

Department of Defense (DoD)
Civilian Personnel Management Service (CPMS)
Field Advisory Services - *FAS*
Classification Appeal Decision

DoD Decision:	(Title to be determined by Agency), GS-1101-13
Initial classification:	Pneudraulics Production Manager, GS-1101-13
Organization:	Air Force Base Commodities Directorate Pneudraulics Division
Date:	August 04, 1998

INFORMATION CONSIDERED

This appeal decision is based on information from the following sources:

1. The appellant's letter with attachments.
2. The official position description for the appealed position and the evaluation statement.
3. Statement of job description accuracy signed by the appellant and position description accuracy statement signed by the supervisor.
4. An organizational chart pertaining to the appealed position.
5. The appellant's latest SF-50.
6. The appellant's latest performance standards.
7. The supervisor's official position description and the evaluation statement.
8. On-site interview with the supervisor and audit with the appellant.

STANDARDS REFERENCED

A. United States Office of Personnel Management General Schedule Supervisory Guide, April 1998.

B. United States Office of Personnel Management Handbook of Occupational Groups and Series, Series Definition of General Business and Industry Series, GS-1101, December 1997, HRCD-4.

C. United States Office of Personnel Management Digest of Significant Classification Decisions and Opinions, No. 19, August 1994.

D. Department of Defense (DoD) Supplementary Guidance for the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG), June 1993.

E. United States Office of Personnel Management Introduction to the Position Classification Standards, December 1997, HRCD-4.

F. United States Office of Personnel Management FWS Job Grading Standard (JGS) for Pneudraulic Systems Mechanic, WG-8255, December 1997, HRCD-4.

G. United States Office of Personnel Management Position Classification standard for Electronics Technician Series, GS-856, December 1997, HRCD-4.

BACKGROUND AND POSITION INFORMATION

The appellant is a Pneudraulics Production Manager, GS-1101-13 in the Commodities Directorate, Pneudraulics Division at Xxx AFB. The Pneudraulics Division provides management guidance to the overall effort and is responsible to utilize the resources to maximize production, maintain high quality standards and labor efficiency. The division serves as the depot single source of repair for servo flight controls and general hydraulic components for all echelons of maintenance. It accomplishes maintenance, modification, overhaul, test and trouble-shooting of electro-hydraulic and mechanical flight controls, pumps, motors, and miscellaneous valves and cylinders.

The appealed position is responsible for planning and directing product line activities through subordinate supervisors, internal support staff, and with staff support from the Program Control Division. The appellant signed a statement that certified the accuracy of his position description of record with one exception; the appellant contends that "the position description does not accurately define that the incumbent has final authority for the full range of personnel actions." The supervisor signed the position description accuracy statement.

The appellant believes that his position should be classified at the GS-14 level. He contends that the servicing personnel office failed to credit him final authority for the full range of personnel actions and organization design proposals recommended by subordinate supervisors which is covered under factor level 3-4b in the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG), Reference A. Additionally, the appellant identified in writing, as well as during the course of the on-site audit, similar positions throughout his directorate which he feels are inconsistently classified. He stated that "Our directorate has three divisions that overhaul homogenous workloads. Two of the division chiefs are GS-14s, and one is a GS-13, which is me. Within our directorate there is inconsistency in that I work for a GS-15, yet I have a GS-13 working for me."

By law, we must make our decision solely by comparing the current duties, responsibilities and the qualifications required to perform them to OPM standards. In reaching our classification decision, we have carefully reviewed all relevant information furnished by the appellant and his component, including his official position description of record, position description number 26741. Classification appeal decisions, by law (sections 5106, 5107, and 5112 of Title 5, United States Code), can not be based on comparisons to other positions which may or may not have been correctly classified and/or which may have had other duties and responsibilities on which the overall grade was based.

TITLE AND SERIES DETERMINATION

As defined in the Handbook of occupational Groups and Series (Reference B) under the series definition for the GS-1101, General Business and Industry Series, "This series includes all classes of positions the duties of which are to administer, supervise. Or perform (1) any combination of work characteristic of two or more series in this group where no one type of work is series controlling and where the combination is not specifically included in another series; or (2) other work properly

classified in this group for which no other series has been provided." While the appellant's duties are not clearly identified with a specific series in the GS-1100 Group, the work is sufficiently similar to work covered by the group to warrant classification in the GS-1101 General Business and Industry Series. Therefore, the appealed position is placed in this series.

The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) does not prescribe titles for positions placed in the GS-1101 series. When titles are not prescribed by governing classification standards, they are to be constructed at the discretion of the agency or the servicing personnel office in accordance with the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards, (Reference E), Part III, H.

GRADE LEVEL DETERMINATION

The GSSG provides criteria for determining the General Schedule grade level for supervisory positions in grades GS-5 through GS-15. It also contains criteria for evaluating managerial responsibilities that may accompany supervisory responsibilities in this range of grades. The appealed position exercises supervisory control and direction over approximately 300 employees through 16 subordinate supervisors for over 25% of the time and therefore meets coverage under the GSSG.

FACTOR 1 - PROGRAM SCOPE AND EFFECT

Level 1-3 550 Points

This factor evaluates the general complexity, breadth, and impact of the program areas and work directed, including the organizational and geographic coverage. It also assesses the impact of the work both within and outside the immediate organization. To credit a particular factor level, the criteria for both Scope and Effect must be met. The servicing personnel office credited factor level 1-3 to this factor.

The appellant plans and directs repair and overhaul of pneumatic components under a product Directorate concept. He manages multiple Product lines and production operations involving building to accommodate new aircraft component workloads; replacement/delivery of test equipment with new ATE; modification of equipment, shop layout and production processes to improve utilization of the large production facility; and manages a one of a kind flow grind process used in the overhaul of pneumatic components. The work force and production activities directed affect a wide range of agency activities and major operations of the Commodities Directorate.

Scope addresses the general complexity and breadth of: the program (or program segment) directed; and the work directed, the products produced, or the services delivered. The geographic and organizational coverage of the program (or program segment) within the agency structure is included in the scope.

For scope, at factor level 1-3, work involves the direction of a program segment that performs technical, administrative, protective, investigative, or professional work. The program segment and work directed typically have coverage which encompasses a major metropolitan area, a State, or a small region of several states; or, when most of an area's taxpayers or business are covered, coverage comparable to a small city. Providing complex administrative or technical or professional services directly affecting a large or complex multi-mission military installation also falls at this level.

At factor level 1-4, work involves the direction of a segment of a professional, highly technical, or

complex administrative program which involves the development of major aspects of key agency scientific, medical, legal, administrative, regulatory, policy development or comparable, highly technical programs; or that includes major, highly technical operations at the Government's largest most complex industrial installations.

For scope, the appealed position meets all aspects of factor level 1-3 as described above. Although the appellant manages a substantial 60 million dollar budget and establishes sales prices for Over 900 line items, the program directed is specific in nature as in regards to customer requirements (Air Force bases; Major Commands; and Foreign Military Sales), inter and intra organizational working relationships, and industrial operations requirements. The scope of the appellant's program segment does not meet factor level 1-4 because the work directed by the appellant does not directly affect agency policy and regulation. Furthermore, the appellant does not direct activities involving the development of his component's policy or other activities impacting the development of major component programs. These functions are assigned to positions at higher levels within his component. The appealed position fully meets factor level 1-3 for scope.

Effect addresses the impact of work, the products and/or the programs described under "scope" on the mission and programs of the customer(s), the activity, other activities in or out of government, the agency, other agencies, the general public, or others.

For effect, factor level 1-3 involves activities, functions, or services accomplished directly which significantly impact a wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, or the operations of outside interests or the general public. At the field activity level (involving large, complex, multimission organizations and/or very large serviced populations) the work directly involves or substantially impacts the provision of essential support operations to numerous, varied and complex technical, professional, and administrative functions.

At factor level 1-4, the work directed impacts on an agency's headquarters operations, several bureau wide programs, or most of an agency's entire field establishment; or facilitates the agency's accomplishment of its primary mission or programs of national significance; or impacts large segments of the Nation's population or segments of one of a few large industries; or receives frequent or continuing congressional or medial attention.

For effect, the work directed by the appellant matches all aspects of factor level 1-3 as described above. Consistent with this level, the work supports the operations and objectives of Air Force, DoD and Foreign Military Sales elements. The appealed position's work direction does not impact at the level which is described in factor level 1-4 above. The appellant's responsibilities for managing, planning, and direction of his program segment is not comparable to the level of significance which must impact on an agency's headquarters operations, several bureauwide programs, or most of the agency's entire field structure. Although important to Air Force specific production, related to servo flight controls and general hydraulic components, the work directed does not facilitate accomplishment of the component's primary mission or programs of national significance and does not affect large segments of the Nation's population. The appealed position fully meets factor level 1-3 for effect.

We concur with the servicing personnel office and both Scope and Effect are credited for factor level 1-3, 250 points.

FACTOR 2 - ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING

Level 2-2 250 Points

This factor considers the organizational situation of the supervisory position in relation to higher levels of management. The servicing personnel office credited this factor with factor level 2-2.

The appellant is accountable to a position (full deputy) that is one reporting level below the first SES, flag, or general officer, or equivalent or higher level position in the direct supervisory chain. We concur with the servicing personnel office and credit the appealed position with factor level 2-2, 250 points.

FACTOR 3 - SUPERVISORY AND MANAGERIAL AUTHORITY EXERCISED

Level 3-3b 775 Points

This factor measures the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities that are exercised on a recurring basis. To be credited with a level under this factor, a position must meet the authorities and responsibilities to the extent described for the specific level. The servicing personnel office credited factor level 3-3, to this factor. The appellant disagrees with the servicing personnel office and believes that he meets both factor level 3-4a and 3-4b which should be credited to upgrade his position to the GS-14 level.

To meet factor level 3-3b, a supervisor must exercise all or nearly all of the delegated supervisory authorities and responsibilities described at factor level 3-2c, and in addition, at least 8 of the following:

1. Using any of the following to direct, coordinate, or oversee work; supervisory, team leaders, group coordinators, committee chairs, or comparable personnel; and/or providing similar oversight or contractors;
2. Exercising significant responsibilities in dealing with officials of other units or organizations, or in advising management officials of higher rank;
3. Ensuring reasonable equity (among units, groups, teams, projects, etc.) of performance standards and rating techniques developed by subordinates or assuring comparable equity in the assessment by subordinates of the adequacy of contractor capabilities or of contractor completed work;
4. Direction of a program or major program segment with significant resources (e.g., one at a multimillion dollar level or annual resources);
5. Making decisions on work problems presented by subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or similar personnel, or by contractors;
6. Evaluating subordinate supervisors or team leaders and serving as the reviewing official on evaluation of nonsupervisory employees rated by subordinate supervisors;
7. Making or approving selections for subordinate nonsupervisory positions;
8. Recommending selections for subordinate supervisory positions and for work leader, group leader, or project director positions responsible for coordinating the work of others, and similar positions;
9. Hearing and resolving group grievances or serious employee complaints;
10. Reviewing and approving serious disciplinary actions (e.g., suspensions) involving nonsupervisory subordinates;
11. Making decisions on nonroutine, costly, or controversial training needs and training requests related to employees of the unit;
12. Determining whether contractor performed work meets standards of adequacy necessary

- for authorization of payment;
13. Approving expenses comparable to within-grade increases, extensive overtime, and employee travel;
 14. Recommending awards or bonuses for nonsupervisory personnel and changes in position classification, subject to approval by higher level officials, supervisory, or others;
 15. Finding and implementing ways to eliminate or reduce significant bottlenecks and barriers to production, promote team building, or improve business practices.

The appealed position meets all criteria for the crediting of factor level 3-3b. Specifically, the appellant performs nearly all of the delegated supervisory authorities and responsibilities described at factor level 3-2c, and in addition, at least 8 of the delegated supervisory authorities and responsibilities described above under factor level 3-3b.

In order to meet factor level 3-4, in addition to meeting delegated managerial and supervisory authorities included at lower levels of this factor, position at this level must meet the criteria in paragraph a or b below:

- a. Exercise delegated authority to oversee the overall planning, direction, and timely execution of a program, several program segments (each of which is managed through separate subordinate organizational units), or comparable staff functions, including development, assignment, and higher level clearance of goals and objectives for supervisors or managers of subordinate organizational units or lower organizational levels. Approve multi year and longer range work plans developed by the supervisors or managers or subordinate organizational units and subsequently manage the overall work to enhance achievement of the goals and objectives. Oversee the revision of long range plans, goals and objectives for the work directed. Manage the development of policy changes in response to changes in levels of appropriations or other legislated changes. Manage organizational changes throughout the organization directed, or major change to the structure and content of the program or program segments directed. Exercise discretionary authority to approve the allocation and distribution of funds in the organization's budget.
- b. Exercise final authority for the full range of personnel actions and organization design proposals recommended by subordinate supervisors. This level may be credited even if formal clearance is required for a few actions, such as removals and incentive awards above set dollar levels.

In accordance with DoD Supplementary Guidance for the GSSG (Reference D), factor level 3-4a would typically be assigned to positions no lower than the first reporting level below an installation commander or directorate level. Also, before considering factor level 3-4b, OPM intends that all of the delegated authorities in both factor levels 3-3a and 3-3b must be met. The criteria of the standard are satisfied if supervisors possess the authority to approve most significant organization design proposals recommended by subordinate supervisors. The appealed position falls short of meeting the intent of factor level 3-4a or 3-4b and does not exercise the required managerial authority (i.e., approve multi year and longer range work plans developed by subordinate supervisors and have authority to approve changes in organization's structure or content). There have been no significant reorganizations requiring organization design proposals in the last four years. Additionally, the presence of the appellant's supervisor, who is credited with coordinating administrative programs, technical activities and industrial operations of the Commodities Directorate, as well as exercising full and final technical authority as the full Deputy to the Director of the Commodities Directorate, strongly weakens the

crediting of factor level 3-4 to the appealed position.

We concur with the servicing personnel office and credit the appealed position with factor level 3-3b, 775 points.

FACTOR 4 - PERSONAL CONTACTS

This is a two part factor that assesses the nature and the purpose of personal contacts related to supervisory and managerial responsibilities. The nature of the contacts, credited under Subfactor 4A, and the purpose of those contacts, credited under Subfactor 4B, must be based on the same contacts.

Subfactor 4A - Nature of Contacts

Level 4A-2 50 Points

This subfactor covers the organizational relationships, authority or influence level, setting, and difficulty of preparation associated with making personal contacts involved in supervisory and managerial work. To be credited, the level of contacts must contribute to the successful performance of the work, be a recurring requirement, have a demonstrable impact on the difficulty and responsibility of the position, and require direct contact. The servicing personnel office credited subfactor level 4A-2 to this factor which the appellant disagrees. During the course of the on-site audit, the appellant stated that he believes his position should be credited with subfactor level 4A-3.

Subactor level 4A-2 involves frequent contacts comparable with: members of the business community or the general public; higher ranking managers, supervisors, leaders and staff of program, administrative, and other work units and activities throughout the field activity, installation, command (below major command level) or major organization level or the agency; representatives of local public interest groups; case workers in congressional district offices; technical or operating level employees of State and local governments; reporters for local and other limited media outlets reaching a small, general population. Contacts may be informal, occur in conferences and meetings, or take place through telephone, televised, radio, or similar contact, and sometimes require nonroutine or special preparation.

The appealed position meets all aspects of subfactor level 4A-2. Specifically, routinely, contacts are with managers, supervisors, program staff, and contractors or other activities within or outside the agency. Contacts may take place through scheduled meetings/conferences, informally, or through written correspondence.

Subfactor level 4A-3 involves frequent contacts comparable to any of the following: high ranking military or civilian managers, supervisors, leaders and technical staff at bureau and major organization levels of the agency; with agency headquarters administrative support staff; or with comparable personnel in other Federal agencies; key staff or public interest groups (usually in formal briefings) with significant political influence or media coverage; journalists representing influential city or county newspapers or comparable radio or television coverage; congressional committee and subcommittee staff assistants below staff director or chief counsel levels; contracting officials and high level technical staff of large industrial firms; local officers of regional or national trade associations, public action groups, or professional organizations; and/or State and local government managers doing business with the agency. Contacts include those which take place in meetings and conferences and unplanned contacts for which the employee is designated as a contact point by higher management. They often

require extensive preparation of briefing materials or up to date technical familiarity with complex subject matter.

The appealed position does not meet the above criteria to be credited with subfactor level 4-A3. Consequently, we concur with the servicing personnel office and credit the appealed position with subfactor level 4A-2, 50 points.

Subfactor 4B - Purpose of Contacts

Level 4B-3 100 Points

This subfactor covers the purpose of the personal contacts credited in Subfactor 4A, including the advisory, representational, negotiating, and commitment making responsibilities related to supervision and management. The servicing personnel office credited subfactor level 4B-2 to this factor which the appellant disagrees. During the course of the on-site audit, the appellant stated that he believes his position should be credited with subfactor level 4B-3.

At subactor level 4B-2, the purpose of contacts is to ensure that information provided to outside parties is accurate and consistent; to plan and coordinate the work directed with that of others outside the subordinate organization; and/or to resolve differences of opinion among managers, supervisors, leaders, employees, contractors or others.

At subactor level 4B-3, the purpose of contacts is to justify, defend, or negotiate in representing the project, program segment(s), or organizational unit(s) directed, in obtaining or committing resources, and in gaining compliance with established policies, regulations, or contracts. Contacts at this level usually involve active participation in conferences, meetings, hearings, or presentations involving problems or issues of considerable consequence or importance to the program or program segment(s) managed.

The appellant, as specified in his job description and verified during the course of the on-site audit, is responsible for managing and balancing such activities such as "negotiating current year workload for components of pneudraulics systems," The appellant is responsible for maintaining production efficiency and effectiveness data which is used to continually negotiate and adjust the Industrial Fund cost to each Air Force customer. This fully meets the intent of subfactor level 4B-3. We concur with the appellant and credit the appealed position with subfactor level 4B-3, 100 points.

FACTOR 5 - DIFFICULTY OF TYPICAL WORK DIRECTED

Level 5-4 505 Points

This factor measures the difficulty and complexity of the basic work most typical of the organization(s) 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 of work credited is the highest grade that: (1) best characterizes the nature of the basic (mission-oriented) nonsupervisory work performed or overseen by the organization directed; and (2) constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload (not positions or employees) of the organization. This means that 25 percent or more of the nonsupervisory duty hours of subordinates and others (based on estimates derived from position descriptions, supervisory, staffing studies, or contract documents) is expended on work at or above the base level credited. The servicing personnel office credited GS-09

as the level of typical work directed.

The following is a breakdown of the 260 positions that are counted (25 percent or more of the nonsupervisory, nonleader duty hours of subordinates) to arrive at the highest level of base work This does not include 24 positions which are excluded because they are support and supervisory positions:

Number	Grade	Percentage
12	GS-11	5%
18	GS-09	7%
27	(WG-11)= GS-09	10%
132	(WG-10) = GS-08	51%
65	(WG-09) = GS-07	25%
06	(WG-07) = GS-05	2%
260		

Excluded from consideration are the following:

- The work of lower level positions that primarily support or facilitate the basic work of the unit;
- Any subordinate work that is graded based on criteria in this guide (i.e., supervisory duties) or the General Schedule Leader Grade-Evaluation Guide, Part 1 or Part II;
- Work that is graded based on an extraordinary degree of independence from supervision, or personal research accomplishments. Or adjust the grades of such work for purpose of applying this guide – to those appropriate for performance under "normal" supervision;
- Work for which the supervisor or a subordinate does not have the responsibilities defined under factor 3.

After considering the above, a review of the appellants organization results in the WG-10 positions significantly making up 51 percent of the work. The WG-10 positions, which are best represented by the Pneudraulic Systems Mechanic Series, WG-8255 (Reference F), when cross referenced with the Electronics Technician Series GS-856 (Reference G), do not exceed the GS-08 level.

The GS-856 standard is a suitable standard for converting the WG-10 work of the Pneudraulic Systems Mechanics to a GS grade. The series includes work that involves installation and maintenance of electronic equipment and requires a knowledge of the capabilities, limitations, operations, design characteristics and functional use of a variety of types and models of electronic equipment and systems.

At the GS-07 level, the technician carries out any maintenance tasks specified and documented by the manufacturer. The technician is also required to adjust the tolerances of the equipment to the maximum attainable by the manufacturer's design. Typically, the responsibility for maintenance and adjustment is limited to equipment that is a component of a larger system. The equipment is well documented in terms of schematic diagrams, maintenance schedules, troubleshooting procedures, etc. At the GS-07 level, technicians work under the supervision of electronics technicians or engineers of higher grade who have technical responsibility for the adequacy and correctness of the GS-07 employee's work.

The work performed by the WG-10 Pneudraulic Systems Mechanics meets and exceeds the GS-07 level. In contrast to this level, the WG-10 mechanics do not merely carry out maintenance tasks specified and documented by the manufacturer. In addition to performing preventive maintenance, they overhaul and maintain various components by diagnosing and locating sources of defective operations

or causes of breakdown. They determine the nature and extent of repairs necessary and make needed repairs by replacing, reworking, or refinishing worn or damaged parts and components. They disassemble, replace, or repair parts, and realign gears, wheels, shafts, and bearings. These duties exceed the GS-07 level, as does the level of independence with which the WG-10 mechanics perform their duties.

The more complicated tasks coupled with the greater independence of operation justify crediting the work of the WG-10 mechanics at the GS-08 level. At this level, technicians typically work on equipment similar to that described for the GS-07 level, but with a greater degree of independence and freedom from technical supervision.

The GS-09 level is not appropriate. This level involves installing, maintaining, and operating equipment that has been specially designed, constructed or modified to carry out a specific function to the organization using it. Also, GS-09 technicians typically are concerned with complex systems that are made up of combinations of components assembled into a configuration designed to accomplish specific objectives. The parts, subassemblies, and components maintained and repaired by the WG-10 Pneudraulic Systems mechanics are not comparable to the complex and unique systems maintained by GS-09 technicians.

Considering the total workload of the organization, the highest level of work that best characterizes the nature of the basic nonsupervisory work directed is GS-08. This work constitutes about 51 percent of the total workload of the organization. WG representative work at the GS-09 and GS-07 levels constitutes no more than 10 percent and 25 percent, respectively, of the total workload.

When the remaining WG and GS positions are considered, the result is a typical base level which is at the GS-07 or 08, or equivalent level. Therefore, factor level 5-4 is credited. We do not concur with the servicing personnel office and credit the appealed position with factor level 5-4, 505 points.

FACTOR 6 - OTHER CONDITIONS

Level 6-4b 1120 Points

This factor measures the extent to which various conditions contribute to the difficulty and complexity of carrying out supervisory duties, authorities, and responsibilities. Conditions affecting work for which the supervisor is responsible (whether performed by Federal employees, assigned military, contractors, volunteers, or others) may be considered if they increase the difficulty of carrying out assigned supervisory or managerial duties and authorities. The servicing personnel office credited factor level 6-4 to this factor.

Under the GSSG, there is a direct linkage of the criteria for factor levels 5 and 6. The latter factor measures the extent to which various conditions contribute to the difficult and complexity of carrying out supervisory duties, authorities and responsibilities. The difficulty of work is measured primarily by the level of work credited under factor level 5. Complexity is measured by the level of coordination required and it increases as the base level increases.

At factor level 6-3b, a position directs subordinate supervisors over positions in grades GS-07 or 08 or the equivalent which requires consolidation or coordination similar to that described at factor level 6-2a within or among subordinate units or with outside units. Factor level 6-4a involves supervision which requires substantial coordination and integration of a number of major work assignments, projects, or

programs segments of professional, scientific, technical, or administrative work comparable in difficulty to the GS-11 level; and factor level 6-4b involves directing subordinate supervisors and/or contractors who each direct substantial workloads comparable to the GS-09 or 10 level. The appealed position meets all aspects of factor level 6-3b but does not meet factor level 6-4.

As specified in the GSSG, "If the level selected is either 6-1, 6-2, or 6-3, refer to the Special Situations section ... If the position meets 3 or more of the situations (i.e., meets 3 or more of the numbered paragraphs), then add a single level to the level selected in Step 1."

SPECIAL SITUATIONS

1. Variety of Work : There are nine series involved in the organization's mission. They are WG-8255, WG-2604, WG-2606, WG-5350, GS-895, GS-802, GS-2001, GS-2005 and GS-1152. This situation is met.
2. Shift Operations: The appellant's organization does function in a "swing shift" configuration with two distinctly staffed shifts. This situation is met.
3. Fluctuating Work Force or Constantly Changing Deadlines: This situation is only credited when the workforce supervised by the position has large fluctuations in size (e.g., when there are significant seasonal variations in staff) and these fluctuations impose on the supervisor a substantially greater responsibility for training, adjusting assignments, or maintaining a smooth flow of work while absorbing and releasing employees. This situation is not met.
4. Physical Dispersion: This situation is met only when a substantial portion of the workload for which the supervisor is responsible is regularly carried out at one or more locations which are physically removed from the main unit (as in different buildings, or widely dispersed locations in a large warehouse or factory building), under conditions which make day-to-day supervision difficult to administer. This situation is not met.
5. Special Staffing Situations: To be credited, a substantial portion of the work force must be regularly involved in special employment programs. Also, there are requirements for counseling and motivational activities as well as specialized training to meet special circumstances. This situation is not met.
6. Impact of Specialized Programs: This is credited when supervisors are responsible for a significant technical or administrative workload in grades above the level of work credited in Factor 5, provided the grades of this work are not based upon independence of action, freedom from supervision, or personal impact on the job. This situation is not met.
7. Changing Technology: This applies when work processes vary constantly because of the impact of changing technology, creating a requirement for extensive training and guidance of the subordinate staff. This situation is not met.
8. Special Hazard and Safety Conditions: Significant unsafe or hazardous conditions occurring during the performance of work must be present to credit this situation. The nature of the industrial operations mission typically create situations where unsafe and hazardous conditions are present during the routine performance of work. This situation is met.

The appealed position does meet the minimum of three special situations and is therefore credited an additional factor level to factor level 6. Consequently, we credit the appealed position with factor level 6-4b, 1120 points.

SUMMARY		
FACTOR	LEVEL	POINTS
1. Program Scope and Effect	1-3	550
2. Organizational Setting	2-2	250
3. Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised	3-3b	775
4. Personal Contacts		
A. Nature of Contacts	4A-2	50
B. Purpose of Contacts	4B-3	100
5. Difficulty of Typical Work Directed	5-4	505
6. Other Conditions	6-4b	1120
No Special Situation Adjustment Factor	TOTAL	3350

Point range 3155 to 3600 = GS-13.

In conclusion, the appealed position's supervisory duties equate to the GS-13 level

DECISION

We have determined that the appealed position is correctly classified as GS-1101-13 with the title to be assigned at the discretion of the servicing personnel office. This decision is a classification certificate that is binding on all administrative certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting offices within the Department of Defense.