

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]

**Agency classification:** Supervisory Shipbuilding Specialist  
GS-1101-12

**Organization:** [organization] Division  
[organization] Department  
Supervisor, Shipbuilding, Conversion  
and Repair (SUPSHIP) [location]  
U. S. Department of the Navy  
[location]

**OPM decision:** GS-1101-12  
title at agency discretion

**OPM decision number:** C-1101-12-03

/s/ Virginia L. Magnuson  
Virginia L. Magnuson  
Classification Appeals Officer

September 17, 2003  
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:**

[appellant]

[address]

[location]

[name]

Director of Human Resources

Human Resources Office

Department of the Navy

[address]

[location]

Mr. Allan Cohen

Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR)

Nebraska Avenue, Complex

321 Somer Court, NW., Suite 40101

Washington, DC 20393-5451

Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR)

U.S. Department of the Navy

Nebraska Avenue, Complex

321 Somer Court, NW., Suite 40101

Washington, DC 20393-5451

## **Introduction**

On February 4, 2003, the Atlanta Field Services Group, formally the Atlanta Oversight Division, of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a classification appeal from [appellant] who is employed as a Supervisory Shipbuilding Specialist, GS-1101-12. He works in the [organization] Division, [organization] Department, SUPSHIP [location], U.S. Department of the Navy, [location]. The appellant requests that his position be reclassified to Supervisory Engineering Technician, GS-802-13. He believes that his agency did not credit the technical responsibilities and supervisory workload of his position. We received the complete appeal administrative report from the agency on June 13, 2003. The appeal has been accepted and processed under section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.).

## **Background**

An original administrative report was furnished to us by the agency on March 28, 2003. On March 31, 2003, the appellant notified OPM that the Production Controller positions in his organization were reclassified from GS-1152-11 to GS-12. As a result, OPM verified the position actions and requested that the agency re-evaluate the appellant's position to determine impact on the grade of his position and provide a new organizational chart reflecting position changes. A second administrative report was subsequently furnished to us.

## **General issues**

The appellant makes various statements about his agency's review and evaluation of his position. In adjudicating this appeal, our only concern is to make our own independent decision on the proper classification of his position. By law, we must make that decision solely by comparing his current duties and responsibilities to OPM standards and guidelines (5 U.S.C. 5106, 5107, and 5112). Therefore, we have considered the appellant's statements only insofar as they are relevant to making that comparison.

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 AEGIS Program Manager Representative (PMR) who is the Executive Officer of the Shipbuilding Program.

## **Position information**

The appellant is assigned to position description number [#]. His supervisor certified the accuracy of the position description. The appellant did not certify position description accuracy because he believes the position description is too generic and does not state, list, or reflect the duties, responsibilities, and magnitude of performance expected of the position.

Our fact finding revealed that the appellant's official position description, though generic and applicable also to personnel in other divisions and organizations, does meet the standards of adequacy described in the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards*. A position description is a statement of the major duties, responsibilities, and supervisory relationships of a

given position. The description of each position must be kept up to date and include information about the position which is significant to its classification. For a supervisory position, the description should identify the information necessary to evaluate the position by the appropriate supervisory criteria. The scope and degree of supervisory responsibility are of primary importance. These are adequately identified through information on the position description cover sheet and referenced organizational chart.

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 supervises the [organization] Division and is responsible for assisting the Waterfront Operations Officer in accomplishing the department's mission. The department's mission involves new construction, conversion, repair, overhaul, reactivation, and modernization of combatant and non-combatant surface ships and craft. The [organization] Division is responsible for overseeing the quality and production requirements of shipbuilding contracts for three or more (currently six) highly complex combatant ships, such as the destroyers currently in various stages of construction, that take approximately four years to construct.

The appellant provides general oversight for manufacturing, construction, waterfront changes and quality assurance of ship construction on the waterfront, from the start of fabrication through delivery and sail-away of the vessel. The oversight is over the hull, mechanical, and electrical aspects of construction, quality assurance, and testing. The appellant's work involves reviewing contracts and other documents to determine required program oversight, validating the shipbuilder's progressing system to ensure events occur as planned and that progress payments are justified, and identifying problem areas that may cause schedule delays or cost overruns. Either personally or through his employees, the appellant acts as liaison with pre-commissioning ship crews, evaluates the effectiveness of contractor's methods, processes and procedures relative to contract requirements, and handles daily issues and problems. He is responsible for coordination of waterfront work changes, monitoring procurement of materials and services for accomplishment, documenting deviations, analyzing quality data and information, and providing status of specifications and drawing deviations to the AEGIS PMR. The appellant is the primary point of contact for the department for production, manufacturing, and quality assurance issues on assigned ships.

In providing oversight, the appellant supervises, coordinates and/or monitors a group of 12 employees and six contract workers performing quality assurance and production control functions. Employees include four Production Controllers, GS-1152-12, one Shipbuilding Specialist, GS-1101-11, one Industrial Specialist, GS-1150-11, and six Quality Assurance Specialists, GS-1910-11.

The Production Controllers support the AEGIS PMR, and his assistant, the Production Control Officer, who are responsible for waterfront production. The Production Controllers' duties include monitoring the progress of design and construction events, assessing the ability of the contractors to meet schedules and their progressing system, analyzing change requests and monitoring the status of changes, procuring material and services for changes, developing cost estimates, conducting negotiations on price and scope of changes, and performing other associated tasks and a minimal amount of quality assurance tasks. Relative to supervision, the appellant essentially is responsible for the timeliness and completion of their work. He reviews their records and ensures that these employees are accomplishing work in a timely manner and that the authorized funds for modification and required man hours are properly balanced. He sits in on their meetings with contractors to observe, but not control, how disagreements are resolved and ensures that the employees are fair in their negotiations. The PMR and the Production Control Officer directs most of their work (approximately 95 percent of the time as identified by the PMR) and provide technical review and input for their performance appraisals.

The appellant's supervision over the four Production Controllers is administrative. He assigns some work to them, signs their performance appraisals, approves leave, and performs other management tasks relative to their oversight. The Production Controllers' position description, recently certified by management as accurate, verifies that the incumbents are responsible to both to the Waterfront Operations Officer and the PMR for waterfront production and quality oversight functions. Our fact finding determined that the PMR and his Production Control Officer provide the technical supervision and input for their performance appraisals. As such, the appellant's supervision over this group does not meet one of the minimum coverage requirements for evaluation under the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG), which requires that the position under review accomplish work through the combined *technical and administrative* direction of others. When technical supervision is provided by a supervisor in a different chain of command, the GSSG does not allow crediting direction of the same work to two supervisors. These positions are, therefore, not included in the workload calculations and are not subordinate positions for purposes of applying the GSSG to the appellant's position.

The appellant monitors the work of the six contract workers. The Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA) determines the need for contractor assistance, developed the work statement, and funds and controls the contract. The appellant's responsibilities over the contract workers include assigning them work or relaying work assignments to them through their contract supervisor, who schedules their time and leave. The appellant does not control the work of the contract supervisor, but coordinates work and discusses work performance issues with him. The appellant coordinates and integrates the contractor work schedules and processes with the work of his subordinates. The appellant accepts or rejects the work product. He signs off on the contract workers' trial cards and other corrective action documents for ships, which are forwarded to contracting personnel as a basis for payment. He maintains records of work provided by the contractor and includes it in weekly reports and periodic ship status presentations. The appellant discusses contract group performance problems both with his supervisor and with NAVSEA personnel as warranted.

The GSSG defines in Factor 3-2b the minimum authorities and responsibilities a supervisor must exercise over work contracted out in order for that work to be considered under the GSSG. To

receive credit for the responsibilities and authorities for work contracted out, the supervisor must perform all or nearly all of the following:

1. Analyze benefits and costs of accomplishing work in-house versus contracting; recommend whether to contract;
2. Provide technical requirements and descriptions of the work to be accomplished;
3. Plan and establish the work schedules, deadlines, and standards for acceptable work; coordinate and integrate contractor work schedules and processes with work of subordinates or others;
4. Track progress and quality of performance; arrange for subordinates to conduct any required inspections;
5. Decide on the acceptability, rejection, or correction of work products

The appellant does not have Responsibilities 1 or 2. These are held at NAVSEA. Relative to Responsibility 3, the appellant does coordinate and integrate contractor work schedules and processes with work of subordinates, but does not perform the full intent of this responsibility in that he does not establish the contractor work schedules and standards for acceptable work. He does fully perform Responsibilities 4 and 5. Because the appellant does not perform all, or nearly all, of the identified responsibilities for crediting contracted work, that work is not considered as part of the supervisory workload in application of the GSSG.

The appellant's official supervisor is the Deputy Waterfront Operations Officer, a Quality Assurance Engineer, GS-801-14. The appellant also receives operational supervision for a significant amount of time (estimated at 50 percent) from the AEGIS PMR. The appellant is assigned an area of responsibility and has the authority and responsibility to accomplish assigned tasks. There is little day to day supervision over routine operations. The appellant keeps the supervisor informed of daily events. The supervisor primarily reviews work through these updates, meetings and reports. He is more involved in the appellant's work on noncompliance issues and important ship milestones or events.

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 General Business and Industry Series, GS-1101, with the title Supervisory Shipbuilding Specialist. The appellant believes his position should be classified in the Engineering Technician Series, GS-802. The GS-802 series includes technical positions that require primarily application of a practical knowledge of the methods and techniques of engineering or architecture; and the construction, application, properties, operation, and limitations of engineering systems, processes, structures, machinery, devices, and materials. Engineering Technicians perform technical functions which involve the solution of technical problems that require primarily application of a practical knowledge of the methods and

techniques by which materials, natural resources, and power are made useful. The paramount requirement for the appellant's work is not the solution of technical problems, but rather the review and monitoring of compliance to contractor construction schedules and quality evaluation of the contractor's work.

The appellant's work includes a mix of work characteristic of both the GS-1100 and GS-1900 occupational groups. Often the appropriate series for positions of a mixed nature is a general series for the occupational group covering the type of work performed. Since the appellant's work involves work representative of two occupational groups, other factors, such as paramount qualifications, reasons for establishing the position, and the background knowledge required should be considered. The GS-1900 occupational group, the Quality Assurance, Inspection and Grading Group, does not include a general series. The GS-1100 Business and Industry Group includes work pertaining to and requiring knowledge of business and trade practices, characteristics and use of equipment, products or property, or industrial production methods and process. The appellant's work requires comparable knowledge and trade practices relative to shipbuilding and is properly allocated to the General Business and Industry Series, GS-1101, the general series in this occupational group. Since a title is not specified for this series, the agency may construct a title consistent with guidance in the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards*. The GSSG is used to evaluate the appellant's supervisory responsibilities.

### **Grade determination**

The GSSG uses a point-factor approach with six evaluation factors designed specifically for supervisory positions. Each factor level in the 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 in any significant aspect, it must be credited at a lower level. Conversely, the position may exceed those criteria in some aspects and still not be credited at a higher level. Each factor level has a corresponding point value. The total points are converted to a grade by use of the grade conversion chart in the standard. Under each factor there are several factor level definitions which are assigned specific point values.

#### *Factor 1 -Program scope and effect*

This factor assesses the general complexity, breadth, and impact of the program areas and work directed, including its organizational and geographic coverage. It also assesses the impact of the work both within and outside the immediate organization. To credit a particular factor-level, the criteria for both scope and effect must be met.

#### *Scope*

The element *Scope* addresses the general complexity and breadth of the program directed, the work directed, or the services delivered. The geographic and organizational coverage of the program within the agency structure is included under this element. In evaluating the population affected under this factor, we may only consider the total population serviced directly and significantly by a program. *Scope* also considers how the activities directed relate to the

agency's mission and to outside entities, and the complexity and intensity of the services provided.

The levels of this factor describe two situations: agency line programs, e.g., providing services to the public; and support programs, e.g., providing administrative or other complex support services within an agency. The SUPSHIP's mission is to serve as contract administrator for shipbuilding and ship repair contracts. The appellant performs a part of the organization's line mission in monitoring contractor shipbuilding processing and quality.

At Level 1-2, the program segment or work directed is administrative, technical, complex clerical, or comparable in nature. The functions, activities, or services provided have limited geographic coverage and support most of the activities comprising a typical agency field office, an area office, a small to medium military installation, or comparable activities within agency program segments. In a field office providing services to the general public, employees at Level 1-2 furnish a portion of such services, often on a case basis, to a small population of clients. The serviced population may be concentrated in one city or spread over a wider geographic area. Comparable to Level 1-2, the appellant furnishes a portion of line services to a small population of clients, those involved in the AEGIS ship building efforts at SUPSHIP which is an Echelon Three field activity and has less than 1000 civilian and military employees and contract personnel involved in both shipbuilding and repair work. The shipbuilding function is done on-site and all ships are constructed within the same geographic area at the activity.

Level 1-3 is not met. At this level, the work directed is technical, administrative, protective, investigative, or professional. The program segment and work directed typically have coverage which encompasses a major metropolitan area, a state, or a small region of several states. This level also covers providing complex administrative, technical or professional services directly affecting a large or complex multi-mission military installation. One illustration is directing design, oversight, and related services for the construction of complex facilities for one or more agencies at multiple sites. The facilities are essential to the field operations of one or more agencies throughout several States. Unlike this level, the work the appellant directs is involved in administering more limited aspects of AEGIS shipbuilding contracts for the field activity, which does not constitute a significant portion of the Navy's total shipbuilding and repair program. The population serviced by the appellant's position is limited to those involved in those aspects of the AEGIS shipbuilding program (contractors, Prospective Commanding Officers, and ships' force) at the field activity. Neither the nature of services nor the size of the population served meets the scope intended at Level 1-3.

Level 1-2 is credited for *Scope*.

#### *Effect*

The element *Effect* addresses the impact of the work on the mission and programs of the customers, the activity, the agency, other agencies, the general public, or others.

Level 1-2 is met. At this level, the work services or products provide services to a moderate, local or limited population of clients or users comparable to a major portion of a small city or



rural county. As at this level, the appellant directs work which involves the monitoring of shipbuilding contracts and helps to ensure a quality product in a timely manner. Services directly impact local shipbuilding contractors at the field activity, Prospective Commanding Officers and ships' force requesting ship changes, and others involved in the AEGIS shipbuilding mission at the activity, a limited population as defined by this factor level.

Level 1-3 is not met. At this level, the activities, functions, or services accomplished directly and *significantly impact* a wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, or the operations of outside interests (e.g., a segment of a regulated industry), or the general public. As discussed previously, the appellant's work involves the ship building part of the mission at a small field activity. As such, it does not impact a wide range of agency activities or the work of other agencies. It also does not impact contractors and others constituting a moderate-sized population of clients as identified at this level.

Both *Scope* and *Effect* are evaluated at Level 1-2. This factor is credited at Level 1-2 for 350 points.

### *Factor 2, Organizational setting*

This factor considers the organizational situation of the supervisory position in relation to higher levels of management. For purposes of determining reporting levels under this factor, a position reporting to a deputy or full assistant chief position is credited as reporting to the chief.

Level 2-1 is met. Comparable to that level, the appellant's position is accountable to a position that is two or more levels below the first SES, flag or general officer, equivalent or higher level position in the direct supervisory chain. The appellant's immediate supervisor is the Deputy Waterfront Operations Officer who reports to the Waterfront Operations Officer (Commander, 05). The Commander reports to the SUPSHIP Director (Captain, 0-6).

Level 2-2 is not met. At that level, the position is accountable to a position that is one reporting level below the first SES, flag or general officer or equivalent or higher level position. The appellant reports to a position that is two levels below the first flag officer in the supervisory chain of command.

Level 2-1 is credited for 100 points.

### *Factor 3, Supervisory and managerial authority exercised*

This factor covers the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities 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.

Level 3-2 identifies three possible supervisory situations. Levels 3-2a describes production-oriented tasks and does not directly relate to the appellant's work. Level 3-2b describes supervisory tasks in contact work oversight situations. As assessed previously, the appellant's

position does not perform all or nearly all of the oversight responsibilities for credit of Level 3-2b.

At Level 3-2c, the supervisor carries out at least three of the first four, and a total of six or more of the 10 enumerated authorities and responsibilities. These include: 1.) planning work to be accomplished by subordinates and setting priorities and deadlines; 2.) assigning work to subordinates based on priorities, nature of assignments, and employee capabilities; 3.) evaluating work performance; 4.) providing advice, counsel, or instruction to employees on both work and administrative matters; 5.) interviewing candidates for positions and recommending appointment, promotion or reassignment to such positions; 6.) hearing and resolving complaints and minor grievances and referring group grievances and more serious unresolved complaints to higher level management; 7.) effecting minor disciplinary actions; 8.) identifying and arranging for developmental and training needs of employees; 9.) finding ways to improve production or increase the quality of the work directed; and 10.) developing performance standards.

Level 3-2c is met. The appellant carries out all of the first four responsibilities. The appellant reviews ship contracts to determine oversight requirements, schedules and milestones. He sets priorities and deadlines for employees accordingly. He provides advice, counsel, and instruction to employees and evaluates performance. Although employees are assigned to ships in turn and typically remain with the ship through completion, the appellant determines priorities of ship events and milestones and assigns personnel to meet those needs or perform other special assignments.

The appellant also carries out four additional responsibilities:

The appellant participates on or heads up selection panels, recommending candidates for selection. Responsibility 5 is met.

The appellant listens to employee complaints and attempts to resolve issues as step 1 concerns. If issues are not resolved at his level, they are referred to the appellant's supervisor who handles and tracks unfair labor practices and grievances. Responsibility 6 is met.

The appellant does have authority to effect minor disciplinary measures. He signs written reprimands and recommends more serious actions. Responsibility 7 is met.

The appellant works with the employees to identify training needs and recommends them for training or selects employees for training opportunities identified by his management. He puts employees on performance improvement plans as necessary. Some classes are mandatory, but when there are changes in the classes or new classes are offered the appellant recommends employees for them. Responsibility 8 is met.

Employees follow specific guidelines for quality established at NAVSEA, however, the appellant participates in management meetings for methods improvement or work restructuring, plans the scheduling of his subordinates to ensure ship milestones are not missed, and makes suggestions, such as for improvement of the compartment completion process and elimination of double inspections in the trial card process. Responsibility 9 is credited.

Employees have the same performance standards under a pass/fail system. While the appellant had input in development of the standards and signed them, he is not responsible for the standards as intended for this responsibility. Responsibility 10 is not credited.

All of the first four and nine of the ten responsibilities are credited.

Level 3-3 is not met. This level describes two situations either of which meets the level. In the first situation, Level 3-3a, supervision involves: (1) exercising delegated managerial authority to set a series of annual, multiyear, or similar types of long-range work plans and schedules for in-service or contracted work; (2) assuring implementation (by lower and subordinate organizational units or others) of the goals and objectives for the program segment(s) or function(s) they oversee; (3) determining goals and objectives that need additional emphasis; (4) determining the best approach or solution for resolving budget shortages; and (5) planning for long-range staffing needs, including such matters as whether to contract out work. Positions exercising these authorities are closely involved with high level program officials (or comparable agency level staff personnel) in the development of overall goals and objectives for assigned staff function(s), programs(s), or program segments(s). For example, they direct development of data; provide expertise and insights; secure legal opinions; prepare position papers or legislative proposals; and execute comparable activities that support development of goals and objectives related to high levels of program management and development or formulation.

Level 3-3a is not met. The appellant is involved in some program planning, but he provides input and does not make managerial decisions affecting the workload and budget as intended at this level. The appellant's position is supervisory rather than managerial in nature. Level 3-3a covers program management work normally delegated to higher levels in the organization where the position is involved in making decisions related to overall program staffing, budgetary, policy, and regulatory matters. The appellant does not have comparable decision making authorities. Financial management decisions are made at higher levels within the command and at higher echelons in the agency.

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 8 of the 15 responsibilities listed in the GSSG. Responsibilities 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8 are 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. These responsibilities may only be credited in situations where the subordinate organization is so large and its work so complex that it requires managing through these types of subordinate positions. The appellant fully supervises, technically and administratively, a small workforce of eight employees and none are used in an official capacity to assist in controlling work of the division. These responsibilities are not credited.

Responsibility 2 includes significant responsibilities in dealing with officials of other units or organizations, or in advising management officials of higher rank. The appellant advises on the status of ship progressing and does presentations evaluating the contractor on each ship, but he

does not make significant recommendations on a course of action as anticipated in this factor. This responsibility is not met.

Responsibility 4 is credited to positions that exercise direct control over a multimillion dollar level of annual resources. Because the appellant does not exercise direct control over major program funds, this responsibility may not be credited.

The appellant recommends rather than makes selections for subordinate civilian, nonsupervisory positions. Responsibility 7 is not credited.

The appellant does not have the authority to resolve group grievances or serious employee complaints. Responsibility 9 is not credited.

Though recommending action, the appellant does not approve serious disciplinary actions involving subordinate employees. Responsibility 10 is not credited.

The appellant recommends rather than makes decisions on non-routine, costly, or controversial training. Responsibility 11 is not credited.

Responsibility 12 applies to supervisory and managerial positions that oversee organizations in which contractors perform a significant amount of line work. As identified previously, the appellant does not have significant responsibility for contract work. Therefore, this responsibility is not credited.

The appellant does not approve expenses comparable to within-grade increases, extensive overtime, and employee travel. Responsibility 13 is not credited.

The appellant recommends awards or bonuses and position classification actions. Responsibility 14 is credited.

Responsibility 15 applies to supervisory and managerial positions that oversee organizations with workloads that are so large and complex as to require attention to team building among subordinates, or comparable methodological or structural improvements. As discussed previously, the appellant does not oversee a workload of this magnitude and complexity. His efforts to improve operations meet the demands of finding ways to improve production as described at Level 3-2. Therefore, this responsibility is not credited.

Level 3-3b is not met. One responsibility is credited for the appellant's position. Because it is not credited with eight or more of the listed responsibilities, it fails to meet Level 3-3b and must be credited at Level 3-2c.

Level 3-2c is credited for 450 points.

*Factor 4, Personal contacts*

This is a two-part factor which assesses the nature and purpose of the personal contacts related to supervisory and managerial responsibilities. The nature of the contacts, credited under subfactor 4A, and the purpose of those contacts, credited under subfactor 4B, must be based on the same contacts.

*Subfactor 4A, Nature of contacts*

This subfactor covers the organizational relationships, authority or influence level, setting, and difficulty of preparation associated with the personal contacts.

Level 4A-2 is met. At this level, contacts are with members of the business community or the general public, higher ranking managers, supervisors, and staff of programs, administrative, and other work units and activities throughout the field activity, installation, command (below major command level) or major organization level of the agency. Contacts may be informal, occur in conferences and meetings, or take place through telephone, televised, radio, or similar contact, and sometimes require non-routine or special preparation. Comparable to Level 4A-2, the appellant has routine contacts with project office ship superintendents, supervisors, subordinates, co-workers, engineering and contract personnel, and with other naval command and ships' force personnel. These contacts occur primarily during meetings and briefings to discuss quality assurance and ship progressing matters, provide factual information on status and problem areas, or other matters related to operations.

Level 4A-3 is not met. At this level, contacts routinely are with high ranking military or civilian managers, supervisors, and technical staff at bureau and major organization levels of the agency, with agency headquarters administrative support staff; or with comparable personnel in other Federal agencies, congressional committee and subcommittee staff assistants below staff director, or chief counsel levels. The appellant does not have regular and recurring contacts with individuals and parties at the bureau and major organizational levels of the agency described at this level. His contacts are typically with officials, managers and other personnel of the command and next higher-level command having a specific interest in relevant shipbuilding matters.

Level 4A-2 is credited for 50 points.

*Subfactor 4B, Purpose of Contacts*

This subfactor covers the purpose of the personal contacts credited under subfactor 4B, including the advisory, representational, negotiating, and commitment making responsibilities.

Level 4B-2 is met. At this level, the purpose of contacts is to ensure that information provided to outside parties is accurate and consistent; to plan and coordinate the work directed with that of others outside the subordinate organization, and to resolve differences of opinion among managers, supervisors, employees, contractors, or others. The purpose of the appellant's contacts is primarily to foster teamwork with the contractor, provide information, facilitate coordination of a ship's scheduled events with the contractor's schedule, and resolve potential

and existing problems and technical issues. The appellant attempts to influence, motivate, and persuade contractors that a different process approach or technique has merit.

Level 4B-3 is not met. At this level, the purpose of contacts is to justify, defend, or negotiate in representing the project, program segment, or organizational unit directed in obtaining or committing resources and in gaining compliance with established policies, regulations, or contracts. Contacts at this level usually involve active participation in meetings or presentations involving problems or issues of considerable consequence or importance to the program or program segment managed. The appellant does not have control over resources and the authority necessary to gain support and compliance on policy issues. Financial control for construction is exercised by NAVSEA. Additionally, work standards are specific and the SUPSHIP chief engineers are responsible for ensuring compliance with technical requirements, standards, processes and policies.

Level 4B-2 is credited for 75 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, directly or through subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or others. 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 is work for which the supervisor does not have the minimum supervisory and managerial authorities defined under Factor 3 (including such technical supervisory functions as assigning and reviewing work and assuring that production and accuracy requirements are met or significant responsibilities for contractor work).

The appellant's subordinate staff for workload consideration includes one Industrial Specialist, GS-1150-11, one Shipbuilding Specialist, GS-1101-11, and six Quality Assurance Specialists, GS-1910-11 positions. For purposes of this evaluation, we accept the agency's classification of all subordinate positions. The work of the Production Controllers in the division and the contracted work is excluded from consideration as previously determined.

The highest level of nonsupervisory work supervised by the appellant that represents at least 25 percent of the nonsupervisory workload of the division is GS-11.

Level 5-6 is credited for 800 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.

Level 6-4 is met. At this level supervision involves substantial coordination and integration of a number of major work assignments, projects, or program segments of professional, scientific, technical, or administrative work comparable to GS-11, or directing subordinate supervisors who each direct substantial workloads comparable to GS-9 or 10. Comparable to this level, the appellant coordinates and integrates work for three or more ships in order to meet ship milestones. He ensures all deficiencies are identified and tracked and corrections are inspected, ensures ship progressing is accomplished and records maintained, attends various management progress meetings for each ship, and prepares and presents periodic ship progress reviews and contractor evaluations, including information furnished by production controllers. He also prepares annual budget estimates for the division including regular and reimbursable overtime.

Level 6-5 is not met. This level identifies three possible situations: significant and extensive coordination and integration of a number of important projects or program segments of work comparable to GS-12; supervision of work comparable to GS-13 or above; or management of work through subordinate supervisors and/or contractors who each direct substantial workloads comparable to GS-11. Supervision at this level involves major recommendations which have a direct and substantial effect on the organization and projects managed. The recommendations involve policy issues, long range goals, objectives, organizational structure, etc. Since the appellant is not fully responsible for the technical accuracy of the GS-12 employees it is not appropriate for consideration here. The typical work directed by the appellant does not require extensive coordination of a number of GS-12 level projects and does not require supervision of GS-13 level work. The identification of subordinate supervisors here indicates a large organization. The appellant's organization is not comparable and he does not make comparable recommendations.

Level 6-4 is credited for 1120 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	5-6	800
Other Conditions	6-4	1120
<i>Total</i>		<u>2945</u>

The total of 2945 points falls within the GS-12 range (2755-3150) on the grade conversion table provided in the GSSG.

**Decision**

This position is properly classified as GS-1101-12, with a title at the agency's discretion that includes a supervisory designation.