



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

Atlanta Oversight Division  
75 Spring Street, SW., Room 972  
Atlanta, GA 30303

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

<b>Appellant:</b>	[Appellant]
<b>Agency classification:</b>	Management Analysis Officer GS-343-12
<b>Organization:</b>	[Department of the Navy]
<b>OPM decision:</b>	Management Analysis Officer GS-343- 12
<b>OPM decision number:</b>	C- 0343-12-01

---

Kathy W. Day  
Classification Appeals Officer

3/11/98

---

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]

[Personnel Director]

Mr. David Neerman  
Director for Classification, Staffing and  
Compensation (OCPM Code C20)  
Office of Civilian Personnel Management  
Department of the Navy  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22203-1998

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

## **Introduction**

On October 30, 1997, the Atlanta Oversight Division, Office of Personnel Management (OPM), accepted an appeal for a Management Analysis Officer, GS-343-12, in the [Department of the Navy]. The appellant believes his position should be classified as Supervisory Management Analyst, GS-343-13. We have accepted and decided his appeal under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code.

To help decide the appeal, an Atlanta Oversight Division representative conducted a telephone audit of the appellant's position on January 23, 1998. In reaching our classification decision, we have reviewed the audit findings and all information of record furnished by the appellant and his agency, including his official position description [#].

## **General issues**

The appellant disagrees with the classification appeal decision issued by the Department of Defense Civilian Personnel Management Service (CPMS) on October 2, 1997. This decision placed the appellant's position at the GS-12 level and changed the title to Management Analysis Officer. He disagrees with the determination by that office that his position does not meet minimum criteria for inclusion under the General Schedule Supervisory Guide. The appellant also disagrees with the evaluation of Factors 1 and 4 using the Administrative Analysis Grade Evaluation Guide.

Classification consistency concerns raised by the appellant about the grade levels of other Department of Navy Supervisory Management Analysts in the [geographical area] were addressed in CPMS' classification appeal decision. The CPMS required [agency organization] to conduct a consistency review of all Supervisory Management Analysts under their classification jurisdiction. The consistency study conducted by the Human Resources Office at [geographical location] found differences between the appellant's position and those of other Management Analyst positions in [the area].

## **Position information**

The appellant's position serves as Chief, Management Services Office and is responsible for providing management consultant and advisory services to the Commanding Officer on matters affecting overall activity management. The majority of the appellant's time is spent on nonsupervisory management analysis duties and responsibilities. Those duties include conducting management surveys, organizational reviews, commercial activities program/contract reviews, manpower surveys and work measurements. The appellant gathers data and input to fulfill [installation] reporting responsibilities under Department of Defense/Department of Navy initiatives such as the Program Objective Memorandum, the Defense Regional Interservice Support Analysis, and the Efficiency Review program. The appellant also conducts special management analysis reviews as requested by [installation] management officials. The appellant functions as the first line supervisor of the management services organization at [installation], supervising 1 Management Analyst, GS-343-11, and 1 Management Assistant, GS-344-5.

## **Standards determination**

GS-343, Management and Program Analysis Series, August 1990.

General Schedule Supervisory Guide, April 1993.

Administrative Analysis Grade-Evaluation Guide, August 1990.

The appellant exercises supervisory responsibility over two subordinate positions. The position description for the GS-343-11, Management Analyst, states the incumbent performs as team leader in manpower and management surveys, providing guidance and instructions to other office staff members and to department heads in accomplishing assigned tasks. The Management Analyst position has latitude for altering the sequence of steps within established guidelines and works independently, referring only problems of unusual difficulty to the appellant. The GS-11 establishes priorities and review methods and techniques to accomplish the assigned tasks in the allotted time with completed work accepted as being technically accurate. According to the position description for the GS-344-5, Management Assistant, that incumbent operates with a similar level of independence on assigned tasks, receiving supervisory guidance only on unfamiliar assignments.

We found that the GS-343-11 position has recently been filled by an individual without a management analysis background and, therefore, currently requires a closer degree of supervision than delineated in the position description. However, this is a temporary situation which should end when the current incumbent becomes operationally proficient and is fully performing the duties as described in the position description of record. We agree with the CPMS analysis that supervision of two employees operating with the degree of independence described above would not normally require 25 percent or more of the appellant's time. Therefore, we have determined that supervisory duties performed by the appellant do not meet the minimum criteria established by the General Schedule Supervisory Guide and this standard will not be used in evaluating the grade of the appellant's position. The guidance material contained in the GS-343 series description directs that nonsupervisory work at GS-9 and above is to be evaluated by reference to the Administrative Analysis Grade-Evaluation Guide.

## **Series determination**

The agency determined that the appellant's duties and responsibilities are properly placed in the GS-343, Management and Program Analysis Series. The appellant does not dispute this determination. This series includes positions which 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 or both. 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.

## **Title determination**

The GS-343 series prescribes that positions, such as the appellant's, which have responsibility for establishing, planning, and directing programs in their respective functional specializations are titled *Management Analysis Officer*.

## **Grade determination**

The Administrative Analysis Grade-Evaluation Guide 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 indicated factor levels. For a position 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 in the standard, the point value for the next lower factor level must be assigned, unless the deficiency is balanced by an equally important aspect which meets a higher level. The total points assigned are converted to a grade by use of the grade conversion table in the standard.

Under FES, positions which significantly exceed the highest factor level or fail to meet the lowest factor level described in a classification standard must be evaluated by reference to the Primary Standard, contained in Appendix 3 of the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards. The Primary Standard is the "standard-for-standards" for FES.

The appellant specifically contests the CPMS determinations for Factors 1 and 4. This decision will, therefore, provide an analysis of those two factors only. The remaining factor level determinations (i.e., 2-4, 3-4, 5-4, 6-3, 7-c, 8-1, and 9-1), made by the agency and not contested by the appellant, will not be discussed further in this decision since we have reviewed each factor and agree with the accuracy of the agency determination.

### *Factor 1 - Knowledge Required by the Position:*

This factor measures the nature and extent of information or facts that a worker must understand to do acceptable work, such as the procedures, practices, rules, policies, theories, principles, and concepts; and the nature and extent of the skills needed to apply this knowledge. In order for any knowledge to be used as a basis for selecting a level under this factor, it must be required and applied in the work of the position being evaluated.

At Level 1-7, projects and studies typically require knowledge of the major issues, program goals and objectives, work processes, and administrative operations of the organization. This level includes

knowledge of pertinent laws, regulations, policies and precedents which affect the use of program and related support resources (people, money, or equipment) in the area studied. Projects and studies typically require knowledge of the major issues, program goals and objectives, work processes, and administrative operations of the organization. Level 1-7 positions require knowledge of organization, programs, missions, and functions of the parent military command along with knowledge of analytical and investigative techniques to conduct requirements and utilization surveys. Assignments require skill in conducting detailed analyses of complex functions and work processes including: examination of production standards; past, present, and programmed workloads; nonproductive time; and deviations from standards to determine validated staffing requirements for the function studied. Work requires considerable interpersonal skills in presenting staffing recommendations and negotiating solutions to disputed recommendations.

At Level 1-8, management analysts operate as experts at the policy level of an agency (e.g., Department of Defense/Department of Navy). Level 1-8 management studies have impact on agency program goals and objectives. These studies identify and propose solutions to management problems which are characterized by their breadth, importance, and severity, and for which previous studies and established techniques are frequently inadequate. Management analysts at Level 1-8 may be involved in policy issues such as developing recommendations for legislation to change the way agency programs are carried out or evaluating content of new/modified legislation for impact upon agency programs and resources, or in translating basic legislation into program goals, actions, and services. Also included at this level is skill to plan, organize, and direct team study work and to negotiate effectively with management to accept and implement recommendations, where the proposals involve substantial agency resources, require extensive changes in established procedures, or may be in conflict with the desires of the activity studied.

The appellant's position meets the criteria described at Level 1-7 in that he serves as an operating management analyst at a field installation of the Department of Navy. The appellant conducts local impact reviews and studies such as Efficiency Studies and investigations of the feasibility of contracting out various [installation] activities such as Bachelor Quarters, Morale, Welfare and Recreation, and the Family Services Center. He researches, analyzes, and consolidates [installation] data input as part of larger command wide or Navy wide studies such as the FY 98 Commercial Activity Studies, BRAC, or regionalization reviews. The appellant is also the [installation] coordinator responsible for developing plans to implement the Chief of Naval Operations' decision to convert air traffic control positions from military to civilian.

To effectively conduct assigned studies, the appellant must have and apply an in-depth knowledge of the organizations, programs and mission of [installation] in order to develop recommendations which study objectives without compromise to installation mission and goals. He must be familiar with and apply various analytical techniques or methodologies, depending on the nature and purpose of the review/study being conducted. He must also be familiar with Department of Defense; Department of Navy; Chief, Naval Education and Training; and Office of Management and Budget review guidelines and requirements that are contained in a variety of issuances published by these organizations. Many of the appellant's studies are aspects of the Department of Defense's ongoing

staff reduction efforts, requiring the appellant to exercise sound interpersonal skills in soliciting input or explaining recommendations to managers/supervisors who are less than enthusiastic about the potential for losing functions and/or staff.

The appellant's position does not function at the agency/policy level as described for Level 1-8. The impact of the studies he conducts is limited to [installation] (e.g. feasibility of contracting out of various base activities), or represents [installation] data input to a much larger Department of Defense/Department of Navy study (e.g. BRAC, regionalization, etc.). The results of the appellant's studies do not involve substantial agency resources or require extensive changes in established procedures. The studies the appellant conducts do not have direct impact on agency (i.e., Department of Defense/Department of Navy) programs or policies. The appellant is not required to develop legislative recommendations or interpret the impact of new or modified legislation on agency mission or program goals and objectives.

Level 1-7 is credited for 1250 points.

This factor is credited at Level 1-7 for 1250 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.

Management analysis work characteristic of Level 4-4 involves gathering information, identifying and analyzing issues, and developing recommendations to resolve substantive problems of effectiveness and efficiency of work operations in a program or program support setting. Level 4-4 management analysts provide advice to management on the distribution of work among positions and organizations and the efficient utilization of positions and employees in programs and program support areas staffed by employees in professional, technical, clerical and blue-collar occupations. The nature of the work is such that the employee must continually gather, interpret, analyze, and correlate large amounts of narrative and statistical information about organizational functions, workload, and productivity. Studies involve consideration of relationships among tasks, positions, organizations, workload distribution, employee capabilities, and requirements of applicable staffing guides.

Management analysis work at Level 4-5 consists of projects and studies which require analysis of interrelated issues of effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity of substantive mission-oriented programs. Decisions about how to proceed in planning, organizing and conducting studies are complicated by conflicting program goals and objectives which may derive from changes in legislative or regulatory guidelines, productivity, and/or variations in the demand for program services. Level 4-5 studies impact on major administrative programs of an agency (e.g., Department of Defense or Department of Navy) or a nationwide program of an agency.

The appellant's work assignments meet the criteria described at Level 4-4. For example, in conducting studies on the economic feasibility of contracting certain base activities, the appellant must gather and analyze workload, staffing, and cost data to be used in developing a specific work statement that forms the basis of a bidding request and subsequent cost and effectiveness comparisons. Based on the information gathered, the appellant makes recommendations to the [installation] Commander regarding the cost benefits associated with the contracting out option. These are significant installation issues requiring that the appellant conduct comprehensive studies that ensure adequate and accurate data gathering and thorough analysis that considers as many potential options as possible in developing recommendations for the command staff's consideration.

Level 4-5 is not met. The appellant conducts two type of studies/reviews: those that are locally initiated and used (e.g., contracting out of base functions, Efficiency Studies); and local data gathering activities that are a part of nationally developed and monitored studies (e.g., BRAC, regionalization). In either situation, the data gathered and recommendations made have only localized (i.e., [installation]) impact. Decisions concerning the scope of nationwide studies, programs to be included and final recommendations are made at organizational echelons above [installation]. For nationwide studies, the [installation] data and recommendations are combined with other installations' input to arrive at agency wide decisions. Other than presenting local data input and recommendations, the appellant does not participate in the analysis leading to a final decision such as which base to close, what activities to combine and where, etc. The appellant is not at the organizational level of the agency making major nationwide program decisions.

This factor is credited at Level 4-4 for 225 points

<b>SUMMARY</b>		
<b>FACTOR</b>	<b>LEVEL</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
1. Knowledge required by the position	1-7	1250
2. Supervisory controls	2-4	450
3. Guidelines	3-4	450
4. Complexity	4-4	225
5. Scope and effect	5-4	225
6. Personal contacts	6-3	180
7. Purpose of contacts	7-c	
8. Physical demands	8-1	5
9. Work environment	9-1	5
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2790</b>



The appellant's position warrants 2790 total points which falls within the range for a GS-12, 2755 to 3150 points. Therefore, in accordance with the grade conversion table on page 4 of the standard, his position is properly graded at GS-12.

**Decision**

The position is properly classified as Management Analysis Officer, GS-343-12.