

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

Dallas Oversight Division  
1100 Commerce Street, Room 4C22  
Dallas, TX 75242-9968

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

**Appellant:** [appellant's name]

**Agency classification:** Supervisory Budget Analyst  
GS-560-12

**Organization:** [appellant's specific organization]  
Department of the Army  
[geographic location]

**OPM decision:** Supervisory Budget Analyst  
GS-560-12

**OPM decision number:** C-0560-12-02

/s/ Bonnie J. Brandon

---

Bonnie J. Brandon  
Classification Appeals Officer

February 15, 2001

---

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 Federal 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:

[appellant's name and address]

### Agency:

[servicing personnel office]

Chief, Position Management and  
Classification Branch  
Office of the Assistant Secretary  
Manpower and Reserve Affairs  
Department of the Army  
ATTN: SAMR-CPP-MP  
200 Stovall Street, Suite 5N35  
Alexandria, VA 22332-0340

Deputy Assistant Secretary  
Civilian Personnel Policy/Civilian Personnel  
Director for Army  
Department of the Army  
Room 23681, Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20310-03000

Director, U.S. Army Civilian Personnel  
Evaluation Agency  
Department of the Army  
Crystal Mall 4, Suite 918  
1941 Jefferson Davis Highway  
Arlington, VA 22202-4508

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

## **Introduction**

On November 1, 2000, the Dallas Oversight Division of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a classification appeal from [the appellant]. Her position is currently classified as Supervisory Budget Analyst, GS-560-12. She believes that her position is properly classified at a higher grade level. She works in [a budget function in the appellant's organization], Department of the Army, at [an Army installation]. We have accepted and decided this appeal under section 5112 of title 5, U.S. Code.

To help decide this appeal, an Oversight Division representative conducted a telephone audit of the appellant's position. The audit included interviews with the appellant and her supervisor. In reaching our decision, we reviewed the audit findings and the information of record furnished by the appellant and her agency, including her official position description [number].

## **Position information**

The appellant supervises and provides technical guidance to a staff of 14 subordinate personnel who perform analyst and technician work in support of a large segment of [the organization's] budget program. The appellant, and the unit she supervises, is responsible for planning and implementing annual and multiyear operating budgets for the installation's mission related activities. This work includes analyzing installation programs and Department of the Army guidance, formulating yearly budgets, executing all aspects of budget administration, controlling and monitoring the expenditure of funds, and briefing organizational superiors about the status of the budget and related issues. Although each of the three major subordinate commands at [the appellant's geographic location] maintains its own comptroller of accounts, the work unit supervised by the appellant is responsible for directly managing the budgets of the separate brigades present at [the location]. The combined budgets for these brigades total approximately \$107.8 million.

As supervisor, the appellant exercises customary first-line supervisory responsibilities. These responsibilities include reviewing the work of subordinate personnel for timeliness and accuracy; establishing work unit priorities; coordinating and assigning work; advising subordinate personnel on technical issues; evaluating performance; controlling attendance; and recommending staff promotions, selections, training, and awards.

## **Series and title determination**

The appellant does not dispute the series and title of her position. We concur with the agency that her position is properly classified to the GS-560 Budget Analysis Series. This series is appropriate because the chief purpose of her position is to perform and direct work related to budget administration and because her position requires knowledge and skill in the application of related laws, regulations, policies, precedents, methods, and techniques of budgeting. Since she has supervisory responsibilities, her position is properly titled *Supervisory Budget Analyst*.

## **Standard determination**

Since the appellant spends at least 25 percent of her time providing technical and administrative supervision to others in her unit and her position meets the lowest level of Factor 3 in the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG), the grade of her position is properly determined by applying the GSSG.

## **Grade determination**

The GSSG uses six factors to determine the grade of a supervisory position. To grade a position, each factor is evaluated by comparing the position to the factor level definitions for that factor and crediting point values designated for the highest factor level which is met. The total number of points accumulated under all factors is then converted to a grade by using the GSSG's point-to-grade conversion table. To credit a level under any factor, the position must *fully* meet that level.

### *Factor 1, Program scope and effect*

This factor assesses the general complexity, breadth, and impact of the program areas and work directed, including its 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 scope and effect of the appellant's position meet Level 1-2 but does not fully meet Level 1-3. At Level 1-2, the scope of the work supervised is administrative, technical, or complex clerical in nature. The work supervised has limited geographic coverage and supports most of the activities comprising a small to medium military installation or comparable activities within agency program segments. At Level 1-2, the work supervised supports and significantly affects the installation or comparable program segments. According to the GSSG, scope and effect at this level include directing budget services that support a small military base and that directly impact functions of the organizations supported.

At Level 1-3, the supervisor directs complex administrative, technical, or professional work supporting an entity comparable to a major metropolitan area, a state, or a large multimission military installation. At Level 1-3, the work supervised significantly and directly affects a wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, or the general public. The work at this level involves or substantially impacts the provision of essential operations to numerous, varied, and complex functions. Directing budget services that directly affect the full operations of a major large multimission military organization is an illustration of this level's scope and effect.

Consistent with the factor level description for Level 1-3, the appellant's position is located at [an Army installation], which is a large multimission military installation. However, the budget support work she supervises does not significantly and directly affect the installation as a whole, a wide range of agency-level (i.e., Army-wide) activities, the work of other agencies, or the general public. Rather, the work she supervises involves a segment of the installation's budget program. This segment, collectively termed "Mission Budget," includes a group of accounts that fund the mission-support programs of the organizations at [the Army installation]. The work she

supervises excludes a budget program segment termed “Garrison Budget” which includes accounts that fund [the Army installation’s] base operations. Although the appellant’s work significantly and directly affects the functions of those installation organizations supported by her unit, which is consistent with factor level descriptions for both Level 1-2 and Level 1-3, there is no evidence to suggest that the budget support work she supervises is properly characterized as being complex administrative in nature. Rather, the budget support unit she supervises operates in a manner keeping with standard budgeting principles and procedures, routine management of accounts, and customary organizational protocol. Although the appellant’s position provides administrative support to organizations at a large multimission military installation, the scope and effect of her work are insufficiently broad-scale or complex to credit her position as fully meeting Level 1-3.

Level 1-2 (350 points) is assigned.

*Factor 2, Organizational setting*

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

The appellant’s position meets Level 2-2. At this level, the position is accountable to a position that is one reporting level below the first Senior Executive Service, flag or general officer, equivalent or higher position in the direct supervisory chain.

The appellant reports to the Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff for Resource Management, a GS-505-14 Financial Manager. The GSSG instructs that when a position is supervised by someone with full Deputy responsibilities, the position is credited with reporting to the same position to whom the Deputy reports. The Deputy, and therefore the appellant, reports to the Assistant Chief of Staff for Resource Management, who reports to the Chief of Staff, a Brigadier General. The Chief of Staff represents the first Senior Executive Service, flag or general, equivalent or higher position in the direct supervisory chain.

Level 2-2 (250 points) is assigned.

*Factor 3, Supervisory and managerial authority exercised*

This factor measures the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities that are exercised on a recurring basis.

The appellant’s position meets Level 3-2c. At this level, the supervisor exercises most of the usual authorities associated with first-level supervision. 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.

The appellant's position does not fully meet Level 3-3. At this level, the supervisor must meet one of two conditions. To meet the first condition (Level 3-3a), 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 kind of authority is not delegated to the appellant's position.

To meet the second condition (Level 3-3b), 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. The appellant's agency credits her position with meeting four of these additional responsibilities. These Level 3-3b responsibilities are numbered 2, 4, 7, and 14, respectively, and include exercising significant responsibilities in dealing with officials in other organizational units and in advising management officials of higher rank; directing a program segment with significant resources; having authority to make personnel selections for subordinate nonsupervisory positions; and having authority to recommend awards and changes in position classification for subordinate nonsupervisory personnel, subject to approval by higher-level officials. After reviewing the appellant's position, we concur with her agency that she has these responsibilities. The appellant believes that her position also should be credited with Level 3-3b responsibilities numbered 1, 5, 10, and 15. However, we conclude that her position cannot be credited with meeting these four responsibilities.

Responsibilities 1 and 5 describe supervisors who use subordinate supervisors or leaders to direct, coordinate, or oversee work. These responsibilities are intended to credit only supervisors who direct at least two persons who are officially classified as subordinate supervisors or leaders. The supervisor's subordinate organization must be so large and its work so complex that it requires using two or more subordinate supervisors or leaders.

The section supervised by the appellant is organized into five smaller work units. One unit consists of a single GS-11 Budget Analyst who performs cost analysis work. Each of the remaining four units represents a group of accounts and is led by a GS-11 Budget Analyst. Although the appellant's supervision is subdivided into teams based on the functional nature of the work, this situation itself does not meet the intent of Responsibility 1 of Level 3-3b. Although higher-level subordinates provide technical guidance to and oversight of lower-graded employees belonging to their teams, this responsibility is not equivalent to the role of an official team leader, and, appropriately, none are classified as official team leaders. Responsibility 5 is not met in that the organization supervised by the appellant is neither sufficiently large nor complex to justify the classification of her higher-graded subordinate personnel as team leaders. For instance, each team is very small, ranging from only one to four personnel, with a senior analyst assisting lower-graded personnel, ranging from GS-7 to GS-9. The appellant's organization does not possess the intricacy and complexity that would *require* the use of multiple team leaders who would devote at least 25 percent their time to full leadership responsibilities.

Responsibility 10 concerns making decisions approving serious disciplinary actions, e.g., suspensions and terminations. Although the appellant indicates that she has authority to act independently in this regard, we have verified with her agency that she has not been delegated authority to carry out such actions without higher-level approval. She may make and implement

decisions in this area, but she cannot do so with the level of independence that is required in order to credit her position as meeting this responsibility.

Responsibility 15 concerns finding and implementing ways to eliminate or reduce significant bottlenecks and barriers to production, promote team building, or improve business practices. To credit a position with meeting this responsibility, the significance of, and independence to execute, these activities must exceed the level of responsibility that typically resides with first-line supervisory positions described in Level 3-2c. In other words, most supervisors at Level 3-2c have responsibilities to resolve problems and issues related to their program areas and to effectively supervise their subordinate personnel. To meet Responsibility 15 of Level 3-3b, the supervisor must possess responsibility for those activities that substantially exceeds the responsibilities of normal first-level supervision. Although the appellant is clearly involved in resolving program related problems, improving operations, and promoting a cooperative work environment for her subordinates (e.g., identifying the accumulation of unplanned bills, suggesting the reprogramming of cost items, and arranging a Myers-Briggs Personality Indicator session for her staff), we find that her position is not responsible for achieving improvements with the degree of independence and significance necessary to be credited as meeting Responsibility 15.

Level 3-2c (450 points) is assigned.

#### *Factor 4, Personal contacts*

This factor measures the nature and purpose of personal contacts associated with supervisory responsibilities. The same contacts that serve as the basis for the level credited under Subfactor 4A, Nature of contacts, must be used to determine the correct level under Subfactor 4B, Purpose of contacts.

##### *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 work.

The appellant's position meets Level 4A-2. At this level, the supervisor has frequent contacts with any one of the following: managers, supervisors, and staff of program, administrative, and other work units throughout the field activity, installation, or major organizational level of the agency; local public interest groups; congressional district offices; employees of State or local governments; or representatives of the local media. Contacts may be either formal or informal and sometime require nonroutine or special preparation. Consistent with this factor level description, the appellant, on a regular and recurring basis, has contact with managers, supervisors, and staff located throughout [the appellant's Army installation]. These individuals include managers and accounting or budget personnel from various organizations for which she provides budget support. Most of this contact is of an informal nature, taking place daily or almost daily, by way of exchanging electronic mail or telephone conversations. The appellant also frequently (at least weekly) accompanies the Assistant Chief of Staff for Operations (who is outside her major organizational level) to his staff meetings where she interacts with both

military and civilian managers and other staff. To respond to electronic mail inquiries to prepare for meetings, the appellant must, at times, make a special effort to locate or summarize pertinent information.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 4A-3. At this level, the supervisor has frequent contacts with high-ranking managers, supervisors, and technical staff at bureau or major organization levels of the agency, with agency headquarters administrative support staff, or with comparable personnel of other Federal agencies. These contacts often require extensive preparation or up-to-date technical familiarity with complex subject matter. Unlike positions at Level 4A-3, the appellant does not have recurring contacts with higher-level management officials. Further, the appellant's position does not require extensive preparation of briefing materials as envisioned at Level 4A-3.

Level 4A-2 (50 points) is assigned.

*Subfactor 4B, Purpose of contacts*

This subfactor covers the purpose of the personal contacts credited in Subfactor 4A.

The purpose of the appellant's contacts credited in subfactor 4A meets Level 4B-1. At this level, the purpose of these contacts includes discussing work efforts for providing services and exchanging factual information about work operations. Consistent with this factor level description, the appellant interacts with the contacts credited in Subfactor 4A mainly to answer questions about the status of budgets and budget related concerns; to provide factual information about costs, cost estimates, bills, and expenditures; to discuss budget management issues; or to inform others about agency budget policies, practices, and experiences that are relevant to the matter at hand. She provides such information to help managers with whom she has contact to plan, resolve problems, and make decisions.

The purpose of the contacts credited in Subfactor 4A does not meet Level 4B-2. At this level, the primary purpose of these contacts is to not only ensure that the information provided to outside parties is accurate and consistent, but to actually plan and coordinate the work directed with other work and to resolve differences in opinion among other managers, supervisors, and others. Although the appellant frequently interacts with higher-ranking personnel outside her major organization level by telephone, electronic mail, and meetings, the primary purpose of these contacts is to provide information to managers as an aid to their decision-making. She is not responsible for functioning as an active participant in their work planning and decision-making, and she does not have responsibility to resolve differences of opinions among managers. These responsibilities belong to those managers, although the information she provides influences their planning, decision-making, and resolution of diverging opinion.

Level 4B-1 (30 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. Under the GSSG, the base level of work supervised by first-level supervisors is the highest grade which (1) best characterizes the nature of the basic (mission-oriented) nonsupervisory work performed by the organization directed and (2) constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload or duty time of the organization. Lower-level positions which primarily support the work being directed are excluded from consideration in determining the base level of work.

In her appeal, the appellant does not question her agency's evaluation of this factor. After reviewing her position, we concur with the agency that GS-11 represents the base level of work supervised by the appellant. For this factor, a GS-11 base level of work equates to Level 5-6.

Level 5-6 (800 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.

The appellant does not challenge her agency's evaluation of this factor. We concur with the agency that her position meets Level 6-4. At this level, supervision requires substantial coordination and integration of a number of major work assignments, projects, or program segments of professional, scientific, technical, or administrative work comparable to the GS-11 level. Supervision at this level typically involves integrating the analytical work of two or more groups and providing leadership in developing, implementing, evaluating, and improving processes, procedures, and effectiveness of the program segment or organization directed.

Level 6-4 (1120 points) is assigned.

*Summary*

In sum, we have evaluated the appellant's position as follows:

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Points</b>
1. Scope and effect	1-2	350
2. Organizational setting	2-2	250
3. Supervisory and managerial authority exercised	3-2c	450
4. Personal Contacts		
A. Nature of contacts	4A-2	50
B. Purpose of contacts	4B-1	30
5. Difficulty of typical work directed	5-6	800
6. Other conditions	6-4	1120
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>3,050</b>

According to the GSSG's grade conversion table, a total of 3,050 points equates to the GS-12 grade level.

**Decision**

The appellant's position is properly classified as Supervisory Budget Analyst, GS-560-12.