



United States
Office of Personnel Management

DIGEST OF SIGNIFICANT CLASSIFICATION DECISIONS AND OPINIONS

No. 9
January 1987
AR-100

Office of Merit Systems
Oversight & Effectiveness

[Main Menu](#) [Help Screen](#)

Note to Readers

The guidance in this issue is still applicable and useful in classifying positions in the Federal government. However, there may be references to names and addresses of organizations within the U.S. Office of Personnel Management that have changed, names of individuals no longer employed at the Office of Personnel Management, or documents such as the Federal Personnel Manual that no longer exist.

For the December 1997 HRCD-4 release, the Office of Classification Appeals and Fair Labor Standards Act Programs made minor, nonsubstantive edits to Digest issues 1 through 19. For example, acronyms and abbreviations were spelled out in many places, references to law and regulation were expanded, typographical errors were corrected, leading zeros were added to 3-digit series numbers, outdated prefaces have been deleted, and the issuance date were added to the header of each page. Because of the change from the original paper version to an electronic format, the page numbers in Digest issues 1 through 19 and other references, such as the General Schedule classification standards and Federal Wage System job grading standards, now available electronically may have changed. In issues 1 through 19, where there is a reference to a page, we either eliminated the page reference or updated the page number with the page number of the electronic version. Beginning with issue 20, pages references are to the electronic version only. Please note that pages numbers may change when a file is printed depending on the format and printer used.

The Office of Classification Appeals and Fair Labor Standards Act Programs is responsible for the content of the Digest. We be reached by telephone at 202-606-2990, by fax at 202-606-2663, or by email at adomsoe@opm.gov fedclass_appeals@opm.gov.

Digest issues are also available on the Office of Personnel Management's website and electronic bulletin board. The website address is <http://www.opm.gov/classapp> and the ~~electronic bulletin board is OPM ONLINE. Using a modem, dial OPM ONLINE at 202-606-4800. Long distance telephone charges may apply.~~ [OPM ONLINE was discontinued July 1999. The *Digest* can also be found on OPM's CD-ROM entitled General Schedule Position Classification and Federal Wage System Job Grading Standards, which is issued by OPM's Classification Programs Division.]

Standard: [Financial Management Series, GS-0505](#)
(June 1963)

Factor: Series coverage

Issue: Implicit series coverage criteria

Identification of the Classification Issue

This issue arose in an Office of Personnel Management region's consideration of an appeal from an individual employed as a Fiscal Officer, GS-0501-11, who believed that the duties and responsibilities of his position warranted reclassification of the position to the Financial Management Series, GS-0505. The appellant was the head of his installation's financial organization and responsible for the performance and supervision of a variety of budget, accounting, and financial services for his installation. The issue was whether the installation's activities were of sufficient size, scope, and complexity for the appellant's position to be included in the Financial Management Series.

Resolution

Implicit in the criteria for the GS-0505 series is the requirement that the organization served be of sufficient size and complexity to allow and require the services characteristic of the series. While there are no explicit minimum size and complexity criteria, the standard contains grade-level criteria that imply the lower limits of work to be included in the series. These are the criteria for the lowest levels of the classification factors.

At Degree C of Subfactor A, Factor I, the operating program served has a significant effect on local industries or industry segments; at Degree C of Subfactor C, financial managers have the authority or opportunity to adapt policies and procedures established by higher echelons to fit local conditions and needs; at Degree C of Subfactor B, Factor II, the financial manager's subordinate organization is divided into several subordinate segments, some of which may be further subdivided.

The appellant's position did not meet these lowest limits for inclusion in the GS-0505 series. The installation did not make regular and significant purchases to meet operating requirements, and the installation did not have a substantial amount of work performed by means of contracts. Therefore, it did not have a significant effect on an industry or industry segments in its local economy. Limitations on the installation's work activities and on its work scheduling eliminated the need for the appellant to adapt higher-echelon policies and procedures. The

standard states that the lack of this authority and the absence of a need to make these adaptations makes inclusion in the series questionable. Finally, the appellant's subordinate organization was smaller and simpler than envisioned by the standard, and the financial services provided were not so broad and complex as were the services that constituted financial management in the terms of the standard.

As the position was judged not to include responsibility for financial management of the type or scope characteristic of the GS-0505 series, the position was excluded and was classified in the GS-0501 series.

Standard: Computer Specialist Series, GS-0334
(December 1980)

Factor: Factor I, Knowledge required by the
position

Issue: Improper use of benchmark language

**This article was deleted in March 1992
because of the issuance of a new standard
for the GS-334 series.**

Standard: Supervisory Grade-Evaluation Guide, Part II

Factor: Grade determination

Issue: Influence of strengthening conditions on final grade GS-0460

This article was deleted in August 1994 because of the issuance of the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (TS-123, dated April 1993), which superseded the Supervisory Grade-Evaluation Guide, issued in January 1976 (TS-23) and the Draft Grade Evaluation Guide for White Collar Supervisors, issued in 1991.

Standard: Boiler Plant Operator, WG-5402
(June 1973)

Factor: General

Issue: Crediting of plant capacity

**This article was deleted in March 1992
because of the issuance of a new standard
for the WG-5402 series.**

Standard: Security Administration, GS-0080
(June 1962)

Factor: Supervisory controls exercised over the
work

Issue: General administrative supervision

**This article was deleted in September 1988
because of the issuance of the new
Security Administration Series, GS-0080,
standard, dated December 1987.**

Standard: N/A

Factor: N/A

Issue: Comparison of the status of civilian and military positions

Identification of the Classification Issue

In an appeal to the Classification Appeals Office, an appellant contended that the grade level of his position did not provide the "status" or "rank" necessary to effectively perform liaison work with flag rank officers.

Resolution

The Office of Personnel Management determined that the appellant had a regular and recurring need to provide advice and assistance to high level (flag rank) military officers as well as to coordinate information with top officials in his agency. This required considerable tact, diplomacy, and an understanding of protocol. The Office of Personnel Management recognized that the status of a particular position can be an important consideration in carrying out duties and responsibilities in a military operation, and that much attention is given to the "rank in the man" concept. In classifying civilian positions under the General Schedule classification system, however, comparison to military rank is not a valid classification consideration. A pay grade cannot be added solely to raise a General Schedule position to equate the "status" of the General Schedule and military positions. Classification decisions must be based solely on an evaluation of a position's official duties and responsibilities in comparison with published the Office of Personnel Management classification standards. The Office of Personnel Management concluded that the position was properly classified at its current grade level.