

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

Dallas Oversight Division
1100 Commerce Street, Room 4C22
Dallas, TX 75242-1027

Classification Appeal Decision
Under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code

Appellant: [appellant's name]

Agency classification: DCPS Civilian Payroll Manager
GM-501-13

Organization: Civilian Pay Division
Civilian Pay Operations
Pay Operations
Military and Civilian Pay Services
Defense Finance and Accounting Service
Department of Defense
[location]

OPM decision: GS-501-11
title at agency discretion

OPM decision number: C-0501-11-04

This decision was reopened, reconsidered, and overturned by OPM decision number C-0501-12-02, dated May 9, 2003.

/s/ Bonnie J. Brandon

Bonnie J. Brandon
Classification Appeals Officer

March 29, 2002

Date

As provided in section 511.612 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), 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).

Since this decision lowers the grade of the appealed position, it is to be effective no later than the beginning of the sixth pay period after the date of this decision, as permitted by 5 CFR 511.702. The appellant's human resources office must submit a compliance report containing the corrected position description and a Standard Form 50 showing the personnel action taken. The report must be submitted within 30 days from the effective date of the personnel action.

The human resources office must also determine if the appellant is entitled to grade or pay retention, or both, under sections 5362 and 5363 of title 5, United States Code, and 5 CFR 536. If the appellant is entitled to grade retention, the two-year retention period begins on the date this decision is implemented.

Decision sent to:

[appellant's name and address]

[appellant's immediate human resources unit]

Deputy Director
Human Resources Deputate
Defense Finance and Accounting Service
1931 Jefferson Davis Highway, Room 312
Arlington, Virginia 22240-5291

Chief, Classification Appeals Adjudication Section
Civilian Personnel Management Service
Department of Defense
1400 Key Boulevard, Suite B-200
Arlington, Virginia 22209-5144

Introduction

On April 20, 2001, the Dallas Oversight Division of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a classification appeal from [the appellant]. The appellant's position is currently classified as Defense Civilian Pay Systems (DCPS) Civilian Payroll Manager, GM-501-13. The appellant believes the position should be classified at the grade 14 level. The appellant serves as the deputy to the DCPS Civilian Payroll Manager, GS-501-14, in the Civilian Pay Division, Civilian Pay Operations, Pay Operations, Military and Civilian Pay Services, Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS), Department of Defense, [location]. We have accepted and decided this appeal under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.).

On May 30, 2001, we received the agency's initial administrative report which did not include a comprehensive evaluation statement for the GS-14 DCPS Civilian Payroll Manager position. Consequently, we asked DFAS headquarters to provide supplemental information regarding its analysis of the division chief position (for purposes of this decision, we refer to the GS-14 position as the division chief position). That information is critical in evaluating the deputy division chief position. We received information from DFAS headquarters on September 24, 2001. While waiting for the additional information, we conducted a telephone audit with the appellant on August 15, 2001, and a telephone interview with his immediate supervisor, the division chief, on August 20, 2001. On October 12, 2001, we conducted an on-site audit with the appellant and also interviewed the Director of Civilian Pay Operations (the immediate supervisor for the division chief position) since the appellant's division chief had moved in September 2001 to another position within the agency. Because of anticipated reductions in force at the appellant's installation, the agency filled the division chief position on a temporary basis and had the appellant reporting temporarily to the Director of Civilian Pay Operations. However, the appellant continued to be in the deputy division chief position and was not serving as the "deputy" to the Director of Civilian Pay Operations.

On March 25, 2002, we followed up with the appellant on the status of the reductions in force and a proposed restructuring in his organization that were pending at the time of our on-site visit. The appellant stated that the reductions did take place, but they had little effect on his organization. His organization lost between 12 to 15 staff members primarily through voluntary early retirements and voluntary separation incentives but gained 12 to 15 staff members from the organizations where the reductions occurred. The appellant also said that his organization combined its two processing branches into one. More information about the appellant's organization is provided under in the "Position information" section of this decision.

General issues

The appellant believes that his position should be at the grade 14 level, in part, because he has been the acting division chief when the division chief has been out of the office for a period of time (for example, on leave or on business travel) and when the division chief position has been vacant. A deputy who fully shares with the manager the direction of all phases of the organization's program and work would also be expected to serve as the acting manager when that manager is absent, for example, on extended leave, on temporary duty away from the organization, or when the position is temporarily vacant. Acting duties are fully considered in

establishing the function of a deputy and are critical in supporting the grade of the deputy position. Since the appellant serves as a full deputy, carrying out the division chief's duties and responsibilities when that person is absent from the division is inherent in the deputy's role.

In his appeal, the appellant raised the issue of classification consistency of deputy division chief positions for civilian, military, and annuity pay within DFAS. By law, OPM must classify positions solely by comparing their current duties and responsibilities to the criteria specified in the appropriate OPM position classification standard or guide (5 U.S.C. 5106, 5107, and 5112). The law does not authorize use of other methods, such as comparison to other positions that may or may not have been classified correctly. Consequently, we cannot compare the appellant's position to others as a basis for deciding his appeal.

Like OPM, the appellant's agency must classify positions based on comparison to OPM standards and guidelines. However, the agency also has primary responsibility for ensuring its positions are classified consistently with OPM appeal decisions. If the appellant considers his position so similar to others that they warrant the same classification, he may pursue the matter by writing to his agency's human resources headquarters. He should specify the precise organizational location, classification, duties, and responsibilities of the positions in question. If the positions are found to be basically the same as the appealed position, the agency must correct the classification of the positions to be consistent with this appeal decision. Otherwise, the agency should explain to the appellant the difference between the appealed position and the others.

Position information

Organizationally, the agency uses the title of Deputy Director for its division chief positions and the title of Assistant Deputy for the deputy division chief positions. We found, however, that the position of Deputy Director for the Civilian Pay Division, the appellant's division chief, does not serve as either a full deputy or alter ego to the Director of Civilian Pay Operations.

Although physically located in [city], the Director of Civilian Pay Operations is responsible for civilian pay functions at DFAS Civilian Pay Divisions located in [three cities]. The appellant serves as a full deputy to the division chief for the Civilian Pay Division in [city]. On April 30, 2001, the appellant and the division chief certified to the accuracy of the appellant's position description [number], a standard position description used within DFAS.

At the time of our on-site visit, the Civilian Pay Division [at the appellant's location] had about 90 employees. The Division included two processing branches (later combined into one branch after the reductions in force) and one support branch. The branches are further organized into units. The Division had three GS-12 supervisors, six GS-11 supervisors, and a few GS-8 leaders. The majority of the remaining staff members were GS-7 technicians. The Division also had about 15 contractor employees who primarily performed lower-graded mailroom duties.

The division chief position is responsible for the full range of pay processing functions for approximately 250,000 civilian employees in the Army, Air Force, Navy, and other Department of Defense components. These functions include basic payroll services, retirement processing,

debt management, Federal employee health benefits reconciliation, quality assurance reviews, and other functions associated with civilian pay. A brief description of the major duties of the division chief position follows.

- Provide managerial guidance and technical oversight, expertise, and administration to ensure that payroll processing services are provided to Defense civilian employees and related employing activities. Ensure the maintenance of civilian employee leave and pay records and preparation of employee gross-to-net salary, employee deductions, and employer contribution payments for disbursement. Provide or oversee the provision of daily, weekly, and biweekly cost accounting and biweekly pay data to the various accounting systems.
- Ensure the provision of effective administrative management services to meet the needs of customers. Advise and consult with customers regarding all aspects of payroll related data available and provide managerial and technical expertise in accounting and disbursing functional interrelationships with payroll.
- Interpret DFAS and local policies and procedures and advise higher level officials on implications of proposed actions. Serve as technical representative and focal point for making DFAS's civilian pay policy and procedures known to a substantial number of civilian employees.
- Analyze, either personally or through subordinate supervisors, fund allocations, staff year usage, workload indicators, travel usage, and other similar indicators to provide continuous review of workload and staffing patterns to identify organization problems and make recommendations for changes in resource allocations.
- Assign work, establish guidelines and objectives, make decisions on unusually complex work problems, evaluate and rate employee performance, resolve grievances, provide for staff development, select new employees, recommend promotions and meritorious awards, and recommend disciplinary actions.
- Serve as a voting member of the DCPS governing body that approves and decides priorities for all DCPS changes (for example, regulatory changes, conversions, modifications, enhancements).
- Represent the agency at conferences or symposiums relating to civilian pay, including the dissemination or discussion of DFAS policy and procedures as they relate to serviced employees and activities.

Series, title, and guide determination

The appellant does not dispute the series and title for his position or his agency's use of the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG) to evaluate the grade of the position. We concur that the appellant's position is properly placed in the GS-501 Financial Administration and Program Series. Since no titles are prescribed for the GS-501 series, the agency may construct

an appropriate title following the instructions in the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards*. We also agree that the GSSG is appropriate for determination of the grade level for the appellant's position.

Grade determination

The GSSG indicates that the evaluation criteria are not designed to be applied directly to deputy positions. Consequently, the grade of the appellant's position must be based on an initial evaluation of the duties and responsibilities of the division chief position. The GSSG also states that the grade of a full deputy should normally be one grade lower than the grade of the supervisory duties of the position to which it reports. The GSSG does not permit assigning the deputy position at the same grade level as the chief position.

The GSSG anticipates that a chief position, which has a deputy, is in charge of a staff of substantial size and, often, multiple subordinate units. Such chief positions require deputies who act in their stead because of the decisions that must be made, the employees who must be supervised, and the volume of work which is produced. The GSSG defines "deputy" as a position that serves as an alter ego to a manager of high rank or level and either fully shares with the manager the direction of all phases of the organization's program and work, or is assigned continuing responsibility for managing a major part of the manager's program when the total authority and responsibility for the organization is equally divided between the manager and the deputy. A deputy's opinion or direction is treated as if given by the chief.

As previously indicated, our fact-finding confirmed that the appellant and the division chief do share in the supervision and management of the civilian payroll services in a manner consistent with the GSSG's definition of deputy positions. Consequently, we will determine the proper grade of the appellant's position by first determining the correct grade of the division chief position. The grade of the appellant's position will then be placed one grade lower than the division chief position.

The GSSG uses a point-factor evaluation approach with six evaluation factors designed specifically for supervisory positions. If one level of a factor or element is exceeded but the next higher level is not met, the lower level must be credited. The total points accumulated under all factors are then converted to a grade by using the point-to-grade conversion table in the GSSG.

The appellant disagrees with his agency's assignment of the levels for Factors 1 and 6. After careful review of the information provided by the appellant and his agency and the information we obtained through the audit and interviews, we disagree with the agency's assignment of levels for Factors 1, 3, and 6. We concur with the agency's assignment of levels for Factors 2, 4, and 5. We will therefore discuss those factors briefly, while discussing Factors 1, 3, and 6 more thoroughly. Our evaluation with respect to the six factors follows.

Factor 1, Program scope and effect

This factor assesses the general complexity, breadth, and impact of the program areas and work directed, including the organizational and geographic coverage. It also assesses the impact of the

work both within and outside the immediate organization. To credit a particular factor level, the criteria for both scope and effect must be met.

The agency initially evaluated this factor at Level 1-4. In the supplemental information provided in September 2001, the agency reevaluated this factor at Level 1-3. The appellant believes that Level 1-5 is appropriate.

The appellant has taken the criteria for Level 1-5 out of context and not considered the inherent inner-factor relationships that clearly exist within the GSSG between Factors 1, 5 (difficulty of typical work directed), and 6 (difficulty and complexity of carrying out supervisory duties, authorities, and responsibilities). To meet the intent of Level 1-5, a position would direct a program for which both the scope and effect of the program or organization would be equivalent to nationwide, agencywide, industrywide, or governmentwide and the position would require significant and extensive coordination of a high base level of work in professional, scientific, technical, managerial, or administrative occupations. As discussed under Factors 5 and 6 of this decision, the typical work directed by the civilian payroll division chief position is GS-7 assistance work. The civilian payroll division chief position does not direct a program with the scope and impact envisioned at Level 1-5.

Scope

This element addresses the general complexity and breadth of the program (or program segment) directed, the work directed, the products produced, or the services delivered. The geographic and organization coverage of the program (or program segment) within the agency structure is included under this element.

At Level 1-2, the program segment or work directed 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.

At Level 1-3, the supervisor directs a program segment that performs technical, administrative, protective, investigative, or professional work. The program segment and work directed typically have coverage which 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, coverage comparable to a small city. Illustrative of this level are positions that direct administrative services which support and directly affect bureau operations or a group of organizations which, as a whole, are comparable.

The division chief position does not meet Level 1-3 in terms of the complexity of the work directed. That is, the work is not technical, protective, investigative, or professional work; instead, the work directed is primarily clerical and assistance work. Although the division staff provide advice and assistance to time and attendance clerks and technicians, payroll technicians, and customer service representatives at various Defense installations, the division chief position is responsible for directing only the work of the division staff [at the appellant's location].

Although the civilian payroll division [at the appellant's location] provides an integral part of the agency's program, the agency's complex technical and administrative field work is vested in other field operating components. The division chief position meets the intent of Level 1-3 in terms of geographic coverage of the program since the division provides payroll services for about 250,000 civilian employees throughout the United States and at various locations outside of the United States. The size of the serviced population is the equivalent of a small city or a portion of a large metropolitan area as illustrated for Level 1-3. Since the position meets Level 1-3 only for geographic coverage, and does not meet the other aspects of *Scope* at that level, Level 1-2 is credited.

Effect

This element addresses the impact of the work, the products, and/or the programs described under *Scope* on the mission and programs of the customer(s), 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.

At Level 1-3, activities, functions, or services accomplished directly and significantly affect a wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, 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 affects the provision of essential support operations to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, and administrative functions.

In contrast to Level 1-3, the civilian payroll services provided by the division chief's organization are more limited than mission-supporting services that directly affect a group of activities that includes complex professional and administrative functions as well as complex, diverse technical functions. Even though the division chief position oversees civilian payroll accounts of employees in seven different Defense agencies, neither the payroll services nor the advice and assistance provided by the division significantly and directly affect the mission work of those agencies as envisioned at Level 1-3. Further, the civilian payroll services overseen by the division chief do not substantially affect a wide range of agency activities as described at Level 1-3. Accordingly, Level 1-2 is assigned for *Effect*.

Level 1-2 (350 points) is assigned since the division chief position does not fully meet both *Scope* and *Effect* at Level 1-3.

Factor 2, Organizational setting

This factor considers the organizational situation of the supervisory position in relation to higher levels of management. As at Level 2-2, the division chief position is accountable to a position that is one reporting level below the first Senior Executive Service level.

Level 2-2 (250 points) is assigned.

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.

The appellant does not disagree with the agency's assignment of Level 3-4 for this factor. However, we determined that the division chief position is properly evaluated at Level 3-3b.

Level 3-3a is appropriate for positions that 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. In addition, positions at this level assure implementation (by lower and subordinate organizational units or others) of the goals and objectives of the program segment(s) or function(s) they oversee. They determine goals and objectives that need additional emphasis, determine the best approach or solution for resolving budget shortages, and plan for long-range staffing needs, including such matters as whether to contract out work. These positions are closely involved with high-level program officials (or comparable agency-level staff personnel) in the development of overall goals and objectives for assigned staff functions(s), program(s), or program segment(s). For example, they direct development of data, provide expertise and insights, secure legal opinions, prepare position papers or legislative proposals, and execute comparable activities that support development of goals and objectives related to high levels of program management and development or formulation.

Our fact-finding disclosed that the position description for the division chief position does not accurately state the managerial authority for that position. Although the position description indicates that the position has the authority to set a series of annual, multiyear, or long-range work plans; to determine the best approach or solution for resolving budget shortages; and to plan for long-range staffing needs, such activities are not an integral part of the division chief's managerial responsibility. While the division chief provides input or recommendations on such matters, the program decisions are made at higher levels within the agency. Typically, the division chief does not plan more than one year ahead. Further, the division chief is not as closely involved with high-level agency officials in the establishment of overall goals and objectives for the civilian payroll function as envisioned at Level 3-3a where a position is involved in the agency's overall program development and program activities. The division chief position is not responsible for managing the scale and scope of functions required for crediting Level 3-3a to the position.

Level 3-3b involves the exercise of a range of supervisory authorities and responsibilities that exceed those normally exercised by a first-line supervisor. At Level 3-3b, the supervisor exercises all or nearly all of the supervisory authorities normally delegated to a full first-level supervisor as described at Level 3-2c in the GSSG and, in addition, at least 8 of the 15 responsibilities described at Level 3-3b.

The division chief position meets 11 of the 15 responsibilities.

- Responsibility 1 is met because the division chief uses subordinate supervisors and leaders to direct, coordinate, and oversee work.
- Responsibility 2 is met because the division chief exercises significant responsibilities in dealing with officials of other units and organizations. For example, the division chief receives calls directly from base commanders, wing commanders, the commanders' executive officers, and base comptrollers about civilian pay problems. The division chief also attends meetings with headquarters staff regarding policy issues and deals with the agency's legal staff for interpretation of or clearance on legal matters.
- Responsibility 3 is met because the division chief ensures equity of performance standards and rating techniques developed by subordinates. For example, the division has developed its own performance standards.
- Responsibility 4 is met because the division chief maintains the multimillion dollar annual operating budget (about \$9 million) for the civilian payroll function [at the appellant's location].
- Responsibility 5 is met in that the division chief makes decisions on work problems presented by subordinate supervisors.
- Responsibility 6 is met since the division chief is the approving official for evaluations of subordinate supervisors.
- Responsibility 7 is met because the division chief has the authority to make selections for subordinate nonsupervisory positions.
- Responsibility 8 is met since the division chief has the authority to make selections for subordinate supervisory positions and leaders.
- Responsibility 9 is met because the division chief hears and attempts to resolve all complaints and grievances regardless of seriousness.
- Responsibility 10 is met because the division chief has final authority to take disciplinary actions, for example, suspensions of employees.
- Responsibility 11 is not fully met since there is no evidence that the division chief makes decisions on nonroutine, costly, or controversial training needs for employees of the division. Most of the training for the division staff is provided on the job. Funds for travel for training purposes are limited and are controlled by headquarters personnel.
- Responsibility 12 is not met. This responsibility applies to supervisory and managerial positions that oversee organizations in which contractors perform a significant amount of line work. As previously stated, the few contractors in the division perform primarily mailroom work, which is not the line work of the division.
- Responsibility 13 is met since the division chief approves within-grade increases, extensive overtime (limited only by budget), and travel within the United States.
- Responsibility 14 is not fully met. The division chief has the authority to approve awards (up to \$1,500). There is no evidence that recommendations for substantive changes in position classification could reasonably be expected to change the standard position descriptions that are used for the division employees.
- Responsibility 15 is not fully met. This responsibility applies to supervisory and managerial positions that oversee organizations with workloads so large and complex that they require attention to team building or comparable methodological or structural improvements. The division's efforts to improve operations by moving staff members

within the office so that the teams could be together meet the description at Level 3-2c where supervisors find ways to improve production or increase the quality of the work directed.

Level 3-4 may be considered only after it is established that the position involves responsibilities that are equivalent to or exceed all of those described in both paragraphs a and b of Level 3-3, that is, both the managerial and supervisory responsibilities depicted at Level 3-3. The division chief position is not delegated supervisory and managerial authority that involves all of those authorities described in both Level 3-3a and 3-3b. Therefore, there is no need to evaluate the position against Level 3-4a or 3-4b criteria since the position fails to meet the minimum criteria for Level 3-4.

Level 3-3b (775 points) is assigned.

Factor 4, Personal contacts

This is a two-part factor which assesses the nature and purpose of personal contacts related to supervisory and managerial responsibilities. Subfactor 4A covers the organizational relationships, authority or influence level, setting, and difficulty of preparation associated with making personal contacts involved in supervisory and managerial work. Subfactor 4B covers the purpose of the personal contacts, including the advisory, representational, negotiating, and commitment making responsibilities related to supervision and management.

Subfactor 4A, Nature of contacts

This subfactor covers the organizational relationships, authority or influence level, setting, and difficulty of preparation associated with making personal contacts involved in supervisory and managerial work. To be credited, the level of contacts must contribute to the successful performance of the work, be a recurring requirement, have a demonstrable impact on the difficulty and responsibility of the position, and require direct contact.

The division chief position meets and does not exceed Level 4A-3 where contacts typically are with high ranking military or civilian managers, supervisors, leaders, and technical staff at bureau and major organization levels of the agency, and agency headquarters administrative support staff. Contacts take place in planned meetings and often require extensive preparation or technical familiarity with complex subject matter.

Level 4A-3 (75 points) is assigned.

Subfactor 4B, Purpose of contacts

This subfactor covers the purpose of the personal contacts credited under Subfactor 4A, including the advisory, representational, negotiating, and commitment-making responsibilities related to supervision and management.

Level 4B-3 requires justifying, defending, or negotiating on behalf of the organization with the necessary level of authority to commit resources and gain compliance with established policies of the organization. Contacts usually involve active participation in conferences, meetings, or presentations involving problems of considerable consequences.

The division chief position meets and does not exceed Level 4B-3. The division chief must negotiate, defend, justify, or resolve management matters involving issues such as modification of automated systems, implementation of agencywide operational changes, and changes in agency policy. The position also has the responsibility and authority to commit resources for the division [at the appellant's location] and to obtain compliance with policies and procedures relating to civilian pay. The division chief participates in conferences and meetings concerning civilian pay matters.

Level 4B-3 (100 points) is assigned.

Factor 5, Difficulty of typical work directed

This factor measures the difficulty and complexity of the basic work most typical of the organization directed, as well as other line, staff, or contracted work for which the supervisor has technical or oversight responsibility, either directly or through subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or others.

For purposes of this evaluation, we are accepting the agency's finding that GS-7 is the base level of the work directed by the division chief. By reference to the chart in the GSSG, Level 5-4 is credited if the highest level of base work is GS-7.

Level 5-4 (505 points) is assigned.

Factor 6, Other conditions

This factor measures the extent to which various conditions contribute to the difficulty and complexity of carrying out supervisory duties, authorities, and responsibilities. Conditions affecting work for which the supervisor is responsible may be considered if they increase the difficulty of carrying out assigned supervisory or managerial duties and responsibilities.

The agency assigned Level 6-4; the appellant believes that Level 6-5a should be assigned.

Under the GSSG, there is a direct linkage of the criteria for Factors 5 and 6. Factor 6 measures the extent to which various conditions contribute to the difficulty and complexity of carrying out supervisory duties, authorities, and responsibilities. The difficulty of work is measured primarily by the level of work credited under Factor 5. Complexity is measured by the level of coordination required, and it increases as the base level of work increases. Therefore, the starting point for Factor 6 is the base level of work granted under Factor 5. Since GS-7 is the base level of work credited under Factor 5 for the division chief position, we cannot consider either Level 6-4 or Level 6-5.

Level 6-2a pertains to supervision of technician or support work comparable in difficulty to the GS-7 or GS-8 level. The coordination required for Level 6-2a ensures consistency of product, service, interpretation, or advice and conformance with the output of other units, with formal standards, or agency policy.

Supervision at Level 6-3a requires coordination, integration, or consolidation of administrative, technical, or complex technician or other support comparable to the GS-9 or GS-10 level. Positions at Level 6-3b direct subordinate supervisors over positions in grades GS-7 or GS-8 which requires consolidation or coordination similar to that described for Level 6-2a within or among subordinate units or with outside units.

The division chief position matches Level 6-3 because it entails the direction of subordinate supervisors over positions in grades GS-7 or GS-8 where consolidation and coordination similar to Level 6-2a is required.

If Level 6-3 is selected, the GSSG indicates that the *Special Situations* section is to be used to determine if three or more of the eight situations are met. If at least three situations are met, another level may be added. The appellant believes that the division chief position meets the following three situations: fluctuating workforce or constantly changing deadlines, physical dispersion, and special staffing situations.

- *Fluctuating workforce or constantly changing deadlines.* This situation is credited when the workforce supervised by the position has large fluctuations in size and these fluctuations impose on the supervisor a substantially greater responsibility for training, adjusting assignments, or maintaining a smooth flow of work while absorbing and releasing employees. Credit may be given for constantly changing deadlines when frequent, abrupt, and unexpected changes in work assignments, goals, and deadlines require the supervisor constantly to adjust operations under the pressure of continuously changing and unpredictable conditions.

The appellant stated that the number of staff members in the division is always changing because of budget cuts. He also said that at one time the division hired 30 additional staff members and at another time the division lost 17 positions. Since July 2000, the authorized staffing level has been lowered by about 14 positions, according to information provided by the appellant and the division chief. There is no evidence that these workforce fluctuations have the impact on the division chief's managerial and supervisory demands equivalent to large fluctuations described in the GSSG, for example, large seasonal variations in the staff. Large fluctuations are typified by demanding and concentrated recruitment and related functions, extensive training or similar preparatory requirements, and planning for and implementing large scale staff losses. The division chief position is not faced with the large fluctuations in the workforce and associated responsibilities required to meet this situation.

The appellant indicated that the division is always "putting out fires." For example, they must constantly manipulate the automated system to process the payroll for the serviced organizations that have employees whose wages are negotiated. The Director of Civilian

Pay Operations also said the division will have a significant workload as the result of a lawsuit settlement for back pay going back 10 years. They will have to create accounts in the automated system for individuals who no longer work for Defense and will have to input each action for the former and current employees affected by the settlement. Although such changes affect the workload of the division, they do not meet the frequency, abruptness, and unexpected nature of changes required for crediting this situation.

- *Physical dispersion.* This situation is credited when a substantial portion of the workload for which the supervisor is responsible is regularly carried out at one or more locations which are physically removed from the main unit, under conditions which make day-to-day supervision difficult to administer.

The appellant believes that the physical dispersion of time and attendance payroll clerks and technicians and customer service representatives at various Defense installations throughout the United States increases the level of difficulty of the work that his division supervises. Although personnel at those installations input data into the pay systems, neither the division chief nor any of the other supervisors in the division provide direct supervision to those clerks, technicians, and customer service representatives. This situation cannot be credited to the division chief position because the workload for which that position is directly responsible is carried out at the [appellant's] site.

- *Special staffing situations.* This situation is credited when (1) a substantial portion of the workforce is regularly involved in special employment programs or in similar situations which require involvement with employee representatives to resolve difficult or complex human resources management issues and problems, (2) requirements for counseling and motivational activities are regular and recurring, and (3) job assignments, work tasks, working conditions, and/or training must be tailored to fit the special circumstances.

This situation is intended to recognize the heavy demands on the supervisor's time in dealing with difficult and complex human resource issues and problems. Both the appellant and the Director of Civilian Pay Operations indicated that morale has been low in the division because of an A-76 study that recently concluded after about four and a half years. The appellant stated that it has been difficult to motivate the employees and that he was constantly referring employees to the Employee Assistance Program because of additional stress caused by implications of the A-76 study. The appellant indicated that some employees had left the division because of potential downsizing. Even though morale may have been low and there may have been some turnover in staff, there is no indication that there were a large number of disciplinary, work performance, and counseling problems that placed heavy demands on the division chief position. Further, there is no evidence that the division has a substantial number of employees who are involved in special employment programs or similar situations and that work assignments, training, etc., must be tailored to fit the special circumstances. When viewed as a whole, the human resource management issues do not reflect the difficulty and complexity of staffing and related issues required to support crediting this situation.

We also determined that the division chief position does not meet any of the other five special situations (variety of work, shift operations, impact of specialized programs, changing technology, and special hazard and safety conditions). Therefore, Level 6-3 (975 points) is assigned.

Summary

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Points</i>
1. Program scope and effect	1-2	250
2. Organizational setting	2-2	350
3. Supervisory and managerial authority exercised	3-3b	775
4. Personal contacts		
4A. Nature of contacts	4A-3	75
4B. Purpose of contacts	4B-3	100
5. Difficulty of typical work directed	5-4	505
6. Other conditions	6-3	975
<i>Total</i>		3,030

A total of 3,030 points falls in the GS-12 range (2,755-3,150) by reference to the point-to-grade conversion chart in the GSSG. Since none of the adjustment factors under Factor 6 apply, the final grade is GS-12.

Decision

The position for the Director of the Civilian Pay Division is properly classified as GS-501-12 with the title at the agency's discretion. Therefore, the grade for the appellant's position is set one grade lower at the GS-11 level.