

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

**Appellant:** [appellant]

**Agency classification:** Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program  
Specialist  
GS-101-9

**Organization:** Army Substance Abuse Program  
Office  
Directorate of Human Resources  
[organization]  
Department of the Army  
[organization],[location]

**OPM decision:** Training Instructor  
GS-1712-9

**OPM decision number:** C-1712-09-06

/s/

---

Kevin E. Mahoney  
Deputy Associate Director  
Center for Merit System Accountability

August 14, 2006  
Date

As provided in section 511.612 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), 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).

Since this decision changes the series and title of the appealed position, it is to be effective no later than the beginning of the fourth pay period after the date of this decision, as permitted by 5 CFR 511.702. The servicing personnel office must submit a compliance report containing the corrected position description and a Standard Form 50 showing the personnel action taken. The report must be submitted within 30 days from the effective date of the personnel action.

**Decision sent to:**

[appellant]  
[address]

Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel G1  
Civilian Human Resources Agency  
[location] Regional Director's Office  
[location] Civilian Personnel Operations Center  
Customer Focus Division  
[location]

Department of the Army  
Office of the Assistant G-1 for Civilian Personnel  
Chief, Policy and Program Development Division  
Attn.: DAPE-CP-PPD  
2461 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22332-0320

Department of the Army  
Office of the Assistant G-1 for Civilian Personnel  
Director, Civilian Personnel Evaluation Agency  
Attn.: DAPE-CP-EA  
2461 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22332-0320

Department of the Army  
Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1  
Assistant G-1 for Civilian Personnel  
Attn.: DAPE-CP  
The Pentagon, Room 2C453  
Washington, DC 20310-0300

Department of the Army  
Office of the Assistant Secretary (Manpower and  
Reserve Affairs)  
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Human Resources)  
Attn.: SAMR-HR  
The Pentagon, Room 2E468  
Washington, DC 20310-0111

## **Introduction**

On March 6, 2006, the Philadelphia Field Services Group of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a classification appeal from [appellant]. His position is currently classified as Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program Specialist, GS-101-9, which the appellant believes should be upgraded to GS-11. We received the agency administrative report on May 22, 2006. The position is located in the Army Substance Abuse Program (ASAP) Office, Directorate of Human Resources, [location], [location], Department of the Army (DA), [organization ], [location]. We have accepted and decided his appeal under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.).

## **Background**

Prior to the appellant's appointment to his current position on September 19, 2005, the ASAP Office was reviewed as part of a Contracting and Competitive Sourcing study done in accordance with Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76. The A-76 report, issued in June 2003, found the ASAP Office warranted two GS-11 positions (including the supervisor), one GS-9 position, and one GS-6 position.

At the appellant's request and because he thought it warranted a higher grade, the [location] Civilian Personnel Operations Center reviewed his position description (PD) and found it remained properly classified as an Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program Specialist, GS-101-9. He subsequently filed this appeal with OPM.

## **General issues**

As part of his appeal request, the appellant provides a PD and evaluation statement dated September 8, 1993, for an Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program Specialist (Program Coordinator), GS-101-11 position, PD [number], at [location], which he believes covers his work. By law, we must classify positions solely by comparing their current duties and responsibilities to OPM position classification standards (PCSs) and guidelines (5 U.S.C. 5106, 5107, and 5112). Since comparison to standards is the exclusive method for classifying positions, we cannot compare the appellant's position to other positions which may or may not be classified correctly.

The installation ASAP Office carries out its assigned work in accordance with Army Regulation (AR) 600-85 and program guidance provided by the Army Center for Substance Abuse Programs (ACSAP) for administering the ASAP. The appellant refers to the description of installation level Prevention Coordinator (PC) work provided within AR 600-85 as supporting his belief his position warrants evaluation at the GS-11 grade level. The regulation identifies tasks performed by individuals acting in particular roles/capacities within the ASAP at various organizational levels. However, that information is insufficient for grade determination purposes because it does not describe how the tasks are carried out in a particular organizational setting, the specific nature and degree of supervision, or address other matters which must be considered in comparison with established OPM position classification grade criteria in order to set a position's grade.

The appellant takes issue with the use of the word “assists” by the agency in evaluating his position and makes various other statements about the classification review processes conducted by his agency. In adjudicating this appeal, our only concern is to make our own independent decision on the proper classification of the appellant’s position. Because our decision sets aside any previous agency decision, the classification practices used by the appellant’s agency in classifying his position are not germane to the OPM classification appeals process.

The appellant raises concern regarding his agency’s decision to designate his position as a testing designated position (TDP). As explained previously, OPM’s authority to adjudicate classification appeals is restricted to those matters and does not include TDP determinations.

Both the appellant and his supervisor certify the appellant’s PD of record is an accurate description of his assigned duties and responsibilities. A PD is the official record of the major duties and responsibilities assigned to a position or job by an official with the authority to assign work. A position is the work made up of the duties and responsibilities performed by an employee. Position classification appeal regulations permit OPM to investigate or audit a position and decide an appeal on the basis of the actual duties and responsibilities assigned by management and performed by the employee (title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), sections 511.607(a)(1) and 609). An OPM appeal decision classifies a real operating position, and not simply the PD. Therefore, this decision is based on the actual work assigned to and performed by the appellant.

### **Position information**

The major objectives of the ASAP are to educate and inform to prevent substance abuse, identify substance abuse, and restore/rehabilitate those with substance abuse problems. The ASAP Office: provides advice and guidance to management personnel, including command; implements and manages the local drug (urinalysis) testing program; provides substance abuse prevention and education training; assesses capabilities of local treatment and rehabilitation service providers and, as appropriate, arranges for treatment in coordination with clinical specialists; presents public/community awareness programs; and develops local policies procedures and practices to implement Department of Defense (DoD), DA and Command initiatives. The office provides services to 8,300 garrison military personnel, civilian employees, tenant activity civilian personnel, and military family members and retirees.

The appellant serves as the installation PC. His PD states “The primary purpose for this position is to serve as education coordinator and provide training for the Army Substance Abuse Program (ASAP) and other integrated programs.” Both he and his supervisor agree this is the position’s main function. The appellant coordinates his work, as necessary, with others within and outside the ASAP Office; provides input to ASAP staff discussions concerning new or significantly modified local policies and procedures including those to implement new DoD, DA and/or command issuances; and keeps his supervisor apprised of his activities, informing him of any unusual matters, problems, or potentially sensitive issues.

The appellant teaches training classes 30 percent of his time, modifies or develops lesson plans 20 percent, and performs ASAP training program related duties 25 percent of his time. The

remaining 25 percent of the time he publicizes ASAP through articles written for the installation newspaper, participates in annual and locally-sponsored campaigns and serves as the installation Risk Reduction Program (RRP) coordinator.

The appellant oversees the installation Unit Prevention Leader (UPL) training program. UPLs are E-5 (sergeants) and above who have completed the required ACSAP training course and passed the certification test and must recertify annually. The course takes 40 hours and is given biannually to 150 installation UPLs and those from Forts [name, name, and name]. For three quarters of the installation UPL course, including the tests, he uses standardized ACSAP materials. One quarter of the course involves locally developed briefings and visits to a local rehabilitation facility and the on-site laboratory. The appellant teaches half the course and the rest is given by the Employee Assistance Program Coordinator (EAPC), Alcohol and Drug Control Officer (ADCO), a Judge Advocate General (JAG) representative, State law enforcement personnel, and the Installation Biochemical Testing Coordinator (IBTC).

He delivers two-to-three hour quarterly training classes to UPLs to provide updates on new initiatives, revised or new policy and procedures, discuss trends and problematic issues surfaced through the RRP or during annual UPL inspections, and provide additional training/briefings to enhance their ability to perform as UPLs. Similar to the initial UPL training course, these sessions may involve presentations by others, e.g., the IBTC and EAPC. The appellant serves as central point of contact for all UPL training records, maintains copies of each unit's training records, and performs UPL unit inspections on a monthly rotational basis to check for proper postings on bulletin boards, review training folders, and ensure training is carried out in accordance with established/approved UPL annual training plans. He provides guidance and assistance, recommends topics, provides access to resources through the ASAP library, and approves all training plans prior to delivery. He occasionally teaches unit training sessions for the UPLs.

The appellant prepares and presents monthly Army Drug and Alcohol Prevention Training (ADAPT) classes for people identified as having substance abuse problems. The training covers alcohol, tobacco and drugs, DoD, DA, and local command policies, procedures, and practices, and applicable State laws. The ACSAP provides a mandatory 12-hour training program which is supplemented by two hours of locally-developed training and a two-hour field trip to a local rehabilitation facility. The appellant works with the EAPC and/or clinical staff to tailor the locally prepared portion to the particular needs of the attendees for that month.

The appellant presents 30 minute "Start Right Program" briefings to 10 to 15 new employees each week. This training covers DoD, DA, and local regulations, policies, and procedures, State laws concerning driving while under the influence, the driver's points assessment system, and discusses substance abuse issues, ASAP services, and provides points of contact.

All active duty personnel receive four hours of mandatory training annually following established ACSAP guidance provided on a CD including the general format and topics. The appellant keeps the training fresh and interesting by adding new references, updated handouts, and addressing substance abuse topics relevant to the local community. The training is given either by the appellant or by the appellant with other presenters. All Army civilian employees

receive a mandatory three-hour Defense Workforce Briefing annually addressing topics relevant to the local community regarding substance abuse. The content is locally developed as a coordinated effort of the ASAP staff. The appellant prepares two hours of the training, and the EAPC prepares one hour. The appellant, ADCO, and EAPC typically each teach one hour of the training.

The appellant develops and provides new/unique training on ASAP topics for various audiences when no standardized course content is specified. Such presentations are typically about an hour in duration, although some may last a few hours. They are presented at elementary schools, parent teacher association (PTA) meetings, pediatric health fairs, at tenant activities, etc. Such presentations frequently include the use of visual displays, handout materials, and/or small promotional giveaway items appropriate to the target audience.

The appellant researches, selects and incorporates material to update/refresh existing training plans and prepare training materials to supplement established course curriculum. He frequently modifies course content to emphasize specific aspects of substance abuse based on information obtained from the RRP, URI surveys, and UPLs. The information is readily available from a variety of sources including the installation ASAP library, Internet, on-line information from the National Traffic Safety Institute, the ACSAP Web page, "Join Together Direct" from the Department of Health and Human Services, and numerous other published or otherwise commercially available sources such as books, articles, visual and audiovisual materials, brochures, and handouts.

The appellant administers the installation resource library of more than 250 items, including audio/visual materials, and is responsible to ensure it provides up-to-date reference materials for use by ASAP staff members and UPLs in the preparation and presentation of required substance-abuse training. He reads pertinent materials, researches topics, and reviews audio/visual products in order to recommend and justify the acquisition of new materials for the library to the ADCO.

The appellant participates in collaborative ASAP office efforts, such as public and community awareness campaigns and programs covering both military and civilian personnel like the: Nation Night Out; National Red-Ribbon Campaign; National Drug Prevention month; National 3D (drunk and drugged driving) month; and Great American Smoke-Out. He also participates in locally-sponsored initiatives such as the "[name]" smoking cessation campaign. The appellant publicizes ASAP initiatives through flyers, bulletins, on-base promotional booths, coordinates with the UPLs, and occasionally writes short articles for publication in the installation newspaper to provide information on substance abuse topics and/or upcoming events.

The appellant serves as installation Risk Reduction Program (RRP) coordinator. He receives reports on a quarterly basis from six other installation activities: the Provost Marshal; Alcohol and Drug Safety; Army Community Services; Family Advocacy; Preventive Medicine; the Chaplain's Office; Community Mental Health; and the Staff Judge Advocate General (JAG) concerning 14 risk factors: financial problems, injuries, deaths, accidents, sexually transmitted diseases, suicide gestures and attempts, absence without leave, drug offenses, alcohol offenses, traffic violations, spouse abuse, crimes against persons, crimes against property and child abuse.

The appellant enters the data into an ACSAP database and submits it for processing by ACSAP which then generates reports, including trend data and unit rankings, back to the appellant. He reviews the data to identify the extent to which particular units are experiencing problems with the risk factors and uses the information to more effectively target his training efforts. He coordinates with the UPLs to inform them of the issues affecting their units and help them address the issues toward reducing and/or eliminating the problematic behaviors. The Installation Prevention Team (IPT) also analyzes ACSAP reports to decide on, recommend, and implement, upon Command approval, effective interventions by appropriate installation offices/activities. The appellant is a member of the IPT, as are the ADCO, EAPC, and representatives from Child and Youth Services, the Director of Emergency Services, and the Chaplain's Office.

As part of the RRP, the appellant coordinates unit risk inventory (URI) surveys on an annual basis through the UPLs to collect self-reported anonymous information from all assigned Army military personnel. The survey uses a 55-question questionnaire to collect information to assess a unit's risk tendencies regarding substance abuse, stress levels, relationships, safe sex practices, family-related abuse issues, violence, crime, suicide, financial difficulties, command issues, and self perceptions. The appellant gathers and submits the data to ACSAP and, similar to the previous process, they provide trend analyses and unit data reports to the appellant for the installation. The URI data are used in conjunction with that gathered on actual occurrences to better identify organizations exhibiting particular propensities for high-risk behaviors, target training and bring other appropriate installation resources to bear on these matters.

The appellant also prepares the annual ASAP training plan and budget proposal; schedules training and arranges for classrooms coordinating with the installation training coordinator; coordinates with other training presenters; arranges for special speakers; maintains all required training records; prepares handouts and other training materials; prepares program-related correspondence; and performs various other activities necessary to provide installation ASAP education services.

The appellant works under the supervision of the ADCO, who occupies a GS-101-11 position. The Office is also staffed with one Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program Specialist, GS-101-11, (EAPC) and one Health Technician, GS-640-6. The ADCO manages all non-clinical ASAP staff, programs, and associated funds. He assigns the appellant's work in terms of his specific roles and responsibilities and provides expectations and objectives for those portions of the overall installation ASAP. The ADCO reviews the appellant's work by: reading trainee feedback and after action reports, reviewing prepared lesson plans, and directly observing some of the appellant's training sessions. The supervisor may suggest revisions/additions to lesson plans concerning local laws, policies, or practices. The supervisor indicated he expected this amount of oversight to decrease because the appellant was relatively new to the position. The supervisor develops local ASAP implementing guidance, policies, and procedures with input from the ASAP staff and coordinates the proposed guidelines with other interested installation activities and the installation JAG prior to Command signature and issuance. The supervisor prepares, justifies, and oversees the installation ASAP budget and evaluates the appellant's annual training budget projections and occasional other funding requests in regard to their impact on the overall installation ASAP budget.



The appellant administers the installation ASAP training program from an overall perspective and coordinates his training efforts with those of the EAPC, whose primary emphasis is on the serviced civilian personnel. EAPC responsibilities include: marketing campaigns and awareness programs; supervisory/managerial and civilian education; and initial assessments, counseling, and coordination with clinical staff to ensure appropriate referrals are made for individuals with substance abuse problems.

To help decide this appeal, we conducted telephone interviews with the appellant on June 20, 2006, and his immediate supervisor on June 28, 2006. In reaching our classification decision, we carefully considered all of the information gained from these interviews, as well as the written information furnished by the appellant and his agency, including the PD of record. We find the PD of record covers the major functions assigned to and performed by the appellant and incorporate it by reference into this decision.

### **Series, title, and standard determination**

The appellant's position is currently classified to the two-grade interval GS-101, Social Science Series, which covers positions the duties of which are to advise on, administer, supervise, or perform research or other *professional* and scientific work in one or any combination of the social sciences when such work is not classifiable in other series of this occupational group. The foundation of the professional social scientist's work is the exploration of facts concerning a case to determine the nature, cause, components, and impact of the situation to better understand present and future effects on individuals.

Work classified to a professional series requires education and training in the principles, concepts, and theories of the occupation. Typically, these can be gained only through completion of a bachelor's or higher degree with major study in, or pertinent to, a specialized field at a college or university. This requirement, called a "positive education requirement," is common to nearly all professional occupational series. We were advised by the ADCO the vacancy announcement last used to solicit candidates for the position did not include a positive education requirement.

Professional work also requires creativity, analysis, evaluation, and interpretation. It involves applying basic or natural law, principles, or theory; evaluating the research of others; and assessing the need for and validity of proposed changes and improvements in procedures and methods. Professional responsibility involves the ability to reason from existing knowledge to unexplored areas; to adapt methods to circumstances that deviate from the standards; and to stay abreast of and evaluate technical subjects, analyses, and proposals in professional literature.

As described above, the appellant presents pre-approved training courses, develops lesson plans for short training sessions, searches readily available established sources to update existing training courses, administers the ASAP training program, coordinates with others following established practices and procedures, collects and submits predetermined data requirements in accordance with established guidelines, and tailors training content based upon RRP and URI results reported by ACSAP. His work does not require professional level creativity, analysis,

evaluation, or interpretation such that he reasons from existing knowledge to unexplored areas; adapts methods to circumstances which deviate from standards; stays abreast of and evaluates technical subjects, analyses, and proposals concerning the essential principles, concepts, and theories of a specialized professional field of study; or applies problem-solving techniques typical of professional work. Instead, the appellant's work is performed applying practical knowledge of the purpose, objectives, operations, policies, procedures, techniques, and pertinent guidelines. Work of this nature supports the conclusion that the fundamental requirements of the position can be learned through on-the-job training. Positions can be considered professional only if the work requires application of professional knowledge and ability. Because the appellant's work does not require professional knowledge of social or behavioral sciences, the position is excluded from the GS-101 series.

The majority of the appellant's time is spent preparing for and providing ASAP training. This is two-grade interval administrative work properly assigned to the GS-1712, Training Instruction series. Similar to the appellant's position, the GS-1712 series includes positions concerned with the administration, supervision, training program development, evaluation, or instruction in a program of training when the paramount requirement of the work is a combination of practical knowledge of the methods and techniques of instruction *and* practical knowledge of the subject matter being taught. The appellant's work requires application of methods and principles of the ASAP/ACSAP training program to provide training and educational services for diverse groups in age, gender, race, and ethnicity, self-concept, life experiences, readiness to learn, orientation to learning, and motivation. Work covered under the GS-1712 series is properly evaluated using the Grade Level Guide for Instructional Work (GLGIW).

The appellant collects and reports data requirements, schedules classrooms, prepares class materials and handouts, maintains records of training and the UPL program, and maintains and updates the ASAP resource library. These functions are ancillary to the appellant's training responsibilities. They are neither grade enhancing, nor do they impact the determination of the position's proper series or title.

Based on the grade-level analysis which follows, the appellant's GS-1712 covered duties are grade-controlling and predominant in terms of the basic purpose of the position and sources of recruitment. Therefore, the appellant's position is properly classified to the GS-1712, Training Instruction series, and is titled Training Instructor.

### **Grade determination**

#### *Evaluation using the GLGIW*

The GLGIW recognizes that instructor and instructional specialist work is performed in a wide range of educational and training programs operated by Federal agencies. It provides grade evaluation criteria in two parts. Part I covers instructor work and Part II instructional specialist work.

*Part I* covers instructor work involving the following activities:

- Preparing daily work plans based on general course outlines and established learning objectives. Plans cover instructional methods and techniques, training materials and aids, time schedules, etc.
- Training in traditional classroom situations or in self-paced learning programs where the instructor guides students in the use of special learning techniques.
- Evaluating the progress of students and advising and assisting them to improve their performance.

*Part II* covers instructional specialist work such as:

- Ascertaining needs for training and education, usually through surveys or job analysis.
- Determining the objectives and scope of the courses, the subjects to be covered, and the criteria for evaluation.
- Developing, revising, or adapting courses and instructional materials and guides.
- Evaluating education and training programs and recommending needed changes and improvements.

As described under Part I of the GLGIW, the appellant develops training materials, determines appropriate instructional methods/techniques and plans class content or tailors courses in preparation for his presentation of the materials. Established OPM guidance (*Digest of Significant Classification Decisions and Opinions*, Digest 16, page 10) indicates that Part I covers situations in which an employee's instructor duties are paramount for grade support and the instructional specialist work is performed almost exclusively in support of the courses he or she teaches. Part II of the GLGIW pertains to positions that primarily develop courses for presentation by others. When used in an educational context, "*course*" normally carries the meaning of a recognized course of study, or a body of prescribed studies constituting a curriculum involving a number of consecutive segments/classes which build upon each other to meet an established goal or objective. We find the appellant's instructor and instructional duties are covered by Part I. Work covered by the GLGIW is evaluated by considering distinctions between grade levels of work based upon two factors: *Nature of Assignment* and *Level of Responsibility*.

#### *Nature of Assignment*

This factor encompasses such aspects as the knowledge, skill, and ability required in performing the work, and the complexity and difficulty of the duties and responsibilities assigned.

At the GS-7 grade level, assignments typically involve short, repetitive courses or course units that are highly structured. In contrast, courses at the GS-9 grade level cover a wide variety of topics in well-established areas of a subject-matter field. They include courses taught by a technical service school in the fundamentals and skills of a technical occupation; courses taught at the secondary level through basic undergraduate levels; or all subjects taught at an elementary school level. Instructors require thorough familiarity with the assigned subject-matter areas and use a wide range of teaching methods or tools depending on the students' learning requirements. They are usually well-structured and have ample training materials. The courses generally

involve instructional problems that require organization, illustration, and interpretation of course material in order to reach and motivate students who may pose typical problems of communication and motivation due to, e.g., diverse ages, backgrounds, and levels of interest in the course. GS-9 instructors need to give concrete expression to the abstract principles and concepts taught at this level. They make recommendations for changes involving substantive rather than procedural matters. Obtaining and adapting current instructional material is typical of this level.

At the GS-11 grade level, the courses cover advanced technical systems of subject-matter areas comparable to the upper-division undergraduate level. These courses are not in standardized or pre-structured format, and they typically have source material problems. For example, source materials may be excessively numerous, may be difficult to locate, or may be difficult to adapt. Instructors at the GS-11 grade level are responsible for overall maintenance of their assigned courses and determine the need for and initiate changes or updates in course content. The instructors participate substantially in course development or modification. Instructors at this level frequently demonstrate techniques to trainee instructors and evaluate the performance of lower level instructors. Some courses taught at this level are similar to those taught at the GS-9 grade level, but GS-11 instructors are required to adapt or revise their courses because of subject-matter or student problems. Subject-matter problems result from technological changes or new developments in the field and require frequent updating of knowledge and course content by instructors. Student problems relate to students with complicated, specialized, or persistent learning difficulties requiring instructors to modify courses to meet the needs of the students.

Typical of the GS-9 grade level, the appellant provides training on a variety of topics in a well-established subject-matter area. Most training materials are either standard course packages developed by the ACSAP or pre-existing locally developed lesson plans which normally include ample learning modules and training materials. Similar to the GS-9 grade level, the appellant adapts existing instructional materials and course content to better address the issues of the local community and/or particular military units. He also occasionally develops short self-contained classes tailored to meet particular educational requirements. The depth and breadth of the classes varies considerably as the appellant provides training ranging from the UPL course with quarterly follow-up sessions, the ADAPT course for those with substance abuse problems, elementary school classes, PTA educational briefings, presentations at promotional events, required annual employee ASAP education briefings, to new employee sessions and various other presentations and classes.

As at the GS-9 grade level the appellant: provides tangible information to explain the nature of and effects caused by alcohol tobacco and drugs, the potential consequences of using them; associated concepts; established statutes, regulations and policies; and other pertinent information regarding a variety of ASAP and related issues. He addresses commonly used terms and explains them providing concrete information on medical implications and legal regulatory meaning. The challenge for the appellant is to teach and motivate a wide range of individuals including people exhibiting substance abuse behaviors; those with pre-established attitudes; and youngsters just beginning to form their own perceptions, opinions, and beliefs regarding alcohol, tobacco, and drugs. Other issues and motivations affecting trainees include peer pressure, family attitudes, and self perceptions. Comparable to the GS-9 grade level, the appellant considers his

teaching approach in deciding the best way to tailor and communicate the information to a particular audience. In some situations, he may find it beneficial to lecture aided with media including handouts and/or PowerPoint presentations. At other times, the appellant may employ cooperative group learning by encouraging students to share their experiences, provide for a question-and-answer session, or adjust the presentation to be age appropriate for younger students. With the exception of the UPL certification and ADAPT courses, the classes taught by the appellant are somewhat limited in comparison to those described at the GS-9 grade level. However, when considered as a whole, the nature of the appellant's instructor duties and training program responsibilities, as described above, minimally meet this grade level.

The appellant's position does not meet the GS-11 grade level where courses cover advanced technical systems or subject-matter areas comparable to the upper-division undergraduate level. Unlike the GS-11 grade level, the course materials used are standardized and do not require recurring modification due to technological changes or new developments resulting from subject-matter problems. Participants receive instruction using a variety of pre-structured courses on ASAP issues. Although the appellant uses various teaching strategies to assist students, the basic level of the training and materials used, as well as the lack of *course development* involving GS-11 grade level difficulty and complexity precludes assignment at the GS-11 grade level. Therefore, this factor is evaluated at the GS-9 grade level.

#### *Level of Responsibility*

This factor includes such things as independence; the extent to which guidelines for the work are available or must be developed; and the kinds of contacts required to perform the work.

At the GS-9 grade level, instructors independently plan and carry out their training sessions within the prescribed course framework. They resolve normal classroom problems, make outside contacts for supplemental information and materials, and obtain guidance before taking action on unusual matters or questions of program objectives and policy. Recommendations for course modification receive review for consistency with overall course material, for technical accuracy, and for educational adequacy. Courses of instructors at this level are audited and evaluated periodically by higher level instructors. The GS-9 instructors may participate in task analyses for determining training requirements or in special staff studies of training and testing materials, for which they receive specific guidance on coverage, methodology, approaches, and sources to use.

At the GS-11 grade level, the instructors may receive course assignments with the course objectives, topics to be covered and general content in a prescribed form; but they also typically participate in original course content development, e.g., development of training courses at the ACSAP level, and in its subsequent modification. Within the framework of approved course objectives and topics to be covered, GS-11 instructors use such methods as they believe will be most effective. They determine the need for additional subject-matter information and may meet with representatives of outside organizations in order to obtain it. They develop or adapt new or revised training or testing materials for formal course use. These materials may be reviewed by the instructor's supervisor for technical accuracy, consistency with course objectives, educational effectiveness, and program policy.

The appellant's position meets the GS-9 grade level in that he works independently in providing classroom instruction to students in assigned subjects. Routine classroom problems are solved by the appellant, and the supervisor is kept informed of difficult or controversial problems. The appellant performs his duties without detailed or specific guidance from the supervisor, and his work is examined for effectiveness as part of the overall program. The appellant is expected to perform all duties and responsibilities relating to the educational services in accordance with DOD, DA, ASAP, and ACSAP guidance as well as local instructions and policies. Personal contacts are generally with employees within the Center, State law enforcement personnel, and ACSAP personnel for scheduling participation in and/or addressing training issues and concerns associated with ASAP training classes/courses.

The appellant's position does not meet the GS-11 grade level. While the appellant performs daily work with relative independence, he is delivering prescribed course materials for students on a short-term basis. He is not involved in the development of original course content as typical at the GS-11 grade level. Instead, as at the GS-9 grade level, any recommendations the appellant may propose for modification of the course content are reviewed for consistency and for technical and educational adequacy by the immediate supervisor. While individual student learning or behavioral problems may occur, the basic nature of the course material taught and the short-term, self-contained nature of the courses precludes crediting at the GS-11 grade level. This factor is evaluated at the GS-9 grade level.

### *Summary*

Based on application of the GLGIW, both factors of the appellant's Part I, Instructor, work are credited at the GS-9 grade level.

### **Decision**

The position is properly classified as Training Instructor, GS-1712-9.