

U.S. Office of Personnel Management
Division for Human Capital Leadership & Merit System Accountability
Classification Appeals Program

Atlanta Field Services Group
75 Spring Street, SW., Suite 1018
Atlanta, GA 30303-3109

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

Appellant: [appellant]

Agency classification: Supervisory Financial Management
Analyst
GS-501-13

Organization: [organization] Division
[organization] Department
[organization]
U. S. Department of the Navy
[location]

OPM decision: GS-501-12
title at agency discretion

OPM decision number: C-501-12-03

/s/ Virginia L Magnuson
Virginia L. Magnuson
Classification Appeals Officer

October 3, 2003
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).

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

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

Decision sent to:

[appellant]
[address]
[location]

Personnel Director
Human Resources Division
U.S. Department of the Navy
[address]
[location]

Director
Human Resources Service Center, [location]
U.S. Department of the Navy
[organization]
[address]
[location]

Mr. Allan Cohen
Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR)
Nebraska Avenue, Complex
321 Somer Court, NW., Suite 40101
Washington, DC 20393-5451

Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR)
U.S. Department of the Navy
Nebraska Avenue, Complex
321 Somer Court, NW., Suite 40101
Washington, DC 20393-5451

Introduction

On April 4, 2003, the Atlanta Field Services Group, formally the Atlanta Oversight Division, of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a classification appeal from [appellant] who is employed as a Supervisory Financial Management Analyst, GS-501-13. She works in the [organization] Division, [organization] Department, [organization], Department of the Navy, [location]. The appellant requests that her position be reclassified to Financial Management Officer, GS-501-14. She believes that her agency did not fully credit the command status, responsibility for employees supervised, and deputy aspects of her position. We received the complete appeal administrative report from the agency on May 19, 2003. The appeal has been accepted and processed under section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.).

General issues

The appellant makes various statements about her agency's review and evaluation of her position. She also compares her position with GS-14 positions in other commands. 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 make that decision solely by comparing her current duties and responsibilities to OPM standards and guidelines (5 U.S.C. 5106, 5107, and 5112). Therefore, we have considered the appellant's statements only insofar as they are relevant to making that comparison.

Like OPM, the appellant's agency must classify positions based on comparison to OPM PCS's and guidelines. Section 511.612 of title 5 of the CFR, requires that agencies review their own classification decisions for identical, similar, or related positions to ensure consistency with OPM certificates. Thus, the agency has the primary responsibility for ensuring that its positions are classified consistently with OPM appeal decisions. If the appellant believes that her position is classified inconsistently with others, she may pursue this matter by writing to her agency headquarters human resources office. In so doing, she should specify the precise organizational location, series, title, grade, duties, and responsibilities of the positions in question. The agency should explain to her the differences between her position and the others, or grade those positions in accordance with this appeal decision.

In reaching our classification decision, we have carefully reviewed all information furnished by the appellant and the agency, including information obtained from on-site and telephone interviews with the appellant, her supervisor, and second level supervisor, the command's Assistant Chief of Staff for Supply and Financial Systems.

Position information

The appellant is assigned to position description number [#]. She and her supervisor certified the accuracy of the position description.

Our fact finding revealed that the appellant's official position description overstates the duties and responsibilities assigned to the appellant, particularly in the nature of the guidelines used and

the judgment required to apply them, complexity of the work performed, the scope and effect of the program and the personal contacts. These areas of the position description typically pertain to positions found at higher organizational levels within an agency. For example, the position description indicates that the appellant is responsible for interpreting and assessing the impact of new and revised congressional legislation and resolving issues where laws and regulations are highly interpretive and precedents are non-existent, obscure, or conflicting. These are matters for which responsibility lies with the policy staff at Commander-in Chief, [organization] and higher echelons within the appellant's agency. Another example includes identification of infrequent contacts as routine and unstructured. The appellant's contacts are primarily with personnel within the agency in a structured setting.

A position description is the official record of the major duties and responsibilities assigned to a position by an official with the authority to assign work. A position is the duties and responsibilities that make up the work performed by an employee. Position classification appeal regulations permit OPM to investigate or audit a position and decide an appeal on the basis of the actual duties and responsibilities currently assigned by management and performed by the employee. An OPM appeal decision classifies a real operating position and not simply the position description. Therefore, this decision is based on the work currently assigned to and performed by the appellant and sets aside any previous agency decision.

The appellant's position description states that the position is the division deputy and supervises division employees. The General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG) defines a "deputy" position as one that serves as an alter ego to a manager of high rank or level and either fully shares with the manager the direction of all phases of the organization's program or is assigned continuing responsibility for managing a major part of the manager's program when the total authority for the organization is equally divided between the manager and the deputy.

The "deputy" concept used in the GSSG is intended to cover a limited number of positions that fit one of two very specific situations. The first, an alter ego, situation requires that the deputy share in the direction of all phases of the work and be authorized to make management decisions affecting the organization without prior clearance by the chief. The second situation describes an organizational arrangement where the chief and the deputy have responsibility for management of an equal (or nearly equal) portion of the total organization. The use of the deputy principle in classifying deputy positions should not be automatic. It is anticipated that a chief position which has a deputy is in charge of a staff of substantial size and often has multiple subordinate units. Chief positions such as this require deputies who act in their stead because of the decisions which must be made, employees who must be supervised, and the volume of work which is produced.

Our fact finding revealed that the appellant's position does not meet the criteria for application of the deputy principle. The appellant's supervisor is the Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff/Force Financial Management Officer (a Navy Commander). The supervisor's assigned duties include assisting the Assistant Chief of Staff for Supply and Financial Management in his assigned management of the entire department and serving as the Financial Management Officer. Assistance to the Assistant Chief of Staff takes 35 to 50 percent of the supervisor's time and includes activities related to submarine supply operations and the 20 employees performing those

functions. The rest of the supervisor's time is spent in managing the [organization] Division. The appellant does not share responsibilities with the supervisor for the supply activities. Neither does she share fully, as an alter ego, in the all the authorities and responsibilities of the [organization] Division. The appellant directs the day to day division operations and directly supervises the staff. In effect, the functions of the division have been separated into two parts with the supervisor managing the division and the appellant directing operations and supervising. The time the appellant spends, 10 to 20 percent of the time, performing duties in the supervisor's absence cannot be credited since duties performed in the absence of others are not considered in determining the grade level of a position.

In considering the second situation for a deputy, sharing of responsibility for an organization, the appellant occupies a position in the direct supervisory line from the chief to the subordinate finance staff, but the supervisor's authorities extend over the whole department and its employees. This authority is not divided equally since the [organization] Division represents only one-third of the Department's organization. The appellant, therefore, does not have responsibility for managing an equal, or nearly equal, portion of the entire organization. While the appellant's position may be identified as a deputy for organizational purposes, the limited authority of the appellant and the small size and structure of the organization also preclude consideration of the appellant's position as deputy for application of the deputy classification principle.

The small size and structure of the division does not support the need for a deputy. The appellant is responsible for division operations and supervises the small division staff consisting of 10 employees: one Supervisory Budget Analyst, GS-560-12, three Budget Analysts, GS-560-11, one Budget Analyst, GS-560-9, one Supply Technician, GS-2005-7, one Financial Clerk, GS-501-4, a Lieutenant (GS-11 equivalent), a Chief Petty Officer (GS-7 equivalent), and a Petty Officer First Class (GS-5 equivalent). She also has oversight over one contract worker performing work equivalent to the GS-5 level. This group is divided into two small units with two subordinate positions exercising supervisory responsibilities over them.

The record, which includes subordinate position descriptions certified as current and accurate, does not support the conclusion that the military and civilian chiefs supervise for 25 percent or more of their time as required for GSSG credit as supervisors. The Supervisory Budget Analyst position description states that the incumbent spends 25 percent of the time supervising three Budget Analysts, GS-560-11. The position descriptions for the Budget Analyst positions show that the incumbents independently perform their day-to-day duties and this independence is crucial in supporting the grade of the positions. Therefore, it is not reasonable to conclude that the time estimate for supervisory duties over this group is accurate.

The second leadership position, the Lieutenant who serves as the Assistant Financial Management Officer, is credited with spending 25 percent of the time supervising two military positions and a Supply Technician, GS-2005-7, and overseeing the contractor's work. One of the subordinate military positions (the Chief Petty Officer) functions as a Staff Supply Officer performing at the GS-7 level, a very independent level for supply technician work. His duties are indicative of independent operation: serves as the staff focal point for service contracts, acts

as primary liaison with external supply activities, maintains, executes, and reconciles specific budget accounts, etc. The Supply Technician, GS-2005-7, also functions independently and is vested with full authority and responsibility for the effective and economical operation of the unit's procurement, contracting, and fiscal functions. The oversight of the one contract worker does not involve supervisory tasks and typically entails identification of work to be done and acceptance or rejection of it. Therefore, it is also not reasonable to conclude that the Assistant Financial Management Officer spends 25 percent of work time in performing supervisory tasks.

The small size of the organization with six of the employees performing work at or above the GS-9 level further substantiates that the appellant's organization does not reflect the difficulty and complexity that would require having multiple units requiring positions that devote at least 25 percent of their time to leadership responsibilities.

The appellant works in the [organization] Division. It is responsible for effective financial and resource management of funds controlled by Commander-in-Chief, [organization] and allocated to [organization] for dispersion and oversight in accomplishment of its mission. The command has responsibility to operate, maintain, train, and equip submarines. [organization] includes Submarine Groups and Squadrons which have Comptroller authority for obligating funds according to budget plans and report through their organizations to the command. The budget executed by the command (approximately \$389 million) includes several appropriations consisting of twelve operating and support programs: Military Sealift Command, Repair Parts, Combat Terrorism, Commands and Staffs, Fleet Travel, Utilities, Combat Systems Readiness, Repair of Vessels, Commander Undersea Surveillance, Our Staff, Intel Program, and Other OPTAR (Operating Target) Consumables. These program areas include funds for such things as transportation and fleet travel, repair parts, consumable supplies, civilian personnel labor, travel, materials, supplies, services, utilities, combat systems readiness (e.g., funds to conduct torpedo proficiency firings, targeting for missile exercises, tactical development training, etc.), and intermediate maintenance. The [organization] Division has responsibility for justification, budget consolidation for submission to [organization], funds disbursement, and reporting and compliance with the provisions of governing legislation. It reviews reprogramming and additional funding requests prior to submission to [organization] and certifies obligations at the end of the year.

The appellant's primary responsibilities involve overseeing and coordinating resource analysis, production of budget products for dissemination to higher echelons, and providing management oversight of financial practices and compliance with policies for the command. She ensures the financial integrity, timeliness, accuracy, and validity of the command's budget formulation information and data and budget execution reports. Her duties include directing or performing continuing program execution review, analysis and appraisal of the command's major operating and support programs, identifying actual or potential financial problem areas and trends and recommending corrective actions. The appellant is responsible for measuring and evaluating progress related to program execution plans, conducting studies to develop and recommend alternative or corrective reprogramming actions, and ensuring that subordinate activities receive and use resources as required by approved plans and operational priorities. She prepares briefs for senior managers on program execution, provides recommendations to correct program variances and problem areas, consults with higher echelons managers regarding problematic

program areas requiring review and analysis and ensures that recommended corrective actions do not conflict with the current budget strategy. She serves as senior liaison with Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) and Fleet Financial Support Facility (FFSF) on accounting and reporting matters and the financial condition of appropriated and reimbursable funds for the command. She obtains and provides technical guidance, rulings, and interpretations on funding policies and procedures for the command and its subordinate organizations. The appellant provides interpretive and analytical advice on financial transactions and program execution, develops the format and content of listings, reports, and data related to the status of funds and propriety of obligations for managers. She performs these duties for 75 percent of her time.

The remaining 25 percent of her time is devoted to providing administrative and technical direction of division personnel responsible for resource analysis and allocation, financial assessments and inspections, cost analysis, management and reporting, and management of government purchase and travel charge card accounts for all command staff and subordinate organizations. The group is also responsible for disseminating policies related to financial execution and planning, tracking civilian labor (end strength, work years, fulltime equivalents) for the continuing program execution, review, analysis, and reporting of the command's major operating and support programs.

The appellant works under the general supervision of the Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff/ Force Financial Management Officer who provides administrative and policy direction in the form of broadly defined organizational missions and functions. The appellant independently plans and carries out assignments. She is also responsible for coordinating and executing actions required to achieve the command's financial goals and objectives. Review of the appellant's work is in terms of results achieved and soundness of judgment. Work and recommendations are generally accepted without significant changes.

The position description of record contains more information about how the position functions and we incorporate it by reference into this decision.

Series, title and standard determination

The agency classified the appellant's position in the Financial Administration and Program Series, GS-501. The appellant does not contest the series determination and we concur. There are no titles specified for the GS-501 series. Agencies may construct titles consistent with guidance in the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards*. The appellant's personally-performed financial administration and program responsibilities are properly evaluated by application of the GS-500 Job Family Standard (JFS) for Professional and Administrative work in the Accounting and Budget Group. The GSSG is used to evaluate the appellant's supervisory responsibilities.

Grade determination

Evaluation using the GS-500 JFS

The GS-500 JFS provides grading criteria using nine factors under the Factor Evaluation System (FES) format where the points assigned under each factor must be fully equivalent to the factor

level described. If a factor level description is not fully met, the point value for the next lower level must be assigned.

Factor 1, Knowledge required by the position

This factor measures the nature and extent of information or facts that an employee must understand to do acceptable work, (e.g., the steps, procedures, practices, rules, policies, theories, principles, and concepts) and the nature and extent of the skills needed to apply this knowledge.

Level 1-7 is met. As at this level, the appellant's work requires detailed, intensive knowledge of the financial policies, precedents, goals, regulations, objectives, and guidelines sufficient to manage budget and program execution, managerial accounting, resource analysis and funds allocation for the command's major operating and support programs. It requires a thorough command of Federal and all agency budget policies, regulations, guidelines, and processes in order to develop budget execution plans, assess execution, and review resource allocation requests, making recommendations for approval, disapproval or modification. The appellant must have knowledge to develop, recommend and implement financial policies and guidelines for all of the command's major programs. Knowledge is also used to project and analyze the potential effects of budgetary actions on viability and attainment of program goals. The appellant's position must evaluate and make recommendations on changes and trends in program requirements and their impact on operations, obligations and expenditures.

Level 1-8 is not met. At that level, work requires mastery of budgetary concepts, principles, practices, laws, and regulations, and the relationship between subordinate and senior levels of financial management and budgeting within the employing entity, sufficient to perform duties such as analyzing national level programs or exceptionally large and complex programs (e.g., multi-million dollar research grants), developing, recommending, and implementing financial and budgetary policies, interpreting and assessing the impact of new and revised legislation on budget formulation and execution, and rendering authoritative interpretations of executive orders, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidelines and directives, and policies and precedents within and across agency lines.

The appellant's duties are primarily concerned with financial management and budget formulation and execution related to the major operating and support programs of the command and do not involve the full budget function. They do not require the appellant to develop budgetary policies or interpret legislation to determine possible impact on agency-level budgeting processes or financial operations. Guidance on matters of this nature is prepared at higher organizational levels within the Department of the Navy.

Level 1-7 is credited for 1250 points.

Factor 2, Supervisory controls

This factor covers how the work is assigned, the extent to which the employee is responsible for carrying it out, and how the work is reviewed.

Level 2-4 is met. Comparable to this level, the appellant functions as the technical authority on budgetary and financial matters for the command. She plans the work, resolves technical problems that arise, and coordinates the work with managers and personnel of the command's subordinate staff organizations and staff at higher levels. She provides direction and guidance to the command's management staffs and subordinate organizations' comptrollers on interpreting, defining, and correctly applying financial policies and procedures, and keeps her supervisor informed of potentially sensitive issues that may adversely impact command programs from a budgetary standpoint. Review of the appellant's work is in terms of her effectiveness in planning formulation of budget submissions and managing all aspects of budget execution and financial records for the command's operating and support programs.

Level 2-5 is not met. At this level, the supervisor provides administrative and policy direction in terms of broadly defined missions or functions. The employee is responsible for significant programs or functions, defines objectives and interprets policy promulgated by higher organizational levels, independently plans, designs, and carries out the work to be done, and is a technical authority for the command. The supervisor reviews the work for fulfillment of objectives and the effect of the employee's advice and decisions on the overall program, and evaluates the employee's recommendations for new systems, methods, projects, or program emphasis in terms of availability of funds and resources. The supervisor rarely makes significant changes to the employee's work.

Level 2-5 covers positions where the employee possesses delegated program management authority to define overall objectives, parameters, and activities of a significant program. Positions at this level are typically located at high levels in the organization, e.g., the first level below the policy promulgation level, without benefit of intervening levels that develop interpretive guidance. The appellant does not have the types of managerial responsibilities intended by the standard at this level. She performs and supervises operating-level budgetary and financial work of a support nature for a command situated multiple levels below the policy promulgation level in the agency.

Level 2-4 is credited for 450 points.

Factor 3, Guidelines

This factor covers the nature of guidelines for the work and the judgment needed to apply them.

Level 3-3 is met. At this level, guidelines typically provide a preferred approach or describe generally accepted standards rather than precisely delineating requirements. In some instances situations are encountered that may require a level of detail or scope of instruction that is greater than what the guidelines provide. The employee uses judgment to adapt the guidelines to specific cases or problems and to interpret for command use a large number of varied policies and regulations. Comparable to this level, the guidelines available to the appellant include regulations, policy and procedural directives, manuals and other guidance developed and provided by the Department of Defense and higher levels within the Department of the Navy that are related to all pertinent aspects of financial management. The appellant is required to use judgment in adapting the guidance to specific problem areas, or in interpreting numerous and

varied policies and regulations affecting the command's major operating and support programs. She refers policy questions involving significant matters to the policy staff at the next higher echelon.

The position does not meet Level 3-4, where guidelines and policies are scarce, very general in nature, pertain only to routine issues and matters, and are stated in terms of goals to be accomplished rather than the approach to be taken. Guidelines also present a number of principles and standards any one of which may reasonably apply to the broad subject matter. Documentation of work done in earlier assignments is not available or is not applicable because of changes in subject matter, objectives, or emphasis. The work at this level requires the employee to use judgment to routinely develop specific objectives and devise new methods, techniques, and criteria pertaining to matters such as identifying trends and patterns, acquiring information and analyzing data, and modifying systems to accept new kinds of data and developing solutions and presenting findings.

The work performed by the appellant does not require extensive interpretation to develop policy statements and instructions that impact operations across an agency. The appellant provides guidance and procedural instructions on implementation of policy developed at higher echelons. Interpretations she provides typically affect only the policies and practices within the command and its subordinate organizations. She does not routinely develop new analytical methods and criteria. Decisions on interpretations of broad policy statements, basic legislation and laws that result in agency-wide policies and practices are made at the Department of Defense and higher levels within the Department of the Navy.

Level 3-3 is credited for 275 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.

The complexity of the appellant's work meets Level 4-4. Comparable to positions at this level, the analytical, technical, and administrative work performed by the appellant supports the operational and functional activities of the command. The work involves providing oversight and coordination of resource analysis and production of budget products and the monitoring of financial policy and practices within the command and subordinate organizations. The appellant conducts recurring reviews and analyses of budget execution for the command, identifies trends, accomplishments, deficiency situations, imbalances and other factors in the command's programs. The appellant analyzes command program requirements and develops recommendations for changes in funding and budget execution. Her responsibilities also involve ensuring that financial management procedures adhere to all applicable laws and regulations to avoid violations that would negatively impact the command's operations.

Level 4-5 is not met. At that level, the work consists of selecting and using many different and unrelated analytical techniques and methods relative to substantive agency programs with widely

varying needs, goals, objectives, work processes, and timetables. Such programs relate to many echelons and components within a large Federal department or agency, to other agencies, to private industry, or to the public. This level includes budget execution work involving the most difficult funds control activities. These activities may include efforts to adapt budgetary policies, analytical methods, and regulatory procedures for use by subordinate echelons, and their centralized or consolidated equivalent. The work covers such matters as multi-year procurement of major weapons systems, construction projects, law enforcement activities, and delivery of payments and benefits to the public. In contrast to work at this level, the work performed by the appellant's position includes approximately 12 substantive programs accounts, but does not relate to many echelons and components within a large Federal department or agency or the most difficult funds control activities such as would be associated with military construction and depot level maintenance. These fund control activities are retained at higher echelons in the agency. In contrast to positions at Level 4-5, the work performed by the appellant's position involves effectively managing the use of the financial resources allocated to support the operations and mission of the command and its subordinate groups and associated squadrons. Budget activities involve operational support activities and are less complex than budget activities intended at Level 4-5.

Level 4-4 is credited for 225 points.

Factor 5, Scope and effect

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

Level 5-3 is met. At this level, work involves conducting a variety of tasks in limited functional areas. Examples of scope at this level include applying specific budgetary rules and regulations related to segments of the budget for assigned support activities, or using conventional accounting methods to reconcile payroll data and analyze internal controls over accounts receivable overpayments. The work affects the operation of systems or programs, information on the amount, timeliness, and availability of funds, the economic well-being of people and the availability of accounting data. As at this level, the appellant is responsible for the providing a wide variety of budget and financial management support services to [organization] and its subordinate organizations. Her responsibilities include coordinating and planning formulation of the annual budget submissions, planning and recommending distribution of operations and maintenance funds, conducting program execution reviews, providing advice and information regarding the availability of funds, developing recommendations to resolve problems and providing input to senior management officials on managing funding for the command's programs and operations.

The position does not meet Level 5-4. At that level, the work involves executing modifications to systems, programs, or operations, or establishing criteria to assess, investigate, or analyze a variety of unusual problems and conditions, where the work involves a wide range of agency activities. For example, the employee may formulate and monitor the execution of long-range (3-5 years or longer) detailed budget forecasts and plans to fund the implementation of

substantive agency programs and projects. At this level, employees also establish financial and budgetary goals, timetables, milestones, and other criteria against which the relative costs and benefits of program achievements can be measured. In contrast, the appellant's duties primarily relate to the command and its subordinate organizations and primarily involve operational support funding activities rather than the substantive programs, e.g., the production and distribution of goods, construction, etc., intended at this level. She does not have direct control over the budget, but rather recommends actions and implements command budget goals and criteria established by higher level management at the command and at higher echelons. The scope of the appellant's work does not have the breadth and depth intended for this level in that it does not have the budget authorities identified at this level and is limited to the command and its subordinate organizations.

Level 5-3 is credited for 150 points.

Factors 6 and 7, Personal contacts and Purpose of contacts

These two factors include face-to-face and other contacts (e.g., telephone, e-mail, video-conferences) with persons not in the supervisory chain, and the purpose of the contacts. The relationship between Factors 6 and 7 presumes that the same contacts will be evaluated under both factors.

Personal contacts

The appellant's contacts are comparable to Level 2, where contacts are with personnel from various levels within the agency such as headquarters, regions, districts, or field offices, or other operating offices in the immediate installation. Contacts are in moderately structured settings. The appellant has routine contacts with officials and senior managers and other financial management personnel within the command and at the next higher echelon. She also has less frequent contacts with personnel at Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) and Fleet Financial Support Facility (FFSF). These contacts primarily occur during meetings and briefings to discuss financial management policy and procedural matters, provide factual information on problem areas or other financial matters related to command programs and operations.

The position does not meet Level 3, where contacts are non-routine and include executives, officials, managers, professionals, taxpayers, employees of other agencies, and outside organizations and businesses. Contacts such as these occur in moderately unstructured settings, and the role and authority of each party must be recognized or learned during the course of the meeting or conversation. The appellant does not have regular and recurring non-routine contacts with the wide variety of individuals or parties typical of this level. Most of her contacts are of a routine, structured nature and are with financial management personnel and senior management officials within the command and at higher and lower echelons. As a subject matter expert, the appellant must frequently be prepared to provide in-depth information related to financial management and budget formulation and execution in the command.

Purpose of contacts

The purpose of the appellant's contacts is comparable to Level C. At this level, contacts are to influence persons or groups when there is wide disagreement on the merits of a proposed action. The appellant participates in briefings, conferences and meetings where a variety of budget and financial management matters are discussed. Attendees are typically senior officials, program managers, and financial personnel of the command, higher echelon and subordinate organizations. The appellant presents recommendations or courses of action to comply with established policies, objectives and regulations and corrective reprogramming actions and budget strategies, etc., that will benefit the command as a whole. There is wide disagreement as a number of parties strongly disagree with recommendations for changes in requirements, priorities for resources, and the need for reprogramming and the appellant must influence and convince them of the merits of fiscal courses of action.

The position does not meet Level D, where contacts are to present, justify, defend, negotiate, or settle matters involving significant or controversial issues. Contacts at this level include defending alternative methods of financing substantive program operations or the redistribution of appropriated funds and programs among components immediately below agency level, or negotiating and resolving controversial financial and program issues of considerable significance that are not susceptible to resolution at lower echelons in government. Contacts at this level are typical of positions that are located at higher levels within the agency. The appellant does not perform comparable negotiation, justification, or defense of issues or funds.

Level 2C is credited for Factors 6 and 7 for 145 points.

Factor 8, Physical demands, and Factor 9, Work environment

This is the only level described for each of these factors in the standard. The appellant's work is primarily sedentary and is performed in an adequately lighted, heated, and ventilated office environment.

Level 8-1 is credited for 5 points and Level 9-1 is credited for 5 points.

Summary

<i>Factors</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Points</i>
1. Knowledge required by the position	1-7	1250
2. Supervisory controls	2-4	450
3. Guidelines	3-3	275
4. Complexity	4-4	225
5. Scope and effect	5-3	150
6. & 7. Personal contacts and Purpose of contacts	2C	145
8. Physical demands	8-1	5
9. Work environment	9-1	5
<i>Total</i>		2505

A total of 2505 points falls within the GS-11 grade level point range of 2355 -2750 points on the Grade Conversion Table.

Evaluation using the GSSG

The GSSG uses a point-factor approach with six evaluation factors designed specifically for supervisory positions. Under each factor there are several factor level definitions which are assigned specific point values.

Factor 1 -Program scope and effect

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

Scope

The element *Scope* addresses the general complexity and breadth of the program directed, the work directed, or the services delivered. The geographic and organizational coverage of the program within the agency structure is included 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.

At Level 1-3, the work directed is technical, administrative, protective, investigative, or professional work. Providing complex administrative, technical or professional services directly affecting a large or complex multi-mission military installation falls at this level. One illustration indicates direction of administrative services (personnel, supply management, budget, facilities management, or similar) which support and directly affect the operations of a bureau or a major military command headquarters; a large or complex multi-mission military installation, or comparable groups.

The first aspect of Level 1-3 *Scope*, size of the organization served, is met. The appellant's organization performs budget consolidation and execution for funds supporting a large part of the command's functions. The command has 15,000 employees responsible for several technical functions, i.e., operations, maintenance, training, and equipping submarines. It is comparable to a large military installation which is defined as one having a supported population exceeding 4000 personnel and with a variety of serviced technical functions.

The second aspect of *Scope*, the nature of the services provided, is not met. The appellant's work does not *directly* affect the command's budget. [organization] retains authority for the command's overall budget and decisions relating to allocations, reprogramming, and additional

funding. The appellant's organization has no direct control over the budget, but rather consolidates annual budget submissions, justifies, and provides oversight and advisory functions primarily relating to the command's adherence to budget criteria and policy established by [organization]. It makes recommendations on acceptable means to accomplish the mission within that framework. The appellant's responsibilities support, but do not directly affect the command's budget as intended at Level 1-3.

Level 1-2 is credited for *Scope*.

Effect

The element *Effect* addresses the impact of the work on the mission and programs of the customers, the activity, the agency, other agencies, the general public, or others.

Level 1-2 is met. At this level, the work services or products support and significantly affect installation level, area office level, or field office operations and objectives, or comparable program segments. The appellant directs budget and budget related supply work which supports the ability of the command and subordinate organizations to effectively spend, monitor, track and report on funds allocated for its major and support programs. The appellant supervises budget analysts and other personnel engaged in a variety of activities involving the monitoring and managing of funds impacting an installation level.

Level 1-3 is not met. At this level, the activities, functions, or services accomplished directly and *significantly impact* a wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, or the operations of outside interests, or the general public. At the field activity level involving a large military installation, the work directly involves or substantially impacts the provision of essential support operations to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, and administrative functions. A Level 1-3 illustration identifies provision of a significant portion of the agency's line program to a moderate-sized population. The appellant directs budget operations for only a portion, primarily support operations and maintenance, of the total funds budgeted for the command. While the appellant's work involves 12 program areas and large sums of money, the more complex budget activities, such as military construction and depot level maintenance, are done at [organization]. Additionally the work directed by the appellant involves primarily assuring the compilation of budgets and execution. This does not fully meet the broader degree of administrative service, e.g., the full range of personnel, budget, IT services, nor affect the wide range of activities described as typical at the 1-3 level.

Both *Scope* and *Effect* are evaluated at Level 1-2. This factor is credited at Level 1-2 for 350 points.

Factor 2, Organizational setting

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

Level 2-1 is met. Comparable to that level, the appellant's position is accountable to a position that is two or more levels below the first SES, flag or general officer, equivalent or higher level position in the direct supervisory chain. The appellant's immediate supervisor is the Financial Management Officer (Commander, 0-5) who reports to the Assistant Chief of Staff Supply and Financial Management (Captain, 0-6). This individual, in turn, reports to the Chief of Staff (Captain, 0-6) who is second in command to the [organization] commander (Vice Admiral). The appellant reports to a position that is more than two levels below the first flag officer in the supervisory chain of command.

Level 2-1 is credited for 100 points.

Factor 3, Supervisory and managerial authority exercised

This factor covers the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities 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.

Level 3-2 identifies three possible supervisory situations. Levels 3-2a and 3-2b describe supervisory tasks in production-oriented and contact work oversight situations and do not directly relate to the appellant's work.

At Level 3-2c, the supervisor carries out at least three of the first four, and a total of six or more of the 10 enumerated authorities and responsibilities. These include: planning work to be accomplished by subordinates and setting priorities and deadlines; assigning projects to subordinates based on priorities, nature of assignments, and employee capabilities; providing advice, counsel, or instruction to employees on both work and administrative matters; interviewing candidates for positions and recommending appointment, promotion or reassignment to such positions; hearing and resolving complaints and minor grievances; referring group grievances and more serious unresolved complaints to a higher level management; evaluating the work performance of subordinates; effecting minor disciplinary actions; and identifying and arranging for developmental and training needs of employees.

Level 3-3 describes two situations either of which meets the level. In the first situation, Level 3-3a, supervision involves: (1) exercising 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; (2) assuring implementation (by lower and subordinate organizational units or others) of the goals and objectives for the program segment(s) or function(s) they oversee; (3) determining goals and objectives that need additional emphasis; (4) determining the best approach or solution for resolving budget shortages; and (5) planning for long-range staffing needs, including such matters as whether to contract out work. Positions exercising these authorities are closely involved with high level program officials (or comparable agency level staff personnel) in the development of overall goals and objectives for assigned staff function(s), programs(s), or program segments(s). For example, they direct development of data; provide expertise and insights; secure legal opinions; prepare position papers or legislative proposals; and execute comparable activities that support development of goals and objectives related to high levels of program management and development or formulation.

Level 3-3a is not met. The appellant has input in the development of the command's long-range plan and activities, but the input involves recommendations, rather than managerial decisions, affecting the workload and budget for assigned projects. The appellant's position is supervisory rather than managerial in nature. Level 3-3a covers program management work normally delegated to higher levels in the organization where the position is involved in making decisions related to overall program staffing, budgetary, policy, and regulatory matters. The appellant does not have comparable decision making authorities. Financial management decisions are made at higher levels within the command and at higher echelons in the agency. Lower and subordinate organizational units refers to organizations at lower echelons within an agency, e.g., programs carried out at multiple field installations. The appellant's organizations and Submarine Groups and Squadrons financial functions constitute lower echelon organizations within the meaning of the GSSG. Therefore, the appellant is not responsible for managing the scale and scope of functions required for crediting Level 3-3a to her position.

To meet Level 3-3b, a position must exercise all or nearly all of the delegated authorities and responsibilities described at Level 3-2c and, in addition, at least 8 of the 15 responsibilities listed in the GSSG. Responsibilities 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8 are intended to credit only supervisors who direct two or more subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or comparable personnel. To support these designations, these subordinate personnel must spend 25 percent or more of their time on supervisory, lead, or comparable functions. These responsibilities may only be credited in situations where the subordinate organization is so large and its work so complex that it requires managing through these types of subordinate positions. As discussed earlier, the appellant's organization is not large or complex as anticipated for credit here and the record does not support recognition of subordinate personnel.

Consideration of the remaining responsibilities follows:

One of the appellant's major functions is to advise management officials of higher rank on program matters affecting the command. Therefore, responsibility 2 is met.

Responsibility 4 is credited to positions that exercise direct control over a multimillion dollar level of annual resources. Because the appellant does not exercise direct control over major program funds, this responsibility may not be credited.

The appellant makes selections for subordinate civilian, nonsupervisory positions. Responsibility 7 is credited.

The appellant hears group grievances and serious employee complaints and recommends actions. She does not have the authority to resolve subject issues. Responsibility 9 is not credited.

Though recommending action, the appellant does not approve serious disciplinary actions involving subordinate employees. Responsibility 10 is not credited.

The appellant recommends rather than makes decisions on non-routine, costly, or controversial training. Responsibility 11 is not credited.

Responsibility 12 applies to supervisory and managerial positions that oversee organizations in which contractors perform a significant amount of line work. The appellant's one staff year of contract support work does not reflect these contractor oversight demands. This responsibility meets the demands of contracting out work and subsequent contractor oversight described at Level 3-2b. Therefore, this responsibility is not credited.

The appellant approves within-grade increases. The workload that she directs does not require the extensive overtime and travel intended in this responsibility. Additionally, none of these responsibilities apply in the supervision of the organization's military personnel. Responsibility 13 is not credited.

The appellant recommends awards or bonuses and position classification actions. Responsibility 14 is credited.

Responsibility 15 applies to supervisory and managerial positions that oversee organizations with workloads that are so large and complex as to require attention to team building, or comparable methodological or structural improvements. As discussed previously, the appellant does not oversee a workload of this magnitude and complexity. Her efforts to improve operations meet the demands of finding ways to improve production or increase the quality of work directed described at Level 3-2. Therefore, this responsibility is not credited.

Level 3-3b is not met. Three responsibilities are credited for the appellant's position. Because it is not credited with eight or more of the listed responsibilities, it fails to meet Level 3-3b and must be credited at Level 3-2c.

Level 3-2c is credited for 450 points.

Factor 4, Personal contacts

This is a two-part factor which assesses the nature and purpose of the personal contacts related to supervisory and managerial responsibilities. The nature of the contacts, credited under subfactor 4A, and the purpose of those contacts, credited under subfactor 4B, 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 the personal contacts.

Level 4A-2 is met. At this level, contacts are with members of the business community or the general public, higher ranking managers, supervisors, and staff of programs, administrative, and other work units and activities throughout the field activity, installation, command (below major command level) or major organization level of the agency. 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. Comparable to Level 4A-2, the

appellant has routine contacts with officials and senior managers and other financial management personnel within the command or at the next higher echelon. She also has less frequent contacts with personnel at DFAS and FFSF. These contacts occur primarily during meetings and briefings to discuss financial management policy and procedural matters, provide factual information on problem areas or other financial matters related to command programs and operations.

Level 4A-3 is not met. At this level, contacts are with high ranking military or civilian managers, supervisors, and technical staff at bureau and major organization levels of the agency, with agency headquarters administrative support staff; or with comparable personnel in other Federal agencies, congressional committee and subcommittee staff assistants below staff director or chief counsel levels. The appellant does not have regular and recurring contacts with individuals and parties at the bureau and major organizational levels of the agency described at this level. Her contacts are typically with officials, managers and other personnel of the command and next higher-level command having a specific interest in relevant financial matters.

Level 4A-2 is credited for 50 points.

Subfactor 4B, Purpose of Contacts

This subfactor covers the purpose of the personal contacts credited under subfactor 4B, including the advisory, representational, negotiating, and commitment making responsibilities.

Level 4B-2 is met. At this level, 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 to resolve differences of opinion among managers, supervisors, employees, contractors or others. The purpose of the appellant's contacts is primarily to provide, discuss, and exchange information on financial management related policies, regulations and procedures, recommend solutions to problems, and ensure coordination of budget related activities involving personnel within the command.

Level 4A-3 is not met. At this level, the purpose of contacts is to justify, defend, or negotiate in representing the project, program segment, or organizational unit directed, in obtaining or committing resources, and in gaining compliance with established policies, regulations, or contracts. The appellant does not have comparable responsibility. This responsibility for representing the command rests at higher managerial levels within the command. The authority to obtain or commit resources for the organization is also the responsibility of management officials above the appellant.

Level 4B-2 is credited for 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 supervisor has technical or oversight responsibility, directly or through subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or

others. It involves determining the highest grade of basic (mission-oriented) nonsupervisory work performed that constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload of the organization. Among the types of work excluded from consideration is work for which the supervisor does not have the minimum supervisory and managerial authorities defined under Factor 3 (including such technical supervisory functions as assigning and reviewing work and assuring that production and accuracy requirements are met).

The appellant's subordinate staff includes one Supervisory Budget Analyst, GS-560-12, who performs personal budget work 75 percent of the time, three Budget Analysts, GS-560-11, one Budget Analyst, GS-560-9, one Supply Technician, GS-2005-7, and one Financial Clerk, GS-501-4. The military include one Lieutenant who performs a combination of supply and financial management duties (GS-11 equivalent) for 75 percent of the time and supervisory tasks the rest of the time. The Lieutenant supervises a Chief Petty Officer (GS-7 equivalent) and one Petty Officer First Class (GS-5 equivalent) both performing substantive work. He also has oversight over the contract worker who performs substantive clerical work equivalent to GS-5. For purposes of this evaluation, we accept the agency's classification of all positions supervised by the appellant and all determinations of grade equivalency.

Including the personal nonsupervisory work performed by two of the staff, the total mission-oriented workload for the organization directed by the appellant is performed by 10.25 positions. The GS-11 or higher work is performed by 4.25 of these positions and constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload of the unit.

Level 5-6 is credited for 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 (whether performed by Federal employees, assigned military, contractors, volunteers, or others) may be considered if they increase the difficulty of carrying out assigned supervisory or managerial duties and authorities.

Level 6-4 is met. At this level supervision involves substantial coordination and integration of a number of major work assignments, projects, or program segments of professional, scientific, technical, or administrative work comparable to GS-11, or directing subordinate supervisors who each direct substantial workloads comparable to GS-9 or 10. Comparable to this level, the appellant coordinates and integrates assignments of administrative work comparable to GS-11. This includes tasks such as integrating the work of the unit, ensuring compatibility and consistency policy interpretation and application, providing leadership in evaluating and improving processes and procedures to monitor the effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity of the organization directed and reviewing and approving the substance of action documents of the unit.

Level 6-5 is not met. This level identifies three possible situations: significant and extensive coordination and integration of a number of important projects or program segments of work

comparable to GS-12; supervision of work comparable to GS-13 or above; or management of work through subordinate supervisors and/or contractors who each direct substantial workloads comparable to GS-11. The typical work directed by the appellant does not require extensive coordination of a number of GS-12 level projects and does not require supervision of GS-13 level work. The identification of subordinate supervisors here indicates a large organization. The appellant's organization is not comparable.

Level 6-4 is credited for 1120 points.

Summary

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Points</i>
Program Scope and Effect	1-2	350
Organizational Setting	2-1	100
Supervisory/ Managerial Authority	3-2	450
Personal Contacts		
Nature of Contacts	4A-2	50
Purpose of contacts	4B-2	75
Difficulty of Work Directed	5-6	800
Other Conditions	6-4	1120
<i>Total</i>		<u>2945</u>

The total of 2945 points falls within the GS-12 range (2755-3150) on the grade conversion table provided in the GSSG.

Decision

This position is properly classified as GS-501-12, with a title at the agency's discretion. The title must include a supervisory designation.