

OPM decision number: C-0334-09-01, 8/14/97

PH:OD:97-14

PERSONAL

Dear:

This is our decision on the position classification appeal filed with our office, which we accepted under the authority contained in section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C).

This appellate decision constitutes a classification certificate that is mandatory and binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting officials of the Government. It is the final administrative decision on the classification of this position, and it is not subject to further appeal. It is subject to review only under the limited conditions and time limits specified in title 5 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 511.603 and 511.613, and the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards, Appendix 4. It must be implemented in accordance with the provisions contained in 5 CFR 511.612.

**POSITION INFORMATION**

Appellant:	[Appellant]
Current Classification:	Management Analyst, GS-343-11
Position Number:	03281E
Requested Classification:	Management Analyst, GS-343-12
OPM Decision:	Computer Specialist, GS-334-09
Organizational Information:	U.S. Department of the Treasury Internal Revenue Service {installation} Regional Office Office of the Compliance Officer {installation city and state}

**ANALYSIS AND DECISION**

In considering your appeal, we carefully reviewed all of the information sub-mitted by you or on your behalf; information obtained from an audit with you on June 26,

1997; an interview with the Acting Director of the Examination Program, an interview with the Director of the Coordinated Examination Program, an interview with a Program Analyst in the Examination Program, and the Acting Director of the Collection Field Function on June 26, 1997; an interview with the former Director of the Examination Program, now on detail to the [city, state] office on June 27, 1997; and telephone interviews during the week of July 7-11, 1997 with the Director of the Collection Field Function, a Program Analyst in the [city] Examination and Analysis Planning Team, a Program Analyst in the Planning and Quality Office of the Assistant to the Regional Commissioner, [and persons] of the Executive Management Support System staff, and a Program Analyst in the Western Region; and other pertinent classification information provided by your activity at our request.

It is our decision that your position is classified properly as Computer Specialist, GS-334-9. Accordingly, your appeal is denied and your position downgraded for the reasons that follow.

The basis of your appeal is that believe your position warrants evaluation as a Management Analyst, GS 343-12. You stated your position should be upgraded because of the additional duties you are performing; i.e., “the significant computer applications for which I am responsible.” You clarified, however, “I never requested to be reclassified to the Computer Specialist position, rather I am seeking to be appropriately compensated for additional duties above and beyond those elements in my current P.D.” Undergirding the basis of your appeal rationale is your belief that your position is comparable in duties and responsibilities to another position located in the Western Region Examination Office that is classified as a Computer Specialist, GS-334-12. In your appeal correspondence, you indicated that your agency’s classification of your position may have been influenced by your gender and ethnic origin. You stressed the quality of your performance, and your desire “to be appropriately compensated for the duties which I have been assigned and perform in the highest quality manner.” You took issue with the quality of position review conduct by your agency in their review of your position.

These statements have raise several issues warranting clarification. All positions subject to the Classification Law contained in title 5, U.S.C., must be classified in conformance with published position classification standards (PCS's) of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) or, if there are no directly applicable PCS's, consistently with PCS's for related kinds of work. Therefore, other methods or factors of evaluation, such as comparison to other positions that may or may not be classified correctly, are not authorized for use in determining the classification of a position. The classification appeal process is a de novo review that includes a determination as to the duties and responsibilities assigned to your position and

performed by you, and constitutes the proper application of PCS's to those duties and responsibilities. Any previous actions taken, or not taken, on your position by your agency has no bearing on our adjudication of your appeal. The quality of your performance is a matter covered under the performance management program and has no bearing on the classification of your position. In addition, your gender and ethnic origin are not germane to the classification appeals process.

Many positions in the Government perform a variety of functions. Not all of these functions, however, will be classifiable at the same grade level. For example, many technician positions perform clerical functions classifiable at grade levels below the technician work that controls the grade level worth of the position. Thus, if other positions perform duties that are similar to some major functions of your position, those duties may not be the grade controlling duties of those other positions.

In the General Schedule classification system each grade represents a band of difficulty. Some positions entail performing work of difficulty and complexity that minimally meets the grade level requirements. Other positions perform work at the top of the grade band, but do not meet the minimum requirements for elevation to the next grade level. For example, all budget analyst positions performing work at the GS-11 grade level would be assigned to the same class; i.e., Budget Analyst, GS-560-11. This does not mean that all budget analyst positions at the GS-11 grade level perform identical work. The allocation of positions to that class is predicated on each position performing work of GS-11 grade level difficulty within a budget program requiring GS-11 budget system skills and knowledges.

The application of OPM PCS's must be accomplished within the confines of the position classification theories, principles, and practices established by OPM. The Introduction to the Position Classification Standards (Introduction) states that:

Some positions involve performing different kinds and levels of work which, when separately evaluated in terms of duties, responsibilities, and qualifications required, are at different grade levels. . . .

In most instances, the highest level of work assigned to and performed by the employee for the majority of time [emphasis added] is grade-determining. When the highest level of work is a smaller portion of the job, it may be grade controlling only if:

- The work is officially assigned to the position on a regular and recurring basis;
- It is a significant and substantial part of the

overall position (i.e., occupying at least 25 percent of the employee's time); and

- The higher level of knowledge and skills needed to perform the work would be required in recruiting for the position if it became vacant.

Our analysis of your position is based in large part on the information you provided during the audit, and our independent review and analysis of the entire appeal record. Our audit with you, and our interviews with your supervisor of record and other supervisors and employees for and with whom you work, confirmed that your position description (PD) of record contains some of the duties that you perform; however, it overstates the analytical responsibilities, and does not accurately describe the computer support activities for which you are responsible.

Your position is officially assigned to the Collection Field Function; however, most of your work is performed for the Examination Program. Some assignments are occasionally for the Coordinated Examination Programs (CEP). The primary and paramount function of your position is to receive, process, extract and reformat data from a variety of fields, tapes and data bases. You code, sort, and input the data into report formats prescribed by the Director of the Examinations Program and/or a Program Analysts in that office, to present comparative evaluations indicating the production statistics, e.g. (Dollars per Return, Dollars per Hour, Average Cycle Time) from all the district offices and/or service centers in the Northeast Region. These reports contain such information as the number of cases produced by individual revenue agents, the length of time taken to process the cases, the dollar amount of revenue collected, the numbers of closed and open returns, the status codes, etc. Other reports reflect Key Performance Indicators, and General Examination and Coordinated Program Measures in rank order, percent of goal and rank vs goal. The automated ranking is done by algorithms created by the IRS Washington, DC Office.

You perform various application programming and special project assignments for other organizational components, as required, e.g. assisted the Planning and Quality Staff using the Executive Management Support System in the development of screens for oral presentations that present visual pictures of data, using ADL language. You also visit the District Offices, as required, to provide automation support such as the installation of new software packages, and training of the staff in their use.

Your PD of record describes a wide range of duties involved in conducting program, content, process studies, systems analysis, and management effectiveness reviews

in district and service center compliance functions. For example, your PD states that you design, develop, and implement statistical models to measure compliance program objectives; assist in reviewing work plan schedules in district offices and service centers, and analyzing actual work performance; assist in developing statistical models using Lotus 1-2-3 to identify staffing needs; participate in program studies; design reports used by functional program analysts to study program operations; and, perform other related work review and evaluation functions. Our fact-finding revealed the analysis and evaluation of program data is performed by the Program Analysts, and not by you as stated in your PD of record. Furthermore, we find that your automated data systems analysis functions are substantially more limited than reflected in your PD of record. We will not address in detail the other functions or aspects of your position contained in your PD of record which we hereby incorporate by reference into this decision.

#### Series and Title Determination

Your agency has determined that your position is classified properly to the Management and Program Analysis Series, GS-343 and is titled Management Analyst according to the titling practices contained in the Management and Program Analysis Series, GS-343 PCS. You have asked for comparison of your duties with those of a position in the Computer Specialist Series, GS-334, but opined your position should continue to be allocated as Management Analyst, GS-343.

The Management and Program Analysis Series, GS-343 includes positions that primarily serve as analysts and advisors to management on the evaluation of the effectiveness of government programs and operations or the productivity and efficiency of the management of Federal agencies. Positions in this series require knowledge of the substantive nature of agency programs and activities; agency missions, policies, and objectives; management principles and processes; and the analytical and evaluative methods and techniques for assessing program development or execution and improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency. The work requires skill in : application of factfinding and investigative techniques; oral and written communications; and development of presentations and reports.

Our fact-finding indicates that the primary purpose of your work is to provide automation support in the extraction of data for production of reports to be evaluated by staff Program Analysts. It is the occupants of these positions who serve as advisors to management. We could not substantiate your claim that you employ analytical and evaluative methods for assessing program execution and improving organizational effectiveness, through interviews with anyone in your current supervisory chain, or by our independent review of your work products.

Consequently, we do find your position is not classifiable to the Management and Program Analysis Series, GS-343.

The Computer Specialist Series, GS-334 includes positions engaged in analyzing, managing, supervising or performing work necessary to plan, design, develop, acquire, document, test, implement, integrate, maintain, or modify systems for solving problems or accomplishing work processes by using computers. Positions are included in this series when the primary need is knowledge of information processing methodology/technology, computer capabilities, and processing techniques.

The primary purpose of your work is the acquisition, extraction, integration, reporting and automation of data by using computers. This requires knowledge of how computers process data and knowledge of how to evaluate and organize work processes and problems for computer solution. The grade level rationale you presented in support of your appeal stresses both your possession of and application of computer programming knowledges and skills in performing what you view to be the grade controlling work of your position. Our fact-finding corroborated the accuracy of this claim.

A significant portion of the computer related work you perform is covered by the Office Automation Grade-Evaluation Guide (OAGEG). The OAGEG covers single grade interval clerical and technician work using commercially available off-the-shelf software to accomplish a wide range of office automation tasks, e.g., creating and using spreadsheets, data bases, and macros. This work is evaluated at lower grade levels than work covered by the Computer Specialist Series, GS-334 in that it does not involve the application of two-grade interval ADP knowledges and skills. We find, however, a sufficient portion of your work time is engaged in performing programming work that minimally meets the coverage requirements of the GS-334 series, as typified by your need to program extracts from a variety of major IRS applications to create the data bases you subsequently manipulate for workload analysis conducted by staff program analysts. Therefore, we find your position is allocated properly as Computer Specialist, GS-334.

#### Grade Level Determination

The published position classification standard (PCS) for Computer Specialist, GS-334 is written in Factor Evaluation System (FES) format. Positions graded under the FES format are compared to nine factors. Levels are assigned for each factor and the points associated with the assigned levels are totaled and converted to a grade level by application of the Grade Conversion Table contained in the PCS. Under the FES, factor level descriptions mark the lower end, i.e., the floor of the ranges for the indicated factor level. If a position fails in any significant aspect to meet a particular

level in the standard, the next lower level and its lower point value must be assigned unless the deficiency is balanced by an equally important aspect that meets a higher level. Because your grade controlling work is covered by the GS-334 PCS, there is no need to apply the OAGEG in detail to the work you perform since it would not yield a higher grade.

Your appeal rationale accepted your agency's crediting of Factor Levels 1-7, 2-4, 5-4, 6/7-2b, 8-1, and 9-1. You requested the crediting of Factor Levels 3-4 and 4-5 rather than the next lower level credited by your agency. Based on our review and analysis of the appeal record, we find Factor Levels 8-1 and 9-1 are appropriate, and have so credited your position. Our analysis of the remaining factors follows.

### **Factor 1, Knowledge Required by the Position**

Factor 1 measures the nature and extent of information or facts which the workers must understand to do acceptable work (e.g. steps, procedures, practices, rules, policies, theories, principles and concepts) and the nature and extent of the skills needed to apply those knowledges. To be used as a basis for selecting a level under this factor, a knowledge must be required and applied.

At Level 1-6 (950 points) employees use knowledge of established techniques and requirements of the employing organization, including e.g. data processing documentation procedures, standard data elements and codes, available utility routines, customary factfinding approaches, decision logic tables and structured analysis and design methodologies. The primary requirement at level 1-6 is for knowledge of how to execute assignments. Computer specialists at this level develop individual programs, test plans, or reports within an approved framework; or facilitate user interface and access to computer systems by giving training on using generalized software. An applications oriented assignment normally entails knowledge of the technical characteristics of an operating mode, the system software, the appropriate programming language, and the inputs, outputs and overall processing logic, and the work process to be accomplished. Such knowledge is used to carry out assignments where the objectives to be reached are clearly identified and realized by straightforward adaptation of precedents and established practices.

In contrast, Level 1-7 (1,250 points) requires knowledge of system software and systems development life cycles, including systems documentation, design development, configuration management, cost analysis, data administration, systems integration and testing. This is used to track the use and status of resources for system design projects through development, modification, maintenance, and evaluation of a standard program management system. Employees use knowledge and skill to modify and adapt precedent solutions to unique or specialized

8.

requirements. Typically, they develop plans or specifications necessary for a proposed application. Also at this level are trouble-shooting design and software implementation problems.

The knowledges required of your work match for those described at Level 1-6 for developing individual programs for reports within an approved framework. You write the coding for the programs using off-the-shelf software packages such as Microsoft Office Excel, Dbase III, and Lotus 1-2-3, using Foxpro test data to ensure reliability. You must be familiar with the local area network technology, i.e. IBM's PC network. The major project work that you stressed is not directly tasked to you. Rather, you function as an assistant to higher graded employees are assigned and perform any systems analysis and design work that exceeds Level 1-6. The knowledges required for these functions do not meet the requirements of level 1-7 for systems development and design and trouble-shooting projects. You program computer applications you develop are based on specifications submitted by National and Regional Management for which the systems analysis found at Level 1-7 has already been accomplished. You are required to manipulate data within established patterns, not to modify and adapt precedent solutions to unique requirements. Report extracting applications, using data base and spreadsheet software, are applications of limited scope, difficulty, and complexity, and do not entail developing the extensive plans, specifications, and extensive system interactions and interrelationships found at Level 1-7. Your assisting offices using off-the-shelf software, e.g., "loading programs," also does not exceed Level 1-6. These systems are extensively documented, and your position is neither required to nor is it delegated the authority and responsibility to develop, modify, or otherwise materially change these systems as would be required to support Level 1-7. Therefore, we credit this factor at Level 1-6 (950 points).

## **Factor 2, Supervisory Controls**

"Supervisory Controls" covers the nature and extent of direct or indirect controls exercised by the supervisor, the employee's responsibility, and the review of completed work.

At Level 2-3 (275 points), the supervisor defines the employee's scope of responsibilities and the objectives, priorities and deadlines. The employee is provided assistance with unusual situations which do not have clear precedents. The employee plans and carries out the successive steps involved and handles problems and deviations in accordance with agency standards, previous training, established practices, or system controls as appropriate in the application or specialty area. Projects typically require the employee to do some preliminary investigation to ascertain interrelationships that may affect the plan of attack. Work



is reviewed for technical aspects such as efficiency of the program, and whether documentation complies with agency guidelines. Techniques used by the employee usually are not reviewed in detail.

In contrast, at Level 2-4 (450 points), the supervisor sets the overall objectives and, in consultation with the employee, determines timeframes, and possible shifts in staff or other resources required. The employee, independently plans and carries out projects and analyses of the organization's requirements; interprets policies in conformance with established mission objectives; integrates and coordinates the work of others as necessary; and resolves most conflicts that arise. The employee informs the supervisor about progress, potentially controversial matters, or far-reaching implications. Completed work is reviewed for feasibility, compatibility with other work, or effectiveness in meeting requirements or achieving expected results.

You receive most assignments from the Acting Director of the Examination Program, and assistance from her and the senior Program Analyst in application design work and report formats, integration of formulas, and the analysis of user problems, e.g. selection of fields, sort patterns, ascending or descending order, etc. You handle problems in accordance with established practices and do some preliminary investigation that may affect the work plan. Work is reviewed to ensure report formats comply with requirements, but techniques are not usually reviewed in detail. This level of supervisory controls meets the specifications of Level 2-3. The role of others in controlling your work assignment objectives and planning shows that you do not independently plan and carry out projects and analyses of the organization's requirements, interpret policies, and coordinate the work of others as found at Level 2-4. The local program analysts as well as the Acting Director, are available to advise, assist and assure compatibility with other work. The projects which you stressed are performed under the lead of other employees. As such, their positions evidence the project lead and resource control responsibilities typical of Level 2-4, not your position. Although you accomplish the technical aspects of your work independently, the very nature of your work, performed within system controls as discussed in Factor 1, fails to meet the scope, depth, and complexity of work projects independently planned and implemented at Level 2-4. Due to these inherent internal work assignment limitations, your position fails to meet the requirements of Level 2-4 and, therefore, is credited at Level 2-3 (275 points).

### **Factor 3, Guidelines**

This factor covers the nature of guidelines and the judgment needed to apply them. Guides used include, for example: established procedures and policies, traditional practices, and reference material such as manuals and handbooks. Guidelines should not be confused with knowledges described under Factor 1 - Knowledge

Required by the Position. Guidelines either provide reference data or impose certain constraints on the use of knowledges.

At Level 3-3 (275 points), reference material such as handbooks, manuals, models, and plans are available but are not completely applicable to work assignments or gaps exist in significant areas. This requires the incumbent to adapt guides and precedents to assigned projects or gather considerable information to supplement lack of specific information for a particular problem. Judgment is required in relating precedent approaches to specific situations. Established guidelines often must be interpreted to advise others on the application of policy or regulation.

In contrast, guidelines at Level 3-4 (450 points) are typically policies and precedents that provide guidance that is general in nature with little specificity regarding the approach to be followed in accomplishing work. Typically, the primary constraints are those imposed by the need for compatibility with existing systems or processes. The studies, design projects, equipment, or system software evaluations conducted usually require deviating from traditional methods or researching trends and patterns to develop improved methods or formulate criteria. The employee uses initiative and resourcefulness in researching and implementing state-of-the-art techniques and technologies in order to develop new and improved methods to cope with particular projects. This means that guidelines for performing the work are scarce and of limited use. The employee exercises considerable judgment in relating technical developments or requirements to particular projects. At this level, the employee demonstrates initiative and resourcefulness in projects that encompass: unprecedented design efforts; integrating the work of others as a team or project leader; or predicting future environments or the impact on future processing.

Our fact-finding revealed that, as at Level 3-3, numerous applicable guidelines are available for performing your primary duties. These include systems and operating instructions, various technical manuals, and computer language guides and references. The guidelines include Foxpro, Dbase, C Language, ADL, Excel, Lotus, Enable, and Harvard Graphics publications. In addition, formal training is often provided and other technical support is available to assist in dealing with new or unique problems or situations, e.g. from the Washington Examination Management and Analysis Planning Team and Workload Management Support Office, and the EMS staff. Available guides are not often specific to particular problems or applications. You are required to research approaches and often modify or extrapolate prescribed methods to accomplish local applications. Indicative of such work is adapting established programming methods to extract reports from established, documented IRS work tracking systems.

In your appeal you note that you believe your work involves situations indicative of Level 3-4. Although it may, at times, represent new applications in your environment, they are not unique or unprecedented in the realm of data processing. Although you may be required to research or consult with others regarding alternative approaches, these are not analogous to the situations described at Level 3-4. You have stated that you have designed computer programming applications based on specifications submitted by National and Regional management. Developing reports or forms and the associated programs do not constitute unprecedented design efforts or require application of state-of-the-art techniques or technologies as envisioned at Level 3-4. These assignments reflect improvement in client use of an established data base system typical of Level 3-3. Therefore, your position is credited at Level 3-3 (275 points).

#### **Factor 4, Complexity**

This factor covers 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 4-3 (150 points), work consists of various task or duties involving different methods or procedures. Typically, assignments concern one or two stages in an automation project, e.g., program design and module development, or a portion of a specialty area, e.g., equipment utilization. Except in the case of small, routine projects, assignments usually are a segment of a project directed by a higher graded worker. Decisions regarding methods to be used depend on the nature of the data involved. Normally the employee must analyze plans to discern deviations or other situations bearing on the choice among established techniques for carrying out an assignment. The assignment involves ascertaining and analyzing interrelationships, e.g., the potential effect of program changes on related programs in the system.

In contrast, Level 4-4 (225 points) assignments consist of projects, studies, or evaluations characterized by the need for substantial problem analysis. Concern is with several stages in an automation project, or project assignments in a specialty area that require a variety of techniques and methods to evaluate alternatives. Decisions involve assessing situations complicated by conflicting or insufficient data that must be analyzed to determine applicability of established methods. Different technical approaches must often be tested and projections made. Consideration must be given to probable areas of future systems changes of comparable automation problems that will facilitate subsequent modifications. The work requires consideration of considerable data. The level of difficulty is typified by developing programming specifications for major modifications to existing systems or new systems where precedents exist at the same general scale of operation as the new

systems. Computer equipment or system software evaluation and modification at this level primarily concern items available from vendors already in use in Government ADP operations.

Your work requires that you manipulate data obtained from other databases or tapes and present it in required report format for a variety of reports, in a timely manner. You encrypt files for security purposes. You program applications that primarily produce reports based on typical reports that have been developed within established patterns. These reports extract information from a large volume of information regarding the production statistics of all the district offices and service centers in the Region. You visit the district offices to distribute and install new programs, e.g. for the utilization and implementation of a newly developed database tracking system, and have prepared a desk guide for automation support for use in the districts.

While you deal with a large volume of data, as is typical of Level 4-4, it is for purposes typical of Level 4-3, e.g., designing small applications programs to extract and display data from a large existent data base. The programs you develop do not impact on other programs run in the system as envisioned at Level 4-4, e.g., major modifications to existing systems. Rather, they must be developed using established techniques for extracting, manipulating, and displaying the data in the ADP package being used. As is typical of Level 4-3, your small, routine report and ADP site assistance work assignments are stand-alone projects for which you are responsible. In the case of larger projects, you assist higher grade employees who have overall project responsibility. Because your position does not meet Level 4-4, your position fails to meet Level 4-5 as you opined in your appeal rationale. Therefore, your position is credited at Level 4-3 (150 points).

### **Factor 5, Scope and Effect**

Scope and Effect covers the relationships between the nature of the work, i.e., the purpose, breadth and depth of the assignment and the effect of work products or services both within and outside the organization.

At Level 5-3 (150 points) work involves resolving a variety of conventional problems, questions or situations such as where responsibility has been assigned for maintenance of a set of programs. Established practices and techniques are used. The work affects the adequacy of field investigations, internal operations, or research conclusions. It includes responsibility for projects that, although affecting activities or individuals throughout the agency, are primarily to facilitate a local operation, e.g., developing or modifying an automated records keeping system at an agency training

center responsible for maintaining training records on agency employees located throughout the country.

In contrast, at Level 5-4 the work involves analyzing unusual problems such as formulating projects or studies to substantially alter major systems. The work affects a wide range of agency activities or non-Government activities, or functions of other agencies. Assignments typically are concerned with the agency's single centralized ADP operation that is linked to terminals at numerous agency sites throughout the country, or standard systems to be used on numerous equipment units or at numerous installation level ADP operations in an agency.

Your work has the scope and effect typical of Level 5-3 in that the small applications programs you develop and maintain produce reports reflecting the internal operations and productivity of the field offices within the region. These limited administrative tracking and reporting applications use established practices and techniques. As at Level 5-3, these reports are analyzed to pinpoint trouble spots and improve operations throughout the region. You do not work on nor does your work directly affect the IRS-wide tax processing operating system or large scale agency-wide administrative support systems envisioned at level 5-4. While the tracking systems which you work are used at multiple sites, you do not have the authority or responsibility for major changes to these systems as required for the crediting of Level 5-4. Therefore, Level 5-3 (150 points) is credited to your position.

### **Factor 6, Personal Contacts**

This factor includes face-to-face contacts and telephone dialogue with persons not in the supervisory chain. The levels for this factor are based on what is required to make the initial contact, the difficulty in communicating with those contacted, and the setting in which the contacts take place, e.g., the degree to which the employee and those contacted recognize their relative roles and authorities.

At Level 2, contacts include those with employees in the agency but outside the immediate organization, such as user representatives or field personnel engaged in different; i.e., non-ADP work. .

In contrast, Level 3 contacts, in addition to those within the agency, are with vendor representatives, computer personnel of other agencies, representatives of professional associations, and the like. This level may also include contacts with the head of the employing agency or program officials several managerial levels above the employee when such contacts occur on an ad hoc or other irregular basis..

Your contacts are primarily with employees in the agency but many are outside the immediate organization, e.g. district personnel, Washington personnel, EMS staff, and counterparts from other regions at annual meetings. These contacts are equivalent to those described at Level 2. They are not meet Level 3-3 which include personnel of other agencies and vendors. Your contacts may include program officials at higher managerial levels from time to time, but to be credited at a particular level all aspects must be met fully. Your contacts with these high level officials are infrequent, do not entail the complex role definition integral to Level 3 and, thus, preclude the crediting of Level 3 for this factor.

### **Factor 7, Purpose of Contacts**

The purpose of contacts that serve as a basis for this factor must be the same as the contacts that are the basis for the level awarded for Factor 6.

At Level b, the purpose of contacts is to coordinate work efforts, solve problems, or to provide advice to managers on noncontroversial organization or program related issues and concerns. As discussed in the FES primary standard, problems are resolved by influencing or motivating individuals or groups who are working toward mutual goals and have basically cooperative attitudes.

In contrast, at Level c the purpose of contact is to (a) influence others to utilize particular technical methods and procedures, or (b) to persuade others to cooperate in meeting objectives when (in either case) there are problems in securing cooperation. As amplified in the FES Primary Standard, the people contacted may be fearful, skeptical, uncooperative, or dangerous, e.g., gaining compliance with established policies and regulations by persuasion or negotiation.

Your contacts are to obtain or exchange factual information, coordinate work efforts, solve problems and provide advice to program analysts on non-controversial organization or program related issues or concerns. The purpose of your district contacts is to train others to use particular technical methods and procedures. The purposes of these contacts fully meets Level b. Your contacts do not regularly entail the difficulties in securing cooperation found at Level c. Accordingly, this factor must be evaluated at Level b which, in combination with Level 2, results in the crediting of your position at Level 2b (75 points).

### Summary

In summary, we have evaluated your position as follows:

Factor 1 - Level 1-6	=	950 points
Factor 2 - Level 2-3	=	275 points
Factor 3 - Level 3-3	=	275 points
Factor 4 - Level 4-3	=	150 points
Factor 5 - Level 5-3	=	150 points
Factor 6 and		
Factor 7 - Level 2-b	=	75 points
Factor 8 - Level 8-1	=	5 points
Factor 9 - Level 9-1	=	5 points
Total		<u>1,885 points</u>

A total of 1,885 points falls within the GS-9 grade level point range of 1,855-2,100 points on the Grade Conversion Table in the GS-334 PCS.

Therefore, based on the preceding analysis, we find that your position is evaluated properly as Computer Specialist, GS-334-9.

Integral to your appeal rationale is your belief that your position is classified inconsistently with those occupied by other Computer Specialists, specifically within the [installation]. We have reviewed the PD of the position cited, PD#04470E, classified as Computer Specialist, GS-334-12. Based on our review, we find substantial differences between the duties and responsibilities contained in that PD and the functions you perform that form the basis of this appeal decision. Therefore, we find no basis to direct your agency to conduct a consistency review. While your agency has the primary responsibility for intra-agency consistency, including consistency with OPM decisions, your agency may not change the classification certified in an OPM decision; nor may your agency classify a position based on position-to-position comparison. Your agency may be able to explain the differences between your position and the other positions or, if the positions are essentially the same, take action to correct the classification of the other positions to achieve internal consistency.

This decision constitutes a classification certificate under the authority of section 5112(b) of title 5, USC. This certificate is mandatory and binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing and accounting officials of the Government. In accordance with 5 CFR 511.702, it must be implemented no later than the beginning of the sixth pay period following the date of this decision. The

servicing personnel office must submit a compliance report containing copies of the action taken with respect to the appellant, e.g., SF 50. The compliance report must be submitted to this office no later than 30 days following the effective date of the SF 50. The appellant may contact her servicing personnel office for information about the implementation of this decision .

By copy of this decision, we are also directing the servicing personnel office to correct the position description to reflect the actual duties and responsibilities assigned to the position as determined in this decision. Documentation of this must be submitted as part of the compliance report directed above.

Please be assured that this decision is not intended to reflect on your ability, qualifications, or the quality of your performance. Rather, it reflects our evaluation of the duties and responsibilities assigned to your position in terms of comparison with the appropriate PCS.

Sincerely,

*/S/ 8/14/97*

Robert D. Hendler  
Classification Appeals Officer