

**OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
ATLANTA MERIT SYSTEMS OVERSIGHT DIVISION
ATLANTA, GEORGIA**

CLASSIFICATION APPEAL DECISION

Under section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code

Appellant: [Appellant]

Position: Operations Research Analyst, GS-1515-11

Organization: U.S. Department of the Army
[installation]
[installation city, state]

Decision: Program Analyst, GS-343-11
(Appeal for higher grade denied, title and series changed)

OPM Decision Number: C-0343-11-01, 8/9/96

Background

On May 3, 1996, the Atlanta Merit Systems Oversight Division, Office of Personnel Management, accepted an appeal for the position of Operations Research Analyst, GS-1515-11, located in the [installation], U.S. Department of the Army, [installation city and state]. The appellant is requesting that his position be changed to Operations Research Analyst, GS-1515-12.

The appeal has been accepted and processed under section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code. This is the final administrative decision on the classification of the position subject to discretionary review only under the limited conditions and time outlined in part 511, subpart F, of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

Sources of Information

This appeal decision is based on information from the following sources:

1. The appellant's letter of April 26, 1996, appealing the classification of his position.
2. The agency's letter of May 21, 1996, providing position and organizational information.
3. A telephone interview with the servicing classifier, on June 17, 1996.
4. A telephone interview with the appellant on June 19, 1996.
5. A telephone interview with the appellant's immediate supervisor, on July 17, 1996.

Position Information

The appellant is assigned to Position Number 90271, which was classified on July 17, 1990. The appellant, supervisor, and agency have certified to the accuracy of the position description.

The appellant performs analytical work involved in the evaluation of training issues and problems based on project assignments received from his superiors or initiated by the appellant. He identifies the nature of the issue or problem, determines the best evaluation approach, and develops a management plan for the study. He selects appropriate data collection techniques and develops data collection instruments and processes to collect information bearing on the issue or problem under study. He analyzes the information collected using a variety of analytical techniques, to define the extent and nature of the issue or problem. He formulates recommendations for management action within the framework of established guidance, regulations, and

military doctrine. The appellant also performs data collection and constructs databases for use by himself and others in performing task analysis to develop training programs for specific military occupational specialties.

The appellant is currently involved in studying and developing recommendations for the implementation of distance learning technology within the Army's special operations community to improve training delivery and readiness, particularly of the reserve forces. He has also conducted studies relating to facility utilization and long-range budget projections for the school.

The appellant functions under the general supervision of the branch chief, who assigns projects in terms of objectives and governing policy. The appellant is expected to independently plan and carry out assignments within established policy and regulations and coordinate his work with other offices and individuals as needed. Policy issues are discussed with the supervisor as they arise. The branch chief reviews completed work for effectiveness in accomplishing objectives, soundness of conclusions and recommendations, and compliance with policy and regulations.

Our fact finding showed that the appellant's current position description is misleading, in that it places considerable emphasis on the design, administration, and analysis of surveys and the use of survey research in the development of training materials. While the appellant performs such work for a minor portion of the time (less than 25 percent of the appellant's time), that work no longer represents the primary work of the position. The appellant's current position description is largely copied from the position description for an Operations Research Analyst, GS-1515-12, position at another military installation, and that fact formed the basis for the appellant's classification appeal.

Standards Referenced

Operations Research Series, GS-1515, June 1967.

Management and Program Analysis Series, GS-343, August 1990.

Administrative Analysis Grade Evaluation Guide, August 1990.

Series and Title Determination

The appellant does not contest the title and occupational series of his position.

The agency placed the appellant's position in the Operations Research Series, GS-1515, which covers positions which involve professional and scientific work requiring the design, development, and adaptation of mathematical, statistical, econometric, and other scientific methods and techniques to analyze problems of management and to provide advice and insight about the probable effects of alternative

solutions to these problems. The primary requirement of the work is competence in the rigorous methods of scientific inquiry and analysis rather than in the subject matter of the problem.

Our fact finding does not support placement of the appellant's position in the GS-1515 series. This series is predicated on the application of rigorous scientific analysis and the use of mathematical and statistical modeling to identify and predict the outcome of the implementation of various alternative solutions to difficult and complex problems. In contrast, the appellant's work involves the examination of a number of different problems or issues and the use of a variety of analytical tools, typically not involving the use of mathematical modeling or statistical analysis, to develop and recommend solutions. While the appellant indicates that he is expected to possess the ability to apply operations research techniques when needed by the organization, he also states that the use of such techniques in the performance of his assignments is minimal. For example, in developing long-range budget projections, his mathematical skills were used to project the costs of known and anticipated program changes in much the same manner as a budget analyst would develop budget projections. In developing distance learning proposals, the appellant indicated that his training as an industrial engineer provided him with the necessary skills to evaluate various types of equipment, identify support requirements, and estimate costs. Consequently, we conclude that the appellant's position is not properly placed in the GS-1515 series, since the paramount duties and qualifications requirements to perform his assigned duties do not require the knowledge and skill associated with that series.

The Management and Program Analysis Series, GS-343, includes positions which primarily serve as analysts and advisors to management on evaluating the effectiveness of government programs and operations or the productivity and efficiency of the management of Federal agencies or both. Positions in this series require knowledge of: the substantive nature of agency programs and activities; agency missions, policies, and objectives; management principles and processes; and the analytical and evaluative methods and techniques for assessing program development or execution and improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency. Some positions also require an understanding of basic budgetary and financial management principles and techniques as they relate to long range planning or programs and objectives. The work requires skill in: application of fact finding and investigative techniques; oral and written communications; and development and presentation of reports. The appellant's work involves the use of a variety of analytical techniques, and requires an understanding of Army training policy and requirements. Consequently, the GS-343 series most closely describes the duties and responsibilities of the appellant and the paramount qualifications required to perform the work.

The GS-343 standard states that nonsupervisory positions, such as the appellant's, involved in planning, analyzing, or evaluating the effectiveness of line or operating programs are titled as *Program Analyst*.

The appellant's position is properly titled and coded as Program Analyst, GS-343.

Grade Determination

The GS-343 standard does not include grading criteria, and directs the use of the Administrative Analysis Grade Evaluation Guide to evaluate positions at GS-9 and above. The guide is written in the Factor Evaluation System (FES) format. Under the FES, positions are placed in grades on the basis of their duties, responsibilities, and the qualifications required as evaluated in terms of nine factors common to nonsupervisory General Schedule positions.

A point value is assigned to each factor based on a comparison of the position's duties with the factor-level descriptions in the standard. The factor point values mark the lower end of the ranges for the indicated factor levels. For a position factor to warrant a given point value, it must be fully equivalent to the overall intent of the selected factor-level description. If the position fails in any significant aspect to meet a particular factor-level description in the standard, the point value for the next lower factor level must be assigned, unless the deficiency is balanced by an equally important aspect which meets a higher level. The total points assigned are converted to a grade by use of the grade conversion table in the standard.

Under FES, positions which significantly exceed the highest factor level or fail to meet the lowest factor level described in a classification standard must be evaluated by reference to the Primary Standard, contained in Appendix 3 of the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards. The Primary Standard is the "standard-for-standards" for FES.

Factor 1 - Knowledge Required by the Position:

This factor measures the nature and extent of information or facts that a worker must understand to do acceptable work, such as the steps, procedures, practices, rules, policies, theories, principles, and concepts; and the nature and extent of the skills needed to apply this knowledge.

At Level 1-7, in addition to the knowledge of the previous level, assignments require knowledge and skill in applying analytical and evaluative methods and techniques to issues or studies concerning the efficiency and effectiveness of program operations carried out by administrative or professional personnel, or substantive administrative support functions. This level includes knowledge of pertinent laws, regulations,

policies, and precedents which affect the use of program and related support resources in the area studied. Projects and studies typically require knowledge of the major issues, program goals and objectives, work processes, and administrative operations of the organization. Knowledge is used to plan, schedule, and conduct projects and studies to evaluate and recommend ways to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of work operations in a program or support setting. The assignments require knowledge and skill in adapting analytical techniques and evaluation criteria to the measurement and improvement of program effectiveness and/or organizational productivity. Knowledge is applied in developing new or modified work methods, organizational structures, records and files, management processes, staffing patterns, procedures for administering program services, guidelines and procedures, and automating work processes for the conduct of administrative support functions or program operations. Knowledge may also be applied in analyzing and making recommendations concerning the centralization or decentralization of operations.

Level 1-7 is met. The appellant applies analytical knowledge and skill in evaluating various operational alternatives and developing recommendations for management consideration which may represent significant departures from current operations. For example, the appellant is currently studying the use of distance learning technology to improve training delivery. He devised the study methodology and measures of effectiveness, identified critical issues in training delivery, identified technology alternatives, and is in the process of evaluating the various alternatives for effectiveness in meeting training delivery requirements. This meets the intent of Level 1-7, and this level is creditable.

Level 1-8 is the level of the expert analyst who has mastered the application of a wide range of qualitative and/or quantitative methods for the assessment and improvement of program effectiveness or the improvement of complex management processes and systems. In addition to knowledge of the next lower level, this level requires comprehensive knowledge of the range of administrative laws, policies, regulations, and precedents applicable to the administration of one or more important public programs. Typically, this includes knowledge of agency program goals and objectives, the sequence and timing of key program events and milestones, and methods of evaluating the worth of program accomplishments. Work requires knowledge of relationships with other programs and key administrative support functions within the employing agency or in other agencies. Knowledge characteristic of this level are applied in a variety of ways. For example, knowledge is applied to the design and conduct of comprehensive management studies where the boundaries of the studies are extremely broad and difficult to determine in advance. Study objectives are to identify and propose solutions to management problems which are characterized by their breadth, importance, and severity, and for which previous studies and established management techniques are frequently inadequate. For other assignments, knowledge may be applied in preparing recommendations for legislation to change the way

programs are carried out; in evaluating the content of new or modified legislation for projected impact upon agency programs and resources; and/or in translating basic legislation into program goals, actions, and services. Also included at this level is skill to plan, organize, and direct team study work and to negotiate effectively with management to accept and implement recommendations, where the proposals involve substantial agency resources, require extensive changes in established procedures, or may be in conflict with the desires of the activity studied.

Level 1-8 is not met. While the appellant makes use of a variety of analytical methods, mastery of those methods is not required to perform the level of analysis required of the appellant. Similarly, the appellant's work does not require the comprehensive knowledge of agency (i.e., Department of the Army) goals and objectives, but does require knowledge of the policies and regulations governing training activities within the agency. For example, the evaluation of distance learning technology requires a knowledge of training policies and requirements, and knowledge of evaluation methods sufficient to assess various alternatives and recommend a selection to management. The parameters of this study and others performed by the appellant are defined prior to the commencement of the study, and typically do not concern areas where previous studies are inadequate. The intent of Level 1-8 is not met and this level is not creditable.

Level 1-7 is credited, for 1250 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 for carrying out assignments, and how completed work is reviewed.

At Level 2-4, within a framework of priorities, funding, and overall project objectives, the employee and supervisor develop a mutually acceptable project plan which typically includes identification of the work to be done, the scope of the project, and deadlines for its completion. Within the parameters of the approved project plan, the employee is responsible for planning and organizing the study, estimating costs, coordinating with staff and line management personnel, and conducting all phases of the project. This frequently involves the definitive interpretation of regulations and study procedures, and the initial application of new methods. The employee informs the supervisor of potentially controversial findings, issues, or problems with widespread impact. Completed projects, evaluations, reports, or recommendations are reviewed by the supervisor for compatibility with organizational goals, guidelines, and effectiveness in achieving intended objectives. Completed work is also reviewed critically outside the employee's immediate office by staff and line management officials

whose programs and employees would be affected by implementation of the recommendations.

Level 2-4 is met. Similar to this level, the appellant receives his assignments in broad terms and is expected to plan and carry out those assignments without further supervisory assistance, except on significant policy issues. His work is reviewed on completion for feasibility and compliance with established policy and is often subject to critical review by outside organizations to whom the work is presented in the form of recommendations.

At Level 2-5, as a recognized authority in the analysis and evaluation of programs and issues, the employee is subject only to administrative and policy direction concerning overall project priorities and objectives. At this level, the employee is typically delegated complete responsibility and authority to plan, schedule, and carry out major projects concerned with the analysis and evaluation of programs or organizational effectiveness. The employee typically exercises discretion and judgment in determining whether to broaden or narrow the scope of projects or studies. Analyses, evaluations, and recommendations developed by the employee are normally reviewed by management officials only for potential influence on broad agency policy objectives and program goals. Findings and recommendations are normally accepted without significant change.

Level 2-5 is not met. Although the appellant works with considerable independence from continuing supervision, he does not have delegated authority to plan and schedule major projects. He may identify projects or receive project assignments from his superiors, but he must clear project plans and schedules with his supervisor prior to commencement. Similarly, the appellant's work is subject to review for feasibility and compliance with policy, which represents a closer supervisory review than is indicated at Level 2-5.

Level 2-4 is credited, for 450 points.

Factor 3 - Guidelines:

This factor covers the nature of guidelines used and the judgment needed to apply them.

At Level 3-3, guidelines consist of standard reference material, texts, and manuals covering the application of analytical methods and techniques and instructions and manuals covering the subjects involved. Analytical methods contained in the guidelines are not always directly applicable to specific work assignments. However, precedent studies of similar subjects are available for reference. The employee uses judgment in choosing, interpreting, or adapting available guidelines to specific issues or

subjects studied. The employee analyzes the subject and the current guidelines which cover it and makes recommendations for changes. Included at this level are work assignments in which the subject studied is covered by a wide variety of administrative regulations and procedural guidelines. In such circumstances the employee must use judgment in researching regulations, and in determining the relationship between guidelines and organizational efficiency, program effectiveness, or employee productivity.

Level 3-3 is met. The appellant's guidelines include established policy and regulations governing the training activities, including guidelines issued by his agency and his immediate organization. Judgment is required in selecting the appropriate guideline for application and in interpreting the guideline in light of the specific issues under study. This is comparable to the application of a wide variety of administrative regulations cited at Level 3-3 and meets the intent of that level.

At Level 3-4, guidelines consist of general administrative policies and management and organizational theories which require considerable adaptation and/or interpretation for application to issues and problems studied. At this level, administrative policies and precedent studies provide a basic outline of the results desired, but do not go into detail as to the methods used to accomplish the project. Administrative guidelines usually cover program goals and objectives of the employing organization, such as agency controls on size of work force, productivity targets, and similar objectives. Within the context of broad regulatory guidelines the employee may refine or develop more specific guidelines such as implementing regulations or methods for the measurement and improvement of effectiveness and productivity in the administration of operating programs.

Level 3-4 is not met. Unlike this level, the appellant's guidelines consist of established policies and published regulations which are directly applicable to his assignments, although they may require some interpretation. This represents a more detailed and specific type of guidance available to the appellant than the general administrative guidelines and management theories described at Level 3-4, and that level is not creditable.

Level 3-3 is credited, for 275 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.

At Level 4-4, the work involves gathering information, identifying and analyzing issues, and developing recommendations to resolve substantive problems of effectiveness and efficiency of work operations in a program or program support setting. This is in addition to improving conditions of a procedural nature which relate to the efficiency of organizations and workers described at the previous level. Work at this level requires the application of qualitative and quantitative analytical techniques which frequently require modification to fit a wider range of variables. Subjects and projects assigned at this level usually consist of issues, problems, or concepts which are not always susceptible to direct observation and analysis. Difficulty is encountered in measuring effectiveness and productivity due to variations in the nature of administrative processes studied. Information about the subject is often conflicting or incomplete, cannot readily be obtained by direct means, or is otherwise difficult to document. For example, assignments may involve compiling, reconciling, and correlating voluminous workload data from a variety of sources with different reporting requirements and formats, or the data must be carefully cross-checked, analyzed, and interpreted to obtain accurate and relevant information. Characteristic of this level is originality in refining existing work methods and techniques for application to the analysis of specific issues or resolution of problems. For example, the employee may revise methods for collecting data on workload, adopt new measures of productivity, or develop new approaches to relate productivity measurements to a performance appraisal system.

Level 4-4 is met. The appellant's assignments involve the study of specific issues and problems and the development of recommendations to management which may impact substantially on the manner in which specific programs are carried out. Similar to this level, the appellant's assignments often involve projections of future results, such as with the adoption of distance learning technology in training delivery or the development of budget projections for known and projected program efforts. These assignments involve some uncertainty as to the completeness or validity of the information on which the projections are based and the resulting measures of projected effectiveness. This meets the intent of Level 4-4.

At Level 4-5, the work consists of projects and studies which require analysis of interrelated issues of effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity of substantive mission-oriented programs. Typical assignments require developing detailed plans, goals, and objectives for the long-range implementation and administration of the program, and/or developing criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the program. Decisions about how to proceed in planning, organizing, and conducting studies are complicated by conflicting program goals and objectives which may derive from changes in legislative or regulatory guidelines, productivity, and/or variations in the demand for program services. Assignments are further complicated by: the need to deal with subjective concepts such as value judgments; the quality and quantity of actions are measurable primarily in predictive terms; and findings and conclusions are highly subjective and not readily susceptible to verification through replication of study methods or reevaluation

of results. Options, recommendations, and conclusions developed by the employee take into account and give appropriate weight to uncertainties about the data and other variables which affect long-range program performance. For example, the employee may need to consider and assess the relative advantages and disadvantages of centralizing or decentralizing work operations in organizations with several echelons of geographically separated components. In some instances, work is complicated by the need to develop data about workload and program accomplishments which is currently unavailable. Current measurements of program effectiveness may be ambiguous and susceptible to widely varying interpretations. Under these circumstances the employee develops new information about the subject studied and establishes criteria to identify and measure program accomplishments, develops methods to improve the effectiveness with which programs are administered, or develops new approaches to program evaluation which serve as precedents to others.

Level 4-5 is not met. While the appellant's assignments often involve significant issues and problems relating to individual programs, his assignments typically do not involve implementation and operation of entire programs, but are more concerned with the methods and practices used in those programs. For example, his study of the application of distance learning technology in training delivery impacts on how training is delivered, but does not directly impact on the content of that training. The judgments which the appellant is called on to make concern the effectiveness and efficiency of various methods based on previous efforts of similar size and scope, and are less subjective than the judgments described at Level 4-5. He is typically not called on to develop data which is otherwise not available or to develop new information about the subjects studied. His assignments concern the compilation and analysis of available data and the development of recommendations based on that data. The intent of Level 4-5 is not fully met, and this level is not creditable.

Level 4-4 is credited, for 225 points.

Factor 5 - Scope and Effect:

This factor covers the relationship between the nature of the work, as measured by the purpose, breadth, and depth of the assignment, and the effect of work products or services both within and outside the organization.

At Level 5-4, the purpose of the work is to assess the productivity, effectiveness, and efficiency of program operations or to analyze and resolve problems in the staffing, effectiveness and efficiency of administrative support and staff activities. Work involves establishing criteria to measure and/or predict the attainment of program or organizational goals and objectives. Work at this level may also include developing related administrative regulations, such as those governing the allocation and distribution of personnel, supplies, equipment, and other resources, or promulgating

program guidance for application across organizational lines or in varied geographic locations. Work that involves the evaluation of program effectiveness usually focuses on the delivery of program benefits at the operating level. Work contributes to the improvement of productivity, effectiveness, and efficiency in program operations and/or administrative support activities at different echelons and/or geographical locations within the organization. Work affects the plans, goals, and effectiveness of missions and programs at these various echelons or locations. Work may affect the nature of administrative work done in components of other agencies.

Level 5-4 is met. The purpose of the appellant's work is the assessment and evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of training activities and of alternatives to current training methods. For example, his assessment of distance learning technology concerned its application to training delivery to units in the field. His work contributes to the overall effectiveness of the training program conducted by the school. This is consistent with Level 5-4, and this level is creditable.

At Level 5-5, the purpose of the work is to analyze and evaluate major administrative aspects of substantive mission-oriented programs. This may involve, for example, the development of long-range program plans, goals, objectives, and milestones, or to evaluating the effectiveness of programs conducted throughout a bureau or service of an independent agency, a regional structure of equivalent scope, or a large complex multimission field activity. The work involves identifying and developing ways to resolve problems or cope with issues which directly affect the accomplishment of principal program goals and objectives. Some employees develop new ways to resolve major administrative problems or plan the most significant administrative management aspects of professional or scientific programs. Some employees at this level develop administrative regulations or guidelines for the conduct of program operations, while others develop new criteria for measuring program accomplishments and the extent to which program goals and objectives are attained. Study reports typically contain findings and recommendations of major significance to management of the agency, and often serve as the basis for new administrative systems, legislation, regulations, or programs. Typical of work products prepared by employees at this level are complete decision packages, staff studies, and recommendations which upon implementation would significantly change major administrative aspects of missions and programs, or substantially affect the quality and quantity of benefits and services provided to the agency's clients.

Level 5-5 is not met. While the appellant's work may significantly alter aspects of the overall training program, such as the technology used to deliver training to dispersed units, the focus of his work is the training mission of the school, not the overall training of special warfare units throughout the Army. For example, the distance learning study evaluated the technology by which the school can deliver training to dispersed units, and related only to training delivery, not the content of that training. Consequently, the

scope and impact of the appellant's work falls short of that described at Level 5-5, and this level is not creditable.

Level 5-4 is credited, for 225 points.

Factor 6 - Personal Contacts and Factor 7 - Purpose of Contacts :

These factors measure the nature and purpose of face-to-face contacts and telephone dialogue with persons not in the supervisory chain. The same contacts must serve as the basis for the level selected under both factors.

Personal Contacts:

At Level 2, contacts are with employees, supervisors, and managers of the same agency, but outside the immediate office, or employees and representatives of private concerns in a moderately structured setting. The Primary Standard describes contacts in a moderately structured setting as those established on a routine basis, usually at the employee's work place; the exact purpose of the contact may be unclear at first to one or more of the parties; and one or more of the parties may be uninformed concerning the role and authority of the other participants.

Level 2 is met. The appellant's personal contacts are largely with persons in the same command to obtain information or to provide recommendations, and occasionally with persons outside the command who can provide information to the appellant necessary to the completion of his assignments.

At Level 3, contacts are with persons outside the agency which may include consultants, contractors, or business executives in a moderately unstructured setting. This level may also include contacts with the head of the employing agency or program officials several managerial levels removed from the employee when such contacts occur on an ad hoc basis. The Primary Standard describes contacts in a moderately unstructured setting as those not established on a routine basis; the purpose and extent of each contact is different; and the role and authority of each party is identified and developed during the course of the contact.

Level 3 is not met. Although the appellant occasionally has personal contacts outside the command, those contacts are typically established with individuals who have information needed by the appellant, and occur on a more routine basis and in a more structured setting than is depicted at Level 3. Consequently, the intent of this level is not met and is not creditable.

This factor is evaluated at Level 2.

Purpose of Contacts:

At Level c, the purpose of contacts is to influence managers or other officials to accept and implement findings and recommendations on organizational improvement or program effectiveness. The employee may encounter resistance due to such issues as organizational conflict, competing objectives, or resource problems.

Level c is met. The appellant's personal contacts are made to obtain information or to provide recommendations to management which may not be readily accepted, especially in those situations where significant changes in current operations are recommended. This meets the intent of Level c, and that level is creditable.

At Level d, contacts are made to justify or settle matters involving significant or controversial issues; e.g., recommendations affecting major programs, dealing with substantial expenditures, or significantly changing the nature and scope of organizations.

Level d is not met. Although the appellant's recommendations may result in changes in operations or the expenditure of funds, there is no indication that his contacts are made to *justify or settle* such issues, but are made to recommend actions to management which may or may not be accepted. The intent of Level d is not met and that level cannot be credited.

This factor is evaluated at Level c.

According to the matrix on page 25 of the guide, the combination of personal contacts at Level 2 and the purpose of contacts at Level c equates to 145 points.

Factor 8 - Physical Demands:

This factor measures the requirements and physical demands placed on the employee in performing the work assignment, including the agility and dexterity required, and the extent of physical exertion.

At Level 8-1, the work is primarily sedentary, although some slight physical effort may be required. At Level 8-2, assignments regularly involve long periods of standing, bending, and stooping to observe and study work operations in an industrial, storage, or comparable work area.

Level 8-1 is met. The appellant's work involves limited physical effort typical of positions which function primarily in an office environment with some requirement for travel and observation of work operations in other locations. While these travel and work observation responsibilities may require a level of physical effort which exceeds that commonly referred to as sedentary, there is no indication in the appeal record that

the appellant is subjected to prolonged standing, bending, stooping, or other types of physical exertion comparable to Level 8-2.

Level 8-1 is credited, for 5 points.

Factor 9 - Work Environment:

This factor considers the risks and discomforts in the employee's physical surroundings, and the safety precautions required.

At Level 9-1, work is typically performed in an adequately lighted and climate controlled office, and may require occasional travel. At Level 9-2, assignments regularly require visits to manufacturing, storage, or other industrial areas, and involve moderate risks or discomforts which require the use of protective clothing and gear and the observance of safety precautions.

Level 9-1 is met. The appellant's work is performed in a school and office environment which involves surroundings such as those described at Level 9-1. There is no evidence in the appeal record that the appellant is regularly exposed to work environments comparable to those described at Level 9-2, or that the use of protective gear and clothing is required to perform his assigned duties.

Level 9-1 is credited, for 5 points.

SUMMARY		
FACTOR	LEVEL	POINTS
1. Knowledge Required By The Position	1-7	1250
2. Supervisory Controls	2-4	450
3. Guidelines	3-3	275
4. Complexity	4-4	225
5. Scope and Effect	5-4	225
6. Personal Contacts and 7. Purpose of Contacts	2c	145
8. Physical Demands	8-1	5
9. Work Environment	9-1	5
	TOTAL	2580

A total of 2580 points falls within the range for a GS-11, 2355 to 2750 points, according to the Grade Conversion Table in the Administrative Analysis Grade Evaluation Guide.

Decision

This position is properly classified as Program Analyst, GS-343-11. This decision constitutes a classification certificate issued under the authority of section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code. This certificate is mandatory and binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting officials of the Government.