



United States Office of Personnel Management

Office of Merit Systems Oversight and Effectiveness
Digest of Significant Classification Decisions and Opinions
October 1997
No. 20-07

Standard: [General Schedule Supervisory Guide](#) (April 1993)
Factor: Factor 6, Other Conditions
Issue: Linkage of Factor 6 to Previous Factors in the Guide

Identification of the Classification Issue

This issue arose in an Office of Personnel Management oversight division's adjudication of the same Supervisory Electrical Engineer, GS-0850-12, appeal discussed in the previous article. The position was a Division chief in the Public Works Department of a medium size military installation. The Division consisted of three branches. The appellant stated that he spent 50 percent of the time in "second-level supervisory efforts over non-supervisory GS-11" level work, and that the alternative base level methodology should result in crediting the position at Level 5-6 (800 points). Using this same base level, the appellant stated that the position should be evaluated at Level 6-5a because it required substantial coordinating and integrating of work.

Resolution

The oversight division observed that Factor 6 is linked directly to the previous factors in the Guide. The difficulty of work is measured primarily by the base level determined in Factor 5. Complexity is measured by the degree of coordination required, and increases as the base level increases. The numbered paragraphs under Factor 6 are structured to address positions that function as either first-level or second-level and higher-level supervisors. Level 6-5a pertains to first-level supervision of GS-12 base level work. The oversight division, in its evaluation of Factors 3 and 5, found the position functioned as a second- and higher-level supervisor over a GS-7 base level of work. Thus, the position could not be credited at Level 6-5a.

The oversight division also found that Level 6-4a was not appropriate because the appellant did not directly supervise nonsupervisory work that supported a GS-11 base level. Rather, the

appellant supervised GS-11 grade level work indirectly as a second-level supervisor. Level 6-4b also was not applicable to the position since there was not sufficient work at or above the GS-9 grade level in the Division to permit the crediting of *each* subordinate supervisory position with supervising substantial workloads with a GS-9 or GS-10 base level. The oversight division concluded the position met Level 6-3b because, based on the amount of GS-7 (base level credited in Factor 5) grade level and higher level work in the Division, the position was characterized as entailing the direction of subordinate supervisors over positions in grades GS-7 or GS-8 or the equivalent which required consolidation and coordination similar to Level 6-2a.