

U.S. Of
Office of Merit Systems C
Classification



nt
:SS
ns
ion
00
96

Classification Appeal Decision
Under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code

Appellant: [appellant's name]

Agency classification: Supervisory Management Analyst
GS-343-13

Organization: Personnel and Administration Division
Management Directorate
[activity name]
[agency]
Department of Defense
[name]Base, [location]

OPM decision: Supervisory Management Analyst
GS-343-12

OPM decision number: C-0343-12-03

Robert D. Hendler
Classification Appeals Officer

11/15/00

Date

As provided in section 511.612 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), 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* (Introduction) appendix 4, section G (address provided in appendix 4, section H).

Since this decision lowers the grade of the appealed position, it is to be effective no later than the beginning of the sixth pay period after the date of this decision, as permitted by 5 CFR 511.702. The servicing personnel office must submit a compliance report containing the corrected position description and a Standard Form 50 showing the personnel action taken. The report must be submitted within 30 days from the effective date of the personnel action.

The personnel office must also determine if the appellant is entitled to grade or pay retention, or both, under title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.), sections 5362 and 5363, and 5 CFR 536. If the appellant is entitled to grade retention, the two-year retention period begins on the date this decision is implemented.

Decision sent to:

[appellant's name]
[appellant's address]

Ms. Janice Siemsen
Assistant Director
Personnel Services Directorate
Washington Headquarters Service
U.S. Department of Defense
AMC Building, Room 2E22
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333-0001

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

Introduction

On October 6, 1999, the San Francisco Oversight Division of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a position classification appeal from [appellant's name] that was initially received on April 1, 1999. The case was received by the Philadelphia Oversight Division for adjudication on May 11, 2000. His position is currently classified as Supervisory Management Analyst, GS-343-13. He believes the classification should be Supervisory Management Analyst, GS-343-14. He works in the Personnel and Administration Division, Management Directorate, [activity name][acronym], [agency name][acronym], Department of Defense, [name] Base [acronym], [state]. We accepted and decided this appeal under section 5112(b) of title 5, U.S.C.

General issues

The appellant believes that his position description (PD) (Position Number C324A) is inaccurate. He states that it does not recognize the following duties: (1) services provided to 50 of the approximately 110 civilians working at [acronym]; (2) screening, hiring, and replacing of approximately 35 "Contract Temporary Employees" (Adecco and Westaff); and (3) "collaborative support to 15 [agency name] and [agency name] civilian employees." He says that other duties not described include: (1) developing and managing the Civilian of the Quarter/Year Program, (2) managing the special emphasis and special hire programs for [acronym] and the collocated [agency name][acronym], and (3) managing and conducting quarterly on-site supervisory in-service training for [acronym] managers. The appellant claims that his subordinates' PD's failed to show these additional functional responsibilities until their recent redescription.

The appellant states that the agency's evaluation of this position does not fully address his: (1) supervision of the Training Branch for both [acronym] and [acronym]; (2) direct involvement in labor management relations with American Federation of Government Employees Local [number] for [acronym]] and [acronym]; (3) supervision of the [acronym] security program, including preparing the Performance Work Statement and Cost Estimate prior to solicitation; and (4) supervision of the Management Directorate in the absence of the Director. He also believes that Factors 1, 6, and 7 in his agency's application of the Administrative Analysis Grade Evaluation Guide (AAGEG) warrant re-evaluation. He bases his appeal, in part, on the inconsistent evaluation of these factors by his agency. The record shows that the agency credited his position at Levels 1-8 and 3c for those factors in an August 6, 1997, evaluation report, but credited Levels 1-7 and 2c in a March 1, 1999, evaluation report. However, a July 22, 1999, Defense Civilian Personnel Management Service (CPMS) advisory evaluation provided to the appellant and his employing agency credits the position at Level 3c, granting the levels requested by the appellant. The record shows that the appellant and his employing agency did not disagree with this advisory decision. The appellant does not address the agency application of the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG) to his position.

These statements raise procedural issues that need to be addressed. By law, we must classify positions solely by comparing their current duties and responsibilities to OPM position classification standards (PCS's) and guidelines (5 U.S.C. 5106, 5107, and 5112). We have

considered the appellants' statements only insofar as they are relevant to making that comparison. The Introduction states that duties performed in the absence of another employee may not control the grade of a position. Therefore, the appellant's supervision of the Directorate in the absence of his supervisor may not be considered in our evaluation of his position. Our decision sets aside all previous agency decisions and advisories regarding the classification of the appellant's position.

Position information

The PD of record states that the appellant manages the civilian personnel, military personnel, security, training, and management controls programs. He assists in managing the AFGE local contract, and participates in contract negotiations. The appellant manages and/or conducts special staff studies, analyses and operational audits involving personnel or administrative issues affecting [acronym] and [acronym]. He develops and manages relationships with other Federal agencies, including entering into Inter/Intra-service Support Agreements, Memoranda of Agreement/Understanding or other less formal arrangements. The appellant develops and recommends Total Quality Management initiatives. He briefs higher level management on the status of program issues. The appellant manages copier and travel and transportation services for [acronym] and [acronym]. He manages the Command Central Library for regulations and directives.

The [acronym] population consists of approximately 65 Department of Defense (DOD) civilian employees, 13 Detachment (Air Force and Army) civilian employees, 31 DOD military employees, and 24 Detachment (Air Force, Army and Navy) military employees. [acronym] has approximately 16 employees. The Division provides courtesy support to approximately 60 to 70 maintenance and security facility support on-site contractors, e.g., making travel arrangements. The Division also provides travel processing support to approximately 32 Cooperative Administrative Support Unit (CASU) contract employees. The appellant's organization coordinates the selection of CASU employees with a private personnel firm called ADECCO. His staff calls the ADECCO point of contact for names of qualified employees for the position to be filled. ADECCO handles the recruitment process. The appellant's staff then receives a list of possible candidates, and refers the list to management. Once management makes a selection, the appellant's staff takes care of the logistics, e.g., setting up the employee's file, checking on their security, taking ID pictures, and ensuring documents are completed. The U.S. Department of the Treasury Franchise Business Activity, an external organization, functions as the contracting officer's technical representative (COTR) for the CASU contract.

The appellant supervises four civilian and four military staff members who are organized into three branches: Civilian Personnel, Military Personnel, and Security and Training. The Civilian Personnel Branch consists of one GS-12, one GS-9, and one GS-3 position. The Military Personnel Branch consists of one E-7, two E-6's, and one E-5. The Security and Training Branch consists of one GS-11 position. At the time of the audit, a CASU employee provided support primarily to the appellant and his staff.

The E-7 deals directly with each of the services concerning military assignment personnel. [name] AFB provides military personnel support to Air Force military personnel. Fort [name]

and Camp [name] provide similar support, respectively, for Army and Navy military personnel. The appellant's organization handles day-to-day logistical support for military personnel, e.g., flagging files to tell military members when they need to take examinations. The E-6's are the primary contact for travel services and base housing. [name] ARB has approximately 60 historical houses that can be rented by service members. The appellant's organization provides civilian personnel liaison services for personnel staffing, classification, and other civilian personnel administration functions. The appellant works directly with his subordinates on more complex projects. For example, the appellant works with the GS-12 and GS-9 to develop statements of work for the CASU contract.

The record shows that the appellant is delegated and exercises typical first level supervisory authority. He sets work schedules and assigns work, schedules and approves leave. The appellant develops performance standards and evaluates performance. He identifies training needs and interviews applicants for vacant positions. The appellant recommends appointments, promotions, reassignments, step increases, and incentive awards. He counsels employees, takes disciplinary action when necessary, and ensures that PD's are current and accurate. The appellant manages budget execution for the Division

The Introduction states that a PD is adequate for classification purposes when it includes enough information so that a proper classification can be made "when the description is supplemented by other information about the organization's structure, mission, and procedures." The functions that the appellant states are missing from his PD are, in fact, tasks covered by program management duties described in the PD of record. The workforce serviced by the appellant can be determined by available information and does not need to be included in the PD of record. Therefore, we find that the PD of record contains the major duties and responsibilities assigned to and performed by the appellant. It is adequate for classification purposes, and we incorporate it by reference into this decision.

In reaching our decision, we carefully reviewed the information provided by the appellant and his agency, including the appellant's PD of record. In addition, we conducted telephone audits with the appellant on June 29 and July 5, 2000. To clarify information provided during those audits, a San Francisco Oversight Division staff member conducted an onsite audit with the appellant and interviewed his immediate supervisor, [name], on August 21, 2000. We carefully considered all information submitted by the appellant, the agency appeal administrative report, and additional information provided by the appellant at our request.

Series, title, and standard determination

The agency has placed the appellant's position in the Management and Program Analysis Series, GS-343, for which there is a published PCS, and titled it Supervisory Management Analyst. The appellant has not disagreed, and we concur with these determinations.

The agency determined that the AAGEG should be used to evaluate the appellant's nonsupervisory work and the GSSG to evaluate his supervisory work. The appellant does not disagree, and we concur.

Grade determination

Evaluation using the AAGEG

The AAGEG is written in Factor Evaluation System (FES) format. Positions graded under the FES format are compared to nine factors. Levels are assigned for each factor and the points associated with the assigned levels are totaled and converted to a grade level by application of the Grade Conversion Table contained in the PCS. Under the FES, factor level descriptions mark the lower end, i.e., the floor, of the ranges for the indicated factor level. If a position fails in any significant aspect to meet a particular level in the standard, the next lower level and its lower point value must be assigned, unless the deficiency is balanced by an equally important aspect that meets a higher level.

As discussed previously, the appellant disagrees with the evaluation of Factor 1. Based on our analysis of the record, we concur with the CPMS evaluation of Factors 2 through 9 and have so credited the position. Our evaluation of his position, therefore, focuses on Factor 1.

Factor 1, Knowledge required by the position

Factor 1 measures the nature and extent of information or facts which the worker must understand to do acceptable work (e.g., steps, procedures, practices, rules, policies, theories, principles, and concepts) and the nature and extent of the skills needed to apply that knowledge. To be used as a basis for selecting a level under this factor, a knowledge must be required and applied.

As at Level 1-7 (1,250 points), the appellant's assignments require knowledge and skill in applying analytical and evaluative methods and techniques to issues or studies concerning the efficiency and effectiveness of program operations carried out by administrative or professional personnel, and substantive administrative support functions that serve to facilitate line or program operations. The work requires knowledge of pertinent laws, regulations, policies and precedents that affect the use of program and related support resources (people, money, or equipment) in the area studied. Projects and studies typically require knowledge of the major issues, program goals and objectives, work processes, and administrative operations of the organization. Illustrative of this level is using qualitative and quantitative techniques to analyze and measure the effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity of administrative and technical programs, and knowledge of the mission, organization, and work processes of programs throughout a military command, complex multi-mission local installation, or equivalent, and the relationships of administrative support activities. This knowledge is applied to conduct studies, analyze findings, and make recommendations on substantive operating programs. It requires skill in preparing project papers and staff reports and skill in organizing and delivering briefings to managers to encourage understanding and acceptance of findings and recommendations.

While the [acronym] is a small field activity, the appellant's overall program responsibilities in a multi-agency, mixed military, civilian and contractor work environment requires the application of Level 1-7 skill and knowledge. Typical of Level 1-7, the appellant uses this knowledge to plan, schedule, and conduct projects and studies to evaluate and recommend ways to improve the

effectiveness and efficiency of work operations in the [acronym]. The assignments require knowledge and skill in adapting analytical techniques and evaluation criteria to the measurement and improvement of program effectiveness and/or organizational productivity. This knowledge is applied in developing new or modified work methods, organizational structures, records and files, management processes, staffing patterns, procedures for administering program services, guidelines and procedures, and automating work processes for the conduct of administrative support functions or program operations. This level of work is typified by the appellant's most complex and demanding assignments. These include his continuing responsibility for the Management Controls Program, more complex administrative support programs, and formulating and conducting internal program studies on a full array of operating issues, e.g., assessing working conditions, developing alternative strategies for unaccompanied military housing, and developing organization and program realignment plans and proposals.

The appellant's work does not meet Level 1-8 (1,550 points) where comprehensive knowledge of the range of administrative laws, policies, regulations, and precedents applicable to the administration of one or more important public programs is applied to the design and conduct of comprehensive management studies. The boundaries of the studies are extremely broad and difficult to determine in advance, and the actual limits of the project are developed as the study proceeds. Study objectives are to identify and propose solutions to management problems that are characterized by their breadth, importance, and severity for which previous studies and established management techniques are frequently inadequate. Knowledge also may be applied in preparing recommendations for legislation to change the way programs are carried out; in evaluating the content of new or modified legislation for projected impact upon agency programs and resources; and/or in translating basic legislation into program goals, actions, and services. This level requires the skill to plan, organize, and direct team study work and to negotiate effectively with management to accept and implement recommendations, where the proposals involve substantial agency resources, require extensive changes in established procedures, or may be in conflict with the desires of the activity studied.

Illustrative of this work is applying mastery of advanced management and organizational principles and practices; comprehensive knowledge of planning, programming, and budgeting regulations, guidelines and process; and thorough knowledge of the military command's facilities planning, acquisition, and management processes. This knowledge is used to prepare long-range (five year) and short-range planning guidance in accordance with broad agency program policies and objectives. It is used to develop resource (staffing and funding) guidance for subordinate activities, and to perform continuous appraisal of the utilization of command resources in accomplishing program objectives and goals. The work requires ability to direct complex studies requiring application of advanced analytical and statistical methods and techniques.

As discussed previously, the scope and scale of [acronym] and its functions falls materially short of the broad and large-scale analytical issues that require the application of Level 1-8 knowledge. The appellant's most complex assignment over the past year was developing a local approach to implementing alternative dispute resolution (ADR). As his study shows, agency implementation of ADR has been an Administration policy goal. The program resources cited in his study show that guidelines and methods have been disseminated. The [name] Federal Executive Board (FEB) Shared Neutrals Program cited in his study represents one of a number of FEB ADR

programs. The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service has been active in training Federal personnel on ADR principles, practices, methods and techniques. While the appellant's developing of proposed local guidelines was complicated by the mixed agency [acronym] structure and tenant activities, it does not reflect the breadth, importance, and severity of challenges for which the use of previous studies and established management techniques would be frequently inadequate. The appellant's study of award distribution mirrors work performed in a wide array of Federal agencies. Longitudinal award reviews are typically performed in equal employment opportunity and performance management programs. Internal climate assessments are routinely used in both the public and private sector. The appellant's implementation of summer youth, unsalaried intern, and similar programs also reflect the application of established management practices, methods and techniques typical of Level 1-7. Based on the foregoing and our review of the appellant's other work assignments, including security management, military and civilian personnel liaison, labor management program operations, and strategic planning, we find the position fails to meet Level 1-8 and must be credited at Level 1-7.

Summary

In summary, we have credited the position as follows using the AAGEG:

Factor	Level	Points
1. Knowledge required by the position	1-7	1,250
2. Supervisory controls	2-4	450
3. Guidelines	3-4	450
4. Complexity	4-5	325
5. Scope and effect	5-4	225
6. Personal contacts and	{3	
7. Purpose of contacts	{c	180
8. Physical demands	8-1	5
9. Work environment	9-1	<u>5</u>
Total points:		2,890

A total of 2,890 points falls within the GS-12 grade level point range of 2,755-3,150 points on the Grade Conversion Table in the AAGEG.

Evaluation Using the GSSG

The appellant also has not disagreed with the CPMS application of the GSSG to his supervisory duties. After careful review of the record, we concur with the crediting of Levels 1-2, 2-1, 3-2, 4A-3, 4B-3, and 6-4. Our analysis of the remaining factor follows.

Factor 5, Difficulty of Typical Work Directed

The record shows that the appellant sought to upgrade his subordinate positions. The agency has found the positions to be properly graded. Absent clear and convincing evidence to the contrary, we must assume that subordinate positions are classified properly for purposes of appeal adjudication. Our crediting of the appellant's personally performed work at the GS-12 grade level is based on his technical program responsibilities and his performing and/or directing the most complex work assignments in the Division. Therefore, we are not persuaded that the agency has erred in its classification of the subordinate positions and must use the grade levels assigned to them in our evaluation of the appellant's supervisory duties and responsibilities.

This factor measures the difficulty and complexity of the basic work most typical of the organization(s) directed that constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload of the organization. It also considers other line, staff, or contracted work for which the supervisor has technical or oversight responsibility, directly or through subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or others.

Excluded from determining the highest level of work is the work of lower level positions that primarily support or facilitate the basic work of the unit. This refers to positions that involve the performance of general support work where the employee has no responsibility for carrying out the mission-oriented work of the unit in which the position is located, i.e., the workload that the unit is essentially established to perform. This support work may be clerical in nature, or it may consist of low-graded manual labor work. In either case, the work does not require any of the specialized knowledge and skills associated with the basic substantive work of the unit. Within this context, the E-6 position clearly involves the performance of specialized functions associated with administrative fields that represent the basic work of the Personnel and Administration Division, travel and housing services. Because the E-5 position provides clerical support, it is properly excluded. In addition, all but one of the contractor employees receives technical oversight from other [acronym] components and may not be considered in evaluating the appellant's position.

Work that is graded based on supervisory duties evaluated by the GSSG or the Work Leader Grade-Evaluation Guide is excluded. While two of the appellant's subordinate positions include limited supervisory duties, they occupy a limited portion of their workload and are not grade controlling. The work time spent on those supervisory duties is excluded from consideration.

The purpose of this factor is to determine the basic work most typical of the organization directed. We find the GS-12, GS-11, GS-9, E-7, and two E-6 positions are properly considered under this factor. The agency has determined that the E-7 position performs work equivalent to the GS-9 grade level. The E-6's perform assistant work evaluated below the GS-9 grade level. Based on the CASU employee's task list, we find those duties fall short of the GS-12 grade level. We are giving the appellant's position the maximum benefit of the doubt by assuming that all nonsupervisory employees are spending 100 percent of their time on work classifiable at their actual grade levels. As a practical matter most positions spend at least a portion of their time on lower-level work. Rarely, if ever, would a single staff year of work performed by subordinates reflect the technical and administrative supervisory demands of a position that meets the

coverage requirements of the GSSG. Thus, the position may not be credited with GS-12 as the level of work directed since it represents less than 25 percent of the workload. Because approximately one third or thirty three percent of the nonsupervisory workload is at or above the GS-11 grade level, the base level of work is credited at GS-11 and Level 5-6 (800 points) is assigned for this factor.

Summary applying the GSSG

Factor	Level	Points
1. Program Scope and Effect	1-2	350
2. Organizational Setting	2-1	100
3. Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised	3-2c	450
4. Personal Contacts		
Nature of Contacts	4A-3	75
Purpose of Contacts	4B-3	100
5. Difficulty of Typical Work Directed	5-6	800
6. Other Conditions	6-4	<u>1,120</u>
Total points:		2,995

A total of 2,995 points falls within the GS-12 grade level point range of 2,755-3,150 points on the Grade Conversion Table in the GSSG.

The GSSG provides for adjusting the final grade one grade above the "base" level of work directed providing the result; i.e., GS-12, from applying the conversion table is not higher than the base grade of work supervised as determined under Factor 5. Since the conversion chart results in the GS-12 grade level, which is one grade above the GS-11 grade level credited in Factor 5, the appellant's position is not subject to adjustment. Therefore, we find the appellant's supervisory work is properly credited at the GS-12 grade level, the same grade level as his nonsupervisory work.

Decision

The appellant's position is classified properly as Supervisory Management Analyst, GS-343-12.