

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

**Chicago Oversight Division
230 South Dearborn Street, DPN 30-6
Chicago, Illinois 60604**

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

Appellant: [Appellant's Name]

Agency Classification: Supervisory Auditor
GS-511-12

Organization: Department of the Navy
[Name of Installation]
Command Evaluation
[City, State]

OPM Decision: **Supervisory Auditor**
GS-511-12

OPM decision number: C- 0511-12-02

/s/

Frederick J. Boland
Classification Appeals Officer

April 30, 1998

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]

Ms. Betty Welch
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy
Civilian Personnel - EEO
Department of the Navy
800 North Quincy Street
Arlington, Virginia 22203-1998

[name and address of appellant's servicing
personnel office]

Mr. William Duffy
Chief, Classification Branch (CPMS-ASFP)
Field Advisory Services Division
Defense Civilian Personnel Management
Service
1400 Key Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22209-2199

INTRODUCTION

The appellant is assigned to position number YPAWR, which was classified as Supervisory Auditor, GS-511-12, on June 14, 1997. The position is located in the Command Evaluation office at the [Installation Name], [City, State]. The appellant feels his position warrants greater credit given the size and organizational diversity of the [Installation Name], his reporting relationships, the supervisory authority he exercises, and the briefings he conducts with the Commander (Factors 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the supervisory classification guide).

POSITION INFORMATION

As Chief of Command Evaluation, the appellant supervises about six staff, including four GS-11 Auditors, a GS-9 Management Analyst, and a GS-5 Office Automation Clerk. Command Evaluation conducts audits and studies of [Installation Name] command or activity operations to detect deficiencies and recommends corrective action.

[City] has approximately 25,000 personnel, including about 16,000 trainees, 4,000 enlisted personnel, 2,200 appropriated fund civilians, 1,100 non-appropriated fund civilians, and 800 contract civilians. It houses the [Name] Command, the [Name] Command with its 13 technical schools, and a 140 bed Naval Hospital, among other activities. It administers about \$20 million in military construction and \$16 million in facilities maintenance contracts. In addition to the [City] site, the [Installation Name] Commander is responsible for Navy activities throughout a five-state area that includes [State], [State], [State], [State], and [State].

The appellant develops an annual audit plan for the command. The audits cover operational and financial review of training programs, supply operations, budgeting, computer systems, activities like Morale, Welfare and Recreation, etc. In addition to directing the command's audit staff, the appellant coordinates inspections by external audit organizations like the General Accounting Office (GAO), Department of Defense (DOD), Inspector General (IG), Naval Audit Service, etc., arranging for entrance and exit conferences and ensuring proper communication and follow-up. He divides his time approximately equally between his supervisory duties and personally performing the examinations for which his office is responsible.

Command Evaluation completed seven audits during the past year. (An eighth audit concerning instructor staffing levels was canceled after the requesting activity completed its own review.) The audits included both financial and operational reviews and concerned, among other things, personnel administration and equal opportunity within Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR), cost controls and purchasing procedures within MWR's Food and Beverage Division, the recording of obligations, payments, and fiscal year charges under the Supply Department's warehouse contract, staffing of the Facilities Department's Energy Manager position and administration of the Energy Conservation program, use of Government travel charge cards, Installation and Environment's use of funds established for critical property repairs, and the [City] Police Department's control of bond money and level of professionalism.

(The official position description contains a number of errors or mischaracterizations of the work. For example, its introductory section misstates the official title as Command Audit Officer, which is permissible only as an organizational title. The Knowledge Required and Guidelines sections of the description claim that the position demands expert knowledge and involves the dissemination of expert guidance. As noted in the Grade Determination section of this decision, such is not the case. The Scope and Effect section lifts language from the GS-511 classification standard concerning the isolation and definition of unknown conditions that has little relation to the appellant's actual assignments and misconveys the level of expertise demanded. Accordingly, the letter transmitting this decision to the agency requests correction of the position description's language wherever it conflicts with our findings.)

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Series and Title Determination

The appellant's duties fall within the type of work covered by the Auditor, GS-511, series, which includes positions the duties of which are to advise on, supervise, or perform work consisting of a systematic examination and appraisal of financial records, financial and management reports, management controls, policies and practices affecting or reflecting the financial condition and operating results of an activity when such work requires the application of professional accounting knowledges, standards, and principles.

The appellant exercises supervisory authorities and responsibilities meeting the criteria for coverage under the OPM *General Schedule Supervisory Guide* (GSSG), dated April 1998 (i.e., his duties require accomplishment of work through the combined technical and administrative direction of others, constitute a major duty requiring at least 25 percent of the position's time, and meet at least the minimum level of Factor 3 in the guide). The prescribed title for supervisory positions, like the appellant's, in the GS-511 series is *Supervisory Auditor*.

Grade Determination

The appellant's supervisory and non-supervisory duties are evaluated separately because the same classification criteria do not apply to both. The overall grade of the position is the higher level of either the supervisory or non-supervisory work. The GSSG is used to evaluate his supervisory and managerial responsibilities. The Auditor, GS-511, standard is used to evaluate his personally performed auditing work.

The appellant does not challenge the results of his agency applying the OPM *Auditor, GS 511, Series* position classification standard, dated May 1982, to his personally performed work. Such work can be no higher graded than the GS-12 grade already assigned to his position unless it entails, among other things, serving as an expert in the profession by regularly resolving highly complex problems, which it does not. Consequently, his personally performed work is not further examined in this decision.

The GSSG uses a point-factor evaluation approach where the points assigned under each factor must be fully equivalent to the factor level described in the guide. If a factor is not equivalent in all respects to the overall intent of a particular level described in the guide, a lower level point value must be assigned, unless the deficiency is balanced by an equally important aspect that meets a higher level.

Factor 1: Program Scope and Effect

This factor measures the general complexity, breadth, and impact of the program areas and work directed, including its organizational and geographic coverage. It also assesses the effect of the work both within and outside the immediate organization. All work for which the supervisor is both technically and administratively responsible, including work accomplished through subordinates or contractors, is considered. To receive credit for a given level, the separate criteria specified for both scope and effect must be met at that factor level.

Subfactor 1a: Scope

Scope addresses complexity and breadth of the program or work directed, including the geographic and organizational coverage within the agency structure. It has two elements: (a) the program (or program segment) directed and (b) the work directed, the products produced, or the services delivered.

The appellant states:

The [City] [Installation Name] is the largest training center in the Navy. All Navy basic training is conducted here. Please refer to the book attached Naval Training, [City], Quick Facts 1997. It has numerous schools and training facilities, a hospital, public works center, Dental activities, police and fire departments, the highest volume Navy Exchange in the Navy (worldwide), and many other activities too numerous to list that involve a multi state area. As of December, 1996, the total population at [City] is 25,899. The base is like a small city which is exactly like the required criteria stated in Factor level 1-3-550 points.

Level 1-2 of the guide covers the direction of administrative, technical, complex clerical, or comparable work that has limited geographic coverage and supports most of the activities of a typical agency field office, a small to medium sized military installation, or comparable activities within agency program segments. Directing budget, staffing, payroll, or similar services that support a small military base is typical of this level.

Level 1-3 covers the direction of a program segment performing administrative, technical, or professional work where the program segment and work directed encompass a major metropolitan area, a state, or a small region of several states; or when most of an area's taxpayers or businesses are covered, coverage comparable to a small city. Providing complex administrative or professional services directly affecting a large or complex multi-mission military installation, or of an organization of similar magnitude, is also characteristic of this level.

Level 1-3's criteria are specific only with regard to the geographic coverage of program scope. Its three examples, however, provide a key to assessing whether the Command Evaluation office's organizational coverage and the work the appellant directs meet Level 1-3 Scope. The first example pertains to managing substantive projects throughout a geographic region, such as the civil works

projects engineering organizations might carry out. The second pertains to furnishing a significant portion of an agency's line program directly to the general public. The third involves directing administrative services (e.g., personnel, supply management, budget, facilities management, or similar services).

The appellant is responsible for directing professional work to evaluate, maintain, and strengthen the [Installation Name] internal controls. Like budget or personnel services, the auditing work he directs is in support of, rather than part of, the training mission of the Center. As such, Level 1-3's third example provides the most pertinent comparison. It indicates that Level 1-3 Scope is met when directing administrative services (e.g., personnel, supply management, budget, facilities management) or similar services, if such services support and directly affect the operations of a bureau, a major military command headquarters, a large or complex multi-mission military installation, or an organization or group of organizations of comparable complexity and size.

Level 1-3 is the highest level that the GSSG credits for less than bureau-wide or entire field establishment-wide responsibilities. The work the appellant directs is an important, professional function that provides essential information to the Commander concerning management and oversight of the [Installation Name]. It is narrower in scope, however, than the multi-functional examples cited under Level 1-3, which refer to directing, for example, a full range of budget and financial operations (which includes some combination of budget formulation, presentation, and execution; accounting, auditing, management analysis, or financial reporting and advice functions) or a full range of personnel management services (staffing, classification, employee/labor relations, etc.). The illustrations in the GSSG make it clear that work at Level 1-3 has significant breadth. Even substantive projects must involve a multiplicity of functions (directing design, oversight, **and** related construction services, for example) or otherwise demonstrate a breadth lacking in the Command Evaluation's work. In addition, Command Evaluation's audit authority and responsibility is shared with other Navy and Defense organizations that conduct broader financial reviews of [City's] activities. Consequently, the scope of the work the appellant directs, while exceeding Level 1-2, falls short of Level 1-3.

We evaluate Scope at Level 1-2.

Subfactor 1b: Effect

Effect addresses impact of programs, products, or correctly performed work both within and outside the agency.

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

At Level 1-3, activities, functions, or services directly and significantly affect 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 (involving large, complex, multi-mission organizations and/or very large serviced populations), the work directly involves or substantially impacts the provision of essential

support services or products to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, and administrative functions.

Command Evaluation work directly affects [Installation Name], which exceeds the small base impact described at Level 1-2. Whether or not its impact meets the Effect criteria of Level 1-3 hinges upon its conduct of audits throughout a full range of organizations housing numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, and administrative functions. Audits of just a portion of [City], activities or activities like MWR lacking complex technical, professional, and administrative functions would not meet Level 1-3. The mere presence of a wide range of agency activities or multi-mission organizations would be insufficient basis for crediting Level 1-3. Regardless of whether Level 1-3's criteria are met, the position's credit under this factor remains limited by its scope, credited at Level 1-2. To receive credit for a level under this factor, the work must meet the criteria under both Scope and Effect.

Consequently, we evaluate this factor at Level 1-2 and credit 350 points.

Factor 2: Organizational Setting

This factor considers the organizational position of the supervisor in relation to higher levels of management (the rank of the person to whom the supervisor reports for direction and appraisal). The appellant states:

My PD clearly indicates that I report to the Commander, [Installation Name] for all audit matters. I report only to the Chief of Staff, Operations for routine administrative purposes only, i.e., annual leave approval. My PD is certified as accurate and agrees with the guidance in GAO Government Audit Standards, 1994 Revision, page 25 which states "To help achieve organizational independence, audit organizations should report to the head or deputy head of the government entity and should be organizationally located outside the staff or line management function of the unit under audit." Since approximately 70% of the command line organizations report to the chief of Staff, Operations, we cannot report to this position and still perform audits under Generally Accepted Government Audit Standards. My position is accountable directly to a flag officer.

Under this factor, if the position being classified reports directly to a Senior Executive, flag officer, or the equivalent, it receives Level 2-3 credit. If not, but the second-level supervisor of the position being classified is a Senior Executive, flag officer, or the equivalent, it receives Level 2-2 credit. In all other cases, the position being classified receives minimum credit, Level 2-1. Full deputies are treated as being at the same level as the deputy's chief for this factor. A position reporting to more than one individual is considered to report to the individual who appraises his performance.

The Chief of Staff, Operations, a Navy Captain, rates the appellant's performance. The Commander, [Installation Name], an Admiral (flag officer), reviews the assigned rating.

We evaluate this factor at Level 2-2 and credit 250 points.

Factor 3: Supervisory and Managerial Authority

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

The appellant believes he has 10 of the authorities (1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, and 15) required for Level 3-3b credit.

Level 3-2 provides three alternative sets of criteria. The third of these options (cited in paragraph 3-2c of the guide) specifies 10 authorities and responsibilities characteristic of supervisors functioning at this level. The appellant exercises nearly all these authorities and thereby meets Level 3-2.

Level 3-3 specifies two alternative sets of criteria. The first of these, Level 3-3a, essentially concerns managerial positions closely involved with high level program officials in the development of overall goals and objectives. Managers at this level typically direct the development of data to track program goals, secure legal opinions, prepare position papers or legislative proposals, and execute comparable activities. The appellant lacks significant responsibility in these areas. Such responsibilities belong to higher level positions than his own.

The second method (cited in paragraph 3-3b) describes 15 supervisory authorities that exceed in complexity and responsibility the 10 depicted under paragraph 3-2c. Under this second provision, a position can be credited at Level 3-3 if, in addition to exercising all or nearly all the Level 3-2c authorities, it also exercises at least 8 of the 15 supervisory authorities specified at Level 3-3b. While the appellant exercises some of Level 3-3b's authorities, he does not exercise the required majority. Eight that he does not significantly exercise are detailed below.

- Authority 1 credits work *requiring* the use of multiple supervisors, team chiefs, or comparable personnel to direct, coordinate, or otherwise oversee work; and/or providing similar oversight of contractors. The appellant is already credited with oversight and coordination of the work that his own staff of six employees accomplishes. He desires additional credit based upon his belief that some of his subordinates function as team leaders when conducting audits. While his subordinates necessarily coordinate their work efforts with each other, they do not regularly assign and review group work, set and adjust group work priorities, assure group members meet timeliness, form, procedure, accuracy, quality, and quantity standards, instruct group members on work and administrative matters, etc., as *bona fide* supervisors or team leaders might. These responsibilities are already credited to the appellant himself in establishing that he satisfies Level 3-2's requirements.
- Authority 4 concerns the direction of a program or major program segment with a funding level in the multimillion dollar range. The appellant is directly responsible for a small work unit whose annual budget consists basically of salary and a small training budget totaling about \$315,000.
- Authority 5 deals with making decisions on work problems surfaced by subordinate supervisors, contractors, or similar personnel. The appellant has no subordinate supervisors, nor does he direct contractors or similar personnel.
- Authorities 6, 8, and 10 are not exercised by the appellant. The first two deal with performance evaluation and selection of subordinate supervisors while the last involves

approval of serious disciplinary actions against subordinates, an authority reserved to higher echelons.

- Authority 9 concerns hearing and resolving group grievances or serious employee complaints. The appellant's authority in these matters is limited to hearing and resolving common complaints and grievances, rather than resolving serious (e.g., sexual harassment) complaints or group grievances of similar magnitude.
- Authority 12 speaks of determining whether contractor work meets standards of adequacy necessary for the authorization of payment. The appellant's responsibilities do not include reviewing contractor performed work for technical adequacy.

Since the appellant does not fully exercise Level 3-3a or a majority of Level 3-3b authorities, Level 3-2 credit applies.

We evaluate this factor at Level 3-2 and credit 450 points.

Factor 4: Nature and Purpose of Contacts

This is a two-part factor that assesses the nature and purpose of personal contacts related to supervisory and managerial responsibilities. The contacts used to determine credit level under one subfactor must be the same used to determine credit under the other subfactor.

Subfactor 4A: Nature of Contacts

This subfactor covers the organizational relationships, authority or influence level, setting, and preparation difficulty involved in the supervisor's work. To be credited, contacts must be direct and recurring, contribute to the successful performance of the work, and have a demonstrable impact on the difficulty and responsibility of the position.

The appellant states:

I have frequent contact with a Flag Officer. I have weekly meetings with the Commander, [Installation Name]. I also have meetings with other activity directors of high rank. I brief him on the results of audits and investigations conducted. I never meet with the Chief of Staff, Operations regarding audits, unless, an activity audited which reports to this position non concurs with our findings and recommendations. In that case, the Chief of Staff, Operations represents the highest level of management to respond to our audit report.

At Level 4A-3, frequent contacts are made with high ranking managers, supervisors, and technical staff at major organization levels of the agency, with agency headquarters administrative support staff, or comparable personnel in other agencies and often require extensive preparation or up-to-date technical familiarity with complex subject matter.

At Level 4A-4, frequent contacts are made with influential individuals *outside* the employing agency, such as executive level contracting and other officials of major defense contractors, key staff of congressional committees, SES, flag or general officer, or Executive Level heads of bureaus in Federal agencies, or the like. The contacts often require extemporaneous responses to hostile

questions. Preparation typically includes briefing packages or similar presentation materials requiring extensive analytical input by the employee and subordinates, or the assistance of a support staff.

Although Level 4A-3 and 4A-4 share some of the same types of contacts (e.g., contracting officials, state and local government officials, and public interest groups), they are distinguished by the management level contacted, the preparation involved, and the degree of adversity encountered. The frequency of contact, rather than variety, is of importance. Infrequent contacts are not creditable, nor are contacts with one's supervisors. The appellant's contacts with the Commander are fully credited under Factor 2. His contacts with high level managers of audited activities often require extensive preparation and equate to Level 4A-3.

We evaluate this factor at Level 4A-3 and credit 75 points.

Subfactor B: Purpose of Contacts

This subfactor includes the advisory, representational, negotiating, and commitment responsibilities related to the supervisor's contacts credited under the previous subfactor.

The appellant states:

The purpose of my contact is to influence, and persuade persons or groups to accept opinions or take actions related to advancing goals and objectives identified in our audits. I believe I qualify for Subfactor Level 4B-4-125 points.

At Level 4B-3, the purpose of contacts is to justify, defend, or negotiate in representing the program, obtaining or committing resources, and in gaining compliance. Contacts at this level usually involve active participation in conferences, meetings, hearings, or presentations involving matters of considerable consequence or importance.

At Level 4B-4, the purpose is to persuade others to accept opinions or take actions related to advancing the fundamental goals and objectives of the program when intense opposition or resistance is encountered due to significant organizational or philosophical conflict or like reasons.

The appellant must often engage in extensive discussions and negotiations in defending technical recommendations and gaining compliance concerning audit report findings and recommendations, as at Level 4B-3. His contacts do not meet Level 4B-4, the highest level recognized by the guide, where top managers are engaged with the most difficult policy and mission issues facing the larger organization.

We accordingly evaluate this factor at Level 4B-3 and credit 100 points.

Factor 5: Difficulty of Typical Work Directed

This factor covers the difficulty and complexity of the basic work most typical of the organization directed, as well as other line, staff, or contracted work for which the supervisor has technical or oversight responsibility (either directly or through subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or others).

The level credited for this factor normally must constitute at least 25 percent of the workload of the organization supervised. Excluded from consideration are:

- work of lower level positions that primarily support the basic work of the unit,
- work that is graded based upon the supervisory or leader guides,
- work that is graded higher than normal because of extraordinary independence from supervision, and
- work not fully under the supervisor's authority and responsibility as defined under Factor 3.

The agency workload analysis indicates at least 25 percent of the work directed meets the GS-11 level. No substantial amount of higher graded, non-supervisory work exists under the appellant's direction. According to the conversion table in the guide, a base level of GS-11 equates to Level 5-6.

We evaluate this factor at Level 5-6 and credit 800 points.

Factor 6: Other Conditions

This factor measures the extent to which various conditions add to the difficulty of supervision. For credit, the condition must be present and dealt with on a regular basis. Positions at Level 6-3 or below are boosted one level if they also meet at least three of the eight special situations described in the guide.

Level 6-4 addresses complications arising from professional, scientific, technical, or administrative work comparable in difficulty to the GS-11 level and requiring substantial coordination and integration of a number of major assignments or projects.

As determined under Factor 5, GS-11 best characterizes the base grade level of the work directed. The appellant is responsible for ensuring compatibility and consistency of interpretation, judgment, logic, and application of policy by his staff in the conduct of audits and the reporting of deficiencies. This equates to Level 6-4 coordination. Unlike Level 6-5 supervisors, he does not direct GS-12 work requiring extensive coordination.

We evaluate this factor at Level 6-4 and credit 1120 points.

FACTOR LEVEL POINT SUMMARY

Factor	Level	Points
1	1-2	350
2	2-2	250
3	3-2	450
4A	4A-3	75
4B	4B-3	100
5	5-6	800
6	6-4	1120
	Total:	3145

The above table summarizes our evaluation of the appellant's work. As shown in the grade conversion table of the guide, a total of 3145 points converts to grade GS-12 (2755-3150).

DECISION

As explained in the foregoing analysis, the proper classification of the appellant's position is Supervisory Auditor, GS-511-12.