



United States Office of Personnel Management

Office of Merit Systems Oversight and Effectiveness
Digest of Significant Classification Decisions and Opinions
August 1994
No. 19-11

Standard: [General Schedule Supervisory Guide](#) (April 1993)
Factor: Factor 6, Other Conditions
Issue: Crediting Level 6-6b

Identification of the Classification Issue

This issue arose in connection with the reconsideration of an appeal decision issued by an Office of Personnel Management region. The appellant was a second-level supervisor who directed a major organization through five subordinate division chiefs, four of whom directed substantial workloads (i.e., sufficient for base level credit) of GS-12 level work. The Office of Personnel Management region denied credit for Level 6-6b because all of the subordinate supervisors did not direct a substantial workload of GS-12 level work. The appellant contested the Region's interpretation of Level 6-6b, arguing that it was too restrictive and placed undue emphasis on the requirement that *each* subordinate supervisor direct a substantial workload of GS-12 level work.

Resolution

The General Schedule Supervisory Guide defines Level 6-6b as follows:

They manage through subordinate supervisors and/or contractors who each directs a substantial workload comparable to the GS-12 or higher level. Such base work requires similar coordination as that described at Factor Level 6-5a above for first-line supervisors.

On the basis of guidance provided by the Office of Classification, the Classification Appeals Office adopted a more liberal interpretation of the criteria for Level 6-6b. Essentially, the Classification Appeals Office concluded that there are two conditions under which it would be appropriate to

credit GS-12 level work for the purpose of crediting Level 6-6b when each subordinate supervisor does not direct a substantial workload of GS-12 level work. First, if the workload/personnel could be redistributed among the subordinate units so that a substantial workload of GS-12 level work *could* be assigned to each subordinate supervisor, then GS-12 level work would be creditable. Second, if all of the lower level work of the organization is assigned to one unit, and removing that unit from the organization left the requisite GS-12 base level work in each remaining subordinate unit, then GS-12 level work would be creditable.

The Classification Appeals Office determined that the second option was applicable in the appellant's situation. All of the lower level work of the organization (performed by four GS-9 and GS-11 level employees) was concentrated in one of the five subordinate divisions under the appellant's direction. Removing that division from the appellant's organization would have left the requisite GS-12 base level of work in the remaining units. Thus, the Classification Appeals Office concluded that the appellant could be credited with supervising an organization through subordinate supervisors who each directed a substantial workload of GS-12 level work. Because the appellant accomplished significant and extensive coordination and integration of a number of important projects carried out by the subordinate divisions and made recommendations in at least three of the areas listed under Level 6-5a, the Classification Appeals Office credited Level 6-6b.