



United States Office of Personnel Management

Office of Merit Systems Oversight and Effectiveness
Digest of Significant Classification Decisions and Opinions
October 1999
No. 23-04

Standard: [Administrative Analysis Grade-Evaluation Guide](#) (August 1990)
Factor: Factor 2, Supervisory Controls
Issue: (1) Appropriateness of Level 2-5 and
(2) Meaning of "Agency" Under Level 2-5

Identification of the Classification Issue

This issue arose in an OPM oversight division's adjudication of a classification appeal. The appellant's position was classified as a Support Services Specialist, GS-342-11 and was located in a regional office of a Federal department. Because the position did not meet the criteria for grade evaluation using the PCS for the Support Services Administration Series, GS-342 (dated November 1978), it was evaluated by application of the Administrative Analysis Grade-Evaluation Guide (AAGEG). The AAGEG was selected because it provided appropriate grading criteria covering the position's staff analytical work and the general administrative subject matter work. Because the position's subject matter knowledge was covered by the AAGEG, OPM determined additional cross-series comparison to another appropriate subject matter PCS was not necessary. Under Factor 2, Supervisory Controls, the appellant's agency assigned Level 2-4. However, the appellant believed that his supervisory controls met Level 2-5 because he dealt with contractors and clients directly, had complete responsibility to plan and perform all his work, and because his work was usually not reviewed by his supervisor in progress or upon completion.

Resolution

OPM determined that the position exceeded Level 2-4 in some aspects because the appellant functioned quite independently in carrying out assignments and received little supervisory review of his work products. However, the scope of those assignments and responsibilities was more limited than that envisioned at Level 2-5. The appellant's assignments affected

administrative and management services primarily within a four state region, and were normally monitored in terms of effectiveness in satisfying client requirements and for compliance with accepted agency policy and budgetary constraints. Unlike Level 2-5, the appellant's work did not regularly influence broad agency policy objectives and program goals. The word "agency" was sometimes used by the appellant's Department to refer to one of its components. However, in OPM PCS's, the word "agency" refers to an Executive department or comparable independent establishment as defined in Title 5, United States Code, Section 105. The appellant's position was, therefore, credited with Level 2-4.

"Back to the Basics"

The factor level relationships table in the AAGEG illustrate which FES factor levels are typically assigned at various levels for administrative analysis positions. Typically, Level 2-4 is the highest level assigned for positions which have been credited with Level 1-7, as was the appealed position. The table also shows that covered positions evaluated at Level 1-8 typically are credited at Level 2-4. This recognizes that the staff analytical functions evaluated by the AAGEG typically are subject to review by line management officials whose programs and employees would be affected by implementation of the staff work.

Additional factor level guidance is found in *The Classifier's Handbook*, which includes a factor relationship table for all administrative occupations covering line as well as staff program functions. Here, Level 2-5 typically is not assigned until Level 1-8 has been credited. When reviewing the grade level criteria in the AAGEG and the relationship tables in *The Classifier's Handbook* as a whole, there is a direct correlation between the scope and importance of the subject studied and/or the significance of the programs or functions managed and the factor levels assigned. While this typical pattern does not preclude assignment of Level 2-5 to a specific position where Levels 1-7 or 1-8 have been assigned for administrative staff work, it would be unusual for a position to vary from the pattern.