

U.S. Office of Personnel Management
Division for Human Capital Leadership & Merit System Accountability
Classification Appeals Program

Dallas Field Services Group
Plaza of the Americas, North Tower
700 North Pearl Street, Suite 525
Dallas, TX 75201

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

Appellant: [appellant]

Agency classification: Human Resources Officer
GS-201-13

Organization: Human Resources Service Center
[organization]
Forest Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
[geographic location]

OPM decision: Human Resources Officer
GS-201-13

OPM decision number: C-0201-13-07

/s/ Robert D. Hendler

Robert D. Hendler
Classification and Pay Claims
Program Manager

February 14, 2006

Date

As provided in section 511.612 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, this decision constitutes a certificate that is mandatory and binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting officials of the government. The agency is responsible for reviewing its classification decisions for identical, similar, or related positions to ensure consistency with this decision. There is no right of further appeal. This decision is subject to discretionary review only under conditions and time limits specified in the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards*, appendix 4, section G (address provided in appendix 4, section H).

Decision sent to:

[appellant's name and address]

Director of Human Resources Management
Forest Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
1601 North Kent Street, Room 600
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Director, Office of Human Capital Management
U.S. Department of Agriculture
J. L. Whitten Building
1400 Independence Avenue, SW.
Washington, DC 20250

Introduction

On September 12, 2005, the Dallas Field Services Group of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a classification appeal from [appellant]. His position is currently classified as Human Resources Officer, GS-201-13. The appellant works in the Human Resources Service Center; [organization], Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, [geographic location]. He believes his position should be classified as Human Resources Officer, GS-201-14. We received the agency's administrative report on November 18, 2005. We have accepted and decided this appeal under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code.

Background

On April 25, 2005, the Director of Human Resources Management in the Forest Service Washington Office issued a decision in response to a request from the Director of the [program name] to upgrade the appellant's position based on accretion of duties. Even though the appellant spends more than half of his time performing personal work, the Washington Office evaluated only the supervisory duties and responsibilities and determined that GS-13 was the proper grade level for the position. In evaluating the position against the criteria in the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG), the Washington Office credited Level 1-2 for Factor 1 (Program Scope and Effect), which is one level lower than the level assigned when the position was initially classified in 2003.

To help decide the appeal, we conducted telephone audits with the appellant on January 12 and 18, 2006, and a telephone interview with his first-level supervisor on January 17, 2006. In addition, we conducted telephone interviews with a Human Resources Specialist in the Forest Service's Human Resources Management Washington office and the Forest Service's National Classification Specialist to gather more information about the appealed position. In reaching our decision, we carefully considered the interviews and all other information of record provided by the appellant and the agency.

Both the appellant and his supervisor have certified to the accuracy of the appellant's official position description (PD), number [number]. The PD was developed using an automated system where duty statements are tied to the factor levels in OPM's classification standards. The factor levels in the appellant's PD merely repeat the OPM classification criteria. Upon review of all information of record, we find that the appellant's PD is somewhat overstated in that some of the described factor levels do not correspond to the duties and responsibilities assigned to the position. Our decision addresses these factors. Since an OPM appeal decision classifies a real operating position, and not simply the duties and responsibilities reflected in the PD, this decision is based on the work currently assigned to and performed by the appellant.

The operational work of the appellant's unit is scheduled to migrate to the [city name] Service Center in June 2006 as part of Forest Service's Business Process Reengineering. Information provided by the agency indicates the appellant's position will be eliminated once the transition of the work in his unit is complete. As a result of the Business Process Reengineering, the appellant's unit is in a state of flux. While some positions have been filled on a temporary basis,

other positions will remain vacant. Consequently, our evaluation of the appealed position takes into consideration the current composition and workload of the unit since our analysis must be based on comparing the appellant's current duties and responsibilities (5 CFR 511.607) to OPM standards and guidelines (5 U.S.C. 5106, 5107, and 5112).

Position information

The appellant's position is responsible for the overall delivery of human resources (HR) management services to 19 [serviced organizational locations] that are geographically dispersed in 13 states. The programs managed include employee relations, labor relations, safety and occupational health, staffing, classification, pay, and benefits. The appellant and his staff provide services to approximately 1,100 full-time permanent and 200 temporary employees. There are unions in 18 of the [serviced locations].

The appellant spends about 70 percent of his time performing personal work and about 30 percent of his time supervising a staff of 10 specialists and support personnel. The 10 positions include the following: 3 GS-201-12s, 1 GS-018-12, 2 GS-201-11s (full performance level), 2 GS-203-8s, 1 GS-203-7, and 1 GS-203-5. At the time of our fact-finding, the appellant was in the process of filling two additional support positions on a temporary basis. The appellant works under the supervision of the Director of the [organization], a position the agency has classified as GS-340-15. The Director reports to a Senior Executive Service position.

The appellant's personally performed work includes advising supervisors on developing accurate PDs, advising and counseling management officials on employee and labor relations issues and assisting in the preparation of disciplinary or adverse actions, and administering the agency's recruitment and placement plan. The appellant also ensures that management officials and employees are kept informed of new changes in HR policies, procedures, and programs.

Series, title, and standard determination

The agency has assigned the appealed position to the Human Resources Management Series, GS-201, and titled it Human Resources Officer. The appellant does not disagree. We concur with the agency's series and title determination.

We have evaluated the appellant's personally performed nonsupervisory work by application of the grading criteria in the Job Family Position Classification Standard (JFS) for Administrative Work in the Human Resources Management Group, GS-0200. The GS-201 series covers two-grade interval positions that manage, supervise, administer, advise on, or deliver HR management products or services. Because the appellant's position fully meets the coverage requirements for evaluation as a supervisor specified in the GSSG, we have used the grading criteria in the GSSG to evaluate his supervisory work. The GS-200 JFS clarifies that the GSSG is to be applied when classifying Human Resources Officer positions.

Grade determination

Evaluation of personally performed work

The GS-200 JFS is written in the Factor Evaluation System (FES), which employs nine factors. Under the FES, each factor level description in a standard describes the minimum characteristics needed to receive credit for the described level. Therefore, if a position fails to meet the criteria in a factor level description in any significant aspect, it must be credited at a lower level. Conversely, the position may exceed those criteria in some aspects and still not be credited at a higher level. Each factor level has a corresponding point value. The total points assigned are converted to a grade by use of the grade conversion table in the standard.

The appellant does not dispute the agency's assigned levels for the personally performed work. We concur with the agency's evaluation of Factors 2, 3, and 6 through 9 but disagree with its evaluation of Factors 1, 4, and 5. Therefore, we address only the factors with which we disagree.

Factor 1, Knowledge Required by the Position

This factor measures the nature and extent of information or facts that an employee must understand to do acceptable work (such as steps, procedures, practices, rules, policies, theories, principles, and concepts) and the nature and extent of the skills necessary to apply that knowledge.

Assignments at Level 1-7 require knowledge of and skill in applying a wide range of HR management concepts, laws, policies, practices, and analytical and diagnostic methods and techniques sufficient to solve a wide range of complex, interrelated HR management problems and issues. Employees use this level of knowledge and skill to provide comprehensive HR management advisory and technical services on substantive organizational functions and work practices. They apply analytical and diagnostic techniques and qualitative and quantitative techniques to identify, evaluate, and recommend to management appropriate HR interventions to resolve complex interrelated HR problems and issues. At this level, employees use techniques for consensus building, negotiating, coalition building, and conflict resolution to interact appropriately in highly charged emotional situations. To deliver effective HR services to their clients, employees at this level apply techniques for developing new or modified HR work methods, approaches, or procedures. They also demonstrate oral and written communication techniques sufficient to deliver briefings, project papers, status or staff reports, and correspondence to managers to foster understanding and acceptance of findings and recommendations. At this level, employees specializing in labor and employee relations apply knowledge and skill in applying a wide range of HR case law, principles, practices, and regulations sufficient to perform detailed analyses and draw conclusions on complex legal issues and problems. They apply mediation techniques and other nonadversarial problem solving approaches, including conflict resolution, to resolve highly contested case matters.

Work illustrations at Level 1-7 include identifying, evaluating, and integrating the widest range of considerations into problem solving efforts for serviced organizations; providing management with flexible alternatives for problem resolution; and incorporating consideration of career ladders, career development and training, management practices, working conditions,

recruitment and retention incentives, organizational design, and position classification and position management into problem solving efforts. Illustrations at this level for employees who specialize in labor and employee relations include advising managers about appropriate disciplinary or other corrective techniques concerning conduct or performance problems; researching and applying administrative decisions so as to analyze and craft defensible solutions to problems where precedent cases are not always directly applicable; and serving as the authoritative local interpreter of labor relations laws, regulations, executive orders, and decisions of labor relations formal bodies.

At Level 1-8, employees apply a mastery of advanced HR management principles, concepts, regulations, practices, analytical methods and techniques, and seasoned consultative skill sufficient to resolve HR management problems not susceptible to treatment by standard methods. They apply this level of knowledge and skill to design and conduct comprehensive HR studies characterized by boundaries that are extremely broad and difficult to determine in advance; identify and propose solutions to HR management problems and issues that are characterized by their breadth, importance, and severity and for which previous studies and established techniques are frequently inadequate; and develop recommendations for legislation that would modify the way agencies conduct programs, evaluate new or modified legislation for projected impact upon existing agency programs, or translate complex legislation to meet agency needs. Further, this level of knowledge is used to collaborate with or lead management in employing change process concepts and techniques by assessing organizational readiness for change, marketing organizational awareness, and leading change initiatives; planning, organizing, or directing team efforts to persuade management officials to accept and implement recommendations, where the proposals involve substantial agency resources or require extensive changes in established procedures and methods; and develop, interpret, and analyze data extracts and reports from automated HR databases or develop the most efficient and effective automated systems approaches for presenting HR reports and graphics for management. At this level, employees specializing in labor and employee relations provide authoritative advisory service or develop authoritative policy interpretations; resolve problems characterized by their breadth, importance, and severity for which previous studies and techniques have proven to be inadequate; plan, organize, and conduct research of complex legal problems that involve major areas of uncertainty in approach, methodology, or interpretation to identify appropriate courses of action; and prepare recommendations to significantly change or modify one or more major programs, evaluate the content of new legislation for impact on agency programs or translate legislation into program goals and objectives.

Work illustrations at Level 1-8 include serving as a recognized senior advisor by other senior HR staff and program managers; collaborating with and leading management in employing change management process concepts and techniques such as strategic planning and workforce development; providing management consultative service involving the full spectrum of HR functions within a decentralized environment to perform a key role in rendering expert advisory service and/or authoritative policy interpretations on highly complex agencywide or equivalent issues (for example, reengineering and improving HR processes); and interpreting complex legislative, regulatory, and policy guidance to prepare study recommendations for management. Illustrations at this level include HR specialists in employee relations who serve as agency or equivalent level senior consultants; review policy and procedures to ensure consistency in their

application and recommend modifications; analyze and solve particularly complex and sensitive problems and issues, such as those involving conflicting laws or untested areas of case law, where policy decisions and case strategy guidance have impact throughout the agency. Specialists in labor relations provide staff advisory services on command-wide issues and develop command methods of measurement that provide a valid measurement of the success of the program. They furnish advice on organization-wide strategic plans and organizational issues (such as multiple reductions in force, outsourcing, and reconfigurations of mission workload) and develop the future vision of the labor relations program.

The appellant's position meets Level 1-7. Similar to that level, the appellant applies a wide range of concepts, regulations, policies, and practices relating to all of the HR management functional areas to provide a full range of effective technical services, advise managers on the disposition of specific actions and approaches for resolving complex issues, and resolve conflicts between management and union representatives. Like the illustrations at Level 1-7, the appellant provides technically accurate advice to managers concerning matters such as appropriate disciplinary and adverse actions, grievance and appeal letters, or other corrective techniques in response to a range of conduct and performance problems.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 1-8, where the employee examines broad HR management problems or issues throughout the agency and develops proposed administrative or legislative solutions. In contrast to Level 1-8, the appellant provides technical services at a field installation. His management advisory services relate to local concerns rather than the broad, complex issues addressed at Level 1-8 and included in the work illustrations. The appellant does not develop recommendations for legislation that would modify the way the Forest Service carries out its HR programs and does not measure the agency-wide impact on changes in HR programs. Such responsibilities are found at the Forest Service headquarters HR management level. While the appellant is recognized as a senior advisor in HR matters within the [organization], he does not develop authoritative policy interpretations since such matters are addressed by higher level staff at Forest Service headquarters.

Level 1-7 (1,250 points) is credited.

Factor 4, Complexity

This factor measures the nature, number, variety, and intricacy of tasks, steps, processes, or methods in the work performed; the difficulty in identifying what needs to be done; and the difficulty and originality involved in performing the work.

At Level 4-4, the work consists of resolving problems and issues that often involve conflicting or incomplete information; applying analytical techniques that frequently require modification to accommodate a wide range of variables; and addressing substantive technical issues that are characterized by complex, controversial and/or sensitive matters that contain several interrelated issues. Employees at Level 4-4 conduct detailed planning to gather and interpret information and data for assessing complex problems; assess situations that are complicated by ambiguous, conflicting, and/or incomplete data requiring significant reconstruction to isolate issues and problems; participate in analyzing the effects of changes in law and regulations; reconcile

conflicting or incomplete information; define problems in terms compatible with appropriate laws, policies, or regulations; and weigh pertinent facts in formulating a legal or factually supportable position.

Illustrative assignments at Level 4-4 include providing the full range of management advisory services within the position classification, recruitment and placement, labor relations, and employee relations specialties. For specialists engaged in employee and labor relations, work illustrations include analyzing a variety of employee conduct and performance-based problems where the specialist assists parties in problem definition and assessment of alternative approaches to resolve problems; conducting fact-finding to provide context and resolve disputes; ensuring that managers are aware of the interaction of different laws and help them to identify actions that are consistent with the facts when proposing disciplinary actions; developing case strategy including considering relevant precedents; and representing the organization in formal administrative proceedings involving various motions, pleadings and arguments, and the negotiation of settlements. Illustrations for specialists involved in recruitment and placement include providing continuing technical advice and assistance to customer service units in all areas of staffing and recruitment, including priority placement, reduction in force, furlough, and outplacement; evaluating trends in mission, technology, manpower, fiscal resources, and other factors influencing future needs; providing advice on difficult and unusual recruitment and placement issues or problems; and troubleshooting and resolving the most difficult and controversial internal and external staffing and placement problems.

At Level 4-5, work consists of addressing issues that significantly affect long-range implementation of substantive operational and/or policy programs throughout an agency, bureau, service, or major military command with numerous subordinate HR offices. Specialists at this level resolve different and unrelated problems and issues that affect long-range implementation and administration of substantive interrelated mission-oriented programs, and conduct studies to develop responses to management on new requirements in program operations, legislation, or agency regulations.

Illustrative assignments at Level 4-5 include providing HR consultative and technical services to program managers at a major level of an organization; leading a team effort, or working individually, to conduct broad studies and develop responses to management on new requirements in program operations, legislation, or agency regulations; and conceptualizing and developing departmental policy and program directives in two or more of the major HR functions such as employment, merit promotion, performance management, pay and leave, benefits, classification, and/or suitability. For specialists engaged in employee and labor relations, examples of assignments include advising top management officials of the agency on issues related to conduct and performance, serving as the principal focal point providing labor relations advisory services on command-wide issues to headquarters staff and HR officials, or being responsible for labor relations program development and evaluation and staff advisory functions. An example of an employee with a specialty in recruitment and placement is one who serves as the command-wide or equivalent focal point responsible for advising top management and subordinate management levels and performs duties such as developing or amending staffing policy in the form of legislative proposals, regulations, and other instructional material.

The appellant's position meets Level 4-4. As at that level, HR matters with which the appellant deals involve conflicting or incomplete information and address substantive technical issues that are complex and sensitive where facts and concerns are interrelated. The appellant must plan, gather, and interpret all relevant information, analyze and assess the impact on the [organization], and propose recommendations to resolve difficult HR management issues. Similar to Level 4-4 illustrative assignments, the appellant assists other managers and HR staff in handling complicated HR management issues and interprets, supplements, and disseminates information to managers on the interaction of different laws and regulations affecting HR management in the [organization]. The appellant personally handles the more sensitive problems encountered, such as adverse actions and dealings with the unions. He is responsible for ensuring that HR management services are provided in a timely manner, support the mission needs of the organization, and comply with governing laws and regulations.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 4-5. Unlike that level, he is not responsible for addressing issues and resolving different and unrelated problems that affect long-range implementation of substantive operational and/or policy programs throughout the Forest Service, resolving problems and issues that affect long-range administration of mission-oriented programs, and developing new requirements in program operations, legislation, or agency regulations. This level of complexity, involving policy and program development issues affecting substantive, large-scale programs, are not delegated to or encountered at the appellant's field office level activity.

Level 4-4 (225 points) is credited.

Factor 5, Scope and Effect

This factor covers the relationships between the nature of work and the effect of work products or services both within and outside the organization.

At Level 5-4, the work involves resolving or advising on complex problems and issues that typically require analyzing and/or troubleshooting a wide range of unusual conditions that affect the objectives and effectiveness of the HR mission and program operations. The assessment, analysis, and ultimate resolution of problems promote the overall quality, effectiveness, and efficiency of program operations.

Illustrations of work at Level 5-4 include providing management advisory services to program managers on significant issues such as establishing criteria, formulating projects, assessing program effectiveness, or researching or analyzing a variety of unusual conditions, problems, or questions. Such work products affect a wide range of agency activities. Illustrative assignments at Level 5-4 of specialists engaged in employee and labor relations include providing management advisory services, developing and assessing program effectiveness, and evaluating and analyzing a variety of complex problems associated with casework. Recommendations serve as a basis for commitment to specific courses of action and results of advice may give rise to precedent-setting decisions by third parties.

At Level 5-5, work involves analyzing, evaluating, and developing major aspects of agency-wide HR programs that require isolating and defining unknown conditions, resolving critical problems, or developing new concepts and methodologies. This level also includes issues of sensitivity and potential controversy that when resolved may promote advances in principal HR program plans, goals, objectives, and milestones. The work establishes precedents for other technical experts to follow, and findings and recommendations are typically of major significance to agency management officials and often serve as the basis for new legislation, regulations, or programs.

Similar to Level 5-4, the purpose of the appellant's work is to provide advice and guidance to managers, HR specialists, and union representatives in a field office setting the agency considers equivalent to a regional office. The work involves planning, researching, analyzing and strategizing approaches and making recommendations on best courses of action. The appellant's work affects the effectiveness and efficiency of the field office's HR operations.

The appellant's position does not involve the scope and impact typical of Level 5-5 where the work involves developing major aspects of agency-wide HR programs, requiring isolating and defining unknown conditions, resolving critical problems, or developing new concepts and methodologies. The appellant's major duties do not involve developing major aspects of the Forest Service's HR programs, and his work does not regularly and recurrently establish precedents for others to follow. The appellant's analyses, recommendations, and decisions affect serviced activities within the [organization's] area of responsibility.

This factor is evaluated at Level 5-4 and credited with 225 points.

Summary of personally performed work

By application of the GS-200 JFS, we have evaluated the appellant's personally performed work as follows:

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Points</i>
1. <i>Knowledge Required by the Position</i>	1-7	1,250
2. <i>Supervisory Controls</i>	2-4	450
3. <i>Guidelines</i>	3-4	450
4. <i>Complexity</i>	4-4	225
5. <i>Scope and Effect</i>	5-4	225
6. & 7. <i>Personal Contacts and Purpose of Contacts</i>	3c	180
8. <i>Physical Demands</i>	8-1	5
9. <i>Work Environment</i>	9-1	<u>5</u>
<i>Total</i>		2,790

A total of 2,790 points falls within the GS-12 point range (2,755-3,150) on the grade conversion table in the GS-200 JFS.

Evaluation of supervisory duties

We concur with the levels the agency has assigned for the six factors in the GSSG. In his appeal, the appellant disputes only his agency's assignment of Level 3-2 for Factor 3. Therefore, we discuss only Factor 3 in detail.

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.

At Level 3-2c, the position must carry out at least 3 of the first 4 and a total of 6 or more of the 10 authorities and responsibilities listed. The appellant's position fully meets the criteria for Level 3-2c. For example, he has authority to plan, assign, and evaluate work; advise, counsel, or instruct employees on both work and administrative matters; interview candidates for positions; hear and resolve employee complaints; effect minor disciplinary measures; and provide for training and development.

To meet Level 3-3b, the supervisor, in addition to exercising the authorities and responsibilities described at Level 3-2c, must meet at least 8 of the 15 additional authorities and responsibilities that establish a level of authority significantly higher than Level 3-2c. The appellant believes his position meets 8 of the 15 responsibilities described at Level 3-3b; i.e., responsibilities 2, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 15.

We agree that the appellant's position does not meet responsibilities 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 12. Responsibilities 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8 refer to situations where work is accomplished through subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or other similar personnel and the organizational workload must be so large and its work so complex that it requires using two or more subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or comparable personnel to direct the work. There are no subordinate supervisors or team leaders in the appellant's organization, and the work is not so complex that it would require using subordinate supervisors or team leaders. Responsibility 4 requires direction of a program or major program segment with significant resources (for instance, one at a multimillion dollar level of annual resources). The appellant does not have direct control over a multimillion dollar level of annual resources. Under responsibility 12, a supervisor must determine whether contractor-performed work meets standards of adequacy needed to authorize payment. The appellant does not oversee the work of contractor employees.

Responsibility 2 is credited since the appellant's position involves exercising significant responsibilities in dealing with directors and supervisors in the [serviced organizational locations] and union officials who represent employees in 18 of the 19 [locations]. The appellant provides advice and guidance regarding HR related functions (for example, labor relations, employee relations, staffing) and the impact of decisions or proposed decisions. He also gives advice to the Director of the [organization] and the Deputy Director on a variety of HR issues that involve employees under their management.

Responsibility 7 is credited since the appellant makes selections for subordinate positions in his unit.

Responsibilities 9, 10, and 11 are not credited. These responsibilities involve significant authority to hear and resolve group grievances or serious employee complaints; review and approve serious disciplinary actions; and make decisions on nonroutine, costly, or controversial training requests for employees of the unit. To be credited, these authorities must be exercised on a regular and recurring basis. The appellant does not have decision or approval authorities for these types of administrative actions, and these actions do not arise frequently. The record shows that the appellant has not dealt with any formal group grievances or serious complaints from his employees during the past two years. The authority to review and approve serious disciplinary actions (for example, reprimand, suspension, removal) is reserved for the appellant's supervisor or higher levels within Forest Service. Authority to approve nonroutine, costly, or controversial training is also reserved for higher levels within Forest Service.

Responsibility 13 involves approving expenses comparable to within-grade increases, extensive overtime, and employee travel. The appellant approves within-grade increases and travel. The workload he directs, however, does not require the extensive overtime intended in this responsibility. Because responsibility 13 is not fully met, it may not be credited to the appellant's position.

Responsibility 14 is credited since the appellant recommends awards for his subordinate employees and changes in classification for positions in his unit with approval from higher levels.

Responsibility 15 applies to supervisory and managerial positions that oversee organizations with workloads that are so large and complex as to require attention to team building, reducing barriers to production, or improving business practices. Even with the anticipated backlog and departure of staff during the transition of work to the [city] Service Center, the workload of the appellant's unit does not reach the magnitude and complexity intended in responsibility 15. His efforts to improve office operations meet the demands of finding ways to improve production or increase the quality of work directed are covered under Level 3-2c.

Because the position meets only 3 of the listed responsibilities for Level 3-3b, it must be credited at Level 3-2c. Level 3-2 (450 points) is credited.

Summary of supervisory work

By application of the GSSG, we have evaluated the appellant's supervisory duties as follows:

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Points</i>
1. <i>Program Scope and Effect</i>	1-2	350
2. <i>Organizational Setting</i>	2-2	250
3. <i>Supervisory & Managerial Authority Exercised</i>	3-2c	450
4. <i>Personal Contacts</i>		
A. <i>Nature of Contacts</i>	4A-3	75
B. <i>Purpose of Contacts</i>	4B-3	100
5. <i>Difficulty of Typical Work Directed</i>	5-7	930
6. <i>Other Conditions</i>	6-5	<u>1,225</u>
<i>Total</i>		3,380

The total of 3,380 points falls within the GS-13 range (3,155-3,600) on the grade conversion table provided in the GSSG.

Summary

The appellant's personally performed HR specialist work is evaluated at the GS-12 level while his supervisory duties which represent more than 25 percent of his time are evaluated at the GS-13 level. Therefore, based on our application of the mixed grade position criteria as stated in chapter 5 of *The Classifier's Handbook*, the final grade of the appellant's position is GS-13.

Decision

The appellant's position is properly classified as Human Resources Officer, GS-201-13.