-2c, must meet at least eight in a list of 15 criteria that establish a level of authority significantly higher than Level 3-2c.

The appellant's position meets only three of these criteria: the appellant exercises significant responsibilities in dealing with officials in other organizational units and in advising management officials of higher rank; he has authority to make personnel selections for subordinate nonsupervisory positions; and he has authority to recommend awards and changes in position classification for subordinate nonsupervisory personnel, subject to approval by higher-level officials. These are Level 3-3b criteria numbered 2, 7, and 14, respectively.

The appellant believes that his position should be credited with additional Level 3-3b criteria, primarily due to the designation of two of his senior subordinates as team leaders in their divisions. The GSSG allows the use of team leaders to be considered when evaluating a supervisory position (i.e., credit may be given for use of official subordinate team leaders in the organization directed in lieu of the presence of official subordinate supervisors). However, precedent OPM appeal decisions and guidance stress that criteria 1, 5, 6, and 8 under Level 3-3b (those dealing with supervisory authority exercised through subordinate supervisors or team leaders) are not intended to be automatically credited to supervisors simply because they direct two or more subordinate supervisors or team leaders. Those criteria also require that the work of the subordinate organization (for which the subject position is responsible) is of sufficient size, intricacy, and complexity to justify the supervisory or quasi-supervisory structure being credited.

In reviewing the organization directed by the appellant, we determined that giving credit to his position for directing work through the use of subordinate team leaders was inappropriate. The designated team leader of the Civilian Personnel Proponent Division, (whose position is classified as a Personnel Management Specialist, GS-201-13), leads two other Personnel Management Specialists, GS-201-12; one Position Classification Specialist, GS- 221-12; and one Personnel Clerk, GS-203-5. In addition to this being a small unit composed of personnel in identical or closely related occupations, the three specialists work with considerable independence from the team leader to be properly classified at the GS-12 level. Similarly, the Data Systems Division is made up of only four employees, with a Computer Specialist, GS-334-12, being the team leader for one Computer Specialist, GS-334-11; one Computer Program Analyst, GS-334-9; and one Computer Assistant, GS-335-9. Because of the small size of the work units and the simplicity of the position structure, combined with the lack of an unusual degree of technical intricacy in the work performed, the appellant's organization does not meet the intent of criteria 1, 5, 6, and 8 under Level 3-3b.

The appellant's position falls short of fully exercising the following authorities described at Level 3-3b: ensuring equity among units of performance standards and ratings developed by subordinates; directing a program with multimillion dollar resources; hearing and resolving group grievances and serious employee complaints; approving serious disciplinary actions (e.g., suspensions); making decisions on costly, controversial training needs of subordinate work units; determining the adequacy of contractor work before rendering payment; approving significant expenses in overtime and travel; and finding and implementing ways to eliminate or reduce significant bottlenecks and barriers to production, to promote team building, or to improve business practices.

For *Factor 3, Supervisory and managerial authority exercised*, we assign Level 3-2c (450 points).

Factor 4, Personal contacts

This factor measures the nature and purpose of personal contacts associated with supervisory responsibilities. The same contacts that serve as the basis for the level credited under Subfactor 4A, Nature of contacts, must be used to determine the correct level under Subfactor 4B, Purpose of contacts.

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 work.

The appellant's position meets Level 4A-3. At this level, there are frequent contacts with high-ranking managers, supervisors, and technical staff at bureau or major organization levels of the agency, with agency headquarters administrative support staff, or with comparable personnel of other Federal agencies. These contacts include those that take place during conferences, committee meetings, etc., as well as unplanned, informal contacts. Contacts often require special preparation. The appellant's recurring personal contacts include high-ranking military officials and civilian managers within the Army Medical Department. His contacts occur both informally, e.g., telephone conversations, and during planned meetings, e.g., Information Management Advisory Committee and Proponent Steering Committee meetings. His personal contacts often require advance preparation.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 4A-4. At this level, frequent contacts include influential groups or organized groups from outside the agency; regional or national officers of trade associations, public action groups, or professional organizations; key staff of congressional committees; or executive-level heads of organizations. Contacts are of a nature that may require extemporaneous response to unexpected or hostile questioning. The appellant states in his appeal that he is in frequent contact with Corps Chiefs (general officers) to improve career management, training, and utilization of Civilian Corps members. The appellant is credited with having contacts with high-ranking military officials in Level 4A-3. These contacts are not creditable under Level 4A-4 as there is no evidence that they involve dialogue or other communication that can be considered hostile, stressful, or unusually taxing on preparation time and resources, or that they are of the nature described under Level 4A-4.

For *Subfactor 4A, Nature of Contacts*, we assign Level 4A-3 (75 points).

Subfactor 4B: Purpose of Contacts

This subfactor covers the purpose of the personal contacts credited in Subfactor 4A.

The appellant's position meets Level 4B-2. At this level, the primary purpose of the supervisor's contacts is to ensure that the information provided to outside parties is accurate and consistent; to plan and coordinate work directed with other work; and to resolve differences in opinion among other managers, supervisors, and others. The primary purpose of the appellant's contacts is to provide technically accurate information and sound analysis of career field issues, to explain policies and recommendations concerning those issues, and to represent his organization on various committees.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 4B-3. At this level, the primary purpose of the supervisor's personal contacts is to defend, justify, or negotiate in order to represent the program segment directed, to obtain compliance with established policies, or to commit agency resources. The

appellant states in his appeal that issues discussed with his personal contacts are of considerable importance to the personnel program, are resource driven, and require him to justify and defend the program segment. However, we do not find that he normally is in situations requiring him to defend, justify, or negotiate in the manner described in Level 4B-3. Although the appellant represents the Army Medical Department on several committees and boards relevant to the civilian personnel proponent program, he primarily provides senior management with analytical information produced by the organization he directs and with his recommendations that are based on the analysis performed. There is no evidence that he must actively and routinely justify, defend, or negotiate points in order to make his personal contacts comply with his position on policies and regulations or to obtain from them resources to advance his cause.

For *Subfactor 4B, Purpose of contacts*, we assign Level 4B-2 (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. Under the GSSG, the base level of work supervised by first-level supervisors is the highest grade which: (1) best characterizes the nature of the basic (mission-oriented) nonsupervisory work performed by the organization directed, and (2) constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload or duty time of the organization. Lower-level positions which primarily support the work being directed are excluded from consideration in determining the base level of work.

The appellant's position meets Level 5-7. At this level, the difficulty and complexity of the most typical work directed is equivalent to the GS-12 grade level. Work supervised by the appellant that is mission-oriented includes work performed by subordinates occupying one GS-13 position, four GS-12 positions, one GS-11 position, and two GS-9 positions. After reviewing the workload of the two divisions, we determined that over 25 percent of the basic work directed is at the GS-12 grade level. Less than 25 percent of the work directed is at the GS-13 grade level.

For *Factor 5, Difficulty of typical work directed*, we assign Level 5-7 (930 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. At this level, supervision requires substantial coordination and integration of a number of major work assignments, projects, or program segments of professional, scientific, technical, or administrative work comparable to the GS-11 level. Supervision at this level typically involves integrating the analytical work of two or more groups and ensuring compatibility and consistency of interpretation and judgement. Supervision at this level also typically involves providing leadership in developing, implementing, evaluating, and improving processes, procedures, and effectiveness of the program segment or organization directed. This factor level

description is consistent with the appellant's position as he directs two work units engaged in administrative and technical work and, as their supervisor, is responsible for coordinating and integrating their work to effectively operate the civilian personnel proponent program for the Army Medical Department. As supervisor of the two work units, he provides both administrative and programmatic leadership for the organization and the program segment he directs.

The appellant's position does not fully meet Level 6-5. At this level, supervision not only requires extensive coordination and integration of work comparable to the GS-12 grade level but also requires making major recommendations in at least three of the following areas: significant internal and external program and policy issues such as those affecting political, social, technological, and economic conditions; restructuring long-range plans to meet substantial changes in legislation, program authority, or funding; determinations of projects to be initiated, dropped, or curtailed; changes in organizational structure; the optimum mix of reduced operating costs and assurance of program effectiveness; the resources to devote to particular programs involving significant staff years and the organization's budget; and policy formulation. Level 6-5 is also credited if the subject position manages work through subordinate supervisors who each direct substantial workloads comparable to the GS-11 grade level or if the subject position supervises highly technical, professional, or administrative work at or above the GS-13 grade level that involves unusual demands on the supervisor.

Although the appellant directs work comparable in difficulty to the GS-12 level, there is insufficient evidence to credit his position with Level 6-5. While the appellant is involved in making recommendations concerning long-range program goals and planning utilization of resources to optimize program effectiveness, he does not typically introduce major recommendations in ways that are sufficient to credit his position in three of the areas listed. For instance, the recommendations made by the appellant to Army Medical Department and Army Civilian Personnel Proponent management officials do not typically involve major issues affecting political, social, technological, or economic conditions. He typically does not introduce major recommendations concerning project termination, curtailment, or initiation, or introduce major recommendations to senior management concerning organizational structure. He does not normally make major recommendations in policy formulation, such as those effecting major changes in functions and programs.

As discussed under *Factor 3, Supervisory and managerial authority exercised*, the use of team leaders in directing the work units for which the appellant is responsible does not sufficiently meet the intent of Level 3-3b. Similarly, it is inappropriate to credit the appellant's position under this factor with managing work through subordinate supervisors.

Finally, the appellant does not supervise GS-13 grade level work that is highly technical or administrative involving matters of unusual urgency, controversy, or comparable demands as described at Level 6-5.

For *Factor 6, Other conditions*, we assign Level 6-4 (1120 points).

Summary

In sum, we have evaluated the appellant's position as follows:

Factor	Level	Points
1. Scope and effect	1-3	550
2. Organizational setting	2-2	250
3. Supervisory and managerial authority exercised	3-2c	450
4. Personal Contacts		
A. Nature of contacts	4A-3	75
B. Purpose of contacts	4B-2	75
5. Difficulty of typical work directed	5-7	930
6. Other conditions	6-4	1120
TOTAL POINTS		3,450

According to the GSSG's grade conversion table, a total of 3,450 points equates to the GS-13 grade level.

Decision

The appellant's position is properly classified as Supervisory Personnel Management Specialist, GS-201-13.