

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

**Appellant:** [Appellant]

**Agency classification:** Civilian Pay Technician  
GS-544-6

**Organization:** [Area] Network Business Office  
VISN [#]  
[Center]  
Department of Veterans Affairs  
[City, State]

**OPM decision:** Civilian Pay Technician  
GS-544-6

**OPM decision number:** C-0544-06-02

//Judith A. Davis for

---

Robert D. Hendler  
Classification and Pay Claims  
Program Manager  
Merit System Audit and Compliance

8/22/2012

---

Date

As provided in section 511.612 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this decision constitutes a 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 the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards (Introduction)*, appendix 4, Section G (address provided in appendix 4, section H).

**Decision sent to:**

[Appellant]  
Civilian Pay Technician  
[Address]  
[City, State]

[Name]  
HR POC  
HRO VISN [#]  
Department of Veterans Affairs  
[Center]  
[Address]  
[City, State, Zip]

[Name]  
HR POC  
HRO VISN [#]  
Department of Veterans Affairs  
[Center]  
[Address]  
[City, State, Zip]

Team Leader for Classification  
Office of Human Resources Management  
and Labor Relations  
Compensation and Classification Service (055)  
Department of Veterans Affairs  
810 Vermont Avenue, HW, Room 240  
Washington, DC 20420

Director  
Compensation and Classification Service (055)  
Office of Human Resources Management  
Department of Veterans Affairs  
810 Vermont Avenue, NW, Room 240  
Washington, DC 20420

## **Introduction**

On December 22, 2011, the Chicago Oversight Division of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a classification appeal from [appellant] and [co-appellant]. We subsequently cancelled [co-appellant's] appeal because she left the appealed position on April 22, 2012, and under controlling law and regulation, no longer had standing to continue this appeal since she no longer occupied the position in question. The remaining appellant occupies a position currently classified as Civilian Pay Technician, GS-544-6; however, she believes her position should be classified as Senior Civilian Pay Technician, GS-544-8. The position is located in the VA [area] Network Business Office, VISN [#], Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), in [city, state]. We received the agency's complete administrative report on May 8, 2012. We have accepted and decided this appeal under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.).

To help decide the appeal, we interviewed the appellant and her immediate supervisor by telephone on June 26, 2012, with follow up interviews with each on July 3 and 31, 2012. During the interviews, the appellant and supervisor described workload and details of the position which we have considered in our evaluation. This decision is based in large part on the information provided during our interviews, additional written information and work logs sent to us at our request, and our independent review and analysis of the entire appeal record.

## **Background**

In a letter dated June 9, 2011, as a result of a classification review, the agency downgraded these positions previously classified as GS-544-8 on position description (PD) number [####-#] to GS-544-6. On June 29, 2011, new PD #[####-#] was written as a re-description of PD #[####-#] to more accurately describe duties. It was certified as accurate by the supervisor and the appellant. We find this new PD sufficient for classification purposes and incorporate it by reference into this decision.

## **General issues**

By law, a classification appeal decision is based on comparing the appellant's current duties and responsibilities to OPM position classification standards and guidelines (5 U.S.C. 5106, 5107, and 5112). 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 PD. Therefore, this decision is based on the work currently assigned to and performed by the appellant and sets aside any previous agency decision.

## **Position information**

The appellant works in the VA [area] Network Business Office, VISN [#], which processes approximately 11,000 employee time cards per pay period and approximately 500-600 corrections to them after payroll flows.

The Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) took over payroll processing for the VISN in spring 2009. According to Business Office staff, this added some complexity to the process of correcting payroll records and the number of data systems. It also added the challenge of balancing VA regulations with DFAS in allowing actions to flow through the system. DFAS is now responsible for calculation and collection of overpayments and underpayments for VA employees. VA payroll staff are able to make corrections to payroll records dating back 26 pay periods; any issues preceding those must be resolved through the creation of a detailed remedy ticket to DFAS. These remedy tickets prompt DFAS to make changes or corrections to records. When the VA office codes a correction to a time card, DFAS is then responsible for calculating the dollar amount and paying the amount to the employee. The VA office codes overtime; DFAS calculates the total hours and maintains leave balances. When a personnel action flows, DFAS automatically begins collecting or deducting money to make up for retroactive payments.

The appellant performs the full range of payroll actions under an automated system for employees appointed under different personnel systems which have unique pay accounts and governing regulations relating to the Federal Wage System, GS title 5 including special salary rates, title 38, title 38 hybrids, law enforcement and firefighter pay, Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), title 38 overtime, irregular tours of duty, etc. Her major duties entail overseeing the timecard corrections made by up to 4 civilian pay technicians (CPT) and researching related regulations. Overseeing the CPTs involves planning the distribution of workload, checking progress of work, conducting on-the-job training, and keeping a daily categorized production log of actions and error rates for her block. The appellant said she spends about thirty percent of her time reviewing actions from the CPTs and the remainder on her own actions. She verifies and releases all work processed, including timecard corrections. She examines and reviews personnel actions, pay changes, and employee requests for proper application of pay regulations and consistency of input for appointments, promotions, pay adjustments, debt waivers, reassignments, awards and separations. The appellant reviews authorized documents and codes the appropriate date for input into an integrated personnel and fiscal automated system to properly update employee master records. She reviews reports within the payroll systems received from DFAS and responds to and corrects pay rejects. She locates appropriate regulations and creates or follows workarounds to ensure rejected payroll data is coded in such a way that it will flow correctly to DFAS.

The appellant reviews retirement packages for accuracy prior to forwarding to DFAS for processing. She identifies any needed retroactive pay adjustments and creates remedy tickets for correction by DFAS. Other duties entail creating remedy tickets to suspend Federal Employee Health Benefits (FEHB) deductions for those for employees on military leave orders. She also pulls a quarterly continuation of pay (COP) report for on-the-job injuries to ensure appropriate persons on the list continue to receive payment. The appellant resolves inquiries from employees and supervisors and provides pay reports and advisory services regarding regulations to payroll liaisons and human resources (HR) assistants. She fills in for other Senior CPTs as needed. She also completes miscellaneous duties such as transmitting forms relating to FEHB benefits and corrections and Thrift Savings Plan (TSP) elections.

The appellant is supervised by a Supervisory Systems and Procedures Analyst, GS-501-10. Other positions in the payroll section are two Systems and Procedures Analysts (Trainer), GS-501-9 and ten Civilian Pay Technicians, GS-544-6. In addition to the appellant, there are two other Civilian Pay Technicians (Senior), GS-544-6. Pay blocks, or teams, within the VISN [#] payroll office are divided into Western and Eastern orbits, based on activities serviced. When fully staffed, each block contains one senior CPT and two to four CPTs.

The appellant's supervisor is responsible for resolving a variety of complex payroll issues, such as those related to EEO cases, establishing guidelines and interpreting impact of regulations, and analyzing the HR and payroll relationship to develop recommendations and respond to policy changes. She acts as technical authority for maintenance of more than 9,000 payroll accounts. However, this technical authority is shared with the Systems and Procedures Analysts who work independently to investigate and resolve complex payroll issues. These GS-9 analysts conduct special studies to address current and retroactive pay problems and work toward elimination or reduction of similar problems in the future. They analyze various audits in order to identify problems and trends.

### **Series, title, and standard determination**

The agency classified the appellant's position in the Civilian Pay Series, GS-544, and the appellant agrees. We concur with the agency's determination. The appellant's duties fall within the type of work performed by Civilian Pay Technicians, GS-544, as described in the Job Family Standard for Clerical and Technical Accounting and Budget Work, GS-500C (GS-500C JFS). Similar to positions classified in the GS-544 series, the appellant processes pay and leave documents and maintains pay and related records, initiates and reviews timecard corrections, trains other CPTs and resolves payroll processing issues. Thus, the proper title and series of the appellant's position is Civilian Pay Technician, GS-544.

The GS-500C JFS contains grade level criteria which we have applied below for evaluating positions classified in the GS-544 series.

### **Grade determination**

The GS-500C JFS uses the Factor Evaluation System (FES) which employs nine factors. Under the FES, each factor-level description in a standard describes the minimum characteristics needed to receive credit for the described level. Therefore, if a position fails to meet criteria in a factor level description 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 the higher level.

The agency has credited the position with Levels 2-3, 5-2, 6/7 2-b, 8-1, and 9-1 with which the appellant agrees. Based on careful analysis of the record, we concur with Levels 5-2, 6/7 2-b, 8-1, and 9-1 and have credited the position accordingly. Therefore, our evaluation will focus on Factors 1 through 4.

*Factor 1, Knowledge Required by the Position*

Factor 1 measures the nature and extent of information or facts which a technician must understand to do acceptable work (e.g., steps, procedures, practices, rules, policies, theories, principles and concepts) and the nature and extent of the skills needed to apply that knowledge. To be used as a basis for selecting a level under this factor, knowledge must be required and applied. The agency credited 1-4.

At Level 1-4, the work requires in-depth or broad knowledge of a body of payroll regulations, practices, procedures and policies related to the specific functions. This would include knowledge of extensive and diverse financial regulations (e.g. payroll regulations) and procedures governing a wide variety of types of related transactions to resolve nonstandard transactions, complaints, or discrepancies, provide advice, or perform other work that requires authoritative procedural knowledge. This knowledge includes various financial requirements such as applicable pay and leave entitlement rules and recording and tracking tax laws to ensure compliance and recommend action. At this level, employees research or investigate problems or errors that require reconciling and reconstructing incomplete information, conduct extensive and exhaustive searches for required information, or perform actions of similar complexity.

The appellant's position meets Level 1-4. Her work is comparable to illustrations 5 and 7 in the JFS:

Employees conduct comprehensive reviews of military pay transactions which include determinations such as allowances, special incentive pay, debt collection, etc. They audit and resolve cases involving overpayment or underpayment for several periods of service. They review error reports and actions and make corrections; and

Employees verify the accuracy of the authorizing documents, reconstruct the payment history for the period involved, determine the amount and extent of underpayment or overpayment, if any, and the procedures for disbursing underpayment or collecting overpayment

Like Level 1-4, the appellant uses a broad knowledge of the regulations, procedures, and policies related to the specific payroll functions as well as knowledge of applicable pay and leave entitlement rules and tax laws. She conducts comprehensive reviews of pay transactions which include determinations such as allowances, recruitment and retention incentives, debt collections, etc. She audits and resolves cases involving overpayment or underpayment for several periods of service by reconstructing the payment history. Her work involves reviewing payroll-related error reports generated from the Personnel and Accounting Integrated Data (PAID) system and the Defense Civilian Pay System (DCPS) to ensure correctness of leave and pay entitlements. She researches discrepancies and reconciles or reconstructs the incomplete information. For example, if a TSP election is rejected in the system, the appellant investigates the source of the rejection and develops the corrective action. Comparable to Level 1-4 work involving conducting extensive searches for required information, the appellant, in calculating a recruitment or retention incentive debt in the event an employee separates prior to fulfilling a service agreement, verifies the service time by finding the start date, determining the pay type, and calculating the total debt based on the period of required service the employee did not complete. This pay calculation would be included on a remedy ticket to DFAS.

At Level 1-5, which is the highest level identified in the JFS, the work requires a broad, in-depth practical knowledge of financial management (e.g. payroll) technical methods, transactions, techniques, precedent cases, and procedures to resolve especially difficult or sensitive problems. The technician must have knowledge of the interrelationships of various system applications and computer file systems and content. At this level, the technician requires knowledge of related financial regulations (e.g. payroll) and rulings covering diverse types of transactions to typically function as a technical authority for the resolution of an extensive range of issues or problems.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 1-5. While the appellant may resolve some difficult or sensitive problems, these issues do not occupy at least twenty five percent of her time. Detailed production logs showed the high volume and variety of transactions the appellant codes and processes each pay period. Based on the interviews and data on these logs, the sheer number of transactions the appellant handles in addition to corrections for pay rejects and assistance she provides to payroll liaison staff precludes her from spending any lengthy amount of time or analysis on one issue. Most of her work requires application of payroll knowledge to fairly routine adjustments and common errors, use of procedural knowledge, and some research to locate and apply guidelines or workarounds. Although portions of her work do require extensive searches for information or "research" to locate the applicable regulation and decide how she should apply it for specific cases, unlike Level 1-5 this work does not entail analyzing data in great depth or reconciling complicated adjustments over long periods of time.

Some of the appellant's work approaches Level 1-5. For example, the appellant is involved in: (1) retroactive pay adjustments to various Federal Employee Group Life Insurance (FEGLI)/TSP/FEHB aspects of pay (assigned if they require fairly minor reconstruction) and retroactive within the past year (approximately 2-5 per pay period); (2) computing, coding, and creating remedy tickets to DFAS for pay adjustments, including those that may involve transfers between pay systems differing in pay, leave, and benefit entitlements (4-6 per pay period); and (3) computing and preparing out-of-system payments that involve records prior to the conversion to DFAS in 2009 and prior to integration of VISN [#] (2-4 per pay period). If a correction precedes the past 26 pay periods, the appellant must investigate details and then create a remedy ticket for DFAS to correct. When required, she computes the amount of back pay owed for an out-of-system adjustment and provides the calculation to DFAS (DFAS would not have access to this pre-conversion data). She also processes requests for waivers of overpayments (1-4 per month). She receives waiver requests from the station managers and works with them to gather details of the case. The waiver moves to a committee that has 90 days to provide a response. Within 90 days, DFAS starts collecting money; however, the appellant completes a remedy to suspend indebtedness for this period, and if approved by the committee, another remedy to stop the collection entirely. According to the appellant's supervisor, the senior CPTs, in contrast to other CPTs, know "who to call" if issues arise, communicate with payroll liaisons and station managers, and research workarounds for issues to adapt procedures compatible with DFAS.

However, work consistent with Level 1-5 is performed by other employees in the section. The more complex and sensitive assignments, such as court settlement agreements, are assigned to the GS-501-9 System and Procedure Analysts. These cases may take as long as eight months to complete, typically involve premium pay, and may require reconstruction further back in time.

While the appellant may prepare and present supporting documents such as corrected timecards to assist them, these GS-9 analysts are responsible for the more complex cases spanning a longer period into the past than the actions the appellant is assigned to resolve independently. According to the supervisor, the pay blocks described previously complete a total of approximately 40 “complex actions” each pay period. Even though the appellant has exposure to some complex cases, we find that in these cases requiring deviation from established procedures, her role is consistent with the reconciliation, reconstruction, and searches for required information found at Level 1-4. The manual computation and processing of many retroactive adjustments and out-of-system payments, while time consuming, flow from mostly well-established processes and procedures (e.g., changes in based and locality pay will impact other predictable portions on an employee’s pay record, ranging from retirement through TSP). The appellant reviews and/or updates approximately 100-200 personnel actions (including accessions) per pay period. Of these and other actions she completes (leave and pay adjustments, correcting fields in payroll), based on the telephone audits, between 10-15 per pay period are more complex issues approaching the demands of Level 1-5, such as retroactive adjustments, out-of-system corrections, or waivers which do not constitute a significant percentage of her overall individually performed workload.

Due to the conversion to DFAS processing payroll, the payroll offices must check three systems: VISTA (the local VA database that reflects employee gains and losses as well as collects error messages from the Austin Finance Center), PAID, and DCPS. The appellant must have knowledge of the coding for DFAS/PAID systems to enter data and to correct errors in final pay actions and follow up requirements. After the payroll cycle runs, she compares data from each of the systems through reports to ensure accuracy. If a discrepancy or reject is found, she investigates why the error occurred and if able to correct, ensures she or another CPT enters the proper data into DCPS. Although finding the appropriate correction may require some trial and error, the work performed by the appellant does not require dealing with the interrelationships of the various pay system applications and computer file systems and content described and illustrated at Level 1-5.

Level 1-4 is credited for 550 points.

### *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. Controls are exercised by the supervisor in the way assignments are made, instructions are given, priorities and deadlines are set, and objectives and boundaries are defined. Responsibility of the employee depends upon the extent to which the employee is expected to develop the sequence and timing of various aspects of the work, to modify or recommend modification of instructions, and to participate in establishing priorities and defining objectives. This factor also takes into account the extent of the employee’s responsibility for independent action and decision making. The agency credited 2-3.

At Level 2-2, the supervisor or other designated employee provides general standing instructions on recurring assignments by indicating what is to be done, applicable policies, procedures and

methods to follow, data and information required, quality and quantity of work expected, priority of assignments and deadlines. Recurring assignments are reviewed for technical accuracy through quality control procedures and selected work products may be spot-checked.

At Level 2-3, the supervisor or other designated employee assigns work with standing instructions on objectives, priorities, and deadlines and provides guidance for unusually involved situations. At this level, the technician processes the most difficult procedural and technical tasks or actions and handles problems and deviations in accordance with instructions, policies, previous practices or accepted practices. This includes planning out successive steps in processing highly complex actions and unusual or unique adjustments. Completed work is reviewed by sampling in a quality review system and/or spot checked by the supervisor for results and conformity to established deadlines and requirements. Typically at Level 2-3, the supervisor provides guidance when problems with a higher degree of difficulty are encountered but does not routinely review the employee's work.

Although the appellant's work is not as closely controlled as typical of Level 2-2, Factor 2-3 is not fully met. The appellant independently determines the types and sources of information needed to complete payroll tasks and has some freedom to deviate slightly from established requirements or procedures, i.e., in order for an action to flow through to DFAS, based on previous training or accepted practices. The record shows the appellant works independently and confers with her supervisor mainly for administrative issues related to performance and work environment, rather than technical issues. Although the appellant may function with greater freedom from supervision due to her knowledge of payroll systems and the kinds of adaptations or exceptions that can be made, the supervisor and computer system control the tasks to be done, deadline criteria to be met, and the overall work methods to be used. Unlike Level 2-3, the appellant does not process the most difficult procedural and technical tasks or actions, and thus is not confronted with handling deviations from established procedures as described at this level. Although the appellant stated that she may speak with other senior pay technicians to discuss issues or errors that she cannot resolve, the GS-9 system analysts and supervisor are technically responsible for handling issues and providing guidance for issues when a higher degree of difficulty are encountered.

The supervisor primarily evaluates the work through such indicators as the frequency and nature of problems resulting from errors in the processing, problems with responding to inquiries and requests, the nature and frequency of complaints from serviced employees, and through the reconciliation of accounts and other controls built into the system. The supervisor reviews summary reports of all actions that flowed during the previous pay period. These reports show accession actions, corrected time cards, special forms that the blocks complete, as well as any out of system (pre-DFAS) and retroactive actions. Any retroactive corrections or manual out-of-system (pre-DFAS conversion) actions are reviewed by the supervisor for appropriateness and accuracy of calculations. The appellant uses a checklist to review retirement packets for salary and effective date, before sending to her supervisor for final signature and forward to DFAS. Although the supervisor does not review all individual corrections or work in detail, she reviews the finished assignments and spot checks finished work for accuracy. Because the supervisor signs off on these actions, the appellant's work is reviewed for more than just results and conformity to established deadlines and requirements. Although review of her work is somewhat

less substantial than typical of Level 2-2, her work is not subject to the more limited technical review found at Level 2-3.

Level 2-2 is credited for 125 points.

### *Factor 3, Guidelines*

This factor covers the nature of guidelines and the judgment necessary to apply them. The agency credited 3-2.

At Level 3-2, a number of established procedures and specific guidelines in the form of agency policies and procedures, Federal codes and manuals, specific related regulations, precedent actions, and processing manuals are readily available and clearly applicable to most transactions. The employee must use judgment to select the most appropriate procedures to use or to select among alternatives. There may be omissions in guidelines, and the employee is expected to use some judgment and initiative to handle aspects of the work not completely covered or to decide which precedent action to follow as a model. The employee may make minor deviations in guidelines to adapt to specific cases.

Level 3-2 is met. The appellant often references a variety of guidelines related to time and leave, including references such as the VA Handbooks 5007 and 5011, MP6 payroll manual, military leave and LWOP regulations, travel regulations, special pay regulations for DFAS, guidelines for title 38 entitlements, TSP, night differential, and FLSA overtime. She may occasionally use regulations and directives including Executive Orders, OPM regulations, IRS instructions for tax levies, United States Code, and the Code of Federal Regulations. Like Level 3-2, she must use judgment to decide where to research applicable regulations. The supervisor stated that the appellant spends about fifteen percent of her time conducting extensive searches and characterized the guidance that the appellant uses to be mostly strict guidance. For cases that she is researching how to resolve, many of them entail slightly adapting an established procedure or changing a value in the system to make the action compatible with DFAS. These are considered workarounds or ways to make an action compatible with DFAS in order to flow.

At Level 3-3, which is the highest level identified in the JFS, the guidelines are the same as Level 3-2 but because of the complicating nature of assignments, they lack specificity, frequently change, or are not completely applicable to the work requirements, circumstances or problems. The employee uses judgment to interpret guidelines, adapt procedures, decide approaches, and resolve specific problems. The employee analyzes the results of applying guidelines and recommends changes. When completing a transaction, the employee may have to rely on significant, experienced judgment, rather than guides, to fill in gaps, identify sources of information, and make working assumptions about what transpired. This may include devising more efficient methods for procedural processing. Employee at this level needs to be aware of constant legislative and regulatory change.

Level 3-3 is not met. The guidelines used by the appellant are more specific in how they are defined and applied than those typical of Level 3-3. Because of the nature of her assignments as discussed previously in this decision, the appellant does not apply the same degree of judgment

in interpreting guidelines, adapting procedures, deciding approaches, and resolving specific problems as described at Level 3-3. Research entails locating regulations, reading and interpreting them, and ensuring their proper application for the specific issue. Guidelines available to the appellant may not completely apply to the work problems, so she may have to adapt procedures slightly. When she must deviate from procedures, her supervisor stated that these are minor deviations and apply to the specific case. The appellant may devise unique workarounds or make minor deviations from guidelines to adapt for specific cases and may share with co-workers; however, these are not at a level that would be considered for broad adoption and use typical of Level 3-3; i.e., devising more efficient methods for procedural processing. The record shows these responsibilities are vested in other higher graded positions in the unit.

Level 3-2 is credited for 125 points.

#### *Factor 4, Complexity*

This factor covers the nature, number, variety, and intricacy of tasks, steps, processes, or methods in the work performed, the difficulty in identifying what needs to be done, and the difficulty and originality involved in performing the work. The agency credited 4-3.

At Level 4-3, the work involves various duties or assignments that use different and unrelated processes, procedures, or methods. The use of different procedures may result because transactions are not completely standardized; deadlines are continually changing; functions are assigned are relatively broad and varied; or transactions are interrelated with other systems and require extensive coordination with other personnel. The employee decides what needs to be done by identifying the nature of the issue and determining the need for and obtaining additional information through oral or written contacts or by reviewing regulations and manuals. The employee makes recommendations or takes action based on a case-by-case review of the pertinent regulations involved. The employee may have to consider previous action and understand how these actions differ from or are similar to the issue at hand before deciding an approach. As an example, the employee would take action (e.g., determine eligibility for entitlements) based on a review of regulations to reconcile various types of transactions involving multiple funds.

The appellant's position meets Level 4-3. Like this level, the appellant decides what needs to be done by identifying the nature of the issue and by reviewing regulations and manuals and previous cases. She makes recommendations or creates remedy tickets based on a case-by-case review of the pertinent regulations. She uses different established procedures to review and reconcile payroll rejects. Typical of this level, she assists payroll liaisons and station managers with payroll questions and researches workarounds for issues to adapt procedures to make them compatible with DFAS. There are some retroactive actions that routinely occur every pay period, actions which the pay technician may know how to fix quickly, as they may impact areas of an employee record in a predictable way (e.g., for uniform allowances, HR did not fill out a field).

At Level 4-4, which is the highest level identified in the JFS, typically the work may require analysis, development or testing of a variety of established techniques and methods to evaluate

alternatives and arrive at decisions conclusions or recommendations. Decisions regarding what needs to be done include assessing unusual circumstances, developing variations in approach to fit specific problems, or dealing with incomplete, unreliable or conflicting data. The work requires originality to determine correct and accurate interpretations. The employee must sort complicated factual information and apply a variety of methods to resolve issues. The work requires making decisions, devising solutions, and taking actions based on program knowledge. The work involves application of many different and unrelated processes and methods relating to examination or analysis of complex and unusual transactions requiring substantial research and thorough understanding of a wide variety of transactions and accounts. The work involves interpreting considerable data to identify problems, determining what is the nature of the problem, what approaches to use to resolve the issues, what to recommend given the variety of options, planning and implementing solutions, and refining or designing new methods or techniques.

Level 4-4 is not met. The appellant cites incompatibility of the three data systems as the factor causing data to be incomplete, unreliable, or conflicting. Although she examines reports generated in all three systems, she is reviewing to ensure consistency and any errors found are resolved based on well-established procedures. For example, a timecard input into VISTA may reflect annual leave taken on a Monday. Once flowed to DCPS, it may incorrectly reflect this leave on a Thursday. As a result, this leave shows up in DFAS incorrectly and may affect that employee's record. The appellant must check error reports to ensure that this type of data flows correctly from VISTA into DCPS. Errors between the systems occur frequently, so the appellant regularly monitors reports. Or, as another example, a nurse or physician's name may show up on the conversion of hours report for an incorrect tour of duty or excess overtime. The appellant also monitors reports that show rejected timecards or missing time. Although she uses knowledge of the systems to manipulate fields to properly pay employees, this is not equivalent to the demands of analyzing complicated factual information for unusual situations; dealing with incomplete, unreliable or conflicting information; or refining or designing new methods and techniques found at Level 4-4.

Level 4-3 is credited for 150 points.

### *Summary*

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Points</i>
1. Knowledge Required by the Position	1-4	550
2. Supervisory Controls	2-2	125
3. Guidelines	3-2	125
4. Complexity	4-3	150
5. Scope and Effect	5-2	75
6 & 7. Personal Contacts/Purpose of Contacts	2-b	75
8. Physical Demands	8-1	5
9. Work Environment	9-1	<u>5</u>
Total		1,110

A total of 1,110 points falls within the GS-6 range (1,105-1,350) on the JFS grade conversion table.

**Decision**

The position is properly classified as Civilian Payroll Technician, GS-544-6.