



United States Office of Personnel Management

Office of Merit Systems Oversight and Effectiveness
Digest of Significant Classification Decisions and Opinions
August 1994
No. 19-04

Standard: [General Schedule Supervisory Guide](#) (April 1993)
Factor: Factor 2, Organizational Setting
Issue: Determining Senior Executive Service equivalency

Identification of the Classification Issue

This issue arose in an Office of Personnel Management region's adjudication of a classification appeal. The appellant occupied a GS-12 Accounting Officer position, with servicing responsibility for approximately 300 employees in a small civil engineering activity. The agency determined that the head of the activity occupied a position equivalent to the Senior Executive Service level because he supervised subordinate GS-15 supervisors. Consequently, the appellant's position was evaluated at Level 2-2 because he reported to a position that was one reporting level below a position equivalent to the Senior Executive Service level. While the appellant did not question the agency's evaluation of Factor 2, the region examined the accuracy of the agency's determination on the Senior Executive Service-equivalency issue.

Resolution

The activity head was a colonel, a military rank one level below a Brigadier General. Organizational information indicated that two GS-15 positions, the Chief Counsel and one division chief, reported to the Executive Office, which consisted of the activity head and a full deputy. Two other division chief positions were classified at the GS-14 grade level, and eight staff organization heads reporting to the Executive Office occupied positions that were classified in grades ranging from GS-11 to GS-13.

According to the General Schedule Supervisory Guide, a position that directs a substantial GS-15 or equivalent workload, or a position that directs work through GS-15 or equivalent level subordinate supervisors, officers, contractors, or others, is to be considered equivalent to the

Senior Executive Service level. The region found that the activity's organizational structure did not include a substantial GS-15 or equivalent workload; nor did it include an adequate GS-15 subordinate supervisory structure to justify recognizing the activity head position as equivalent to a Senior Executive Service position. Thus, the region concluded that the appellant did not report to a position that was one level below a position equivalent to the Senior Executive Service level; therefore, Level 2-2 could not be credited. Consistent with Level 2-1, the appellant reported to a position that was two or more levels below the first Senior Executive Service level position in the direct supervisory chain. Accordingly, the region credited Level 2-1.