

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



Washington Oversight Division  
1900 E Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20415

**Classification Appeal Decision**  
**Under Section 5112 of Title 5, United States Code**

**Appellant:** [name]  
(See list of other appellants attached)

**Agency classification:** Education Program Administrator  
GS-1710-14

**Organization:** Department of Defense (DOD)  
DOD Defense Education Activity  
DOD Dependents Schools  
Europe and Pacific Areas  
Various District Offices

**OPM decision:** Education Program Administrator  
GS-1710-14

**OPM decision number:** C-1710-14-01

---

Richard Quasney  
Classification Appeals Officer

September 29, 1998

---

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:**

[appellants]

Mr. Paul Wolfe  
Director of Personnel  
DOD Education Activity  
4040 North Fairfax Drive  
Arlington, VA 22203-1634

Defense Civilian Personnel Management Service  
Field Advisory Services Division  
Classification Branch  
1400 Key Boulevard, Suite B-200  
Arlington, VA 22209-5144

## **Introduction**

On January 30, 1998, the Washington Oversight Division of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a position classification appeal from 11 appellants who are employed as Education Program Administrators, GS-1710-14 (District Superintendents) in the Department of Defense (DOD), DOD Education Activity, DOD Dependents Schools, Europe and Pacific Areas, at various District Offices overseas. The appellants requested that their position be classified as Education Program Administrator, GS-1710-15. This appeal was accepted and decided under the provisions of section 5112 of title 5, United States Code.

To help decide the appeal, personal interviews were conducted with 3 of the appellants on July 31, 1998 while in the U.S. to attend organizational conferences. [appellant], [appellant], and [appellant], District Superintendents of the [3 specific districts], respectively, were interviewed. The two immediate supervisors over the 11 appellants, [name], [geographic location] Area Office Superintendent and [name],[geographic location]Area Office Superintendent, were also interviewed at this same time. We also spoke with the top official of the DOD Education Activity, [name], Director, and considered her follow-up written response on September 4, 1998. This appeal was decided by considering the audit findings, information furnished by the appellants, OPM requested information sent by the agency on February 18, 1998, April 17, 1998, and September 14, 1998, and all other information of record.

## **General issues**

The appellants have raised pay issues in their classification appeal, essentially comparing their salaries with those of other positions. Pay may not be considered in determining the classification of a position. Similarly, the appellants argue that because they have acquired some of the responsibilities of a since abolished higher graded position, their position should be higher graded. However, we may not compare a position to another position, which may or may not be properly classified, in determining the classification of a position. By law, we must classify positions solely by comparing their current duties and responsibilities to OPM standards and guidelines.

The position description, revised after an extensive position review, includes the appellants' major duties and responsibilities, and is thus adequate for classification purposes. It had not yet been implemented at the time of the appeal.

## **Position information**

The appellants serve as the head education program administrator for their respective districts in either the Europe or Pacific areas. They are responsible for administering the provision of education for dependents of active duty military personnel and some civilians stationed overseas. As such, they oversee schools teaching pre-school through high school curriculums in their assigned areas. The number of schools range from about 7 to 20 in each district within a country or, in some cases, a few countries. The immediate supervisor over the appellants is an Area Office Superintendent, who is responsible for multiple districts. There are 2 Area Office Superintendents. The Europe Area Office Superintendent is responsible for 8 districts in that area. The Pacific Area Office Superintendent is responsible for 3 districts. The appellants provide supervision, leadership, and direction to all schools

in their districts on all matters of education and school affairs. The appellants insure that their schools are able to provide the best education possible to their students and that the schools are meeting and implementing all DODEA, regional, and local requirements and standards. Among others, this includes oversight and monitoring of curriculum and training of staff. The appellants prepare district budgets and distribute funds to their schools. They monitor budget execution and take reprogramming actions. The appellants oversee and monitor information management. They provide manpower management for the staffing of schools. They are responsible for planning for maintenance, repair of school facilities. They supervise their own support staff of about 20 employees who assist the appellants to accomplish their mission with various education and administrative support functions. Although the size of their districts vary somewhat, the appellants' basic duties and responsibilities are sufficiently similar to permit adjudication of this group appeal. The appellants' position description and other material of record furnish much more information about their duties and how they are performed.

### **Series determination**

The appellants' position is properly assigned to the Education and Vocational Training Series, GS-1710, which covers positions concerned with supervising and managing in educational administration work when the work requires the application of professional knowledge of the theories, principles, and techniques of education and training in the direct delivery of instruction or training services. Neither the agency nor the appellants disagree.

### **Title determination**

The authorized title is Education Program Administrator. Neither the agency nor the appellants disagree.

### **Standard determination**

The position was evaluated by application of the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG), dated April, 1998.

### **Grade determination**

The GSSG is used to determine the grade of General Schedule (GS) supervisory positions in grades GS-5 through GS-15. The GSSG employs a factor-point evaluation method that assesses six factors common to all supervisory positions. These are: (1) Program Scope and Effect, (2) Organizational Setting, (3) Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised, (4) Personal Contacts, (5) Difficulty of Typical Work Directed, and (6) Other Conditions. To grade a position, each factor is evaluated by comparing the position to the factor level definitions for that factor and crediting the points designated for the highest factor level which is met in accordance with the instructions specific to the factor being evaluated. In order to assign a level within a factor, the level must be fully met or the

next lower level must be assigned. The total points accumulated under all factors are then converted to a grade by using the point-to-grade conversion table in the Guide.

### *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.

#### *Subfactor 1A, 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 to be addressed under Scope.

At Level 1-4, the supervisor directs a segment of a professional, highly technical, or complex administrative program that: (1) involves the development of major aspects of key agency scientific, medical, legal, administrative, regulatory, policy development, or comparable highly technical programs; or (2) includes major highly technical operations at the Government's largest, most complex industrial installations.

Level 1-4 is appropriate for supervisors who direct work involving the actual development of major aspects of critical agency programs, i.e., the overall policies, goals and objectives, program plans, and directives. Each of the appellants are responsible for an organization administering the delivery of education services in the field. While this may necessitate the development of district -wide plans and requirements, the appellants' work does not entail program development as intended here by the guide. Program development activities for the work directed by the appellants are carried out by organizations at DODEA headquarters. Likewise, the appellants' work does not meet the other criteria in the guide for scope at level 1-4, i.e., "major, highly technical operations at the Government's largest, most complex industrial installations." Thus, the appellants' position does not meet the requirements for scope at Level 1-4.

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. Providing complex administrative, technical, or professional services directly affecting a large or complex multimission military installation is also creditable at Level 1-3.

Level 1-3 is consistent with the appellants' work situation. They direct the delivery of professional education services that involve the performance of administrative and professional work. Their district covers the military or civilian dependents student population at several to many schools

located within a country or several countries. Their student populations range from several thousand to over ten thousand. Their districts administer most of their major organization's (DODEA) programs. Level 1-3 is assigned for scope.

*Subfactor 1B, Effect*

This element of Factor 1 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 outside the Federal Government, the agency, other agencies, the general public, or other entities.

At Level 1-4, the work impacts an agency's headquarters operations, several bureauwide programs, or most of an agency's entire field establishment; or facilitates the agency's accomplishment of its primary mission or programs of national significance; or impacts large segments of the Nation's population or segments of one or a few large industries; or receives frequent or continuing congressional or media attention.

While the work of the appellants in each individual district has a significant effect on each of their student populations, the military community as well as others in the area, individual district operations do not impact the Department of Defense (DOD) headquarters operations, several bureauwide programs, or most of DOD's entire field establishment. Similarly, while the provision of quality education for their dependents overseas is an important quality of life issue for the district military community, individual district operations do not facilitate accomplishment of DOD's primary mission of national defense. In addition, the work of the appellants is not so far reaching as to impact large segments of the Nation's population or segments of one or a few large industries. Finally, district operations are not so inherently controversial or contentious as to receive frequent or continuing congressional or media attention.

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, the operations of outside interests, (e.g., a segment of a regulated industry), 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.

Level 1-3 is more consistent with the work the appellants' position. Their districts' educational programs directly and significantly impact the operations of outside interests, e.g., the military community, foreign Governments, other Government agencies, labor unions, and others.

Both Scope and Effect are assigned Level 1-3.

Level 1-3 is credited.

550 points

### *Factor 2 - Organizational Setting*

This factor considers the organizational situation of the supervisory position in relation to higher levels of management.

The appellants report to an Area Office Superintendent, who reports to the Director, DODEA, an SES position. This organizational setting matches Level 2-2, which is creditable to positions that are one level below the first SES or equivalent level position in the direct supervisory chain.

Level 2-2 is credited.

250 points.

### *Factor 3 - Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised*

This factor covers the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities that are exercised on a recurring basis. Duties measured under this factor are only those related to managing the organizational unit or units under the supervision or management of the position being evaluated. To be credited with a level under this factor, a position must carry out the authorities and responsibilities to the extent described for the specific level. The criteria for each level represents the minimum criteria for a particular level. Levels under this factor apply equally to the direction of specialized program management organizations, line functions, staff functions, and operating and support activities.

Two situations are described at Level 3-3. Level 3-3a provides for positions with significant managerial authority to set long-range work plans, assure program implementation by lower and subordinate organizational units or others. Positions at this level determine goals and objectives that need additional emphasis, plan for long-range staffing needs, determine the best approach for resolving budget shortages. Positions at this level are closely involved with high level program officials in development of overall goals and objectives for assigned staff functions(s), program(s), or program segment(s). Level 3-3b provides for positions that supervise fairly sizable staffs and that are delegated more extensive supervisory authorities than those described at Level 3-2c. Characteristic of this level are such features as the oversight of subordinate supervisors and a program with annual resources at the multimillion dollar level, and decision making or approval authority over such actions as group grievances, serious disciplinary actions, costly or controversial training requests, and expenses comparable to within-grade increases, extensive overtime, and employee travel.

Level 3-3 is comparable to the appellants' position. They are responsible for the management of their districts' operations. As such, they develop multiple year staffing and other work plans for the schools in their districts. They monitor school progress with the DODEA strategic plan, standards, and other requirements. They develop plans for improvement and shift emphasis on goals and objectives based on the needs and progress of their districts. They develop and execute a multimillion dollar district budget providing needed funding for school and district activities. They initiate actions to reprogram funds. They collect data and closely monitor a variety of school activity to track

progress, take corrective actions, and provide DODEA headquarters with education data. They serve as second and higher level supervisors, supervising all school principals, assistant principals, one or two subordinate supervisors on their immediate office staff, all teachers, and other nonsupervisory personnel on their staff and assigned to schools. They supervise, directly or indirectly, from several hundred to over a thousand employees. As the top management official responsible for district operations, they have been delegated authority to decide or approve a wide range of personnel actions and spending decisions (as described at Level 3-3b).

Level 3-4 includes all of the managerial and supervisory authorities at the lower levels of this factor and additional criteria.

Positions at this level exercise delegated authority to oversee the overall planning, direction, and timely execution of a program, several program segments (each of which is managed through separate subordinate organizational units), or comparable staff functions, including development, assignment, and higher level clearance of goals and objectives for supervisors or managers of subordinate organizational units or lower organizational levels. They approve multi year and longer range work plans developed by the supervisors or managers of subordinate organizational units and subsequently manage the overall work to enhance achievement of the goals and objectives. They oversee the revision of long range plans, goals and objectives for the work directed. They manage the development of policy changes in response to changes in levels of appropriations or other legislated changes. They manage organizational changes throughout the organization directed, or major change to the structure and content of the program or program segments directed. They exercise authority to approve the allocation and distribution of funds in the organization's budget. Alternatively, positions at this level exercise final authority for the full range of personnel actions and organization design proposals recommended by subordinate supervisors. This level may be credited even if formal clearance is required for a few actions, such as removals and incentive awards above set dollar levels.

The appellants exercise considerable authority in managing their organizations (as discussed and credited under Level 3-3, above). However, Level 3-4 represents a higher level of control and exercise of authority over human and program resources than is found at the individual District Superintendent level. District Superintendents are fully responsible for managing the operations within their districts. Within the context of Level 3-4, District Superintendents oversee the equivalent of a "program segment." Thus, they do not exercise authority to oversee the overall planning, direction, and timely execution of a program or several program segments, as required by Level 3-4. Similarly, while the District Superintendents make multi year plans and develop and measure other yardsticks pertaining to the work of their districts, they do not oversee the revision of long range plans, goals and objectives. They do not exercise authority in managing the development of policy changes in response to changes in levels of appropriations or other legislated changes. These activities are carried out at other management levels within the major organization, DODEA.

Although the appellants exercise broad supervisory authority in personnel management (as described at Level 3-3b), they do not exercise "**final** authority for the full range of personnel actions and organization design proposals recommended by subordinate supervisors," as required at Level 3-4.



This final authority has been credited to the supervisory position immediately over the appellants, the Area Office Superintendent. This authority is described in the official position description of the supervisor and has been credited in the classification of this position. Moreover, we found no evidence that organizational design recommendations were made at the subordinate supervisor level and regularly given consideration and final approval by District Superintendents. Indeed, the Area Office Superintendent's position description assigns the responsibility for "considering and advising the Director on improved organizational structures" to that position.

Level 3-3 is credited.

775 points

#### *Factor 4 - Personal Contacts*

This is a two-part factor which assesses the nature and the purpose of personal contacts related to supervisory and managerial responsibilities. The same contacts that serve as the basis for the level credited under Subfactor 4A must be used to determine the correct level under Subfactor 4B.

##### *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 (face-to-face, telephonic, but **not** written).

Level 4A-4 is the highest level described in the GSSG for Subfactor 4A and is reserved for employees who frequently engage in the most difficult and demanding contacts required by supervisory and managerial work. Such frequent contacts include: heads of bureaus and higher level organizations in other Federal agencies; key staff of congressional committees and congressmen, e.g., majority and minority staff directors, chief counsels, and directors of field operations; elected or appointed officials of State and local governments; influential individuals or organized groups from outside the employing agency, such as executive level contracting and other officials of major defense contractors or national officers of employee organizations; journalists of major metropolitan, regional, or national newspapers, magazines, television, or radio media; national or regional officers of trade associations, public action groups, or professional organizations of national stature.

Contacts at this level are characterized by extensive difficulty in preparation, i.e., development of briefing packages or similar presentation materials, extensive analytical input required by the employee and subordinates, and/or requires the assistance of a support staff. Contact settings usually include oversight hearings, briefings, presentations, speeches, conferences, and meetings and may require extemporaneous response to unexpected or hostile questioning.

Contacts at Level 4A-3 include: high ranking civilian or military leaders, managers, supervisors, and technical staff at bureau and major organization levels of the agency; agency headquarters

administrative support staff; or with comparable personnel in other Federal agencies. They also include: key staff of public interest groups (usually in formal briefings) with significant political influence or media coverage; journalists representing influential city or county newspapers or comparable radio or television coverage; congressional committee and subcommittee staff assistants below staff director or chief counsel levels; contracting officials and high level technical staff of large industrial firms; local officers of regional or national trade associations, public action groups, or professional organizations; and state local government managers doing business with the agency.

Contacts typically take place in meetings and conferences. Other contacts at this level occur as a result of the employee being designated by higher management as a contact point for the organization. Contacts often require up-to-date technical familiarity with complex subject matter or extensive preparation of briefing materials.

The appellants' contacts are consistent with Level 4A-3. The appellants serve as their organization's point of contact within their respective districts. The most frequent contacts required by the appellants include those with their immediate staff, Director, DODEA, Area Office Superintendent, program and administrative support officials at DODEA headquarters and Area Service Centers, other District Superintendents, school principals and other school personnel. Other contacts include high ranking military officers including local and regional commanders, parents, students, parent organizations, representatives or members of private and professional organizations, representatives of other governmental agencies, representatives of host-nations, union officials, local or military related media, and similar contacts.

Although the appellants sometime make contacts comparable to Level 4A-4, e.g., head of a major military command of such size and scope to be equivalent to a large bureau of an agency or head of state, their overall recurring contacts are more typical of Level 4A-3. In addition, the preparation required for making most contacts is more akin to Level 4A-3, i.e., up-to-date technical familiarity with complex subject matter or preparation of briefing materials, than that required at Level 4A-4, i.e., development of briefing packages or similar presentation materials requiring extensive analytical input by the employee and subordinates. This is also true with respect to the setting where contacts take place, where the appellants' situation more closely matches Level 4A-3, e.g., meetings, conferences, and unplanned contacts as the organization's point of contact, than Level 4A-4, e.g., oversight hearings, presentations, speeches, and briefings.

Level 4A-3 is credited.

75 points

*Subfactor 4B, Purpose of Contacts*

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

At Level 4B-4, the highest level described in the guide for this subfactor, the purpose is to influence, motivate, or persuade persons or groups to accept opinions or take actions related to advancing the fundamental goals and objectives of the program or segments directed, or involving the commitment or distribution of major resources, when intense opposition or resistance is encountered due to significant organization or philosophical conflict, competing objectives, major resource limitations or reductions, or comparable issues. At this level, the persons contacted are sufficiently fearful, skeptical, or uncooperative that highly developed communication, negotiation, conflict resolution, leadership, and similar skills must be used to obtain the desired results.

At Level 4B-3, the purpose of contacts is to justify, defend, or negotiate in representing the project, program segment(s), or organizational unit(s) directed, in obtaining or committing resources, and in gaining compliance with established policies, regulations, or contracts. Contacts at this level usually involve active participation in meetings, conferences, hearings, or presentations involving problems or issues of considerable consequence or importance to the program or program segment(s) managed.

At Level 4B-2, the purpose of contacts is to ensure that information provided to outside parties is accurate and consistent; to plan and coordinate the work directed with that of others outside the subordinate organization; and/or to resolve differences of opinion among managers, supervisors, leaders, employees, contractors or others.

The purpose of contacts in the appellants' position is to coordinate program and administrative matters, provide direction and guidance to school officials and staff, provide program and district operations information, maintain good relations with the military community and host nation officials, keep open lines of communication, resolve problems, explain, justify, and defend program positions and decisions, and investigate and gather information. The District Superintendents coordinate program and administrative matters with stakeholders, the Area Office Superintendent, Area Service Center, or DODEA headquarters. They negotiate with school officials in committing resources by providing additional funding, staffing, or services. They explain, justify and defend program positions or decisions in representing the organization with such stakeholders as parents, students, community leaders, union officials, principals, teachers, and others on a wide range of issues including such difficult issues as school closings, class room size, student redistribution, curriculum changes, new teaching methods, school discipline, and school emergencies. The purpose of these contacts, overall, is most comparable to Level 4B-3.

The appellants do not regularly engage in contacts for the purpose described at Level 4B-4. They do not regularly engage in contacts to influence, motivate, or persuade persons or groups, in the face of intense opposition or resistance, to commit major resources or accept opinions related to advancing the fundamental goals and objectives of their overall program or program segments. Such opposition or resistance is due to significant organization or philosophical conflict, competing objectives, or major resource limitations or reductions. Some of the appellants' contacts require a significant degree of negotiation and persuasion, but not under the complex and demanding conditions required by Level 4B-4. The purpose of the appellants' contacts are generally at Levels 4B-2 and 4B-

3 and have been credited overall at Level 4B-3, above. We find that the contacts credited under Subfactor Level 4A-3 are primarily for purposes that align with Subfactor 4B-3.

Level 4B-3 is credited.

100 points

*Factor 5 - Difficulty of Typical Work Directed*

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

Under the GSSG, the base level of work supervised by first-level supervisors is determined by the highest grade which (1) best characterizes the nature of the basic (mission-oriented) **nonsupervisory** work performed or overseen by the organization directed, and (2) constitutes 25 percent or more of the total **nonsupervisory workload** (not positions or employees) of the organization.

In the case of second (and higher) level supervisors, the GSSG instructs the user to first use the method prescribed (above) for first level supervisors. The GSSG advises that for many second level supervisors, the base level arrived at by that method will be the correct one. However, a heavy supervisory or managerial workload related to **nonsupervisory** work **above** that base level may be present in some positions. In that case, the GSSG instructs the user to determine the highest grade of **nonsupervisory** work directed which requires at least 50 percent of the duty time of the supervisory position under evaluation. The resulting grade may be used as the base level for second (and higher) level supervisors over large workloads.

Finally, the resulting grade under either method is assigned a level and points using the conversion chart in the GSSG.

The appellants supervise, directly or indirectly, several hundred to over a thousand employees. The overwhelming majority of the work is performed at the school level rather than from the appellants' immediate office staff. Considering both workloads, however, the teaching work in schools constitutes the base level of work. All, or nearly all, of this work is performed by positions that are **not** subject to the classification requirements of 5 U.S.C. chapter 51. However, in applying appropriate OPM classification standards and guides to this work, as required by the GSSG, the agency finds these positions would be classifiable to the GS-1710, Education and Vocational Training Series, at the GS-11 level. Based on our general review of the description of this work, we agree that this work would be classifiable at no higher than the GS-11 level. This work represents about 70 percent or greater of the total nonsupervisory work performed and directed within a district. This work, then, represents the highest graded mission oriented nonsupervisory work performed that constitutes at least 25 percent of the total nonsupervisory work directed within the organization. Thus, under the method for determining the base level for first level supervisory positions, the base level is GS-11.

As second (and higher) level supervisors, the appellants also supervise work performed by their immediate office staff. Most of this work is supervised directly by the appellants while some is directly supervised by the appellants' subordinate supervisor on the immediate office staff, e.g., Assistant District Superintendent or other supervisory position, e.g., Business Manager. The majority of this work is substantive work that directly contributes to the accomplishment of the district's goals and objectives. Work is performed in such areas as educational services and curriculum monitoring and assistance, information technology and media, training and staff development, budget formulation, execution, and monitoring, manpower management, and other supporting services. The overwhelming majority of this work is performed by positions which have been classified at the GS-12 level (or equivalent level in cases where positions are not covered by title 5 U.S.C.). Based on our general review of some of the position descriptions covering this work, we agree that this work would be classifiable at no higher than the GS-12 level. District Superintendents indicated that they spend about 50 percent or more of their time supervising such work. Most of this work is at the core of managing the delivery of educational services in the appellants' districts. In addition, the GS-11 teaching base level work determined under the first level supervisor method (above) is performed at the school level and is directly supervised by Principals and Assistant Principals. Thus, this work is far removed from the immediate attention of District Superintendents. Based on this, it is plausible that the District Superintendents would spend a majority of their time supervising the core work of their immediate office. Consequently, the base level work under this method is GS-12 and we credit that for this factor in the evaluation.

Level 5-7 is credited.

930 points

#### *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. Like most factors in the GSSG where the grade level of work is considered, this factor considers **nonsupervisory** work that is supervised, directly or indirectly, by the position under evaluation.

This factor contains 6 separate levels (Level 6-1 thru Level 6-6). The GSSG instructs the user to apply the criteria at the different levels and if the resulting evaluation yields Levels 6-1, 6-2, or 6-3, the "Special Situations" Section should be referred to for possible credit of one additional level (which would result in a final evaluation no higher than Level 6-4). Alternatively, the instructions provide that if after applying the different levels, the resulting evaluation yields Levels 6-4, 6-5, or 6-6, this evaluation represents the final level (no additional credit may be given from the "Special Situations" Section).

At Level 6-5, the GSSG contains three sets of criteria, any one of which may be met for a position to be evaluated at Level 6-5. One set of criteria provides that a position may be evaluated at this level when the position under evaluation manages work through subordinate supervisors who each direct substantial (nonsupervisory) workloads comparable to the GS-11 Level. The GS-11 base level must

require similar coordination as that described in the GSSG at Factor Level 6-4a for first line supervisors.

The appellants' position meets this criteria. Each District Superintendent supervises several hundred GS-11 (or equivalent) level teaching positions through subordinate supervisors located at the many schools within their districts. Principals and, in most cases, Assistant Principals at each school provide first or second level supervision over this work. This work requires similar coordination as that described at Level 6-4a in the GSSG.

In order to be evaluated at Level 6-6, a position must **directly** supervise GS-13 (nonsupervisory) work (and meet other criteria) or manage work through subordinate supervisors who each direct substantial workloads comparable to the GS-12 or higher level.

The appellants' position meets neither of these provisions. They do not supervise (directly or indirectly) nonsupervisory work at the GS-13 level. They also do not manage work through subordinate supervisors who each direct substantial GS-12 level nonsupervisory workloads. While in some instances, GS-12 nonsupervisory staff work is shared (for supervision) with an Assistant District Superintendent, the only substantial workloads in the District Superintendents' districts are the GS-11 Teaching work at the various schools. The highest level that the appellants' position fully meets is Level 6-5.

Level 6-5 is credited.

1225 points

### *Summary*

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Level</u>	<u>Points</u>
1. Program Scope and Effect	1-3	550
2. Organizational Setting	2-2	250
3. Supervisory/Managerial Authority	3-3	775
4. Personal Contacts		
A. Nature of Contacts	4A-3	75
B. Purpose of Contacts	4B-3	100
5. Difficulty of Typical Work Directed	5-7	930
6. Other Conditions	6-5	<u>1225</u>
Total		3905

The total of 3905 points falls within the GS-14 range (3605-4050) on the grade conversion table provided in the guide.

### **Decision**

The appealed position is properly classified as Education Program Administrator, GS-1710-14.