



United States Office of Personnel Management

Office of Merit Systems Oversight and Effectiveness
Digest of Significant Classification Decisions and Opinions
June 1998
No. 21-04

Standard: [General Schedule Leader Grade Evaluation Guide](#) (April 1998)
Factor: N/A
Issue: Coverage of the GSLGEG

Identification of the Classification Issue

This issue arose in an OPM oversight division's adjudication of an appeal. The appellant occupied a Loan Specialist (General), GS-1165-11, position. The appellant spent approximately 20 percent of her time on administrative functions over a staff of three employees (one Loan Specialist (Realty), GS-1165-9; one Community Development Loan Technician (OA), GS-1101-6; and one Community Development Assistant (OA), GS-1101-5) inclusive of leader duties. The agency determined the appellant's leading three positions "up to and including grade GS-9" required application of the Work Leader Grade-Evaluation Guide (WLGEG), subsequently replaced by Part I of the GSLGEG, resulting in evaluation at the GS-11 grade level, one grade over the highest level of nonsupervisory work led. The issue was whether the GSLGEG should be used to evaluate the position and, if so, how it should be applied.

Resolution

Part I of the GSLGEG is used to classify positions that, as a regular and recurring part of their assignment, lead three or more employees *in accomplishing clerical or other one-grade interval occupations* in the General Schedule. Work leaders also perform nonsupervisory work that usually is of the same kind and level as that done by the group led. Because the appellant led only two covered employees, OPM declined to apply Part I directly to the appealed position or use it for titling purposes. Since leader work occupied less than 25 percent of the appellant's work time, these duties could not be grade controlling. Part II also was not applicable to the appellant's position in that she did not spend 25 percent or more of her time leading GS

employees in accomplishing two-grade interval work. Only one of the three subordinate positions would be covered by Part II.

The oversight division found, however, that the grade level worth of the appellant's leader duties merited evaluation to assure all aspects of the position were assessed fully. The record showed that the appellant performs a full range of leader functions, including distributing and balancing work load; assuring work is accomplished timely and correctly; reviewing work, and amending or rejecting work not meeting established standards; identifying training needs and training employees in accordance with established procedures, policies, practices, and regulations; resolving informal complaints; reporting on performance or disciplinary problems; and, providing input on promotions, reassignments, and awards.

Although not directly applicable, Part I provided the most appropriate criteria for evaluating the appellant's leader functions since two of the three subordinate positions would be covered by that portion of the GSLGEG. Part I provides for classifying leader positions one grade over the highest level of nonsupervisory work led, i.e., nonsupervisory one-grade interval work. The GS-1165-9 work, therefore, could not be used as the level of work led. Applying established classification principles and practices, the oversight division found that the level of work led would not exceed a constructed GS-8 grade level and, therefore, the leader functions performed by the appellant would not exceed the GS-9 grade level. An advisory from the Classification Programs Division affirmed this interpretation of the GSLGEG.