

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's name]

Agency classification: Supervisory Business Process Manager
GS-1101-13

Organization: [organizational location]
Department of the Navy
[location]

OPM decision: Supervisory Production Controller
GS-1152-13

OPM decision number: C-1152-13-01

/s/

Timothy P. Heath
Classification Appeals Officer

7/12/01

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*, appendix 4, section G (address provided in appendix 4, section H).

Since this decision changes the title and series of the appealed position, it is to be effective no later than the beginning of the fourth 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 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.

Decision sent to:

[appellant's name and address]

[Director of Human Resources
Agency address]

[Human Resources Service Center
Agency address]

Director, Plans, Programs, and Diversity
Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary
of Navy, Civilian Personnel (CP/EEO)
Department of the Navy
800 North Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22203-1998

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

Introduction

On March 2, 2001, the Atlanta Oversight Division, Office of Personnel Management (OPM), accepted an appeal for the position of Supervisory Business Process Manager, GS-1101-13, at the [agency/state]. The appellant is requesting that his position be changed to Supervisory Business Manager, GS-1101-14.

The appeal has been accepted and processed under section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C). 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, CFR.

General issues

The appellant believes that the work he is performing warrants a higher grade based on a major accretion of duties and the range of his program responsibilities. According to the Classification Supervisor, the appellant's position was erroneously classified at the GS-14 level and was changed to the GS-13 level after an advisory classification opinion from the Department of the Navy. The appellant disagrees with this decision and compares his position to a similar one at the GS-14 level.

The appellant makes various statements about his working conditions, his agency, and its evaluation of his position. In adjudicating this appeal, our only concern is to make our own independent decision on the proper classification of his position. By law, we must classify positions solely by comparing their current duties and responsibilities to OPM standards and guidelines (5 U.S.C. 5106, 5107, and 5112). Since comparison to standards is the exclusive method for classifying positions, we cannot compare the appellant's position to others as a basis for deciding his appeal.

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, his supervisor, and the Deputy Supervisor, Supervisor of Shipbuilding Conversion and Repair.

Position information

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

The appellant is responsible for managing and directing a multi-functional surface ship planning program. He manages and coordinates advance planning projects and the ship class planning program, develops the workload/resource forecasting schedule, and he manages the program budget for projects in the Engineering and Planning Department. He supervises and provides administrative support to one Secretary, GS-318-6, and four Advance Planning/Project Managers, GS-1152-12. He provides some administrative supervision (approves leave and provides input for his performance appraisal) to one General Project Engineer, GS-801-13, who

is an onsite representative assigned to the program. However, this position is supervised by the Operating Cycle Management Team Leader who is located in Washington, DC. The appellant spends 35 percent of his time performing supervisory duties and 65 percent of his time performing non-supervisory duties.

The appellant reports to the Engineering and Planning Officer. He works with his supervisor to develop and implement policy that deals with process improvement, work acceptance, and technical matters. The appellant works independently in carrying out work assignments and objectives, and he has the freedom to make decisions and changes to program activities as needed. He has total program responsibilities for the FFG-7 SHAPEC class ships in six homeports. His work is reviewed in terms of overall results and effectiveness. Unusual or significant problems are reported to the supervisor.

Standards Referenced

Handbook of Occupational Groups and Families, February 1998.

General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG), April 1998.

Production Control Series, GS-1152, May 1992.

Series

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

The agency placed the appellant's position 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.

We believe that the work performed by the appellant is covered by the Production Control Series, GS-1152, standard which includes positions involved in the supervision or performance of planning, estimating, scheduling, and expediting the use of labor, machines, and materials in specific manufacturing or remanufacturing operations that employ mechanical or automated production systems and methods in the fabrication, rebuilding, overhaul, refurbishing, or repair of any type of Government-owned, controlled, or operated equipment, systems, facilities, and supplies. Some positions are involved in the preparation of contract bids that include the preproduction analysis of specific proposed work packages to determine workload capacity, labor, material, services, and machine requirements to arrive at the most competitive bid.

This is similar to the appellant's work where he manages the multifunctional surface ship planning program, which requires him to coordinate advance planning projects, estimate workload and resources (materials, labor, etc.), schedule the work to be accomplished, and review and analyze the technical portion of individual contractor bids or proposals.

Title

Since the position is delegated supervisory responsibilities that meet the minimum criteria for coverage under Factor 3 of the GSSG, the title should denote these responsibilities. Therefore, *Supervisory Production Controller* is the appropriate title for this position.

Grade Determination

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 guide is intended to measure the difficulty, complexity, and responsibility of work involved in the administrative and technical direction of others through the equivalent of an employer/employee relationship. 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 guide.

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

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 geographical 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. The agency credited Level 1-2. The appellant believes Level 1-4 is appropriate.

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 geographical 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, has limited geographical coverage, and supports 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.

Level 1-2 is met. The appellant's work is administrative/technical and is carried out through a combination of line and staff functions. According to the Deputy Supervisor, his work supports the Advance Planning Division which is a program within a medium sized field level activity that is not considered a major command. The program provides services to the private sector and other Navy commands.

At Level 1-3, the position directs a program segment that performs technical, administrative, protective, investigative, or professional work covering 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.

The appellant's position does not meet the criteria at Level 1-3. The work supervised primarily impacts the production control planning for the Advance Planning Division. The position does not fully meet the complexity and breadth typical of Level 1-3 programs or administrative services since his work supports the Advance Planning Division which is a program within a medium sized field level activity that is not considered a major command.

Level 1-2 is credited for Scope.

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 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 met. The appellant's work effects the field office programs and objectives and compares to Illustration #1 of Level 1-2, where the services provided directly or significantly impact other functions and activities throughout the organization.

At Level 1-3, 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, i.e., a segment of a regulated industry, or the general public. At the field activity level, i.e., large, complex multi-mission organizations 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 met. The appellant's work directly impacts the SUPSHIP offices. It does not impact a wide range of agency activities, nor does it substantially impact numerous, varied, and

complex technical, professional, or administrative functions, such as those found at large or complex military installations.

Level 1-2 is credited for Effect.

Both Scope and Effect equate to Level 1-2. Therefore, Factor 1 is credited with Level 1-2, for 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 carry out 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 credited Level 3-2a, and the appellant disagrees with that evaluation.

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 third situation, Level 3-2c, describes a supervisor who exercises most of the usual authorities associated with first-level supervision.

Level 3-2c is met. Consistent with the factor-level description, the appellant has authority to plan work to be accomplished by subordinates, assign and evaluate work, advise on administrative matters, resolve complaints, effect minor disciplinary measures, identify developmental needs, effect measures to improve work productivity and quality, and develop performance standards.

At Level 3-3, supervisors typically exercise managerial authorities over lower organizational units and subordinate supervisors or leaders, or have second-level authority and responsibility. 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. This level essentially concerns managerial positions closely involved with high level program officials (or comparable agency level staff personnel) in the development of overall goals and objectives. Managers at this level typically direct the development of data to track program goals, secure legal opinions, prepare position papers or legislative proposals, or comparable objectives.

The appellant's position lacks significant responsibility in these areas and does not meet Level 3-3a. The appellant does not have delegated supervisory or managerial authority over subordinate programs nor does he develop long-range program plans beyond the regional level.

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 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. Further, the supervisor's subordinate organization must be so large and its work so complex that it requires using those two or more subordinate supervisors or comparable personnel. The appellant meets only six of the 15 authorities and responsibilities of this factor level (2, 4, 7, 13, 14, and 15). He does not routinely exercise supervisory responsibilities as indicated in (1, 5, 6, and 8) listed at this factor level since he does not have delegated supervisory or managerial authority over subordinate supervisors. There is no evidence of the appellant having supervisory responsibility for the remainder of the authorities (3, 9, 10, 11, and 12) which deals with ensuring equity of contractors; resolving group grievances and serious disciplinary actions; or making decisions on non routine training requests. This position does not meet Level 3-3b.

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

Summary

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Points</i>
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		
A. Nature of Contacts	4A-3	75
B. Purpose of Contacts	4B-3	100
5. Difficulty of Typical Work Directed	5-7	930
6. Other Conditions	6-5	1,225
	Total	3,230

A total of 3230 points equates to GS-13, 3155 to 3600 points, according to the point-to-grade conversion chart of the GSSG.

NON-SUPERVISORY DUTIES

The GS-1152, standard uses the Factor Evaluation System (FES) format. Under the FES, positions are evaluated on the basis of their duties, responsibilities, and the qualifications required in terms of nine factors common to non-supervisory General Schedule positions. A point value is assigned to each factor based on a comparison of the position's duties with the factor-level descriptions in the standard. Under FES, positions which significantly exceed the highest factor level or fail to meet the lowest factor level described in a classification standard must be evaluated by reference to the Primary Standard, contained in Appendix 3 of the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards. The Primary Standard is the "standard-for-standards" for FES.

The factor point values mark the lower end of the ranges for the indicated factor level. For a position factor to warrant a given point value, it must be fully equivalent to the overall intent of the selected factor-level description. If the position fails in any significant aspect to meet a particular factor level description in the standard, the point value for the next lower factor level must be assigned, unless the deficiency is balanced by an equally important aspect which meets a higher level. The total points assigned are converted to a grade by use of the grade conversion table in the standard.

The appellant performs various administrative/program management duties associated with directing, planning, developing, analyzing, and evaluating the planning program. Work requires comprehensive knowledge of the mission, goals and objectives of the program, as well as the regulations and policies governing the resources; knowledge of manpower requirements and systems; ability to use a variety of qualitative and quantitative methods and techniques for assessment and evaluation; and skills to plan effectively.

Factor 1 - Knowledge Required by the Position:

This factor measures the nature and extent of information or facts that a worker must understand to do acceptable work, such as the procedures, practices, rules, policies, theories, principles, and concepts; and the nature and extent of the skills needed to apply this knowledge. In order for any knowledge to be used as a basis for selecting a level under this factor, it must be required and applied in the work of the position being evaluated.

At Level 1-7, the highest level in the standard, positions require a comprehensive and intensive practical knowledge of all the production methods and procedures, machines, and materials; and considerable skill and experience to plan for the future or immediate production control for the manufacture, overhaul, or repair of prototype or very complex products, e.g., spacecraft; combat or strategic fixed wing aircraft; large and very complex weapon systems like a warship or submarine; or responsibility for a number of complex "compartmented zones" of a very large ship (the complete propulsion system is one such zone). The controller must have knowledge, skill, and experience to prevent or alleviate production delays, scheduling conflicts, the lack of sufficient materials, faulty processes, labor shortages, or skilled trade imbalances. This requires a good working knowledge of the basic requirements and procedures of all departments being coordinated both in and outside of the production area. The employee must apply a variety of methods to investigate, analyze, plan, and implement corrective action, as well as establish effective cost controls for difficult and complex production problems that may occur during the preplanning or the work-in-progress phase. Some production controllers, because of their advanced knowledge and experience, may function as the principle employee responsible for the production control planning for a particular type of product.

Level 1-7 is met. The appellant's work requires a practical knowledge of ship repair methods and procedures, a comprehensive knowledge of a technical field, and the skills to apply this knowledge to the development of new methods, approaches, and procedures for complex Naval ship repair and projects. He develops plans and schedules for ship overhauls which are then carried out by his assigned homeports. He has a thorough knowledge of a variety of procedures

and policies based on his experience to direct the Advance Planning Division and to represent the division at high level conferences and meetings.

At Level 1-8, according to the Primary Standard, the position requires a mastery of a professional or administrative field sufficient to apply experimental theories and new developments to problems not susceptible to treatment by accepted methods; and make decisions or recommendations significantly changing, interpreting, or developing important public policies or programs.

Level 1-8 is not met. The appellant's work does not involve applying experimental theories and new developments. His work involves implementing policy and changes and assessing the impact of these changes on his local program as they relate to ship repair functions.

This factor is credited at Level 1-7, for 1250 points.

Factor 2, Supervisory Controls:

This factor covers the nature and extent of direct or indirect controls exercised by the supervisor, the employee's responsibility for carrying out assignments, and how completed work is reviewed.

At Level 2-4, the supervisor and the controller confer to set the overall objectives and adjust any conflicting priorities. The controller receives minimal guidance and is expected to analyze, plan, and carry out complex production control tasks independently and resolve most production, labor, machine, and material conflicts or shortages which arise. The controller plans and coordinates most of the timing and integrated production efforts of many different departments or shops that are responsible for work on various segments of the product. The supervisor is informed of any situations that could impact on long-term production requirements. The controller may consult with the supervisor to provide information needed by management, to report potentially troublesome situations, or to recommend corrective action in areas that extend beyond the area of the controller's authority. Completed work is reviewed only in terms of effectiveness in meeting and coordinating production requirements and deadlines.

The appellant meets Level 2-4. The employee works with the supervisor to develop the deadlines, projects, and work to be done. The employee plans and carries out the assignment, such as determining the approach to be taken or methodology to be used, developing a fact finding plan, determining the depth of analysis or review required, and performing the initial planning procedures and business process. The employee initiates necessary coordination with major DOD/Navy commands and private sectors. Completed work is reviewed from an overall standpoint in terms of feasibility, compatibility with other work, or effectiveness in meeting requirements or expected results

At Level 2-5, according to the Primary Standard and the highest level described, the supervisor provides administrative direction for assignments in terms of broadly defined missions or functions. The employee has responsibility for independently planning, designing, and carrying out programs, projects, studies, or other work. Results of the work are considered technically

authoritative and are normally accepted without significant change. If the work should be reviewed, the review concerns such matters as fulfillment of program objectives, effect of advice and influence on the overall program, or the contribution to the advancement of technology. Recommendations for new projects and alteration of objectives usually are evaluated for such considerations as availability of funds and other resources, broad program goals, or national priorities.

Level 2-5 is not fully met. The appellant works within a framework of established priorities, program objectives, and deadlines. According to the Deputy Supervisor, Supervisor of Shipbuilding Conversion and Repair, the Fleet determines when and where the ships will be available for service, and what specific modifications or repairs need to be performed. Unusual situations that do not have clear precedents are discussed with the supervisor. He works in concert with the Engineering Planning Officer to develop, plan, design, and carry out programs, projects, studies, or other work. Even though the appellant is considered the recognized authority for the advance-planning program, he does not have full technical authority for the program which lies primarily with the Engineering and Planning Officer. This falls short of Level 2-5, where the employee is subject only to administrative and broad policy direction concerning overall major program priorities and objectives. The well-defined framework under which he works limits the discretion and judgment the appellant has to determine priorities, objectives, and the scope of his work. Neither the absence of immediate supervision in the day-to-day operations nor the fact that the appellant's technical decisions are normally accepted serves to support a level above 2-4.

This factor is credited at Level 2-4, for 450 points.

Factor 3 - Guidelines:

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

At Level 3-4, the highest level described in the standard, there is a significant lack of definitive or directly applicable guidelines and standard data. The controller usually refers to previous methods, procedural guides, and instructions, which cover major production functional areas and are of limited use or application. The employee exercises a high degree of initiative in searching out sources of information, much of it indirect or obscure, to develop project estimates and plans for control of complex production projects. The controller may depart from traditional criteria, methods, and procedures to develop new ones which may also require proposing new policies to obtain effective results, overcome unusual problems, and meet the individual program and customer requirements.

Level 3-4 is met. The directives used by the appellant do not include specific instructions and guidance and normally require considerable interpretation and initiative in search of information. Therefore, the appellant has wide latitude to use judgment to plan solutions, develop methods, and implement policies and procedures that meet program objectives.

At Level 3-5, according to the Primary Standard, guidelines are broadly stated and nonspecific, e.g., broad policy statements and basic legislation that require extensive interpretation. The

employee must use judgment and ingenuity in interpreting the intent of the guides that do exist and in developing applications to specific areas of work. Frequently, the employee is recognized as a technical authority in the development and interpretation of guidelines.

Level 3-5 is not met. Although Navy guidelines used by the appellant are general in terms, he is not required to develop applications and interpret broad stated guidelines such as legislation. The appellant analyzes and applies existing guidelines but he is not the technical authority responsible for developing guidelines from the kind of broad or nonspecific policy statement as described at this level.

This factor is credited at Level 3-4, for 450 points.

Factor 4 - Complexity:

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

At Level 4-5, the highest level in the standard, the work consists of production control assignments including a broad range of duties involving substantial breadth and depth of analysis, and consideration of numerous interrelationships and variables to develop production control plans and programs for very difficult and complex products or projects. Typically, they require multi-year funding and more than a year of preproduction planning and immediate production. The production process requires a wide variety of skilled trades for hundreds of thousands of worker-days to accomplish the project. The most important function of controllers at this level is the complex coordination of the timing and sequence of large amounts and wide varieties of materials; hundreds of work orders for the overhaul, modification, removal, repair, and replacement work by many skilled trade shops scattered about the facility and at various contractor locations across the country; and a multitude of requirements for new equipment and materials. Controllers make frequent adjustments to production schedules and prepare justification for additional funding for unplanned work discovered during the disassembly or overhaul of the product.

Level 4-5 is met. The appellant is responsible for a variety of duties that require multi-functional planning for Navy technical activities. He plans maintenance and modernization for ships; directs surface ship advance planning and project management; plans workload forecasting and scheduling, and program budgeting/funding. He identifies what needs to be done, coordinates the planning procedures, and monitors and tracks the business plans and projects. Planning, scheduling, and funding frequently changes which causes some difficulties and adjustments in meeting program objectives and priorities. His planning cycle takes about one year (10 to 14 months) and involves multi-year funding.

At Level 4-6, according to the Primary Standard, the work consists of broad functions and processes of an administrative or professional field. Assignments are characterized by breadth and intensity of effort and involve several phases pursued concurrently or sequentially with the support of others within or outside of the organization. Decisions regarding what needs to be

done include largely undefined issues and elements and require extensive probing and analysis to determine the nature and scope of the problems. The work requires continuing efforts to establish concepts, theories, or programs, or to resolve unyielding problems.

Level 4-6 is not met. The appellant's work mainly involves technical issues and is well- defined. The difficulties of the work do not require extensive probing and analysis as described at this level. The appellant is not required to establish concepts, theories, or programs.

This factor is credited at Level 4-5, for 325 points.

Factor 5 - Scope and Effect:

This factor covers the relationship between the nature of the work, as measured by the purpose, breadth, and depth of the assignment, and the effect of work products or services both within and outside the organization.

At Level 5-4, the highest level in the standard, the purpose of work is to plan, develop, and implement production control programs of considerable breadth and complexity. The work involves establishing criteria, formulating effective production control programs, assessing the effectiveness of production programs, and investigating or analyzing a variety of unusual production problems and conditions. The work affects a wide range of organizations within the industrial activity, and typically has application to other agency activities that are performing similar work at other locations. Completed assignments have a direct impact on the industrial mission of the agency and the safety and security of personnel in the organization to which the product must be shipped in full operational condition

Level 5-4 is met. The purpose of the appellant's work is to direct and plan the repair, modernization, and construction of private sector and Navy ships. The work affects the Navy's ship readiness, program improvement, and operational schedule commitments, which have a direct impact on the ships assigned to the appellant's homeports.

At Level 5-5, according to the Primary Standard, the work involves isolating and defining unknown conditions, resolving critical problems, or developing new theories. The work product or service affects the work of other experts, the development of major aspects of administrative or scientific programs or missions, or the well-being of substantial numbers of people.

Level 5-5 is not met. The appellant's work deals with defined issues and conditions that impact program operations, resources, staff, and policies, and affects the quality of services provided within the Naval Air Station or local population. His work does not have the broad scope or level of impact intended to credit Level 5-5.

This factor is credited at Level 5-4, for 225 points.

Factor 6 - Personal Contacts and Factor 7 - Purpose of Contacts:

This factor measures face-to-face contacts and telephone dialogue with persons not in the supervisory chain and the purpose of those contacts. In General Schedule occupations, the purpose of personal contacts ranges from factual exchanges of information to situations involving significant or controversial issues and differing viewpoints, goals, and objectives. The personal contacts which serve as the basis for the level selected for Factor 6 must be the contacts which are the basis for the level selected for Factor 7.

Personal Contacts

At Level 3, personal contacts are with individuals from outside the employing agency as well as with agency program heads. They normally take place on the telephone and in person in a moderately unstructured setting. They are significant to the production control effort and are normally established on a nonroutine basis. Such contacts may include contractors or personnel from other Government agencies who may provide work projects, funding, support services, equipment, machinery, labor, or transportation.

Level 3 is met. The appellant's personal contacts are with senior management officials, employees and military officials from various commands and agency headquarters, and contractors.

At Level 4, according to the Primary Standard, contacts are with high-ranking officials from outside the employing agency at national or international levels in highly unstructured settings. Contacts are characterized by problems such as the following: officials may be relatively inaccessible; arrangements may have to be made for accompanying staff members; appointments may have to be made well in advance; each party may be very unclear as to the role and authority of the other; and each contact may be conducted under different ground rules. Typical of contacts at this level are those with Members of Congress, leading representatives of foreign governments, presidents of large national or international firms, nationally recognized representatives of the news media, presidents of national unions, State governors, or mayors of large cities.

Level 4 is not met. The appellant does not have regular and recurring contacts with persons of the caliber described.

Purpose of Contacts

At Level c, the highest level described in the standard, the purpose of contacts is to influence, motivate, and persuade production shop and department supervisory personnel and others in positions of decision-making authority to follow a different course of action. Such contacts often arise due to unexpected production material delays, or changes in production methods, procedures, requirements, and priorities. The controller must overcome objections of skeptical or uncooperative personnel and may have to negotiate on significant and/or controversial issues to achieve compromise or an alternative solution.

Level c is met. The appellant represents the organization at meetings and conferences, negotiates agreements, and resolves problems related to the programs he directs. For example, contacts are

made for the purpose of maintaining effective working relationships with all internal departments and major customers, and to influence and persuade others to improve efforts or take a different course of action to help resolve delays.

At Level d, according to the Primary Standard, the purpose of contacts is to justify, defend, negotiate, or settle matters involving significant or controversial issues. The work usually involves active participation in conferences, meetings, hearings, or presentations involving problems or issues of considerable consequence or importance. The people contacted typically have diverse viewpoints, goals, or objectives requiring the employee to achieve a common understanding of the problem and a satisfactory solution by convincing them, arriving at a compromise, or developing suitable alternatives.

Level d is not met. The appellant's contacts do not typically involve the matters described at this level. Contacts do not have diverse goals or objectives since the overall purpose of the work is Naval ship repair, overhaul, and modernization.

This factor is credited at Level 3-c, which converts to 180 points using the chart in the guide.

Factor 8 - Physical Demands:

This factor measures the requirements and physical demands placed on the employee in performing the work assignment, including the agility and dexterity required, and the extent of physical exertion.

At Level 8-2, assignments regularly involve carrying out production controller duties; the controller is frequently required to stand, walk, and climb in industrial facilities where it is necessary to bend, crouch, stoop, reach, and lift moderately heavy items. The employee may also be required to perform these and other functions in obstructed areas, in confining or potentially dangerous spaces in or around a ship, aircraft, or submarine under construction, overhaul, or repair.

Level 8-2 is met. The appellant makes regular visits to inspect ships. This compares to an industrial environment that requires walking, crouching, bending, and reaching.

At Level 8-3 according to the Primary Standard, the work requires considerable and strenuous physical exertion such as frequent climbing of tall ladders, lifting heavy objects over 50 pounds, crouching or crawling in restricted areas, and defending oneself or others against physical attack.

Level 8-3 is not met. There is no evidence that the physical demands of the appellant's position regularly require the type of strenuous exertion described at this level.

This factor is evaluated at Level 8-2, for 20 points.

Factor 9 - Work Environment:

This factor considers the risks and discomforts in the employee's physical surroundings, and the safety precautions required.

At Level 9-2, the highest level described in the standard, the employee works in an office part of the time, but production control duties necessitate regular visits to production areas which involve moderate risks and discomfort and require safety precautions, working near shielded or contained radiation sources, operating machinery, moving vehicles, and cranes; down in dry docks; on and around scaffolding; or in areas of high noise levels from engine test facilities. Visits take place in all weather conditions. The employee may be exposed to strong odors or fumes from paint, fuels, or chemicals used in the work processes. Regular use of safety equipment is an occupational requirement, hard hat, safety glasses, ear plugs, steel toe safety shoes and other kinds of protective devices.

Level 9-2 is met. The appellant is required to make ship visits for inspections; therefore, he must take safety precautions and is exposed to other moderate discomforts.

At Level 9-3, according to the Primary Standard, the work environment involves high risks with exposure to potentially dangerous situations or unusual environmental stress that require a range of safety and other precautions, e.g., working at great heights under extreme outdoor weather conditions, subject to possible physical attack or mob conditions, or similar situations where conditions cannot be controlled.

Level 9-3 is not met. There is no evidence that the appellant's work environment exposes him to the high risk situations described at this level.

This factor is evaluated at Level 9-2, for 20 points.

Summary

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Points</i>
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	6-3	
7. Purpose of Contacts	7-c	180
8. Physical Demands	8-2	20
9. Work Environment	9-2	20
	Total	2,920

A total of 2920 points falls within the range for a GS-12, 2755 to 3150 points, according to the Grade Conversion Table in the GS-1152 standard.

Decision

The supervisory work is evaluated at the GS-13 level, and the non-supervisory work performed by the appellant is classified at the GS-12 level. In this case, the supervisory work is grade controlling and this position is properly classified as Supervisory Production Controller, GS-1152-13.