

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's name]

Agency classification: Supervisory Supply Management
Specialist
GS-2003-9

Organization: [organization]
[name] Flight
[name] Squadron
[name] Wing
Air Combat Command
U.S. Department of the Air Force
[location]

OPM decision: Supervisory Supply Management
Specialist
GS-2003-9

OPM decision number: C-2003-09-02

Marta Brita Pérez
Associate Director, Division for Human Capital
Leadership & Merit System Accountability

June 15, 2004

Date

As provided in section 511.612 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, this decision constitutes a certificate that is mandatory and binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting officials of the government. The agency is responsible for reviewing its classification decisions for identical, similar, or related positions to ensure consistency with this decision. There is no right of further appeal. This decision is subject to discretionary review only under conditions and time limits specified in the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards*, appendix 4, section G (address provided in appendix 4, section H).

Decision sent to:

PERSONAL

[appellant]

[address]

[location]

Civilian Personnel Officer

[address]

[address]

[location]

Ms. Janice W. Cooper

Chief, Classification Appeals

Adjudication Section

Department of Defense

Civilian Personnel Management Service

1400 Key Boulevard, Suite B-200

Arlington, VA 22209-5144

Director, Civilian Personnel Operations

HQ AFPC/DPC

U.S. Department of the Air Force

550 C Street West, Suite 57

Randolph Air Force Base, TX 78150-4759

Director of Civilian Personnel

HQ USAF/DPCC

1040 Air Force Pentagon

Washington, DC 20330-1040

Introduction

On November 13, 2003, the Dallas Field Services Group of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a classification appeal from [appellant] who is employed as a Supervisory Supply Specialist, GS-2003-9. The appellant is assigned to a position located in the [organization], [name] Flight, [name] Squadron, [name] Wing, Air Combat Command, U.S. Department of the Air Force (AF), [location]. The appellant requests that his position be reclassified to Supervisory Supply Specialist, GS-2003-11. He believes that his agency did not properly credit his supervisory responsibilities for a new function within his organization. OPM received a complete administrative report on December 3, 2003. The appeal was subsequently transferred from the Dallas Field Services Group to the Atlanta Field Services Group on December 15, 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 appealed to his agency in 2000 and the agency issued its decision on June 15, 2000, substantiating the position's existing classification. In October 2002, the [name] Section (MSL) was realigned from the Logistics Group, now abolished, to the [organization]. The installation determined that the MSL chief functions with considerable independence and the appellant's duties were not significantly impacted by the realignment. It revised the position description, but maintained that the agency appeal decision was still applicable. The appellant subsequently appealed to OPM.

In reaching our classification decision, we have carefully reviewed all information furnished by the appellant and the agency, including information obtained from telephone interviews with the appellant, his supervisor, and the [name] Squadron civilian liaison representative, a Logistics Manager.

Position information

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

Based on our review of the record, including the official position description, we have concluded that the position description is overstated. For example, the size and composition of the workforce identified and references to team leaders in the position description imply a larger and more complex organization than is present. The position description indicates that the incumbent develops a variety of metrics, but according to the record, the supervisor is responsible for establishing metric and analysis systems for sections managed. The appellant insures supply data is input into the system and then reviews output. Similarly, the position description indicates that the incumbent develops and analyzes metrics to ensure the interface among several systems is consistent and accurate. This implies a responsibility for interaction between supply systems for which the appellant is not responsible. The appellant monitors the timing of supply requests and subsequent actions as they process through the systems. The position description also identifies requirements for an extensive knowledge of a broad range of supply program

relationships and ability to interpret policy direction for the supply programs supervised, neither of which is supported by the appellant's assigned duties and responsibilities. The record shows that basic policies, standards, and procedures cover most aspects of the appellant's work and a practical supply knowledge of well established and commonly applied supply principles, concepts and methodologies is required to manage the supply program operations. The need for extensive supply knowledge and interpretation of policy statements are overstatements of the position's requirements.

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 supervises the [organization] of the [name] Flight which is part of the [name] Squadron. The squadron provides support services to the [name] Wing and its associate units. In addition to deployment functions, the wing trains aircrews in various aircraft, including stealth fighters, weapons instructor courses and provides support to over 18,000 personnel. The primary function of the appellant's position is to provide a point of contact for customer assistance and a centralized one-stop shopping operation to support base and tenant supply activities. The work also supports the [name] Test Group and the [name] Center and provides infrequent equipment issue support for [names] Missile Range exercises.

For approximately 70 percent of his time, the appellant manages a variety of supply operational functions involving requisition, storage, distribution, and disposal of supply critical, unique, and routine items. Functions include demand processing, equipment liaison, bench stock, research and record keeping, maintenance supply liaison, and residual mission capable (MICAP) item research, records maintenance and stock control. The appellant supervises a staff of civilian and military positions. These include 1 Supervisory Supply Technician, GS-2005-7, 1 Supply Technician, GS-2005-6, and 2 Supply Technician, GS-2005-5, positions. Military positions with civilian equivalency determined by the agency include: two Master Sergeants, equivalent to GS-2001-9, six Technical and Staff Sergeants, equivalent to GS-2005-5, one Staff Sergeant, equivalent to GS-2005-4, and eight Senior Airmen and Airmen First Class, equivalent to GS-2005-4.

The appellant serves as the primary point of contact for supply item requests for issues of equipment and bench stock from customers both on and off the installation. He identifies needs and works with customers to determine appropriate levels for bench stock. He ensures details are properly loaded into the supply system and oversees periodic review of bench stock accounts. He analyzes metrics and computer listings to monitor timing, consistency, and status of supply requests and procurement actions entered through the base supply and integrated logistics, supply tracking, core maintenance, and other systems. He researches supply problems and erroneous transactions and coordinates with customers, command or other agency supply item

managers, and contractors to resolve them. He manages on-base redistribution and takes action to prevent excessive accumulation of equipment. He reviews supply system changes and procedures and develops internal procedures or implementing guidance. He makes or directs customer service visits and provides interpretation, guidance and technical assistance to subordinate and other supply personnel and operating officials on supply support and transaction requirements. He also manages residual MICAP research, records maintenance, and stock control functions. The MICAP function tracks status of maintenance supplies for aircraft and provides oversight, guidance and assistance on supply interface, directives and procedures to maintenance work centers processing maintenance requirements. The appellant maintains status, attends daily status meetings, and prepares or oversees preparation of reports relating to all assigned functions. He spends approximately 30 percent of his time performing supply program work.

The appellant works under the general supervision of the flight chief, a Supervisory Logistics Management Specialist, who provides general supervision. The employee plans and carries out the work as a technical expert, resolving most of the conflicts that arise, integrating and coordinating the work of others, and interpreting policy in terms of established objectives. Completed work is reviewed from an overall standpoint in terms of feasibility, compatibility with other supply program requirements, or effectiveness in meeting objectives.

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 Supply Program Management Series, GS-2003, and titled it as Supervisory Supply Management Specialist. The appellant does not disagree with the agency's series and title determinations. We concur.

The GS-2003 series does not include grading criteria and directs use of the Grade-Evaluation Guide for Supply Positions (the Guide) for evaluation of nonsupervisory supply program work. The General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG) is used to evaluate the appellant's supervisory duties.

Grade determination

Evaluation using the Guide

The Guide is written in the Factor Evaluation System (FES) format, under which factor levels and accompanying point values are assigned for each of nine factors. The total is converted to a grade level by use of the grade conversion table provided in the standard. Under the FES, each factor level description in a standard describes the minimum characteristics needed to receive credit for the described level. Therefore, if a position fails to meet the criteria in a factor level description in any significant aspect, it must be credited at a lower level.

The appellant disagrees with his agency's determinations for Factor 1 and believes that his position should be credited at Level 1-7. He agrees with his agency's crediting of Levels 2-4,

3-3, 4-3, 5-3, 6-2 and 7-b, 8-1, and 9-1. After careful review of the record, we concur with the uncontested agency determinations except Factor 2. Our discussion of Factors 1 and 2 follows.

Factor 1, Knowledge required by the position

At Level 1-6, employees use practical knowledge of a wide range of well-established and commonly applied supply principles, concepts, and methodologies in supply program operations, when such work requires the application of some judgment and analysis to provide services or resolve problems. Employees perform recurring kinds of assignments, operations, and/or procedures, planning, or program management. They use knowledge of established supply systems in weighing the impact of variables such as cost, existing policies and procedures, data processing requirements, and other issues that influence the course of action taken. They search for and analyze information; trace sequences of transactions to resolve questions; prepare entries for supply record systems; provide supply information, reports, and services and recommend actions to eliminate problems involved in delivering services to supply customers or in implementing policies.

Illustrative of work at this level is an employee maintaining inventory control records in an automated system for parts needed in depot support and maintenance programs. The employee monitors usage transactions, tracks the timing of reorder actions, verifies cost changes for parts and subassemblies, and generally observes activity in the account to ensure that parts and supplies are available when required. The employee evaluates fluctuations in rates of usage and adjusts procurement lead times for approved acquisitions. The employee takes note of changes in rate of usage, cost, availability for established suppliers, alternative sources of supply, and other activities in the account requiring intervention, such as changes in pricing, accelerated or decelerated acquisition, notifications to seek additional vendors, or other actions designed to support maintenance operations without interruption in the flow of materials.

Level 1-6 is met. The appellant uses a practical knowledge supply principles and concepts, supply systems, and a variety of AF, command, and base standards and procedures to accomplish work in requisition receipt, storage, issuance, inventory and disposition of items primarily for base and tenant activities. He maintains surveillance of the supply program operations, coordinates with higher organizational levels concerning changes, discrepancies, and inventories related to the organization's equipment and supplies, and delivery dates. The appellant analyzes supply metrics and interprets computer listings to identify problems and areas needing increased management. He ensures that actions are timely, consistent, and accurate and all supply records are accurately maintained. He reviews status and traces complex supply actions on back-ordered requisitions. The appellant serves as a point of contact for customers for supply problems and status of supply actions and determines necessary actions to resolve problems. He reviews supply system changes and procedures to determine operational impact and make operational changes. The appellant provides technical assistance and guidance to supply technicians and operating officials on regulatory and procedural requirements for all authorized supply actions. He reviews item consumption and requirements and advises customers of need for and appropriate levels of bench stock, including MICAP items. The appellant also prepares recurring and special reports.

At Level 1-7, work requires knowledge of a broad range of supply program relationships or significant expertise and depth in one of the specialized fields of supply operations (inventory, packaging, storing/distributing, or cataloging). Assignments require knowledge of specialized methods and techniques to analyze and evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of supply programs and/or operations. The work requires the employee to analyze independently and resolve difficult issues and problems in the assigned area of responsibility involving, for example, supply processes, work methods, supply data management, or day-to-day operational procedures. At this level employees often use knowledge of interrelated supply processes to coordinate the objectives and plans of two or more specialized supply programs, and/or two or more independent organizations receiving local supply support (e.g., regional office, outpatient clinic, or medical center).

Employees using this level of knowledge commonly consider and recommend several alternatives. They must evaluate variables such as availability of materials, relationships with other programs, and cost-benefit considerations. They also consider administrative processes such as: (1) the status of funds for purchases; (2) the schedule and rate of progress for assembly and delivery; (3) conflicting requirements between ongoing and new programs; and, (4) similar considerations where the employee must make decisions about priorities and allocation of resources.

Employees use this level of knowledge in a variety of technical supply operations and general supply support programs to perform independently work such as resolving issues and controlling actions in an inventory management function for a complete category of materials such as electronic parts, a major commodity such as computers, or a complete system such as a major military vehicle, a naval fire control system, or equipment for physical science laboratories. They approve recommendations made by users and/or lower level inventory management employees to increase stock levels for components or subassemblies, authorize significant changes in expenditure and stocking levels based on order and usage records, and meet with groups of users and suppliers to arrange for or modify stock levels, storage points, acquisition lead times, and units of issue. They participate in original provisioning conferences and establish inventory controls for complete systems, subassemblies, and parts.

Level 1-7 is not met. The appellant does not deal with the depth, breadth, or scope of supply program issues envisioned at Level 1-7. He is primarily concerned with the operations of a base supply program and the timing, accuracy, and consistency of specific supply transactions. The two or more specialized supply programs, and/or two or more independent organizations receiving local supply support found at Level 1-7 is intended to reflect dealing with the demands of managing unrelated supply program needs. Dealing with differing or conflicting program requirements is intended to cover the demands of analyzing significant programmatic differences, e.g., local program inventory stocking and positioning preferences that differ from higher level supply program item management and administrative cost resource control objectives. In contrast, the appellant manages a supply program involving items managed at higher organizational levels. Reports on inventory trends and analyses and processes are run and analyzed by the procedures and accountability section within the supervisor's flight organization. The interagency and inter-organization groups, major organizational level, and similar analytical examples at Level 1-7 contemplate dealing with supply program issues beyond that of direct

support to a military base level environment. The appellant's supply support program does not reflect a Level 1-7 environment in which the specialist would provide authoritative interpretations to other supply specialists at the same and lower levels in the organization; i.e., a supply program sufficiently complex so as to require specialists rather than technicians and clerks to manage the program at the same and lower levels. Instead, the appellant ensures compliance with established supply procedures and directives by others processing supply transactions.

Level 1-6 is credited for 950 points.

Factor 2, Supervisory controls

This factor covers the nature and extent of direct or indirect controls exercised by the supervisor, the employee's responsibility, and the review of completed work. The agency credited Level 2-4. We disagree.

At Level 2-3, the supervisor defines the employee's scope of responsibilities and the objectives, priorities, and deadlines. The employee consults with the supervisor in determining which projects to initiate, develops deadlines, and identifies staff and other resources required to carry out an assignment. The employee is provided assistance in unusual situations that do not have clear precedents. The employee plans and carries out the successive steps involved and handles problems, conflicting information, and deviations in accordance with agency standards, previous training, established practices, or system controls. Work is reviewed for technical soundness and appropriateness in relation to the nature and level of supply support required. Techniques used by the employee during the course of the assignment are not usually reviewed in detail.

Level 2-3 is met. The supervisor makes assignments by defining objectives and priorities. The appellant plans and carries out the steps of routine assignments, performing them within defined goals, priorities and deadlines. He consults with the supervisor, if needed, on projects with unusual situations, those not having clear precedents, or when she must deviate from standard practices. The supervisor reviews the appellant's work for appropriateness and conformity to policy and requirements. Further controls exist through the supervisor's procedures and accountability section which conducts inventory data analysis. The methods used by the appellant in arriving at end results are not usually reviewed.

At Level 2-4, the supervisor sets the overall objectives. The employee consults with the supervisor in determining which projects to initiate, develops deadlines, and identifies staff and other resources required to carry out an assignment. The employee, having developed expertise in a particular supply specialty or program area, is responsible for planning and carrying out the work, resolving most of the conflicts that arise, integrating and coordinating the work of others as necessary, and interpreting policy on own initiative in terms of established objectives. The supervisor is kept informed of progress, potentially controversial matters or unusual conditions with far-reaching implications. Completed work is reviewed from an overall standpoint in terms of feasibility, compatibility with other supply requirements, or effectiveness in meeting requirements or achieving expected results.

Level 2-4 is not met. The appellant provides limited input on resources required, timeframes, or projects to initiate. While the appellant has proficiency and expertise in supply program operations it is not the full proficiency in a particular supply specialty or program area intended at this level. Unlike Level 2-4, the appellant does not interpret policy on his own initiative in terms of the established program objectives. He essentially follows standard supply item and system requirements, procedures, and policies established by his supervisor or at higher agency levels. The typical work does not present the full range of conditions requiring the level of judgment and initiative described at this level. Significant problems, potentially controversial matters, or unusual conditions with far-reaching implications are referred to the supervisor.

Level 2-3 is credited for 275 points.

Summary

<i>Factors</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Points</i>
1. Knowledge required by the position	1-6	950
2. Supervisory controls	2-3	275
3. Guidelines	3-3	275
4. Complexity	4-3	150
5. Scope and effect	5-3	150
6. and 7. Personal contacts and Purpose of Contacts	2-b	75
8. Physical demands	8-1	5
9. Work environment	9-1	5
<i>Total</i>		1885

A total of 1885 points falls within the GS-9 grade level point range of 1855-2100 points on the Grade Conversion Table.

Evaluation using the GSSG

The GSSG uses a point-factor evaluation method that assesses six factors common to all supervisory positions. To grade a position, each factor is evaluated by comparing the position to the factor level definitions for that factor and crediting the points designated for the highest factor level which is met, in accordance with the instructions specified for the factor being evaluated. The GSSG is a threshold standard. A defined level must be fully met before it can be credited. The total points accumulated under all factors are then converted to a grade using the point to grade conversion chart in the GSSG.

The appellant disagrees with the agency's determination that the military position overseeing the maintenance supply liaison function operates independently and the supervision of this position and subordinate positions in the section did not significantly impact the classification of the appellant's position. He contests the base level of work supervised. He believes the base level of work supervised is GS-9 and the GSSG's grade adjustment conditions apply to his position. After careful review of the record and agency determinations, we concur with the agency's crediting of Levels 1-2, 2-1, 4A-2, and 4B-2. We will, therefore, discuss Factor 3, which though

we agree with the agency determination warrants further analysis, and Factor 5 which involves determination of the base level of work supervised. We will also discuss Factor 6 with which we disagree.

The military position, which the agency determined equivalent to a GS-2001-9, managing the maintenance supply liaison function operates with considerable independence. However, the record supports that the appellant provides both administrative and technical supervision to this position. He ensures the quality and quantity of work through technical guidance and oversight, and reviews work for technical soundness and progress toward objectives. Neither the absence of on-site day-to-day supervision, since the position is located three miles from the appellant's office, nor the fact that technical recommendations are normally accepted indicate an extraordinary degree of independence from supervision and establish a basis for eliminating this position from base level work or any other GSSG consideration.

Factor 3, Supervisory and managerial authority exercised

This factor covers the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities that are exercised on a recurring basis. To be credited with a level under this factor, a position must meet the authorities and responsibilities to the extent described for the specific level. The agency credited Level 3-2c and the appellant does not contest it. We agree that Level 3-2c is met. Due to the large workforce, consisting of both civilian and military personnel performing supply functions, we explored the possibility of credit for Level 3-3.

The GSSG defines in Factor 3-2c the minimum authorities and responsibilities a supervisor must exercise over work in order for that work to be considered under the GSSG. To receive credit for the responsibilities and authorities for work, the supervisor must carry out at least three of the first four and a total of six or more of the 10 authorities and responsibilities identified.

Level 3-2c is met. The appellant carries out the first four and a total of 9 of the 10 identified responsibilities and authorities. He develops work plans and establishes timeframes for all the employees in his organization. He assigns work to employees based on consideration of assignment requirements and difficulty and capabilities of employees. The appellant is either the rater or reviewing official for most civilian and military performance appraisals. He advises employees on work and administrative matters and hears and resolves complaints, referring more serious issues to his supervisor. He interviews and selects civilian employees and effects minor disciplinary measures. The appellant recommends training needs for civilian employees and establishes internal procedures to increase quality or improve the production of work. The appellant does not develop performance standards which are established either by AF regulation for military or by higher organizational levels developing standard position description documentation for civilians.

Level 3-3 is not met. This level, which may only be considered if Level 3-2 is met, consists of two possible sets of criteria. Level 3-3a reflects the exercise of direct managerial authority and relates essentially to program management rather than direct supervisory functions. Level 3-3a involves managerial positions closely involved with high-level program officials in the development of overall goals and objectives for the staff function, program, or program segment they oversee. They determine the best approach to resolve budget shortages, plan for long range

staffing needs, direct the development of data to track program goals, secure legal opinions, prepare position papers or legislative proposals, and execute comparable activities. The appellant does not have significant responsibility in these areas. These responsibilities are vested in higher levels in the organization.

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 eight of the 15 responsibilities listed at Level 3-3b. Overall, level 3-3b is intended to credit only supervisors who direct at least two or three persons who are officially recognized as subordinate supervisors or leaders in an organization so large and complex that it requires using two or more subordinates in a supervisory or leader capacity. Our analysis of the responsibilities listed at Level 3-3b follows.

Responsibility 1 is 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.

The appellant's organization consists of 22 positions which are organized into five units based on functions. One of the assigned Master Sergeant positions assists the appellant in the supervision and oversight of the workload in all but one section of the organization.

Relative to the subordinate units, the second Master Sergeant position supervises the maintenance supply liaison workload for 20 percent of the time as recorded on the civilian equivalent position description and confirmed by the appellant's supervisor.

A Supervisory Supply Technician, GS-7, position is credited with supervising the fifth unit for 25 percent of the time, but the technician's position description reflects oversight of nine positions rather than the three currently assigned. Due to the section's workload, as reflected in numbers of military and civilian positions in the section, the authorities retained by the appellant, and the independence credited to the one GS-5 Supply Clerk position in the unit, it is not reasonable that this position performs supervisory duties 25 percent of the time. For example, the record does not support that this position performs minimal supervisory duties, such as planning and preparing schedules for completion of work, interviewing candidates, independently counseling employees, identifying developmental and training needs for more than one position, or developing performance standards. Based on careful evaluation of all information of record, we are crediting a more reasonable 15 percent of time for performance of supervisory duties. Senior technician positions are used within the other three units to coordinate and review the work of other lower graded positions, but they are not officially recognized as supervisor or leader positions.

In contrast to the Responsibility 1 criteria, only one of the appellant's subordinate positions provides leadership over the organization for more than 25 percent of the time, and that position provides leadership virtually fulltime. However, the appellant's organization is large and complex enough to require additional supervisory work, performed by one position for 20 percent of the time and one position for 15 percent of the time, in managing the work units, including one located off-site. In calculating the subordinate supervisory workload of the

organization, a total of 1.35 staff years are expended on supervisory duties, which fully meets the amount of supervision anticipated for Responsibility 1 credit. If the workload were organized differently, it would, in fact, support at least two positions performing supervisory duties for at least 25 percent of the time. In considering the organization's size, complexity, and leadership requirements, Responsibility 1 is credited.

Responsibility 2 is credited. It involves exercising significant responsibilities in dealing with officials of other units or organizations, or in advising management officials of higher rank. The appellant advises higher level base management and other unit personnel on the status of supply items and coordinates with item managers at higher organizational levels, e.g., regional supply or Defense Logistics Agency, or major equipment contractor personnel, e.g., Lockheed Martin, to resolve supply requisition problems.

Responsibility 3 is not credited. This responsibility applies to positions assuring equity of performance standards and rating techniques developed by subordinates or assuring equity in the assessment of contractors' capabilities or work products. Though the appellant reviews ratings for his organization, he does not develop performance standards. He also does not have responsibility for contractor assessments.

Responsibility 4 is not credited. It applies to positions that exercise direct control over a multimillion dollar level of annual resources. The appellant does not have control over program funds.

Responsibility 5 is credited. The appellant makes decisions on work problems presented by subordinate supervisors and similar personnel.

Responsibility 6 is not credited. This responsibility requires the presence of subordinate supervisors or team leaders. Unlike other responsibilities covered under this factor, it does not provide for the crediting of alternative leadership positions. Because only one subordinate supervisory position is present in the organization, this responsibility may not be credited.

Responsibility 7 is not credited. This responsibility involves making or approving selections for subordinate nonsupervisory positions. Within the appellant's organization, all military interviews and selections are done by the Chief Enlisted Manager under the Commander. In contrast, the appellant's responsibility is limited to no more than three subordinate nonsupervisory civilian positions. Because this authority is retained by higher level management, it may not be credited to the appellant's position.

Responsibility 8 is not credited. This responsibility involves recommendations for selections of subordinate supervisory positions and work leader, group leader, or project director positions. The appellant has one subordinate civilian position and two military positions performing supervisory duties. He has authority to make selections for the civilian position, but not the military positions. For reasons comparable to Responsibility 7, this responsibility does not present significant demands for the appellant.

Responsibilities 9, 10, and 11 are not credited. They involve significant authority to hear and resolve group grievances or serious employee complaints, review and approve serious disciplinary actions, and make decisions on non-routine, costly, or controversial training requests for employees of the unit. The appellant does not have decision or approval authorities for these types of administrative actions.

Responsibility 12 applies to supervisory and managerial positions that oversee organizations in which contractors perform a significant amount of line work. This authority is not applicable since the appellant does not oversee contractor work.

Responsibility 13 is not credited. It involves approving expenses comparable to within-grades, extensive overtime, and employee travel. The appellant's supervisor approves within grade increases, overtime, and travel.

Responsibility 14 is not fully met and is not credited. It involves recommending awards or bonuses for nonsupervisory personnel and changes in position classification. The appellant prepares justification and recommends awards for both military and civilian employees. The military positions are not subject to position classification actions and only four positions are civilians and subject to position classification. Classification actions are not as frequent or regular as to impose significant supervisory demands.

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

In summary, we have credited the position with Responsibilities 1, 2, and 5. Because the position is not credited with 8 or more of the listed responsibilities, it fails to meet Level 3-3b.

Factor 3 is credited at Level 3-2c for 450 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. 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 are work for which the supervisor does not have the minimum supervisory and managerial authorities defined under Factor 3 and lower-level support work that primarily facilitates the basic work of the unit. The agency credited Level 5-3. We concur.

We eliminated from workload consideration the Master Sergeant position which primarily assists the appellant in supervising and overseeing the work of the Branch. We are considering the

personal work performed by the second Master Sergeant over the maintenance supply liaison function and the Supervisory Supply Technician. The Master Sergeant performs personal work, determined by the agency as equivalent to GS-9, for 80 percent of the time.

The agency evaluated the nonsupervisory work of the Supervisory Supply Technician, GS-2005-7, position at the GS-6 level. Since it is not reasonable that the position performs supervisory duties for 25 percent of the time, we are adjusting this figure to recognize performance of supervisory or oversight duties for 15 percent and personal supply technician duties for 85 percent of the time.

The positions performing nonsupervisory work representing the substantial mission-oriented work for base level consideration are:

- 1 Master Sergeant, equivalent to General Supply Specialist, GS-2001-9 (80 percent of the time)
- 1 Supply Technician, GS-2005-6 (85 percent of the of time)
- 1 Supply Technician, GS-2005-6
- 2 Supply Technicians, GS-2005-5
- 6 military of varying ranks, equivalent to Supply Technicians, GS-2005-5
- 10 military of varying ranks, equivalent to Supply Clerks, GS-2005-4

The substantive work is performed by 20.65 positions in the organization (This includes the nonsupervisory work of the supervisors as noted above).

The GS-9 workload is performed by .80 positions and represents 4 percent of the nonsupervisory substantive work of the organization.

The GS-6 workload is performed by 1.85 positions and represents 9 percent of the workload.

The GS-5 workload is performed by 8 positions and represents 39 percent of the workload.

The GS-4 workload is performed by 10 positions and represents 48 percent of the workload.

Based on the workload of the organization, we find that 25 percent or more of the workload is at or above the GS-5 level.

Level 5-3 is credited for 340 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. When Levels 6-1, 6-2, or 6-3 are identified for this factor, the GSSG requires further consideration of eight Special Situations. If the position meets 3 or more of the situations, an

additional single level is added to the initial Factor 6 level determination. The agency credited this factor at Level 6-2 and did not recognize any Special Situations.

Factor 6 is linked directly to previous factors in the GSSG. The difficulty of the work is measured primarily by the base level determined in Factor 5. Complexity is measured by the degree of coordination required, and increases as the base level increases.

At Level 6-1, the work supervised or overseen involves clerical, technician, or other work comparable in difficulty to the GS-6 level, or lower. This could vary from basic supervision over a stable workforce performing work operations that are routine, to a level of supervision which requires coordination within the unit.

Level 6-1 is met. The appellant supervises and oversees work comparable in difficulty to the GS-5 level.

At Level 6-2, the work supervised or overseen involves technician and/or support work comparable in difficulty to GS-7 or GS-8, or work at the GS-4, 5, or 6 level where the supervisor has full and final technical authority over the work, which requires coordination and integration of work efforts, either within the unit or with other units, in order to produce a completed work product or service. Full and final technical authority means that the supervisor is responsible for all technical determinations arising from the work, without technical advice or assistance on even the more difficult and unusual problems, and without further review except from an administrative or program evaluation standpoint.

Level 6-2 may also be met when the supervisor directs subordinate supervisors of work comparable to GS-6 or lower, where coordinating the work of the subordinate units requires a continuing effort to assure quality and service standards, limited to matters of timeliness, form, procedure, accuracy, and quantity.

Level 6-2 is not fully met. Although the appellant oversees work at the GS-5 level, performs considerable coordination with both internal and external organizations in order to produce a completed work product or service, and resolves most of the conflicts that arise, he does not have full and final technical authority for all technical determinations arising from the work. The appellant functions with general supervision, and his completed work is reviewed in terms of feasibility and compatibility with other supply programs. He discusses problems and supply standards with his supervisor, a Supervisory Logistics Management Specialist, whose position is credited with technical supervision for this and the other functions he supervises, and also works with technical specialists at the Regional Supply Squadron at the Air Combat Command. Local technical oversight is further supported by the metric and analysis systems the supervisor has established to assess efficiency, effectiveness, and compliance with regulatory procedures. The second situation for Level 6-2 is also not met since, as identified previously, the size and complexity of the organization supervised by the appellant does not support the need for two or more officially recognized positions performing leadership duties.

Level 6-1 is tentatively credited.

The agency did not recognize the existence of any of eight possible Special Situations. We have thoroughly reviewed the agency rationale and concur that the situations do not apply or do not increase the difficulty of carrying out assigned supervisory or managerial duties and authorities. We will discuss Situations 1 and 2 because of the functions and physical location of the maintenance supply liaison section.

Variety of Work

This situation is credited when more than one kind of work, each representing a requirement for a distinctly different additional body of knowledge on the part of the supervisor, is present in the work of the unit. A “kind of work” usually will be the equivalent of a classification series. Each “kind of work” requires substantially full qualification in distinctly separate areas. In addition to the supply clerical and technician work the appellant supervises a military position evaluated by the agency as GS-2001-9. The GS-2001 work is performed on a day-to-day basis with relative independence, though the appellant provides guidance as needed, ensures timely work accomplishment, and technically reviews work products. Because of the daily independence and minimal amount, less than a manyear, of work present, we find that this work does not impose significantly greater difficulty and complexity in carrying out the supervisory duties of the appellant’s position.

This Special Situation is not credited.

Physical Dispersion

This situation is credited when a substantial portion of the workload for which the supervisor is responsible is regularly carried out at one or more locations which are physically removed from the main unit (as in different buildings, or widely dispersed locations in a large warehouse or factory building), under conditions which make day-to-day supervision difficult to administer.

The work of the maintenance supply liaison section is carried out in a building on base but physically removed from the appellant’s office. The appellant is readily available for advice and guidance. He attends supply status meetings with the Master Sergeant overseeing the work of that section on an almost daily basis and has daily contact for with him for staff attendance and any special instructions. The section personnel are expected to use initiative and independently carry out assignments involving standard methods, practices, procedures, and concepts and precedents with which they are familiar. The Master Sergeant is expected to supervise their work assignments, coordinate with other technicians as appropriate, and resolve immediate work issues or problems involving personnel at lower grades. The degree of initiative and independence exercised by the subordinates in carrying out assignments and availability minimizes the impact the physical dispersion might have on the appellant’s position and does not result in the need for day-to-day technical supervision and oversight envisioned for this situation.

This Special Situation is not credited.

Because none of the Special Situations are credited, an additional level for Factor 6 cannot be credited. Level 6-1 is credited for 310 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	5-3	340
Other Conditions	6-1	310
<i>Total</i>		1675

The total of 1675 points falls within the GS-8 range (1605-1850) on the grade conversion chart provided in the GSSG.

If the grade which results from applying the conversion chart is not higher than the base grade of work supervised, as determined under Factor 5 of the GSSG, the final grade for the supervisory work evaluated will be one grade above the “base” grade of work directed if specific GSSG criteria are met. No further consideration is warranted since the grade for the appellant’s supervisory responsibilities is higher than the GS-5 base grade determined under Factor 5.

The appellant’s supply program work is evaluated at GS-9 and his supervisory responsibilities are evaluated at GS-8.

Decision

This position is properly classified as Supervisory Supply Management Specialist, GS-2003-9.