

U.S. Office of Personnel Management  
Office of Merit Systems Oversight and Effectiveness  
Classification Appeals and FLSA Programs

Atlanta Oversight Division  
75 Spring Street, SW., Suite 972  
Atlanta, GA 30303-3109

<b>Classification Appeal Decision</b> <b>Under Section 5112 of Title 5, United States Code</b>	
<b>Appellant:</b>	[Appellant]
<b>Agency classification:</b>	Administrative Officer GS-0341-12
<b>Organization:</b>	[Division] [Installation] [Region] National Park Service Department of the Interior [Location]
<b>OPM decision:</b>	Administrative Officer GS-0341-12
<b>OPM decision number:</b>	C-0341-12-05

          (s)            
Timothy Heath  
Classification Appeals Officer

          5/25/01            
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]

Personnel Management Specialist  
National Park Service  
[Installation]  
[Location]

Director of Personnel  
U.S. Department of Interior  
Mail Stop 5221  
1849 C Street, NW.  
Washington, DC 20240

## **Introduction**

On March 19, 2001, the Atlanta Oversight Division, U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM), accepted an appeal for the position of Administrative Officer, GS-0341-12, [Division], [Installation], [Region], National Park Service, Department of the Interior, [Location]. The appellant is requesting that her position be classified as Administrative Officer, GS-0341-13.

The appeal was 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.

## **General issues**

The appellant does not believe her position has been given adequate credit for the breadth of advisory services she provides, the size of the serviced population, nor the number of authorities delegated to the position.

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 and her supervisor.

## **Position information**

The appellant is assigned to position description number [Number]. The appellant, the supervisor, and the agency have certified the accuracy of the position description.

The appellant is responsible for providing administrative services (e.g., budgeting and financial management, information management, and human resources management) to the [Installation], which has 90 permanent full-time employees. In addition, she provides partial administrative services to the [Program Manager] and the [Project Director]; advisory service on human resources management matters to three additional parks with a total work force of 91 permanent full-time employees; and contracting support service (above \$100,000 and not exceeding \$1,000,000) to the [Parks], which have 55 full-time permanent employees.

The appellant supervises the staff of the [Installation] Administrative Division. She is the first level supervisor over one Contract Specialist, GS-1102-12; one Budget Analyst, GS-560-11; one Personnel Management Specialist, GS-201-11; one Administrative Assistant, GS-303-7; one Staff Support Assistant, GS-326-5; and one Secretary, GS-318-5.

The appellant reports to the Park Superintendent. She independently plans, designs, and carries out the work to be done. Completed assignments are considered technically authoritative and accepted without significant changes.

### **Series and title determination**

The appellant does not contest the agency determination of the title and series of the position. We agree with the agency determination that the appellant's position is properly classified as an Administrative Officer, GS-0341.

### **Standard determination**

Administrative Officer Series, GS-0341, dated August 1966 and February 1968.  
General Schedule Supervisory Guide, dated April 1993.

### **Grade determination**

The Administrative Officer Series standard does not include grade-level criteria. Rather, the standard instructs that these positions be evaluated using the standards for the various kinds of work related to the major duties or functions, depending on what aspects of a particular position are predominant and/or represent the highest grade level of work performed. Guidance provided in the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards states that for those positions that involve performing different kinds of work, an individual category of work or type of function may be considered grade-controlling only if it is performed for at least 25 percent of the time and if the duties are a regular and recurring part of the job. Since the appellant's position requires her to perform non-supervisory duties only 15 percent of the time, and supervisory duties 85 percent of the time, the position must be evaluated using the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG).

The GSSG provides evaluation criteria for determining the grade level of supervisory positions in grades GS-5 through GS-15. This guide uses a factor-point method that assesses six factors: program scope and effect, organizational setting, supervisory and managerial authority exercised, personal contacts, difficulty of typical work directed, and other conditions. The appellant disagrees with the agency evaluation of Factors 1 and 3. She does not contest the agency evaluation of Factors 2, 4, 5, and 6. Based on our review of these factors, we agree with the agency determination. Accordingly, we will limit our discussion to Factors 1 and 3.

#### *Factor 1, Program Scope and Effect:*

This factor assesses the general complexity, breadth, and impact of the program areas and work directed, including organizational and geographic coverage. It also assesses the impact of the work within and outside the immediate organization and the geographic coverage. To credit a particular factor level, the criteria for both scope and effect must be met. The agency evaluated this factor at Level 1-2, while the appellant believes the factor should be credited at Level 1-3.

a. *Scope*

This element addresses the general complexity and breadth of: (1) the program (or program segment) directed; and (2) the work directed, the products produced, or the services delivered. The geographic and organizational coverage of the program (or program segment) within the agency structure is addressed under this element.

Level 1-2 describes a program segment or work directed that 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.

The appellant's duties meet level 1-2. She is responsible for providing the full spectrum of administrative services to the [Installation]; personnel services, excluding classification, to employees at the [Parks] and the [Historical Site]; and contracting and acquisition support services to the [Parks]. Finally, she provides some administrative services to the [Program Manager] and the [Project Director]. The total population of employees serviced by the appellant's office is 238.

Level 1-3 describes directing a program segment that performs technical, administrative, protective, investigative, or professional work. The program segment and the work directed typically have coverage that encompasses a major metropolitan area, a state, or a small region of several states; or, when most of an area's taxpayers or businesses are covered, comparable to a small city. Providing complex administrative or technical or professional services directly affecting a large or complex multi-mission military installation (i.e., a total serviced employee-equivalent population exceeding 4000 and engaged in a variety of serviced technical functions) also falls at this level.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 1-3. The *Scope* of work the appellant directs is administrative and directly affects employees at several different parks located in the state of [State]; however, it does not fully meet all aspects of this factor level. For example, according to the GSSG, positions at Level 1-3 direct administrative services that support and directly affect the operations of an entire bureau or a major military command headquarters. Providing administrative services to 238 employees at five parks in one state is not equal to being responsible for providing the same type services to an entire bureau of an agency and does not meet the intent of Level 1-3.

Level 1-2 is credited for Scope.

b. *Effect*

Effect addresses the impact of the work, the products, and/or the programs described under scope on the mission and programs of the customer, the activity, other activities in or out of government, the agency, other agencies, the general public, or others.

At Level 1-2, the services or products support and significantly affect installation level, area office level, or field office operations and objectives, or comparable program segments; or 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. For example, at this level the employee directs budget, management, staffing, payroll, or similar services which support a small military base (with no extensive research, development, testing, or comparable missions), a typical national park, a hospital, or a nondefense agency field office of moderate size and limited complexity.

The appellant's position meets Level 1-2. The *Effect* of the administrative services directed by the appellant supports and significantly affects the [Installation] and the other four parks that receive partial administrative support.

At Level 1-3, 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, or the general public. At the field activity level (involving large, complex, multimission organizations and/or very large serviced populations), the work directly involves or substantially impacts the provision of essential support operations to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, and administrative functions.

The appellant's position does not meet the criteria at Level 1-3. The appellant's organization provides full administrative services to the employees of the [Installation] and partial administrative services to four other parks. The work directly affects the employees and managers of the five parks; however, the work does not have a direct and significant impact on activities of the National Park Service as a whole, the work of other agencies, the operation of outside interests (e.g., a segment of a regulated industry), or the general public. The appellant's work does not have the wide reaching affect described at Level 1-3.

The appellant believes her position should be credited with affecting the nearly 4 million visitors that come to the five different parks annually. However, we may consider only the population directly and significantly serviced by a program. The illustrations and the discussions in the GSSG all indicate that in evaluating magnitude, only the population directly and significantly serviced by the program (i.e., the 238 employees serviced) may be considered. It is this population that has a major and direct affect on the difficulty and complexity of a supervisor's work.

Level 1-2 is credited for *Effect*.

Since the appellant's work meets Level 1-2 for *Scope* and Level 1-2 for *Effect*, this factor is credited at Level 1-2 for 350 points.

*Factor 3, Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised:*

This factor covers the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities that are 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. Levels

under this factor apply equally to the direction of specialized program management organizations, line functions, staff functions, and operating and support activities. Where authority is duplicated or not significantly differentiated among several organizational levels, a factor level may apply to positions at more than one organizational level. The agency evaluated this factor at Level 3-2c, while the appellant believes the factor should be credited at Level 3-3b.

Level 3-2 describes three situations, any one of which meets this level. The first situation (a) relates to planning and scheduling production-oriented work. The second situation (b) relates to supervising work that is contracted out. Neither of these situations applies to the appellant's position. Even though [Installation] has a computer services contract with a private sector company, the appellant does not have a supervisory relationship (e.g., she does not discipline, approve leave, identify training needs, etc.) with the one contract employee who performs the work on a part-time basis.

At Level 3-2c the supervisor exercises most of the usual authorities associated with first-level supervision such as planning work to be accomplished by subordinates, setting and adjusting short-term priorities, evaluating work performance of subordinates, and effecting minor disciplinary measures.

The appellant's position meets Level 3-2c. Consistent with the factor-level description, the appellant has authority to plan work to be accomplished by subordinates, assign work to subordinates, evaluate work of subordinates, advise on administrative matters, interview candidates for positions within the organizational unit she supervises, resolve complaints from subordinates, effect minor disciplinary measures, identify developmental needs of subordinates, effect measures to improve work productivity and quality, and develop performance standards.

At Level 3-3, supervisors typically exercise managerial authorities over lower organizational units and subordinate supervisors or leaders, or have second-level authority and responsibility. At Level 3-3, the supervisor must meet one of two conditions. To meet the first condition the supervisor must exercise 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. This level essentially concerns managerial positions closely involved with high level program officials (or comparable agency level staff personnel) in the development of overall goals and objectives. Managers at this level typically direct the development of data to track program goals, secure legal opinions, prepare position papers or legislative proposals, or comparable objectives.

The appellant's position lacks significant responsibility in these areas and does not meet Level 3-3a. The appellant does not have delegated supervisory or managerial authority over subordinate programs nor does she develop the type of long-range program plans or have the degree of overall program responsibility depicted at Level 3-3a.

To meet the second condition (b), the supervisor, in addition to exercising the authorities and responsibilities described at Level 3-2c, must meet at least 8 in a list of 15 criteria that establish a level of authority significantly higher than Level 3-2c.

This position does not meet Level 3-3b. This level is intended to credit supervisors who direct at least two or more employees who are officially recognized as subordinate supervisors, leaders, or comparable personnel. Further, the supervisor's subordinate organization must be so large and its work so complex that it requires using those two or more subordinate supervisors or comparable personnel. The appellant does not supervise subordinate supervisors. In addition, she meets only five of the 15 authorities and responsibilities of this factor level (2, 7, 13, 14, and 15).

This factor is credited at Level 3-2c for 450 points.

<b>SUMMARY</b>		
<b>FACTOR</b>	<b>LEVEL</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
1. Program Scope and Effect	1-2	350
2. Organizational Setting	2-2	250
3. Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised	3-2	450
4. Personal Contacts		
A. Nature of Contacts	4A-2	50
B. Purpose of Contacts	4B-2	75
5. Difficulty of Typical Work Directed	5-6	800
6. Other Conditions	6-4	1120
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3095</b>

A total of 3095 points equates to GS-12, 2755 to 3150 points, according to the point-to-grade conversion chart in the GSSG.

### **Decision**

Duties evaluated by use of the GSSG equate to the GS-12 level. The supervisory duties require 85 percent of the appellant's time and are grade-controlling; therefore, this position is properly classified as Administrative Officer, GS-341-12.