

**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., Room 972  
Atlanta, GA 30303**

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

<b>Appellant:</b>	[Appellant]
<b>Agency classification:</b>	Budget Officer GS-0560-13
<b>Organization:</b>	[Installation] Defense Commissary Agency Department of Defense [Location]
<b>OPM decision:</b>	Budget Officer GS-0560-13
<b>OPM decision number:</b>	C-0560-13-01

/s/

\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy P. Heath  
Classification Appeals Officer

4/04/01

\_\_\_\_\_  
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]

Defense Commissary Agency  
[Location]

Executive Director for Support  
Headquarters  
Defense Commissary Agency  
1300 E Avenue  
Fort Lee, VA 23801-1800

Chief, Classification Appeals  
Adjudication Section  
Department of Defense  
Civilian Personnel  
Management Service  
1400 Key Boulevard, Suite B-200  
Arlington, VA 22209-5144

Chief, Personnel & Training

## **Introduction**

On October 25, 2000, the Atlanta Oversight Division, Office of Personnel Management, accepted an appeal for the position of Budget Officer, GS-0560-13, [Installation], Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA), Department of Defense (DoD), [Location]. The appellant is requesting that her position be classified as a Budget Officer, GS-0560-14.

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

## **General Issues**

The appellant believes that because of a recent reorganization within the [Location] and the resulting changes to her position, her position should be classified as a Budget Officer, GS-0560-14. After her installation servicing personnel office classified the position as a Budget Officer, GS-0560-13, she appealed the decision to the DoD Civilian Personnel Management Service (CPMS). The DoD CPMS classified the position as a Budget Officer, GS-0560-13. The appellant does not believe she has been credited for being a senior budgetary advisor to the Regional Director, supervising a lead Management Analyst, nor coordinating and directing the work of two GS-12 Financial Advisors who work for Area Vice Presidents.

In reaching our classification decision, we have carefully reviewed all information furnished by the appellant and the agency, including information obtained from telephone interviews with the appellant and her supervisor.

## **Position Information**

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

The appellant supervises the Budget and Program Branch, Resource Management Division, [Location]. As Branch Chief, she supervises all activities involved in the accomplishment of manpower control functions for the region. She is the first level supervisor over six Budget Analysts, GS-560-12; three Management Analysts, GS-343-12; two Budget Technicians, GS-561-7; and one Management Assistant, GS-344-7. She is responsible for the effective operations of the budgeting process and for the technical and managerial expertise of the budget staff and program managers in the region.

The appellant reports to the Chief of the [Location] Resource Management Division. She independently plans, designs, and carries out the work to be done. Completed assignments are considered technically authoritative and accepted without significant changes.

## **Standard Determination**

Job Family Position Classification Standard (JFS) for Professional and Administrative Work in the Accounting and Budget Group, GS-0500, December 2000.  
General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG), April 1993.

### **Title and Series Determination**

The appellant does not contest the agency determination of the title and series of the position. We agree with the agency determination that the appellant's position is properly classified as a Budget Officer, GS-0560.

### **Grade Determination**

Since the appellant's position requires her to perform non-supervisory duties 60 percent of the time, and supervisory duties 40 percent of the time, the position must be evaluated separately using the appropriate classification criteria for each. The overall grade of the position is the higher level of either the non-supervisory or supervisory duties. The GS-0500 standard is used to evaluate the non-supervisory duties, and the GSSG is used to evaluate the supervisory duties.

### **SUPERVISORY DUTIES**

The GSSG is used to determine the grade of General Schedule (GS or GM) supervisory positions in grades GS-5 through GS-15. The GSSG employs a factor-point evaluation method that assesses six factors common to all supervisory positions. To grade a position, each factor is evaluated by comparing the position to the factor-level descriptions for that factor and crediting the points designated for the highest factor-level which is fully met, in accordance with the instructions specific to the factor being evaluated. The total points accumulated under all factors are then converted to a grade by using the point-to-grade conversion table in the GSSG.

The appellant disagrees with factors 1, 3, and 4. We have reviewed factors 2, 5, and 6, and agree with the agency determination. Therefore, our decision will discuss only those factors contested by the appellant.

#### *Factor 1, Program Scope and Effect:*

This factor assesses the general complexity, breadth, and impact of the program areas and work directed, including the organizational and 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.

a. *Scope*

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

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

This position meets Level 1-2. The *scope* of the work requires the appellant to direct work that is both administrative and technical in nature. She directs the functions, activities, and services regarding the effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity of budget and management analysis for the [Location] of DeCA.

At Level 1-3, the program segment directed includes technical, administrative, protective, investigative, or professional work. The program segment and work directed typically have coverage that encompasses a major metropolitan area, a state, or a small region of several states; or, when most of an area's taxpayers or businesses are covered, comparable to a small city. Providing complex administrative or technical or professional services directly affecting a large or complex multi-mission military installation also falls at this level.

This position does not fully meet Level 1-3. The *Scope* of work the appellant directs is technical and administrative and directly affects a region of several states; however, it does not fully meet all aspects of this factor level. According to the GSSG, positions at Level 1-3 direct administrative services that support and directly affect the operations of an entire bureau or a major military command headquarters. The appellant is one of four regional Budget Officers whose primary purpose is to provide expertise on budgetary matters affecting their region. Her immediate supervisor is the Financial Manager, who reports directly to the Regional Director and directs the work of the regional Resource Management Division. The Financial Manager has responsibility for all aspects of resource planning, budgeting, funds control and accounting in support of the [Location] of DeCA. In addition, there is one overall Budget Officer at DeCA Headquarters who has nationwide program responsibility.

Scope is credited at Level 1-2.

b. *Effect*

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

At Level 1-2, The *Effect* of 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.

Level 1-2 is fully met by the position. The *Effect* of the budget and management analysis directed by the appellant supports and significantly affects the [Location] of DeCA.

At Level 1-3, the *Effect* of the activities, functions, or services accomplished directly and significantly impact a wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, the operations of outside interests, e.g., a segment of a regulated industry, or the general public. At the field activity level (involving large, complex multi-mission organizations and/or very large serviced populations), the work directly involves or substantially impacts the provision of essential support services to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, or administrative functions.

Level 1-3 is not fully met. The *Effect* of the work does not directly and significantly impact a wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, the operations of other agencies, a segment of regulated industry, or the general public. Her work also does not directly involve or substantially impact the provision of essential support services to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, or administrative functions. The appellant's work impacts the budget and management analysis work only for the [Location] of DeCA. It does not have the wide reaching effect described at Level 1-3.

Both elements are evaluated at Level 1-2; therefore, the overall evaluation of this factor is Level 1-2 (350 points).

*Factor 3, Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised:*

This factor covers the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities that are exercised on a recurring basis. To be credited with a level under this factor, a position must 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. Where authority is duplicated or not significantly differentiated among several organizational levels, a factor level may apply to positions at more than one organizational level.

Level 3-2 describes three situations, any one of which meets this level. The first situation (a), relates to planning and scheduling production-oriented work. The second situation (b), relates to supervising work that is contracted out. Neither of these situations applies to the appellant's position.

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 she supervises, 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.

At Level 3-3, 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.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 3-3a. The appellant does not have delegated supervisory or managerial authority over subordinate programs nor does she develop long range program plans.

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 8 in a list of 15 criteria that establish a level of authority significantly higher than Level 3-2c.

This position does not meet Level 3-3(b). This level is intended to credit supervisors who direct at least two or more employees who are officially recognized as subordinate supervisors, leaders, or comparable personnel. Although one of the appellant's subordinates, a Management Analyst, GS-343-12, is the lead manpower liaison for the [Location], and directs work of some of the appellant's subordinates, the position does not have the equivalent responsibilities of a subordinate supervisor or leader necessary for credit at this level. In addition, the appellant meets only six of the 15 authorities and responsibilities of this factor level (2, 4, 7, 13, 14, and 15).

The overall evaluation of this factor is Level 3-2(c) (450 points).

#### *Factor 4, Personal Contacts:*

This is a two-part factor that assesses the nature and the purpose of personal contacts related to supervisory and managerial responsibilities. The *Nature of Contacts* and the *Purpose of Contacts* must be based on the same 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 and managerial work. To be credited, the level of contacts must contribute to the successful performance of the work, be a recurring requirement, have a demonstrable impact on the difficulty and responsibility of the position, and require direct contact.

At Level 4A-2, frequent contacts are with members of the business community or the general public; higher-ranking managers, supervisors, and staff of program, administrative, and other work units and activities throughout the field activity, installation, command (below major-command

level), or major organizational level of the agency; representatives of local public interest groups; case workers in congressional district offices; technical or operating level employees in state and local governments; or reporters for local or other limited media outlets reaching a small, general population. These contacts may be informal, occur in conferences and meetings, or take place through telephone, televised, radio, or similar contact, and sometimes require non-routine or special preparation.

This position meets Level 4A-2. The appellant's supervisory contacts are limited to subordinates within her branch, higher-ranking managers in the [Location], area offices, field operating activities, DeCA headquarters, and staff members of military departments.

At Level 4A-3, frequent contacts are with high-ranking military or civilian managers, supervisors, and technical staff at bureau and major organizational levels of the agency; with agency headquarters administrative support staff; or with comparable personnel in other Federal agencies; key staff of public interest groups (usually in formal briefings) with significant political influence or media coverage; journalists representing influential city or county newspapers or comparable radio or television coverage; congressional committee and subcommittee staff assistants below staff director or chief counsel levels; contracting officials and high level technical staff of large industrial firms; or local officers of regional or national trade associations, public action groups or professional organizations; and/or with state and local government managers doing business with the agency. Contacts include those that take place in meetings and conferences and unplanned contacts for which the employee is designated as a contact point by higher management. They often require extensive preparation of briefing materials or up-to-date technical familiarity with complex subject matter.

This position does not meet Level 4A-3. Although the appellant meets with high levels of agency management and representatives of other Federal agencies, these contacts are related to the position's non-supervisory duties.

The overall evaluation of this factor is Level 4A-2 (50 points).

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

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

This position meets Level 4B-2. The appellant ensures that information provided to her contacts is accurate and consistent. She coordinates work of her staff with that of others in the [Location] and at DeCA headquarters, often resolving differences of opinion among managers, supervisors, employees, and others.



At Level 4B-3, the purpose of contacts is to justify, defend, or negotiate in representing the project, program segment(s), or 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.

This position does not meet Level 4B-3. The appellant's contacts in relation to her supervisory duties are to plan and coordinate work and ensure information is accurate and consistent. The appellant's contacts that require her to resolve problems and gain compliance are related to the position's non-supervisory duties. These responsibilities are related to the position's non-supervisory duties.

The overall evaluation of this factor is Level 4B-2 (75 points).

<b>SUMMARY</b>		
<b>FACTOR</b>	<b>LEVEL</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
1. Program Scope and Effect	1-2	350
2. Organizational Setting	2-2	250
3. Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised	3-2c	450
4. Personal Contacts		
A. Nature of Contacts	4A-2	50
B. Purpose of Contacts	4B-2	75
5. Difficulty of Typical Work Directed	5-7	930
6. Other Conditions	6-4a	1120
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3225</b>

A total of 3225 points equates to grade GS-13, 3155 to 3600 points, according to the point-to-grade conversion chart in the GSSG.

#### BUDGET DUTIES

The agency evaluated the appellant's budget work at GS-12 using the new JFS. The CPMS determined that the duties were properly graded at GS-11 using the old standard. We have determined that grade GS-12 is correct. Since the budget work is not grade controlling, only a summary evaluation is provided.

<b>SUMMARY</b>		
<b>FACTOR</b>	<b>LEVEL</b>	<b>POINTS</b>

1. Knowledge Required by the Position	1-7	1250
2. Supervisory Controls	2-4	450
3. Guidelines	3-4	450
4. Complexity	4-4	225
5. Scope and Effect	5-4	225
6. Personal Contacts and 7. Purpose of Contacts	3C	180
8. Physical Demands	8-1	5
9. Work Environment	9-1	5
	Total	2790

A total of 2790 points equates to grade GS-12, 2755 to 3150 points, according to the point-to-grade conversion chart in the JFS.

### **Decision**

The budget duties equate to GS-12 and the supervisory duties equate to GS-13. The supervisory duties are grade-controlling; therefore, the position is properly classified as Budget Officer, GS-560-13.