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Introduction

On September 26, 2000, the Dallas Oversight Division of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management accepted a classification appeal from [the appellant]. The appellant is employed as a Supervisory Border Patrol Agent at the [the appellant’s activity], U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), Department of Justice, in [city, state]. The agency uses the organizational title Assistant Patrol Agent in Charge (APAIC) for the appellant’s position. The appellant believes his position should be graded at the GS-13 level. We have accepted and decided this appeal under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code.

On November 30, 2000, the INS Classification and Compensation Policy office issued an evaluation report supporting the GS-1896-12 classification of the appellant’s position. The agency classifier concluded that the appellant’s position description of record is accurate and adequate for classification purposes even though the position description does not reflect the appellant’s supervision of two GS-1896-13 supervisory positions (organizationally titled as Watch Commander) and the increase in nonsupervisory Border Patrol Agent positions at the Station from 43 to 66. The appellant agrees that his current position description is accurate, except for the omissions noted by the agency classifier.

The appellant says he does not understand why his position warrants only a GS-12 when he directly supervises the two GS-13 Watch Commanders who now serve as the second-level supervisors for Station nonsupervisory personnel. Prior to the establishment of these positions, the appellant was the second-level supervisor for Station nonsupervisory personnel. The appellant confirms that he continues to serve as the alter ego to the GS-1896-13 Supervisory Border Patrol Agent in charge of the [appellant’s] Station (the organizational designation of the position is Patrol Agent in Charge (PAIC)). As the PAIC’s deputy, the appellant fully shares in the management of all phases of the organization’s work. The PAIC is responsible for the overall management of the Station, and the appellant handles all Station operations, such as making sure the fleet of 62 vehicles is operational, that monthly reports are timely and accurate, and that Border Patrol Agents are kept informed about changes in immigration policies and relevant court decisions.

The General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG) contains specific guidance for classifying deputy positions. It states that Deputy positions which fully share in the duties, responsibilities, and authorities of the “chief” are normally set one grade lower than the grade of the supervisory duties of the position to which the Deputy reports. The fact that the appellant now supervises two GS-13 Watch Commanders does not affect the way in which the appropriate grade level of his position is determined.

To help decide the appeal, we conducted a telephone audit with the appellant and a telephone interview with his first-line supervisor, the PAIC. In reaching our decision, we reviewed all information of record furnished by the appellant and his agency as well as materials provided in conjunction with our discussions by telephone.
**Position information**

The appellant’s position is assigned to the [appellant’s] Station in [a state]. The Station’s mission is to apprehend undocumented aliens and to profile trends in illegal immigration throughout its territory of about 16,000 square miles. The [appellant’s] Station is a backup to line Stations along the United States-Mexico border assigned to the [appellant’s] Sector. The [appellant’s] Station is located [a certain number of miles] north of [a city] and covers predominantly [two] counties and portions of [three] counties in [a state]. Much of the area around the [appellant’s] Station is unpopulated desert and includes military reservation lands used for weapons testing and military exercises. [The city], with a population of about 32,000, is the largest town in the Station’s coverage area and has few substantial economic enterprises.

Approximately 75 percent of the Station’s operations are devoted to 24-hour-a-day traffic checks at two permanent checkpoints located south of [the city] on the area’s two major highways, [U.S. highways]. There are no secondary roads in the Station’s southernmost territory [a county] and only a few dirt roads that cross [a specific mountain range] to [city, state]. The Station’s remaining work hours are spent patrolling the interior, checking freight trains, processing and removing undocumented aliens, and responding to calls from other agencies.

The appellant works under the general direction of the PAIC at the [appellant’s] Station. As the APAIC, the appellant fully shares the PAIC’s responsibility for the management, administration, and technical direction of all of the Station’s functions. The PAIC primarily relies upon the appellant to handle Station operations. The primary functions of the Border Patrol program are to prevent and deter the illegal entry of aliens into the United States, to seek out and apprehend smugglers of aliens, and to enforce the criminal provisions of immigration and nationality laws. The PAIC and the APAIC work jointly to maintain a strong liaison with county sheriffs, chiefs of police, [state] police, [police at an Air Force Base], a contingency of [a foreign government’s] air force, various law enforcement agencies, and [a professional law enforcement association]. The Station regularly receives inquiries about immigration laws from the public and about alien apprehensions from local news media.

The appellant is the first-line supervisor for two GS-13 Supervisory Border Patrol Agents (the Watch Commanders). He is the second-line supervisor for the nine GS-1896-12 Supervisory Border Patrol Agents who oversee the Station’s four Border Patrol units. The GS-1896-12 supervisors spend 50 percent or more of their time working with the lower graded Border Patrol Agents at traffic checkpoints to make arrests, process undocumented aliens, and perform “walk arounds” (back-up surveillance) around the checkpoints. Supervisory agents also work along with the nonsupervisory agents to perform freight train checks and other patrol activities.

Border Patrol Agents work three rotating shifts that cover a 24-hour period, seven days a week. The day shift begins at 7 a.m., the evening shift at 3 p.m., and the night shift at 11 p.m. Agents normally work five days a week, 10 hours a day. The agents in [one unit] have special assignments. One GS-11 agent in that unit performs work with the Border Patrol Criminal Alien Program (BORCAP) which involves checking local and county jails for immigrants arrested for offenses such as drunken driving, child abuse, and domestic abuse. Another GS-11 agent in the unit works “Intelligence” which involves checking for patterns of people walking around
checkpoints, monitoring attempts to avoid passing through checkpoints, and patrolling the Station’s territory to look for signs of illegal entries. Two of the unit’s agents (one GS-11 and one GS-9) serve as Prosecutions Officers, working on a rotational basis. They represent INS in court with the U.S. Attorney to prosecute persons who were caught smuggling aliens. Two agents (GS-9’s and/or GS-11’s) serve as task force officers on a rotational basis. They work primarily with Drug Enforcement Agency personnel on narcotics issues involving illegal aliens apprehended at one of the Station’s checkpoints. [The unit] also has a permanently assigned GS-1896-11 canine instructor. The Station has nine dogs, and the canine instructor is responsible for training and maintaining the skill levels of the animals and their handlers.

Unlike some of the larger stations, the [appellant’s] Station does not have a separate Prosecutions Unit, Anti-Smuggling Unit, or Employer Sanctions program. Although the Border Patrol Agents at the Station are not allowed to perform job site inspections, they are vigilant about stopping individuals who exhibit suspicious behavior.

**Series, title, and guide determination**

The appellant does not contest the series or title of his position. We concur with the agency that the position is properly assigned to the GS-1896 Border Patrol Agent Series and correctly titled *Supervisory Border Patrol Agent*.

The appellant’s position functions as a deputy to a supervisory position (the PAIC) that meets the criteria for coverage by the GSSG. Therefore, we used the GSSG to arrive at the appropriate grade for the appellant’s position.

**Grade determination**

The GSSG contains specific guidance for classifying deputy positions. Full deputy or full “assistant chief” supervisory positions which share fully in the duties, responsibilities, and authorities of the “chief” are normally set one grade lower than the grade of the supervisory duties of the position to which they report. The agency used this provision to classify the appellant’s position. Therefore, the appealed position was established one grade lower than the [appellant’s] Station PAIC.

According to the GSSG, the definition of deputy excludes some positions. Specifically, it excludes positions at lower organizational or program segment levels that primarily involve performing supervisory duties. The deputy concept is intended to cover positions that fit one of two very specific situations. First, the concept covers a traditional organizational arrangement where a position is designated as a full assistant to the organizational head and shares in the management of the entire organization. Second, it covers an arrangement where the chief and the deputy manage equal portions of the total organization. The [appellant’s] Station (which is staffed with 66 GS-1896 nonsupervisory positions and 11 GS-1896 subordinate supervisory positions) is comparable to the first situation. Consequently, we determined the proper grade of the appellant’s position by first determining the correct grade of the PAIC position.
The GSSG uses a point-factor approach with six evaluation factors specifically designed to assess supervisory positions. The points for all levels are fixed, and no interpolation or extrapolation of them is permitted. If one level of a factor is exceeded, but the next higher level is not met, the factor is credited at the lower level. Points accumulated under all factors are converted to a grade using the GSSG’s point-to-grade conversion table. An adjustment provision is applied if the supervisory work does not fall at least one grade above the base level of work supervised.

**Factor 1, Program scope and effect**

This factor has two components, *scope* and *effect*. The full intent of the criteria for both components must be fully met in order to assign a particular factor level.

**Scope**

This component addresses the general complexity and breadth of the program and work directed, including geographic and organizational coverage. At Level 1-2, the program segment or work directed is administrative, technical, complex clerical, or comparable work. 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, or comparable activities within agency program segments. At Level 1-3, technical, administrative, protective, investigative, or professional work is directed that typically encompasses a major metropolitan area, a State, or a small region of several States. When most of an area’s businesses or taxpayers are concerned, coverage may be comparable to a small city.

The program segment directed by the PAIC position exceeds Level 1-2 but fails to fully meet Level 1-3. The [appellant’s] Station covers two counties and portions of three others and encompasses approximately 16,000 square miles of [a state]. However, the area is mostly rural and sparsely populated. [The city], the largest community in the Station’s jurisdiction, has only 32,000 residents, many of whom work at adjacent military installations. [An Air Force Base] is one of those installations, and it has a workforce of about 18,000. Not counting residents who work at [an Army installation], this leaves few taxpayers or businesses to be affected economically by an influx of aliens illegally entering the area. The predominant work of the Station’s Agents is to perform traffic checks at two permanent checkpoint facilities south of [the city]. The traffic checks briefly affect citizens within the Station’s jurisdiction who have to pass through one of the checkpoints. Passing through a checkpoint is a significant event only for those who attempt to circumvent immigration laws by entering the country illegally. Work associated with carrying out Employer Sanctions provisions more closely resembles the kinds of administrative and inspection activities that are characteristic of Level 1-3. However, the [appellant’s] Station does not perform this type of work. The Station does not have the geographical or organizational coverage envisioned at Level 1-3.
**Effect**

This component addresses the impact of the program areas and work directed on the mission and programs of the agency, the activity, other agencies, other activities in or out of the Government, and the general public. At Level 1-2, services support and significantly affect area office level or field office operations and objectives. Positions that direct operating program activities at the section or branch level of a bureau are illustrative of this level. At Level 1-3, activities significantly impact a wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, or the general public. At the field activity level, the work directly involves or substantially impacts providing essential support operations to numerous, varied, and complex technical and administrative functions.

The effect of the program area under the PAIC position’s control exceeds Level 1-2 but does not meet Level 1-3. To a limited extent, the work impacts the work of other agencies and the general public. The PAIC and his subordinate staff interact regularly with county sheriffs, local police departments, and other law enforcement officials to identify, prosecute, and remove illegal aliens, but this does not significantly impact the work of these entities. Catching illegal aliens before they can travel beyond the State’s borders does support and significantly affect the Station’s operations and objectives.

This factor is evaluated at Level 1-2 (350 points).

**Factor 2, Organizational setting**

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

The PAIC reports to a GS-14 Supervisory Border Patrol Agent (organizationally, one of seven Assistant Chief Patrol Agents) of [a specific] Border Patrol Sector. The GS-14 position is subordinate to the GS-15 Supervisory Border Patrol Agent (organizationally, the Deputy Chief Patrol Agent) position at the [specific] Border Patrol Sector. The Deputy Chief Patrol Agent functions as a full deputy to the Chief Patrol Agent (a Senior Executive Service (SES) position) for the Sector. For purposes of application of the GSSG, the PAIC’s immediate supervisor reports to the Chief Patrol Agent. Therefore, Level 2-2 is the appropriate level to assign because the PAIC’s position is accountable to a position that is one reporting level below the first SES position.

This factor is evaluated at Level 2-2 (250 points).

**Factor 3, Supervisory and managerial authority exercised**

This factor covers the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities which are exercised on a recurring basis. To be credited with a level under this factor, a position must meet the authorities and responsibilities described for the specific level.
To be credited at Level 3-2, positions must meet one of three descriptions. Level 3-2a contains criteria for evaluating positions that supervise production-oriented work, and Level 3-2b covers supervision in organizations where work is contracted out. Neither is appropriate for the PAIC position. Level 3-2c is the appropriate description to use in evaluating the PAIC’s supervisory and managerial duties and responsibilities.

The PAIC carries out all of the authorities and responsibilities described at Level 3-2c. He meets regularly with the APAIC and other subordinate supervisors to establish the framework for Station operations. The APAIC coordinates biweekly schedules with the Watch Commanders for Border Patrol Agent coverage of traffic checkpoints and other patrol activities. Work is assigned through subordinate supervisors based on priorities and consideration of the difficulty of assignments in relation to the abilities of the employees. The PAIC relies on the APAIC to collaborate with subordinate supervisors on the content of individual performance standards. The PAIC is the rating official for the APAIC and the second-level reviewing official for the Watch Commanders. The PAIC evaluates work performance and gives advice, counsel, and instruction to the APAIC on technical and administrative matters. He provides input and makes recommendations for promotions to the Sector Chief. He effects minor discipline, such as warnings and reprimands, and recommends more serious disciplinary actions when circumstances warrant. The PAIC relies on the APAIC to coordinate local training needs. For example, an in-service training day is set aside semiannually to update the staff on subjects such as pursuit techniques, recent legal decisions, and handling firearms. Additionally, the Station has four Border Patrol Agent trainees and seven more are expected to graduate from the Academy soon. All trainees are required to attend post-Academy training in immigration laws and Spanish. GS-11 level Border Patrol Agents receive one-year rotational assignments to provide this training at the Station. Periodically, the PAIC meets with the APAIC and other subordinates to discuss trends and ways to improve mission accomplishment. Recently, the APAIC suggested limiting the number of Border Patrol Agents involved in “busts” to minimize the number of agents who have to appear in court when cases are prosecuted. Appearances in court significantly affect the number of agents available to cover traffic checkpoint operations.

To be credited at Level 3-3, positions must meet either paragraph a or b of the factor description. Level 3-3a is applicable to positions that are closely involved with high level program officials, or comparable agency level staff personnel, in developing overall goals and objectives for assigned programs. This is not characteristic of the PAIC position.

Level 3-3b is appropriate for positions which exercise at least 8 of 15 authorities specified in the factor description. The PAIC position meets nine of the responsibilities: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 15. The PAIC position meets responsibility 1 because it uses the APAIC, two Watch Commanders, and nine subordinate supervisors to direct, coordinate, and oversee Station operations that involve 66 line positions and two support positions. It meets responsibility 2 because the PAIC exercises significant responsibilities in dealing with officials of other units or organizations. For example, he deals with management officials in [an INS] District and in other Border Patrol stations about the removal of deportable aliens, interdiction activities, and detecting patterns of illegal entry. The PAIC coordinates special operations with Drug Enforcement Agency representatives and meets with numerous heads of law enforcement agencies about ongoing investigations and strategies to reduce illegal entries into the United
States. The PAIC position meets responsibility 3 because it relies on the APAIC to assure equity among the four units in how performance expectations are described and in how performance is assessed. The APAIC performs a final review of performance appraisals for all Station personnel. The PAIC position meets responsibility 4 because it directs a major program segment with significant resources. The Station has an annual payroll and budgetary outlay of several million dollars. The PAIC position meets responsibility 5 because it directs operating program activities for the Station through the APAIC, who, in turn, makes decisions on work problems presented to him by subordinate supervisors. The PAIC meets responsibility 6 because he is the rating official for the APAIC and the second-level reviewing official for the Watch Commanders. The APAIC rates the Watch Commanders and is the second-level reviewing official for the nine GS-12 Supervisory Border Patrol Agents. The PAIC position meets responsibility 8 because it provides input and recommends selections for subordinate supervisory and similar positions to the Sector Chief. The PAIC position meets responsibility 9 because it hears and attempts to resolve all complaints and grievances regardless of the seriousness. The PAIC position meets responsibility 15 because it is empowered to eliminate outdated and ineffective operations and practices which might become barriers to the effective management of the Station.

The PAIC position does not meet responsibilities 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. The PAIC position does not meet responsibility 7 because all selections must be approved by the Sector Chief. The PAIC position does not meet responsibility 10 because it is authorized only to propose disciplinary action up to and including a written reprimand. Serious disciplinary actions are reviewed and approved by higher level management. The PAIC position does not meet responsibility 11 because higher management makes decisions about nonroutine, costly, or controversial training. Locally, training activities mostly involve coordinating training sessions and documenting training needs. The PAIC position does not meet responsibility 12 because it does not regularly oversee the work of contract employees in the same manner as it directs and oversees the work of subordinate employees. The PAIC position is responsible for determining whether janitorial services at checkpoint facilities meet standards of adequacy for payment. This level of oversight of contractor work does not meet the intent of responsibility 12. The PAIC position does not meet responsibility 13. The PAIC position is authorized to approve within grade increases, but it does not have the authority to approve extensive overtime. It can only recommend approval to higher management. The PAIC position does not meet responsibility 14 even though it recommends approval of awards for Station personnel. It cannot propose substantive changes in position classification which could reasonably be expected to change the composition of the Station’s authorized personnel.

The PAIC position exercises nine of the authorities specified in the factor description. This is sufficient to meet Level 3-3b.

Level 3-4 may be credited only after it is established that the position involves responsibilities that are equivalent to or exceed all of those described in both paragraphs a and b of Level 3-3, that is, both the managerial and supervisory responsibilities depicted at Level 3-3. As previously stated, the PAIC position does not meet the criteria for Level 3-3a. Therefore, there is no need to evaluate the position against Level 3-4a or Level 3-4b since the position fails to meet the minimum criteria for Level 3-4.
This factor is evaluated at Level 3-3b (775 points).

**Factor 4, Personal contacts**

This is a two-part factor which assesses the nature and purpose of personal contacts related to supervisory and managerial responsibilities. Subfactor 4A covers the organizational relationships, authority or influence level, setting, and difficulty of preparation associated with making personal contacts involved in supervisory and managerial work. Subfactor 4B covers the purpose of the personal contacts, including the advisory, representational, negotiating, and commitment making responsibilities related to supervision and management.

*Subfactor 4A, Nature of contacts*

At Level 4A-2, frequent contacts are with members of the business community or the general public; technical or operating level employees of State and local governments; higher ranking managers, supervisors, and staff of other work units and activities throughout the field activity; or reporters for local and other limited media outlets reaching a small, general population. Contacts may be informal, occur in conferences and meetings, or take place through telephone, television, or similar contact.

At Level 4A-3, frequent contacts are comparable to contacts with high ranking managers, supervisors, and technical staff at bureau and major organization levels of the agency; key staff of public interest groups (usually in formal meetings) with significant political influence or media coverage; Congressional committee and subcommittee staff assistants; local officers of professional organizations; or State and local government managers doing business with the agency. Contacts include those which take place in meetings and conferences and unplanned contacts for which the employee is designated as a contact point by higher management. Contacts often require extensive preparation of briefing materials or up-to-date familiarity with complex subject matter.

The PAIC position meets Level 4A-2. His managerial duties and responsibilities require frequent interaction with Federal, State, and local government officials concerning the enforcement of immigration laws. He is required to maintain up-to-date familiarity with the complex subject matter this involves. Although the PAIC position meets some aspects of Level 4A-3, the PAIC does not have frequent contacts with high level bureau management, State and local government officials, or other individuals where the issues discussed would be of such magnitude as to require the degree of preparation described at this level.

This subfactor is evaluated at Level 4A-2 (50 points).

*Subfactor 4B, Purpose of contacts*

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 with others outside the organization; and/or to resolve differences of opinion among managers, supervisors, employees, or 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 usually involve active participation in conferences, meetings, or presentations involving problems or issues of considerable consequence or importance to the program or program segment(s) managed.

The PAIC position fully meets Level 4B-2. It does not match Level 4B-3. The PAIC position is not required to justify, defend, or negotiate on behalf of his organization, and the position does not have the requisite control and level of authority to commit resources.

This subfactor is evaluated at 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, as well as other line, staff, or contracted work for which the PAIC has technical or oversight responsibility, either directly or through subordinate supervisors.

The work is carried out through 11 subordinate supervisors who provide administrative as well as technical supervision to those they supervise. The only mission-oriented work performed at the [appellant’s] Station is classifiable to the GS-1896 Border Patrol Agent Series. All nonsupervisory GS-1896 work is applicable in determining the difficulty of the typical work directed.

The highest grade that best characterizes the nature of the mission-oriented nonsupervisory work is GS-11 because it constitutes at least 25 percent of the workload of the [appellant’s] Station. There is no nonsupervisory workload above the GS-11 level. The following table depicts the estimate of how duty hours of the nonsupervisory staff are expended. It shows that 70 percent of the workload is equivalent to GS-9 and 30 percent is equivalent to GS-11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series/Grade</th>
<th>Number of Positions</th>
<th>Description of Work Performed</th>
<th>Nonsupervisory Work Performed (as a percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS-1896-11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BOR Criminal Alien Program</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-1896-11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intelligence Officer duties</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-1896-11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canine Instructor</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-1896-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Task Force duties</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-1896-11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prosecution Officer</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-1896-11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Detecting and apprehending aliens</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-1896-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prosecution Officer</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-1896-9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Detecting and apprehending aliens</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This factor is evaluated at Level 5-6 (800 points).
Factor 6, Other conditions

This factor measures the extent to which various conditions contribute to the difficulty and complexity of carrying out supervisory duties, authorities, and responsibilities. Conditions affecting work for which the supervisor is responsible may be considered if they increase the difficulty of carrying out assigned supervisory and managerial duties and responsibilities.

The PAIC position requires supervision and oversight of a number of major work assignments of administrative work comparable in difficulty to the GS-11 level. Coordination provided by the PAIC position involves:

- recommending resources to devote to particular projects or to allocate among program segments to the [name] Sector;

- providing leadership in developing, implementing, evaluating, and improving processes and procedures to monitor the effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity of the organization directed;

- identifying and integrating internal and external program issues that affect the immediate organization; and

- reviewing and approving the substance of reports, decisions, case documents, and other action documents to assure that they accurately reflect the policies and position of the organization and the views of the agency.

The PAIC position fully meets Level 6-5c. For paragraph c to apply, work must be managed through subordinate supervisors who each direct substantial workloads comparable to the GS-11 level. The first-line supervisors must provide similar coordination as that described at Level 6-4a. At that 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 in difficulty to the GS-11 level. At the [appellant’s] Station, two GS-1896-13 Watch Commanders oversee daily operations of the Station’s four Border Patrol Agent units. Three of the units perform traffic checks at two stationary checkpoints 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and conduct freight train checks and other patrol duties. Eight of the nine GS-1896-12 supervisors spend 50 to 80 percent of their time overseeing field operations carried out by the 59 of the 66 Border Patrol Agents. These supervisors ensure that Border Patrol Agents consistently apply immigration laws to aliens who have entered the United States. The other GS-1896-12 supervisor oversees seven Border Patrol Agents assigned to perform BORCAP, intelligence, task force, canine operations, and prosecutions work. Twenty-five percent or more of the workload in each unit is comparable to the GS-11 level. Subordinate supervisors coordinate and integrate work assignments and ensure that agency policy is consistency interpreted and applied as described at Level 6-4a.

This factor is evaluated at Level 6-5 (1225 points).
Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Program scope and effect</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational setting</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervisory and managerial authority exercised</td>
<td>3-3b</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Personal contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Nature of contacts</td>
<td>4A-2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Purpose of contacts</td>
<td>4B-2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Difficulty of typical work directed</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other conditions</td>
<td>6-5c</td>
<td>1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 3,525 points falls within the GS-13 range of 3,155 to 3,600 points on the Point-to-Grade Conversion Chart of the GSSG.

Decision

The PAIC position is appropriately classified at the GS-13 level. The appealed position, as a full deputy supervisory position, is properly classified one grade lower than the position to which it reports. The appealed position is properly classified as Supervisory Border Patrol Agent, GS-1896-12.