



United States Office of Personnel Management

Office of Merit Systems Oversight and Effectiveness
Digest of Significant Classification Decisions and Opinions
August 1994
No. 19-08

Standard: [General Schedule Supervisory Guide](#) (April 1993)
Factor: Factor 3, Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised
Issue: Crediting Level 3-4b

Identification of the Classification Issue

This issue arose in an Office of Personnel Management region's adjudication of a classification appeal. The appellant was a personnel officer at a medium-size military installation with a total employee population of about 1,450 employees. The employing agency credited the appellant's supervisory responsibilities at Level 3-3b; however, the appellant contended that Level 3-4b was creditable because he exercised final authority for approving the full range of personnel actions and organization design proposals recommended by his subordinate supervisors.

Resolution

The region requested an advisory opinion from the Office of Classification on distinguishing between Levels 3-3b and 3-4b. The Office of Classification advised that Level 3-4b is creditable when all of the following conditions are met:

--The position involves responsibilities that are equivalent to or exceed *those described in both paragraphs a and b of Level 3-3*, i.e., both the managerial and supervisory responsibilities depicted at Level 3-3.

--The position fully meets Factor Level 3-4b. This level is met when the position exercises full authority, with one or two exceptions, for all of the following actions affecting supervisory *and* nonsupervisory subordinate employees: selections, performance ratings, promotions, high-cost awards and bonuses, resolution of serious group grievances (including those of subordinate

supervisors), suspensions, removals, high-cost training and travel, classification, and other actions representing the full range of *final* authorities affecting human resources and pay management.

--The position has final authority to approve organization design recommendations submitted by subordinate supervisors.

--The organizations, program segments, and workload directed are of sufficient size and complexity to require and provide opportunities for fully exercising these responsibilities on a recurring basis.

The region found that the appellant's position did not meet all of the above conditions for crediting Level 3-4b. First, the region noted that the criteria in paragraphs *a* and *b* of Level 3-3 were not met. Specifically, the appellant's managerial authorities were not fully comparable to those that characterize Level 3-3a because he was not closely involved with agency-level officials in the development of the overall goals and objectives for the agency's personnel program. The level of involvement in program development and program management activities contemplated by Level 3-3a was not required of the appellant's position. Further, the region found that the appellant did not have the final authority to approve organizational design recommendations as required by Level 3-4b. In view of these findings, the region concluded that Level 3-4b could not be credited. Instead, the region credited Level 3-3b, since this was the highest level that the appellant's position fully met.