

**U.S. Office of Personnel Management  
Classification Appeal Decision  
Under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code**

**Appellants:** [Appellant]

**Agency classification:** Information Technology Specialist  
(PLCYPLN)  
GS-2210-12

**Organization:** [Organization]  
[Organization]  
[Organization]  
Department of Navy  
[Location]

**OPM decision:** Information Technology Specialist  
GS-2210-12

**OPM decision number:** C-2210-12-03

*//Ana A. Mazzi*

---

Ana A. Mazzi  
Deputy Associate Director  
Merit System Audit and Compliance

2/7/2012

---

Date

As provided in section 511.612 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this decision constitutes a classification certificate which 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 5 CFR 511.605, 511.613, and 511.614, as cited in the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards (Introduction)*, appendix 4, section G (address provided in appendix 4, section H).

As discussed in this decision, the appellant's position description (PD) is not adequate for purposes of classification and the title of the appealed position must be changed. Since PDs must meet the standards of adequacy in the *Introduction*, the appellant's agency must revise her PD to meet the standard. The servicing human resources office must submit a compliance report containing the corrected PD and a Standard Form 50 showing the personnel action taken to include the change in the position title. The report must be submitted to the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) office which adjudicated the appeal within 45 days of the date of this decision.

**Decision sent to:**

[Name]  
[Address]  
[Location]

[Name]  
Naval Sea Systems Command  
1333 Isaac Hull Avenue, SE  
Building 197, 3E3697  
Washington, DC 20376-0001

Chief, Classification Appeals  
Adjudication Section  
Department of Defense  
Defense Civilian Advisory Service  
1400 Key Boulevard, Suite B-600  
Arlington, VA 22209-5144

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Civilian Human Resources)  
Department of the Navy  
614 Sicard Street SE Suite 100  
Washington Navy Yard, DC 20374-5072

Director, Office of Civilian Human Resources  
Department of the Navy  
614 Sicard Street SE Suite 100  
Washington Navy Yard, DC 20374-5072

Director, Workforce Relations and Compensation Division

Department of the Navy  
Office of Civilian Human Resources  
614 Sicard Street SE, Suite 100  
Washington Navy Yard, DC 20374-5072

Principal Classifier  
Department of the Navy  
Human Resources Service Center – Southeast  
9110 Leonard Kimble Road  
Stennis Space Center, MS 39522-0002

## **Introduction**

On July 14, 2011, OPM's Atlanta Oversight accepted a classification appeal from [Appellant], and on September 9, 2011, it was transferred to Philadelphia Oversight for adjudication. The appellant's position is currently classified as an Information Technology Specialist (PLCYPLN), GS-2210-12, and is located in the [Name], [Organization], [Organization], Department of the Navy (DON), in [Location]. The appellant believes her position warrants a higher-grade level. We received the complete agency administrative report on August 19, 2011, and have accepted and decided this appeal under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.).

To help decide this appeal, we conducted telephone interviews with the appellant on November 2 and December 15, 2011, her previous supervisor on December 21, 2011, and her current supervisor on January 3, 2012, respectively. In reaching our classification decision, we have carefully considered all of the information obtained from the interviews, as well as all other information of record provided by the appellant and her agency.

## **General issues**

The appellant raises concerns about the agency's classification review process (e.g. revising her PD, and denial of a request for re-classification to the GS-13 grade level along with adding "Supervisory" to her position title). She also alludes to classification inconsistency based on the grade of another position. The appellant states almost all of the duties listed in her supervisor's PD, classified as a Supervisory Information Technology Specialist (PLCYPLN), GS-2210-14, were extracted from her own PD . She further states there are other GS-2210-12 positions at [Organization] with less responsibility than her position.

By law, we must make our decision solely by comparing the appellant's current duties and responsibilities to OPM position classification standards (PCS) and guidelines (5 U.S.C. 5106, 5107, and 5112). Since comparison to OPM PCSs and guidelines is the exclusive method for classifying positions, we cannot compare the appellant's current duties to other positions which may or may not be classified properly as a basis for deciding her appeal. In adjudicating this appeal, our responsibility is to make our own independent decision on the proper classification of her position. Because our decision sets aside all previous agency decisions, the agency's classification review process is not germane to this decision. By law (5 U.S.C. 302 and 5102(a)(3), and further discussed in 5 U.S.C. 7106 (a)), agency management has the right to establish positions and determine the work assignable to each position. Such actions are not reviewable under the classification appeals process.

The appellant does not agree that her official PD# [Number], dated June 25, 2010, accurately reflects the proper title of her position. The appellant states her PD includes supervisory duties and so "supervisory" should be added to the title. Her current supervisor states the Information Assurance (IA) section of her PD does not accurately show the appellant's level of responsibility in the program. He further states the appellant has responsibility for a small legacy network of three to five servers and some software applications and she works with the Information Assurance Manager (IAM) and a contract Information Assurance Officer to accomplish the duties listed in the IA section of her PD.

A PD is the official record of the major duties and responsibilities assigned to a position or job by an official with the authority to assign work. A position is the duties and responsibilities which make up the work performed by the employee. Classification appeal regulations permit OPM to investigate or audit a position and decide an appeal based on 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 PD. This decision is based on the work currently assigned to and performed by the appellant.

### **Position information**

The [Organization] is a unique shore installation that provides the best maritime and littoral environment, operational team, high-fidelity combat systems and platform sensors, along with the ability to connect with ships, aircraft, and other land-based sites for surface Navy testing, training, and support of deployed surface combat systems, advanced systems under development, warfare systems integration, interoperability, and at-sea testing and exercises. The mission of the ACIO is to provide enterprise solutions to the [Organization] Commanding Officer in the area of information operations to include: business management, data and applications management, information assurance, and information technology infrastructure.

The record shows the appellant's PD describes the duties she performs but overstates the level of programmatic responsibility vested in her position. The appellant has responsibility for the business systems portion of the IT program not overall technical authority for the [Organization] IT program. This authority rests with her supervisor. The PD states: "creates, coordinates and updates strategic plans". The appellant provides recommendations to her immediate supervisor on what should be included in the proposed strategic plans. However, her supervisor exercises control over and ultimately is responsible for all strategic plans. She performs the duties listed in the Information Assurance (IA) section but only for business systems which is not clearly stated in the PD. There is a separate department with responsibility for performing Information Assurance functions. The appellant performs the duties listed in the Navy Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI) section, but her ability to resolve issues locally is more limited than is implied as she needs to involve her [Organization] points-of-contact, a fact not included in the PD, since [Organization] is the Contract Technical Representative (CTR) for the NMCI contract. The leadership section covers the appellant's duties for the one employee she administratively and technically supervises. This section incorrectly reads as if she administratively and technically supervises several Federal employees when she provides both technical and administrative supervision to a single Federal employee. This section does not include the one federal employee she technically supervises or the nine contractor personnel whose work she technically oversees. The term "Command" is used throughout the PD but the appellant's position is located at the [Organization], a field activity. As a result, the PD fails to meet the standards of PD accuracy for classification purposes as discussed in section III.E. of the *Introduction* and must be corrected as part of the compliance report directed on page ii of this decision.

We find the appellant is performing the following duties from her PD based on the information of record:

The appellant performs the following information management/information technology (IM/IT) duties for business systems: administers the installation, testing, operation, troubleshooting, and maintenance of hardware and software systems; evaluates and defines infrastructure requirements, and manages and consolidates networks utilizing security policies and principles to support network services; is responsible for ensuring the designing, documenting, developing, modifying, testing, installing, implementing, and supporting application software; and works with other [Organization] officials to coordinate work-related changes affecting operations.

She performs the following leadership duties: plans, establishes, assigns, and directs the work to be accomplished within the department; directs and provides technical oversight to her subordinate; resolves problems the subordinate cannot; initiates personnel actions; makes a selection for the staff position; and outlines overall work objectives and priorities to assure compliance with established policies and regulations, completion of deadlines, and overall efficiency of operations.

The appellant performs the following information assurance duties for business systems: ensures the information security program requirements are met; oversees [Organization] IT risk management program; verifies appropriate security tests are conducted and results are documented; ensures accreditation support documentation is developed and maintained; provides those with Operational Designated Approval Authority and/or the Developmental Designated Approval Authority with accreditation packages for systems under their purview to verify that each information system meets security specifications for an acceptable level of risk; reviews accreditation plans and reaccreditation requirements; ensures the proposed system changes are reviewed and the implemented system modifications do not adversely impact the security of the system; and ensures the activities of information security users are monitored to verify their compliance with security policies and procedures.

She performs the following duties as the NMCI Assistant Contract Technical Representative (ACTR): develops and prepares all preliminary reviews and documentation needed for each implementation phase; reviews and evaluates customer requirements and works on resolving inconsistencies or conflicting requirements; works with the contractor to resolve on-site technical issues; coordinates with the contractor on technology refreshes; validates the delivery of services for invoice payments; provides asset reconciliation services; monitors recurring technical problems; monitors the contractor help desk and customer satisfaction database information; mitigates security compromises; monitors and validates the contractor's compliance with the established Service Level Agreements; and provides the data required by higher echelons.

The appellant performs the following telecommunications duties: plans, directs operations and administers the overall [Organization] telecommunications program; coordinates with the host agency NASA for [Organization] telecommunication services; and works with the commercial vendor for [Organization] wireless services to ensure they observe all the current Department of Defense and DON policies and procedures.

**Series, title and standard determination**

The appellant does not question the series or use of the Job Family Standard (JFS) for Administrative Work in the Information Technology Group, 2200 to evaluate her position and, based on a review of the record, we concur.

She believes the title of her position should be changed from Information Technology Specialist (PLCYPLN) to Supervisory Information Technology Specialist (PLCYPLN). The Official Specialty or Parenthetical Titles section of the 2200 JFS states:

Specialty titles are typically displayed in parentheses and referred to as parenthetical titles. Parenthetical titles may be used with the basic title of the position to further identify the duties and responsibilities performed and the special knowledge and skills needed”.

The record shows the appellant’s duties incorporate individual functions of some of the specialties, not the full scope of functions for any of the specialties (e.g. under policy and planning she provides policy guidance to IT management, staff and customers; under security she conducts systems security evaluations, audits, and reviews; under applications software she works with customers to test applications and assures software and systems quality and functionality). Therefore, we do not find the appellant’s position meets the 2200 Group JFS specialty titling requirements.

In her initial request to OPM, the appellant states:

Duties defined in assigned position description align to the definition of Supervisor from the Classification Dictionary and Information: Supervisor – Supervisory work and related managerial duties and responsibilities of the position must require 25 percent of the position’s time. Supervisory and managerial duties include hiring, firing, disciplinary actions, leave approval, setting performance plans, and giving performance appraisals, etc.”

Implicit in the appellant’s rationale is that the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG) should be used to evaluate the position’s grade level.

To be covered by the GSSG, a supervisory position must meet all three of the following requirements: (1) requires accomplishment of work through combined technical and administrative direction of others; (2) constitutes a major duty occupying at least 25 percent of the position’s time; and (3) meets at least the lowest level of Factor 3 in the GSSG based on supervising Federal civilian employees, Federal military or uniformed service employees, volunteers, or *other non-contractor personnel*. The appellant said she spends 25 percent of her time supervising her staff of one Federal employee she technically and administratively supervises, one Federal employee in the Public Works Department to whom she provides technical direction, and nine contractors whose work she oversees. However, the only employee

who can be considered in determining if the appellant performs supervision 25 percent of the time for purposes of applying the GSSG is the one subordinate employee to whom she provides both technical and administrative supervision. The appellant said this employee functions at the full-performance level and works independently unless she is assigned a new or unique duty. Given the limited amount of supervision this subordinate receives as certified in the subordinate's PD of record and confirmed by the appellant, we must conclude the appellant does not spend 25 percent or more of her time providing administrative and technical supervision to this one employee. Therefore, we find the appellant's position does not meet the GSSG's minimum coverage requirements and, thus, may not be titled "Supervisory."

Based on the mandatory titling requirements of the 2200 JFS, the appellant's position is allocated as Information Technology Specialist, GS-2210.

### **Grade determination**

The 2200 JFS uses the Factor Evaluation System (FES) under which factor levels and accompanying point values are assigned for each of the nine factors, with the total then being converted to a grade level by use of the grade-conversion table provided in the JFS. Under the FES, each factor-level description in a PCS 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 unless the deficiency is balanced by an equally important aspect that meets a higher level. Conversely, the position may exceed those criteria in some aspects and still not be credited at a higher level.

The appellant disagrees with her agency's assignment of Levels 1-7, and 2-4, but agrees with the agency's crediting of Levels 3-4, 4-5, 5-5, 6&7 3C, 8-1, and 9-1. After careful review, we disagree with the agency's assignment of Level 5-5 but concur with the agency's assignment of the other undisputed factors and have so credited the position accordingly. Therefore our evaluation will focus on Factors 1, 2, and 5.

#### *Factor 1, Knowledge Required by the Position*

This factor measures the nature and extent of information or facts a worker must understand in order to do acceptable work and the nature and extent of skills needed to apply that knowledge.

In her rationale, the appellant states she meets Level 1-8 because as the IT department head, she is responsible for the administration and results of the overall IT business operations at [Organization] which include business network, application management, audio/visual, and telecommunications. The appellant states she implements performance metrics to measure the services provided by the department, prepares budget requests and impact statements for the funding of existing and new IT requirements, reports to Echelon II personnel on business IT matters, and performs briefings for [Organization] visitors on IT issues.

At Level 1-7, employees have knowledge of and skill in applying most of the following common requirements: IT concepts, principles, methods, and practices; the mission and programs of customer organizations; the organization's IT infrastructure; performance



management/measurement methods, tools, and techniques; systems testing and evaluation principles, methods, and tools; IT security principles and methods; requirement analysis principles and methods; commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) products and components; Internet technologies to analyze the Internet potential of systems, networks, and data; new and emerging information technologies and/or industry trends; acquisition management policies and procedures; cost-benefit analysis principles and methods; analytical methods and practices; project management principles and methods; and oral and written communication techniques.

This knowledge must be sufficient to: plan and carry out difficult and complex assignments and develop new methods, approaches, and procedures; provide advice and guidance on a wide range and variety of complex IT issues; interpret IT policies, standards, and guidelines; conduct analyses and recommend resolutions of complex issues affecting the specialty area; evaluate and recommend adoption of new or enhanced approaches to delivering IT services; test and optimize the functionality of systems, networks, and data; identify and define business or technical requirements applied to the design, development, implementation, management, and support of systems and networks; ensure optimal use of commercially available products; evaluate proposals for the acquisition of IT products or services; prepare and present reports; represent the organization in interactions with other organizations; and provide technical leadership on group projects.

At Level 1-8, common requirements involve mastery of and skill in applying advanced IT principles, concepts, methods, standards, and practices sufficient to accomplish assignments such as: developing and interpreting policies, procedures, and strategies governing the planning and delivery of services throughout the agency; providing expert technical advice; guidance, and recommendations to management and other technical specialists on critical IT issues; applying new developments to previously unsolvable problems; and making decisions or recommendations that significantly influence important agency IT policies or programs. This level also requires mastery of and skill in applying most of the following: interrelationships of multiple IT specialties; the agency's IT architecture; new IT developments and applications; emerging technologies and their applications to business processes; IT security concepts, standards, and methods; project management principles, methods, and practices including developing plans and schedules, estimating resource requirements, defining milestones and deliverables, monitoring activities; evaluating and reporting on accomplishments; and oral and written communication techniques.

This knowledge must be sufficient to: accomplish assignments such as ensuring the integration of IT programs and services; developing solutions to integration/interoperability issues; designing, developing, and managing systems that meet current and future business requirements and applying and extending, enhancing, or optimizing the existing architecture; managing assigned projects; communicating complex technical requirements to non-technical personnel; and preparing and presenting briefings to senior management officials on complex/controversial issues.

The appellant's position meets but does not exceed Level 1-7. Similar to this level, the appellant plans and carries out difficult and complex assignments, provides advice and guidance on a wide range of complex IT issues, and ensures the needs and requirements of [Organization] business

systems IT users are met. For example, the appellant instituted a process improvement by taking a paper version program change request form and developing a Computer Program Change Request (CPCR) form. A locally developed software applications user completes the form on [Organization] intranet when the user has a new requirement (e.g. more information needed for a report or a need for the application to read scanned material) for the software. The change request is then routed to the application point-of-contact for processing. Since the process is now automated, the user can check the status of his or her request on-line at anytime. Another process improvement implemented by the appellant is the Consumable Plan for Printers. In this revised process, the appellant purchases the consumables for [Organization] printers. When a user needs a new printer consumable (e.g. toner, waste cartridge, transfer belt, or fuser) he or she submits a Maintenance Request (MRQ) through the [Organization] intranet. The user locates the printer on a listing broken down by building and clicks on the printer. The user is shown a listing of the consumables needed for the printer, sees how many are in stock, and makes a selection. Once the request is submitted, an e-mail is sent to the IT department for processing. The benefits include reduced costs from keeping a lower amount of inventory on hand and using the inventory within the expiration date as well as being able to track the inventory and maintain needed levels.

Also illustrative of Level 1-7 work is dealing with a user's need which cannot be met - such as a user who is told he could not be issued a portable hard drive to back up his files upon his request. The user was dissatisfied and brought up the issue with his supervisor as well as the appellants' immediate supervisor. The appellant informed each of them that [Organization] requires a hard drive be issued to each department and be connected only to the designated workstation within the department. The hard drive is for all department users and is not to be moved between workstations. The appellant's [Organization] point-of-contact stated the guidance she provided was correct. The appellant informed the user's supervisor the hard drive can support more than one user if the user's temporarily move the files for back up to a common drive and then move them to the hard drive. If the user's want a back up of all their files, they need to use a compact disk (CD) or digital video disk (DVD). The appellant's position further meets Level 1-7 by working on a department goal, which the [Organization] Commander approved, of reducing the number of local printers located within 25 feet of a network printer throughout [Organization]. The appellant found out the number and variety of [Organization] printers and plotted them out for each building. She is currently developing a set of floor plans which will show the printers to be phased out. The goal is to retain printers which are multi-functional and share consumables in order to reduce costs.

The appellant's work does not meet Level 1-8. Although she possesses knowledge of the concepts, principles, methods, and practices of IT issues, and is considered a technical expert on business systems, unlike Level 1-8 she is not in a position to develop and interpret policies, procedures, and strategies governing the planning and delivery of services throughout the agency. She is directly concerned with providing IT support to [Organization] Commander and users at the activity level and is not involved in making decisions or recommendations that significantly influence critical agency-wide IT policies or programs; providing expert technical advice, guidance, and/or recommendations on critical IT issues; making decisions or recommendations significantly changing, interpreting, or developing important public policies or programs, or apply experimental theories and/or new developments to problems not susceptible

to treatment by accepted methods as described at Level 1-8. Such responsibilities are vested in employees at higher Navy levels, rather than in the appellant's installation operating-level position. Thus, the various knowledges described by the appellant as required by the position and as meeting the requirements of Level 1-8, discussed previously, do not meet the Level 1-8 requirement of making decisions which influence agency-wide IT programs. Since Level 1-8 is not met, Level 1-7 must be assigned.

This factor is evaluated at Level 1-7 and 1,250 points are assigned.

### *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.

In her rationale, the appellant states she meets Level 2-5 because she is expected to know what mission or objectives she needs to fulfill without it being communicated to her by her supervisor. The appellant states that if her supervisor does provide guidance, it is in the broadest sense and she is expected to complete the project from start to finish, appropriate what resources are needed, and keep the Senior Lead Team (SLT) apprised as required.

At Level 2-4, the supervisor establishes overall objectives and available resources for the work, and the employee and supervisor together develop the scope, timeframes, stages and possible approaches to accomplish the work. The employee determines the approach to take, degree of intensity, depth of research, and the most appropriate principles, practices, and methods to apply in each phase of the assignments. The employee also independently interprets and applies regulations; applies new methods to resolve complex, intricate, unique and/or controversial problems; resolves most conflicts that arise; and keeps the supervisor informed of progress and potentially sensitive and/or controversial issues. Completed work is reviewed from an overall standpoint for soundness of approach, feasibility, compatibility with other projects and effectiveness in meeting requirements and producing expected results. At this level the supervisor does not usually review the methods used by the employee to complete assignments.

At Level 2-5, the supervisor provides only policy and administrative direction in terms of broadly defined missions or functions of the agency. The employee is responsible for a significant agency-led IT program or function, interprets and applies policies established by senior authorities above his supervisor's level, independently plans and carries out the work to be done, and is a recognized technical authority regarding the work. At this level, the supervisor reviews the work for its potential impact on broad agency-level program goals and policy objectives, and the work is normally accepted without significant change or technical review.

The appellant's position meets but does not exceed Level 2-4. Similar to this level, the appellant determines the most appropriate principles, practices and methods to apply in all phases of assignments. When a user of one of the locally developed software applications has a new requirement (e.g. more information needed for a report or a need for the application to read scanned material), he or she submits the request using the CPCR form found on [Organization] intranet. The change request is then routed to the application point-of-contact for processing.

Once the programmer makes the change, the user and the programmer test the application to ensure it satisfactorily performs the new requirement. The programmer works with the user to make the application work as needed. If the programmer has technical questions on implementing the user's new requirement, the appellant provides guidance. When the request is completed, the appellant reviews the process taken by the programmer for compliance with local, [Organization], and Navy policies and procedures. Once she is satisfied with the process taken, she approves and closes out the request through CPCR. The appellant works largely independently within the established parameters of the work. The appellant further meets Level 2-4 by meeting with her supervisor on a weekly basis to discuss the timeframes and scope of her assignments including possible approaches and keeping him informed of progress on projects, and potentially controversial matters such as a user who is told he cannot be issued a portable hard drive to back up his computer, was dissatisfied with the response he received, and brought the matter to his supervisor's attention. . The appellant's previous supervisor also stated he discussed with her timeframes, scope of her assignments, and ways to resolve IT issues. Like Level 2-4, the appellant's supervisor reviews some of her work products for soundness of overall approach and effectiveness in producing results. He electronically reviews Maintenance Requests (MRQs) for the satisfaction rates of the submitting user – if a user is having a problem with their computer, audio visual equipment, printers, software application or telephone, a repair or new item request is electronically submitted through an icon on the intranet, which in turn, is forwarded to the technical group responsible for the equipment for resolution. The appellant submits a weekly situation report to her supervisor for his review prior to forwarding it to the [Organization] Commander. This report includes updates on MRQs submitted, web support modification updates, information on [Organization] and/or Navy IT information requests, and information on IA issues. The appellant's previous supervisor stated he sometimes reviewed her work but many times she worked directly with the [Organization] Commander or [Organization] personnel.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 2-5. Unlike Level 2-5, the appellant's immediate supervisor (both previous and current) provides technical oversight by discussing with her the best way to resolve IT issues, not just administrative and policy direction. Implicit in Level 2-5 is a degree of program management authority that is not delegated to the appellant's position. Specifically, the appellant is not responsible for a significant agency IT *program or* function such that her work by its breadth would be limited to the type of review expressed at Level 2-5. Her position is responsible for a local IT program, not a significant agency or equivalent level program which is required to be assigned Level 2-5.

Level 2-5 represents not only increased independence of action over Level 2-4, but also a corresponding increase in the level of responsibility assigned to the employee largely as a function of the nature of the assignment. Level 2-5 is predicated on a significant degree of program authority which provides the context for the degree of supervisory controls described, i.e., administrative direction defined in terms of broadly defined programs or functions. The appellant's local program functions within the confines of substantial policy and program controls exercised at the [Organization] and higher Navy levels which limits both the programmatic and technical decisions that can be made at the local activity level. This is distinguished from the responsibilities described at Level 2-5, where the employee has the authority to determine the overall framework of the IT program or function assigned, subject

only to broader, policy-oriented review. Although the appellant may be considered a technical expert for business systems, she is not a technical *authority* within the meaning of that term as used at Level 2-5, i.e. she is not delegated responsibility to make unreviewable technical decisions for the systems. Thus, the supervisory controls described by the appellant as meeting the requirements of Level 2-5, discussed previously, is not accurate and does not meet the Level 2-5 requirement of directing an agency-level IT program with agency-level responsibilities. Since Level 2-5 is not met, Level 2-4 must be assigned.

This factor is evaluated at Level 2-4 and 450 points are assigned.

*Factor 5, Scope and Effect*

This factor covers the relationship between the nature of the work, and the effect of the work products or services both within and outside the organization.

At Level 5-4, work involves establishing criteria; formulating projects; assessing program effectiveness; and/or investigating/analyzing a variety of unusual conditions, problems, or issues. The work affects a wide range of agency activities or the activities of other organizations.

At Level 5-5, work involves isolating and defining unprecedented conditions; resolving critical problems; and/or developing, testing, and implementing new technologies. The work affects the work of other technical experts or the development of major aspects of agency-wide IT programs.

The appellant's position meets but does not exceed Level 5-4. Similar to this level, the appellant is responsible for developing and implementing processes and procedures to improve the services provided to the users of [Organization] business systems; reviewing and approving the process taken by a programmer who makes user-requested changes to locally developed software applications; initiating and implementing process improvements which would improve system processes and lower costs; and serving as the point-of-contact for issues dealing with business systems for [Organization] and other tenant Navy users located at [Location]. Like Level 5-4, her work results in improvements in the efficiency and quality of business system processes. Further, her work affects a wide range of agency activities through the quality of user assistance provided by Federal technical personnel and contractor staff.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 5-5. The record does not show the appellant's work regularly involves isolating and defining unprecedented conditions or resolving critical problems. Like Level 5-4, the appellant works within the parameters of an established NMCI network. Any unprecedented or critical problems that occur are referred to [Organization] personnel for NMCI issues as the CTR or NASA personnel for telecommunications issues as the host agency. The record shows [Organization] uses approximately eight locally developed software applications developed prior to the appellant entering her position and all software applications used on the network are pre-approved by [Organization]. If a user requests access to an unapproved application or application version upgrade, a search is performed of approved applications to see if one of them is a suitable substitute. If not, a detailed request goes to [Organization] for consideration once the appellant reviews and agrees with it. If the software

application request is approved, the appellant purchases the software and it is forwarded to the NMCI contractor for remote installation to the end user's computer or to the local systems administrator or programmer contracting personnel for installation to the local servers or the programmer's computer. If the systems administrator or programmer has technical difficulty uploading or using the software application, they contact the vendor for assistance and keep the appellant up-to-date (e.g. if the systems administrator tells the appellant the vendor is willing to travel to [Organization] to work on resolving the program issue, the appellant decides if the amount of money being requested can be spent for the vendor's travel). These requirements and program limitations preclude crediting Level 5-5 to the appellant's position.

This factor is evaluated at Level 5-4 and 225 points are assigned.

### *Summary*

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Points</i>
1. Knowledge Required by the Position	1-7	1250
2. Supervisory Controls	2-4	450
3. Guidelines	3-4	450
4. Complexity	4-5	325
5. Scope and Effect	5-4	225
6 & 7 Personal Contacts and Purpose of Contacts	6-3 7-C	180
8. Physical Demands	8-1	5
9. Work Environment	9-1	<u>5</u>
<i>Total Points</i>		2890

The total points assigned to the appellants' position equals 2890. According to the 2200 JFS grade-conversion table, positions with total point values between 2755 and 3150 are properly graded at the GS-12 level.

### **Decision**

The appellants' position is properly classified as Information Technology Specialist, GS-2210-12.