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

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

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

Appellant:	[appellant]
Agency classification:	Supervisory Budget Analyst GS-560-11
Organization:	Fiscal Operation Subunit Administrative Support Unit [city] Field Division Drug Enforcement Administration Department of Justice [city and state]
OPM decision:	Supervisory Budget Analyst GS-560-11
OPM decision number:	C-0560-11-02

/s/

Bonnie J. Brandon
Classification Appeals Officer

November 15, 2002

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 Personnel
Drug Enforcement Administration
U. S. Department of Justice
2401 Jefferson Davis Highway, Room 3162
Alexandria, VA 22301

Director of Personnel
JMD Personnel Staff
U. S. Department of Justice
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Suite 1110
Washington, DC 20530

Introduction

On June 20, 2002, the Dallas Oversight Division of the U. S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a classification appeal from [appellant]. We received his agency's administrative report on August 14, 2002. The appellant's position is currently classified as Supervisory Budget Analyst, GS-560-11. The appellant believes his position should be classified at a higher grade. His position is located in the Fiscal Operations Subunit, Administrative Support Unit, [city] Field Division, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), Department of Justice (DOJ), in [city, state]. We have accepted and decided the appeal under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code.

We conducted on-site interviews with the appellant and his supervisor on October 3, 2002. In deciding this appeal, we fully considered the interview findings and all information provided by the appellant and his agency, including his current work assignments and position description of record.

DEA's Office of Personnel conducted a review of all Fiscal Operation Subunit positions approximately two years ago. As a result of that review, standard position descriptions were established, and each Division was advised by memorandum dated July 24, 2001, to reassign the incumbents to the revised position descriptions. Even though the appellant was never officially reassigned by a formal personnel action, he has been operating under the revised position description for the past year. We consider the revised standard position description, number [number] to be the appellant's official position description of record based on DEA's July 24, 2001, memorandum.

Although the appellant and his supervisor disagree with two aspects of position description number [number], they believe it generally describes the appellant's duties and responsibilities. They both contend that the position description does not fully describe the appellant's supervisory responsibilities. The appellant's supervisor also believes the position description does not capture the appellant's involvement in developing budget proposals and the knowledge of the Division's mission, programs, and objectives necessary to do so. We reviewed the position description and find, with one exception, that it is adequate for classification purposes. Although the position description does not go into great detail regarding the supervisory responsibilities, it provides sufficient information that, along with the supplemental information we received, permits proper classification. In addition, the appellant's position description lists knowledge of the organization and programs, including goals and objectives, as one of the position's knowledge requirements. This information is fully considered in our decision that follows.

The exception to the position description's adequacy that we identified involves *Factor 4, Complexity.* The position description credits Level 4-4 for *Factor 4* and describes complexities that are characteristic of that level. In its evaluation statement, however, DEA credits Level 4-3 in grading the appellant's budget duties. Our review, as explained below, also credits Level 4-3. The position description should be revised to reflect the correct information in the factor level description used to credit Level 4-3. The agency must provide this office a copy of the revised position description and the personnel action effecting that revised position description.

Position information

As a Budget Analyst, the appellant is responsible for preparing and monitoring the budget for the [city] Field Division of the DEA. The [city] Field Division covers DEA offices in [four states]. The appellant advises Division management on the full range of financial activities and recommends solutions to fiscal problems, such as redistribution of funds to cover budget surpluses or shortfalls. The appellant prepares and analyzes a variety of financial reports in order to compare actual fiscal performance with budget estimates. The appellant reviews policy and procedural changes and advises managers regarding the impact the changes may have on program funding. The appellant certifies vouchers and invoices for payment and authorizes disbursement of funds.

The appellant supervises a staff of Federal and contractor personnel that provide fiscal support in invoice and voucher approval, obligation reconciliation, payment processing, data entry, and budget monitoring assistance. Staff members also respond to inquiries from vendors and serve as imprest fund cashiers.

Series and title determination

According to the GS-500 Job Family Position Classification Standard (PCS) for Professional and Administrative Work in the Accounting and Budget Group, positions that perform any phase of budget administration are covered by the GS-560 Budget Analysis Series. The appellant performs work related to formulating and executing a budget, and his position is properly placed in the GS-560 series.

The PCS for the GS-500 series prescribes that the title for positions that perform analytical, technical, and administrative duties in one or more phases of the budget process is Budget Analyst. The prefix "Supervisory" is added to the title of positions with supervisory responsibilities. The appealed position is properly titled Supervisory Budget Analyst.

Standard and guide determination

The appellant performs both budget-related and supervisory duties and responsibilities. The grade of the budget-related duties is determined by applying the grading criteria in the GS-500 PCS. The General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG) is used to determine the grade level of the appellant's supervisory duties and responsibilities.

Grade determination

Evaluation using the GS-500 PCS

The GS-500 PCS is written in the Factor Evaluation System (FES) format. Under the FES, positions are placed in grades on the basis of their duties, responsibilities, and the qualifications required as evaluated in terms of nine factors common to nonsupervisory General Schedule positions.

A point value is assigned to each factor based on a comparison of the position's duties with the factor-level descriptions in the standard. The factor point values mark the lower end of the ranges for the factor levels. For a factor to warrant a given point value, it must be fully equivalent to the overall intent of the selected factor-level description. If the position fails in any significant aspect to meet a particular factor-level description, the point value for the next lower factor level must be assigned. The total points are converted to a grade by use of the grade conversion table in the standard. Our evaluation with respect to the nine FES factors follows.

Factor 1, Knowledge required by the position

As described in the GS-500 PCS, assignments at Level 1-7 require intensive and detailed knowledge of the policies, precedents, goals, objectives, regulations, and guidelines of a budget function (such as budget formulation and/or execution) in order to analyze and evaluate continual changes in program plans and funding and their effect on budget program milestones. Recommendations for budgetary actions are often made under uncertain conditions, short timeframes, and conflicting objectives. The PCS provides a representative work situation at this level of reviewing and consolidating annual and multiyear budget estimates for assigned organizations and programs. Also included is work monitoring a budget with many different sources and types of funding and analyzing trends in obligations and expenditures to ensure that funds are available to support program objectives.

The work at Level 1-8 requires mastery of the concepts, principles, laws, and regulations of budgeting and the relationships between subordinate and the most senior levels of budgeting within the employing entity. This level of knowledge is used to analyze national level programs, develop and implement budget policies, interpret new and revised Congressional legislation concerning the formulation and execution of budgets, develop new methods and techniques of budgeting, or render authoritative interpretations of executive orders, policies, and precedents within and across agency lines.

Level 1-7 is met. The appellant is involved in the formulation and execution of the budget for the [city] Field Division. The appellant must apply a comprehensive and detailed knowledge of cost accounting techniques; Federal, DEA, and DOJ procedures and regulations; and the objectives and performance measures of each program office. This knowledge is used to develop an annual budget proposal, monitor expenditures and cost estimates for each program during the fiscal year, advise program managers on the status of their budgets and activities that may affect funding, and determine whether requests for funds are necessary and proper. The appellant must deal with funding for programs that do not remain constant in terms of mission objectives, funding requirements, and work processes.

Level 1-8 is not met since the appellant's budget responsibilities do not extend to the national level of his agency and do not cross agency lines. In addition, the appellant does not serve in an authoritative capacity using the broad parameters as depicted at Level 1-8.

Level 1-7 is credited for 1250 points.

Factor 2, Supervisory controls

At Level 2-4, the supervisor outlines overall objectives. The employee and supervisor together discuss timeframes and possible approaches for completing assignments. The employee at this level is fully experienced in applying concepts and methodologies and is knowledgeable in program requirements. The employee is responsible for planning and carrying out assignments, directing other functional specialists, resolving most conflicts that arise, interpreting policy and regulatory requirements, and providing recommendations for improvements. The employee keeps the supervisor informed of progress and potentially controversial matters. The supervisor reviews completed work for soundness of overall approach and adherence to requirements.

The supervisor at Level 2-5 provides administrative and policy direction in terms of broadly-defined missions or functions of the organization. The employee independently plans, designs, and carries out the work to be done. The employee is responsible for a significant program or function. The employee defines objectives, interprets policy by higher authorities, and determines their effect on program needs. The work is reviewed for fulfillment of budget program objectives and the effect of decisions on the overall program

Level 2-4 is met. The appellant, along with his supervisor, determine timeframes for completing special projects and assignments. The appellant independently carries out his assignments with little or no review by the supervisor while work is in progress. The appellant resolves most conflicts that arise, clearing matters of a controversial or precedent-setting nature with his supervisor. The appellant interprets policy on his own initiative. The supervisor reviews completed work for effectiveness in meeting goals and objectives.

Level 2-5 is not met because the appellant receives more than administrative direction in carrying out his responsibilities and performs his duties using more than the broad policy direction depicted at Level 2-5. In addition, the appellant is responsible for a portion of a significant program; i.e., budget and fiscal operations at a field division as opposed to the overall budget program for an agency.

Level 2-4 is credited for 450 points.

Factor 3, Guidelines

Guidelines at Level 3-3 typically provide a preferred approach or describe generally accepted standards rather than specific requirements. Guidelines include handbooks developed at higher echelons, a handbook containing specifications for a financial information system, Internal Revenue Code, Federal tax regulations, Treasury regulations, precedent cases, and other legal decisions. The employee at this level uses judgment to adapt the guidelines to specific cases or problems and to interpret a large number of varied policies and regulations.

Guidelines and policies at Level 3-4 are typically scarce and very general in nature. The guidelines are stated in terms of goals to be accomplished rather than the approach to be taken. Precedents are either not available or not applicable. Examples of guidelines used at this level include Office of Management and Budget circulars and regulations, Treasury regulations,

judicial decisions, Comptroller General decisions, and broad agency program goals and policy statements. The employee routinely develops specific objectives and devises new methods, techniques, and criteria, such as identifying trends and patterns, acquiring information, modifying systems, developing solutions, and presenting findings.

Level 3-3 is met. The appellant uses a wide range of Federal, DOJ, and DEA regulations, policies, and guidelines that are both specific and general in nature. Examples include Chief Financial Officer Bulletins, Financial Manager's Handbook, Federal Financial System user manuals, Government Accounting Office Policy and Procedures Manual for Guidance of Federal Agencies, Department of Treasury Financial Manual, Government Performance and Results Act, a variety of Office of Management and Budget guidelines, and DEA's Strategic Plan. Some of the guidelines directly apply to work assignments, and some require interpretation and adaptation to specific situations. For example, the guidelines do not explain how to reprogram funds to accommodate shortages or surpluses in budget accounts or changes in program initiatives.

Level 3-4 is not met. While many of the guidelines available to the appellant provide only general information, they are not as scarce or vague as to impose the high degree of interpretation on a regular basis as intended in order to credit Level 3-4. There is also no indication that the appellant routinely develops new methods to identify trends, acquire information, or modify systems.

Level 3-3 is credited for 275 points.

Factor 4, Complexity

The work at Level 4-3 consists of varied duties that require application of different, but established methods, practices, and techniques. Organizations, activities, services, and accounts are relatively stable from one year to the next and throughout the fiscal year. Funding is from readily identifiable sources, such as allotments and reimbursements. Information may pertain to past, present, and future costs of basic administrative programs and services, such as salaries and wages of employees, office supplies, equipment, and travel. The employee at this level compiles, analyzes, and summarizes financial and budgetary information; translates organizational needs and objectives into budget dollars and the funding actions required to accomplish them; and considers program goals, provisions of policies and regulations, and alternative methods of obtaining and distributing funds. Decisions are based on factual considerations, such as the amount of funds in an account, deadlines integral to the budget cycle, and local controls over and regulations pertaining to spending.

At Level 4-4, the work consists of a variety of analytical, technical, and administrative work for substantive programs and support activities. These programs and activities are funded through a number of sources, such as appropriations, allotments, reimbursable accounts, and transfers of funds between organizations. Programs and funding are unstable and subject to change throughout the fiscal year, necessitating frequent adjustments to budget estimates. The employee at this level identifies and analyzes changes in budgetary and financial policies, regulations, and available funds that affect accomplishing program objectives; analyzes data to develop annual and multiyear budget estimates; conducts research and identifies trends in the use of funds; and

recommends adjustments in program spending that require the rescheduling of program workloads. The employee assists program managers and staff officials in interpreting the impact of and planning for multiyear budgetary, financial, and program changes. Unpredictable short-term deadlines, available funding, program goals, and workload make it difficult to identify trends in the use of funds, recommend program spending adjustments, and assist program managers in planning for multiyear changes.

Level 4-3 is met. The appellant's work involves a variety of budget and accounting duties involving the Division's operating funds. The appellant and his supervisor formulate a three-year budget plan for the Division, which is a conceptual plan of what may occur in the future. They also prepare a detailed budget proposal each fiscal year based on past spending levels and ongoing and planned program activities. The appellant monitors the budget throughout the fiscal year and prepares financial data reports for program managers so that they can make informed decisions. The appellant provides recommendations for resolving budget shortfalls and other problems that arise. There are 65 accounts for which the appellant is responsible that are funded through appropriations and a grant. Many of the accounts involve agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies. Most of the accounts are stationary in that they are targeted for specific programs, and the funds cannot be moved around. Six of the funds can be moved around. The accounts cover 28 programs, such as overhead expenses, task force operations, regulatory programs, and anti-narcotic initiatives. The anti-narcotic initiatives are funded through two-year grants. The accounts remain relatively stable each year. In carrying out his assignments, the appellant must consider a myriad of regulatory constraints, proposed uses of requested funds, mission priorities that may change based on national initiatives, how best to reprogram funds to accommodate program objectives, and cyclical timeframes and deadlines.

Level 4-4 is not met since the budget for which the appellant is responsible does not involve the variety of funding sources or unstable conditions expected at this level. The long-range planning typical of this level is also not present in the appellant's budget responsibilities. The appellant is involved in three-year budget forecasting, but the actual budget development, execution, and assistance to management is carried out on an annual basis. The appellant's duties do not involve the level of difficulty envisioned at Level 4-4 in identifying trends in the use of funds, proposing adjustments in spending that require rescheduling of program workloads, and planning for multiyear program changes.

Level 4-3 is credited for 150 points.

Factor 5, Scope and effect

The work for a budget analyst at Level 5-3 involves independently conducting a variety of tasks associated with all phases of budget formulation and execution related to segments of the budget for assigned support activities. The employee at this level uses standard methods to resolve conventional problems and issues. The work results in information on the amount, timeliness, and availability of funds and affects program operations.

The budget analyst at Level 5-4 formulates and executes long-range (i.e., three to five years or longer) detailed budget forecasts and plans for substantive agency programs and projects. The

analyst at this level establishes financial and budgetary goals, timetables, milestones, and other criteria against which the relative costs and benefits of program achievements can be measured. The work at this level affects the amount and availability of funds for major substantive or administrative programs and services.

Level 5-3 is met. The purpose of the appellant's work is to prepare and monitor a one-year detailed budget for a segment of a substantive agency program, provide advice and recommendations to management, certify payments, and authorize disbursement of funds. The work contributes to attaining the financial goals of the Division, the cost effective and legal use of funds, and ensures the programs have the funds necessary to operate.

Level 5-4 is not met since the appellant is not responsible for formulating and executing a detailed budget that extends beyond one year. In addition, the Division is not considered a substantive agency program, but rather a portion of one. The appellant does not establish goals, timetables, milestones, and other criteria for a substantive agency program. Because of these factors, the impact of his work does not extend to the degree envisioned for crediting Level 5-4.

Factor Level 5-3 is credited for 150 points.

Factors 6 and 7, Personal contacts and Purpose of contacts

These two factors are evaluated separately but combined for the purpose of arriving at a total point value.

Personal contacts

Contacts at Level 3 are with executives, officials, managers, professionals, and employees of other agencies and outside organizations and businesses. Contacts are not routine or recurring. Participants must learn the role and authority of each party during the course of the contact. Examples include representatives of contractors; attorneys and accountants of business firms; representatives of State and local governments; administrators, professors, and staff of universities and hospitals; other Federal agencies; and various levels of agency management at higher levels in the agency.

Contacts at Level 4 are with high-ranking officials from outside the employing agency at national or international levels in highly unstructured settings. Examples include Congressional appropriations committee members, Presidential advisors, State governors, mayors of large cities, presidents of national unions, or the news media on matters of national significance.

Level 3 is met. The appellant has regular contacts with Division program managers and Resident/Special Agents in Charge; financial policy specialists and attorneys at DEA headquarters; budget and accounting officials from other Federal, State, and local government agencies; and members of the business community. These contacts are not always routine in that the appellant must explain the purpose of the contacts. The contacts are not with the high-level officials depicted at Level 4.

Purpose of contacts

The purpose of contacts at Level B is to plan, arrange, coordinate, or advise on work efforts and obtain information. Differences of opinion may exist, but the persons contacted are usually working toward a common goal and are generally cooperative. Contacts at this level typically are for the purpose of explaining the significance of guidelines, appropriateness of recommendations, necessity for additional information, preferred course of action, resolving problems, and answering questions.

At Level C, contacts are to influence, motivate, interrogate, or controls persons or groups when there is wide disagreement on the merits of a proposed action or when persons are fearful or uncooperative. An example includes persuading program managers and other officials in positions of decision-making authority with widely differing goals and interests to follow a recommended course of action.

Level B is met. The purpose of the appellant's contacts is to obtain vendor information for goods and services, obtain reimbursement agreements from other government agencies, resolve budget and fiscal problems, advise managers on fiscal activities, and persuade supervisors and managers to accept his recommendations. While there may be some degree of skepticism at times on the part of management officials to accept the appellant's recommendations, we do not find the high degree of uncooperativeness that is typical of Level C to exist in his routine contacts.

Both factors are credited at Level 3B for a combined total of 110 points.

Factor 8, Physical demands

The work at Level 8-1 is principally sedentary. Some work may require walking and standing when traveling and attending meetings and conferences. Some employees may carry light items or drive a car. No special physical effort or ability is required to do the work.

Level 8-1 is met and not exceeded. The appellant's work is primarily sedentary and involves some overnight travel.

Level 8-1 is credited for 5 points.

Factor 9, Work environment

At Level 9-1, the employee works in an adequately lighted, heated, and ventilated office setting. Some employees may be exposed to uncomfortable conditions in such places as factories, construction yards, and supply yards.

Level 9-1 is met and not exceeded. The appellant works in an office setting and is not exposed to uncomfortable conditions.

Level 9-1 is credited for 5 points.

Summary

Factor	*Level*	*Points*
1. Knowledge required by the position	1-7	1250
2. Supervisory controls	2-4	450
3. Guidelines	3-3	275
4. Complexity	4-3	150
5. Scope and effect	5-3	150
6. Personal contacts and		
7. Purpose of contacts	3B	110
8. Physical demands	8-1	5
9. Work environment	9-1	5
Total		2395

A total of 2395 points falls within the range for GS-11 (2355 to 2750 points), according to the grade conversion table in the GS-500 PCS. The appellant's budget analyst duties are properly graded at the GS-11 level.

Evaluation using the GSSG

The GSSG is intended to measure the difficulty, complexity, and responsibility of work involved in the administrative and technical direction of others. The GSSG uses a factor-point evaluation method that assesses six factors common to all supervisory positions. The appellant's supervisory responsibilities are evaluated as follows.

Factor 1, Program scope and effect

To credit a particular level under this factor, the criteria for both scope and effect must be met.

a. Scope

At Level 1-2, the supervisor directs a program segment that is administrative, technical, or complex clerical in nature. The functions performed have limited geographic coverage and support most of the activities of a typical agency field office, an area office, or a small to medium military installation. An illustration of the scope of work at this level is directing budget services that support a small military base with no extensive research or development missions or a field office of moderate size and limited complexity.

The supervisor at Level 1-3 directs a program segment that performs complex technical, administrative, protective, investigative, or professional work. The program segment and work directed typically have coverage that encompasses a major metropolitan area, a state, or a small region of several states. Illustrative of this level are positions that direct administrative services (personnel, supply management, budget, and facilities management) that support and directly affect bureau operations or a group of comparable organizations. An illustration of the scope of

work at this level is directing administrative services that support the operations of a bureau or major military command headquarters.
Level 1-2 is met. The appellant directs work that is technical and administrative in nature, providing fiscal services for a Division with offices in four states and a workforce of less than 300. Although the area serviced covers four states, the size of the workforce serviced is more similar to that of a moderate-sized field office. In addition, the nature of the work is more limited in terms of complexity than intended for crediting Level 1-3; i.e., fiscal operations as opposed to the full range of administrative services for a bureau or major military command.

b. *Effect*

At Level 1-2, the services or products support and significantly affect installation level, area office level, or field office operations and objectives. Also at this level are services provided to a moderate, local, or limited population of clients comparable to a major portion of a small city or rural county.

The services at Level 1-3 directly and significantly impact a wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, the operations of outside interests, or the general public. At the field activity level, the work directly impacts the provision of essential support operations to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, and administrative functions.

Level 1-2 is met. The services directed by the appellant affect fiscal operations at a field activity for a moderate-sized workforce. The work does not impact a wide range of agency activities, external organizations, or a variety of complex functions as described at Level 1-3.

Because Level 1-2 is assigned to both *Scope* and *Effect*, Level 1-2 is credited for this factor for 350 points.

Factor 2, Organizational setting

This factor considers the organizational situation of the supervisory position in relation to higher levels of management. As at Level 2-1, the appellant reports to the Administrative Officer, who is two reporting levels below the first Senior Executive Service level position.

Level 2-1 is credited for 100 points.

Factor 3, Supervisory and managerial authority exercised

Level 3-2 describes three situations, only one of which must be met for this level to be credited. Situation c lists 10 supervisory authorities and responsibilities. At least three of the first four and a total of six out of the ten responsibilities must be performed before crediting this level. The appellant meets all ten of the responsibilities as follows.

- Plans work to be accomplished by subordinates, sets and adjusts short-term priorities, and prepares schedules for completion of work.

- Assigns work to subordinates based on priorities, selective consideration of the difficulty and requirements of assignments, and the capabilities of employees.
- Evaluates work performance of subordinates.
- Gives advice, counsel, or instruction to employees on both work and administrative matters.
- Interviews candidates for positions in the unit; recommends appointment, promotion, or reassignment to such positions.
- Hears and resolves complaints from employees, referring group grievances and more serious unresolved complaints to a higher supervisor or manager.
- Effects minor disciplinary measures, recommending other action in more serious cases;
- Identifies, provides, and arranges for needed development and training.
- Finds ways to improve production or increase the quality of the work directed.
- Develops performance standards.

Level 3-3 describes two situations, one of which must be met to be credited. In situation a, the position exercises delegated managerial authority to set a series of annual, multiyear, or similar long-range work plans and schedules for in-service or contracted work; assures implementation by subordinate organizational units of program goals and objectives; determines which goals and objectives need additional emphasis; determines the best solution to budget shortages; and plans for long-range staffing needs. Positions in this situation are closely involved with high-level program officials or comparable agency staff personnel in developing overall goals and objectives for assigned programs. For example, they direct development of data; provision of expertise and insights; securing of legal opinions; preparation of position papers or legislative proposals; and execution of comparable activities which support development of goals and objectives related to high levels of program management and development or formulation.

The appellant does not meet situation 3-3a which requires participation in program management, development, and formulation with high-level program officials (e.g., at an agency headquarters level). In addition, the appellant does not have subordinate organizational units for which he is responsible.

Situation b involves the exercise of a range of supervisory authorities and responsibilities that exceed those normally exercised by a first-line supervisor. The supervisor at this level must exercise all or nearly all of the supervisory responsibilities described at Level 3-2c, as well as at least 8 of the 15 responsibilities described in situation b. The appellant meets three of the responsibilities as follows.

- Responsibility 1 is not met since the appellant does not use supervisors or leaders to direct, coordinate, or oversee the work, including the work performed by contractors.
- Responsibility 2 is met. The appellant works with officials in other units and advises management officials of higher rank in the Division.
- Responsibility 3 is not met. The appellant does not assure reasonable equity among units, groups, or teams of performance standards and rating techniques developed by subordinates due to the small size of his subordinate staff.
- Responsibility 4 is not met. The appellant does not have final authority for directing a program with significant resources. While the appellant monitors the budget for the

Division, it is higher-level management officials who have ultimate responsibility for how the funds are used.

- Responsibility 5 is not met since the appellant does not make decisions on work problems presented by subordinate supervisors or team leaders, including contractor supervisors.
- Responsibility 6 is not met since the appellant does not evaluate subordinate supervisors or leaders.
- Responsibility 7 is not met since the appellant does not have approval authority to select subordinate nonsupervisory positions.
- Responsibility 8 is not met since the appellant does not recommend selections for subordinate supervisory positions.
- Responsibility 9 is not met since the appellant does not hear and resolve group grievances of serious employee complaints. Complaints of this nature would be resolved at a higher level.
- Responsibility 10 is not met since the appellant may recommend a serious disciplinary action, but such an action is approved at a higher level.
- Responsibility 11 is not met since training requests are approved by the appellant's supervisor.
- Responsibility 12 is not met since the appellant does not determine whether contractor-performed work meets standards of adequacy necessary for authorization of payment. While the appellant oversees the work of contractor personnel and provides input on their performance, the actual determination of whether their work meets standards of adequacy is made by the contracting officer's technical representative, who is located at DEA headquarters.
- Responsibility 13 is not met since employee travel and extensive overtime requires approval by a higher-level official.
- Responsibility 14 is met since the appellant recommends awards and changes in position classification, subject to approval by higher-level officials.
- Responsibility 15 is met since the appellant identifies and implements ways to eliminate or reduce significant bottlenecks and barriers to production or improve business practices.

Level 3-3b is not met since the appellant's position is not credited with at least 8 of the 15 responsibilities. Level 3-2c is credited for 450 points.

Factor 4, Personal contacts

This is a two-part factor that 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

At Level 4A-2, frequent contacts are with members of the business community or the general public; higher-ranking managers, supervisors, and staff of other units throughout the activity or at levels below bureau or major military command level; representatives of local public interest groups; case workers in Congressional district offices; technical or operating personnel in State

and local governments; reporters for local or other limited media outlets; or comparable contacts. These contacts may be informal, occur in conferences and meetings, or take place through telephone, televised, radio, or similar contact, and sometimes require nonroutine or special preparation.

At Level 4A-3, recurring contacts are with high-ranking military or civilian managers at bureau and major organizational levels within the agency; agency administrative personnel or with comparable personnel in other agencies; key staff of public interest groups with significant political influence or media coverage; journalists representing influential city or county news media; Congressional committee and subcommittee staff assistants; contracting officials and high-level technical staff of large industrial firms; or local officers of regional or national trade associations, public action groups or professional organizations; or with State and local government managers. These contacts take place in meetings and conferences and often require extensive preparation.

The appellant's contacts meet Level 4A-2. The appellant routinely meets with Division program managers, headquarters administrative staff, officials from other government agencies, contractors, and members of the business community. The appellant does not routinely meet with higher-ranking managers within DEA or with the high-level personnel and groups as described at Level 4A-3. In addition, the appellant's contacts do not normally require the high degree of preparation as described at Level 4A-3.

This subfactor is credited with Level 4A-2 for 50 points.

Subfactor 4B, Purpose of contacts

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

Contacts at Level 4B-3 are to justify, defend, or negotiate in representing the program segment or organizational unit 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 conferences, meetings, hearings, or presentations involving problems or issues of considerable importance to the program segment managed.

The purpose of the appellant's contacts meets Level 4B-2. The appellant's contacts are primarily for the purpose of obtaining and exchanging information, advising on fiscal problems and issues, obtaining reimbursement agreements, and persuading supervisors and managers to accept his recommendations. We do not find that the appellant is involved in defending or negotiating to the degree intended for crediting Level 4B-3.

This subfactor is credited with Level 4B-2 for 75 points.

Factor 5, Difficulty of typical work directed

This factor measures the difficulty and complexity of the basic work most typical of the organization directed. For first-level supervisors, this means the highest grade that best characterizes the nature of the basic nonsupervisory work performed and that constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload.

The appellant supervises four Federal employees: one GS-561-9 Budget Technician, two GS-525-7 Accounting Technicians, and one GS-530-7 Imprest Fund Cashier. At the time the appellant filed his appeal with OPM, he was also supervising two contract support personnel who performed essentially the same duties as the Federal employees. Since the appellant filed his appeal, however, the contract for the support personnel was terminated, and the appellant is currently supervising only the four Federal employees.

A new contract was recently issued that will place under the appellant's supervision three Accounting Clerks, one Secretary, and one Switchboard Operator-Receptionist. These employees had not entered on duty at the time of this decision pending their security clearances. Nonetheless, we evaluated the duties of the Accounting Clerks to determine their General Schedule grade equivalency. The Secretary and Switchboard Operator positions were not evaluated since they are not performing the basic budget and accounting work of the organization.

- Two of the Accounting Clerks will support payment processing and responding to inquiries, similar to the work performed by the GS-525-7 Accounting Technicians.

- The other Accounting Clerk will perform and report on internal reviews of the quality of processed transactions, such as reviewing obligations open more than 21 days to determine the legitimacy and necessity of the obligation or reviewing obligating documents for informational sufficiency or regulatory compliance. We applied the GS-500 Job Family Standard (JFS) for Clerical and Technical Accounting and Budget Work to determine the grade of this position. The GS-500 JFS covers work in verifying the accuracy of accounts and adequacy of supporting data. The JFS also covers work in reviewing the efficiency of clerical processes and compliance with prescribed procedures and recommending improvements where needed. Our review determined the work of this position would not exceed the GS-7 grade level.

We find the basic nonsupervisory work performed that constitutes at least 25 percent of the workload to be at the GS-7 grade level. This grade level covers the subordinate Federal employees under the appellant, as well as the contractor personnel that may enter on duty in the near future. Using the chart provided in the GSSG, Level 5-4 is credited if the highest level of work is GS-7.

Level 5-4 is credited for 505 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. Two steps are used to evaluate Factor 6. First, the highest level that a position substantially meets is initially credited. If the level selected is 6-1, 6-2, or 6-3, the *Special Situations* section is to be used to determine if three or more of the eight situations are met. If at least three situations are met, another level may be added.

Level 6-2a applies when the work supervised involves technician or support work comparable in difficulty to GS-7 or GS-8, or work at the GS-4, 5, or 6 levels where the supervisor has full and technical authority over the work, and the work requires coordination and integration of work efforts in order to produce a completed product or service. Full and final technical authority means that the supervisor makes all technical determinations without advice or assistance on even the most difficult and unusual problems and without further review except from an administrative or program evaluation standpoint. Credit should be limited to situations involving an extraordinary degree of finality in technical decision making. At this level, the required coordination ensures consistency of product, service, interpretation, or advice and conformance with the output of other units, formal standards, or agency policy. Supervisors typically coordinate with supervisors of other units to deal with requirements and problems affecting others outside the organization.

At Level 6-3a, supervision and oversight requires coordination, integration, or consolidation of administrative, technical, or complex technician or other support work comparable to GS-9 or 10, or work at the GS-7 or 8 levels where the supervisor has full and final technical authority over the work.

Level 6-2a is assigned since GS-7 is the highest level of work supervised by the appellant and the coordination required of the supervisor is typical of the 6-2 level. The appellant does not serve as the full and final technical authority for the work supervised.

Special situations

1. Variety of work. This situation is credited when more than one kind of work, each representing a requirement for a distinctly different additional body of knowledge on the part of the supervisor, is present in the work of the unit. A "kind of work" is usually the equivalent of a classification series.

   This situation is not credited. The employees supervised by the appellant are all performing accounting/budgeting support work.

2. Shift operations. This situation is credited when the position supervises an operation carried out on at least two fully staffed shifts.

   The appellant does not supervise shift work, so this situation is not credited.

3. Fluctuating workforce or constantly changing deadlines. This situation is credited when the workforce supervised by the position has large fluctuations in size, e.g., seasonal variations in staff. This situation can also be credited when frequent, abrupt, and unexpected changes in work assignments, goals, and deadlines require the supervisor to constantly adjust operations under the pressure of continuously changing and unpredictable conditions.

   This situation is not credited since the appellant supervises a workforce that does not fluctuate in size. Although the appellant has a large workload, there is no indication that he must constantly adjust operations under pressure and unpredictable conditions.

4. Physical dispersion. This situation is credited when a substantial portion of the workload for which the supervisor is responsible is regularly carried out at one or more locations physically removed from the main unit.

   This situation is not credited. Even though the appellant has technical oversight over four Imprest Fund Cashiers in other Division offices, he does not have direct supervision over these employees. The technical oversight the appellant provides over the cashiers does not create a more difficult degree of supervision sufficient to credit this situation.

5. Special staffing situations. This situation is credited when a substantial portion of the workforce is involved in special employment programs, require counseling on a regular and recurring basis, and require job assignments or training that must be tailored to fit special circumstances.

   This situation does not apply to the appellant since he is not required to resolve difficult human resources management issues such as those described.

6. Impact of specialized programs. This situation is credited when supervisors are responsible for a significant technical or administrative workload in grades above the level of work credited in Factor 5.

   This situation is not credited. The appellant supervises one employee at the GS-9 level. This is not considered a significant workload that would complicate the appellant's supervisory responsibilities enough to warrant credit.

7. Changing technology. This situation is credited when work processes and procedures vary constantly because of the impact of changing technology, creating a requirement for extensive training and guidance of the subordinate staff.

   This situation is not credited. There is no indication that changing technology imposes additional complications on the appellant's supervisory responsibilities.

8. Special hazard and safety conditions. This situation is credited when the supervisory position is regularly made more difficult by the need to make provision for significant unsafe or hazardous conditions.

This situation is not credited. The appellant and his staff are not exposed to unsafe or hazardous conditions.

Since none of the special situations applies to the appellant's supervisory responsibilities, an extra level is not warranted. Level 6-2 is credited for 575 points.

Summary

Factor	*Level*	*Points*
1. Program scope and effect	1-2	350
2. Organizational setting	2-1	100
3. Supervisory and managerial authority exercised	3-2c	450
4. Personal contacts		
4A. Nature of contacts	4A-2	50
4B. Purpose of contacts	4B-2	75
5. Difficulty of typical work directed	5-4	505
6. Other conditions	6-2	575
Total		*2105*

A total of 2105 points falls in the GS-10 range (2105–2350) by reference to the grade conversion chart in the GSSG.

Grade summary

The appellant's budget analyst duties are evaluated at the GS-11 grade level, and the supervisory duties at the GS-10 grade level. The budget analyst duties are determined to be grade controlling. The appellant's position is properly classified at the GS-11 grade level.

Decision

The appellant's position is properly classified as Supervisory Budget Analyst, GS-560-11.