

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



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

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

**Appellant:** [Appellant]

**Agency classification:** Museum Curator (Science & Technology)  
GS-1015-12

**Organization:** [Department of the Army]

**OPM decision:** Supervisory Museum Curator  
(Science & Technology)  
GS-1015-12

**OPM decision number:** C-1015-12-01

---

Kathy W. Day  
Classification Appeals Officer

Date 5/14/98  
rdrive # 1015121.r2

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]

[Civilian Personnel Officer]

Ms. Carol Ashby Smith  
Director of Civilian Personnel  
U.S. Department of the Army  
Room 23681, Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20310-0300

Mr. Harrel Sholar  
Director, U.S. Army Civilian Personnel  
Evaluation Agency  
U.S. Department of the Army  
Crystal Mall 4, Suite 918  
1941 Jefferson Davis Highway  
Arlington, VA 22202-4508

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

## **Introduction**

On October 21, 1997, the Atlanta Oversight Division, Office of Personnel Management (OPM), accepted a classification appeal for the position of Museum Curator (Science and Technology), GS-1015-12, [Department of the Army]. The appellant requested that his position be upgraded to GS-13 or GS-14. We accepted the appeal under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code. Based on the position description of record and information obtained during the fact finding process, OPM determined the position to be correctly classified as Museum Curator (Science and Technology), GS-1015-13, and issued a classification certificate on January 30, 1998. The agency determined, after reviewing the OPM decision, that the position description of record was incorrect and that inaccurate information had been provided to OPM during the fact finding process. They requested reconsideration of the decision on February 18, 1998, and provided a correct position description.

## **General issues**

The appellant compares his position to other museum curators whom he believes are less involved in research and education than he is but are classified at a higher grade. Section 5107 of title 5, United States Code, requires that positions in the Federal service be classified exclusively by comparison to standards published by OPM. Consequently, other means of classification, including the volume of work and comparison to other positions may not be used as a basis for deciding an appeal.

Because of the discrepancy in information furnished to OPM, the Classification Appeals Officer conducted an onsite audit of the position on May 4, 1998.

## **Position information**

The appellant is assigned to position number [#]. The appellant, supervisor and agency have agreed to the accuracy of the rewritten position description.

The appellant is the Director of a major branch museum with responsibility for the operation of the museum and its programs. He is responsible for planning and coordinating the collecting, classifying, recording, preserving, reconditioning, researching, maintaining, and exhibiting of memorabilia dealing with the history of the [subject matter]; for the acquisition of historical data and artifacts, implementation of appropriate collection policies, and acquisition and use of historical library and archives; for any long range planning; for providing educational programs; for monitoring the museum budget; and for hosting special museum activities.

The appellant is the subject matter expert for the United States Army Museum System for [subject matter] devices. He conducts systematic research of equipment, answers inquiries, and researches the historical development of the [branch] and the technological history of the equipment developed by members of the [branch]. He may be called upon to authenticate collections and objects from other museums and identify equipment and objects for collectors.

He is responsible for the overall exhibit plans and operates the museum based on policy guidance furnished by the Department of the Army Center for Military History. He approves exhibit designs; prepares technical documents defining the scope, nature and composition of the exhibits; and prepares or participates in the preparation of contracts to acquire requisite products and services from the private sector (such as contracting to have antique flag restored, contracting for new data based inventory management system currently under consideration). The appellant is responsible for attendant research, documentation and content of labels in the exhibit galleries. He is also responsible for exhibit exchanges or loans of objects when the opportunity arises. He is considered an expert in his field and is occasionally contacted by writers or movie/television producers for information.

The appellant develops and maintains educational programs for blocks of instruction offered to the military personnel in training at [base] and for local school children. These courses include information on the history of the [branch] and on technological problems in the development of systems and problems of [subject matter] during battle. He also performs routine docent activities and may provide other information on the [branch] and museum to community groups as requested.

The appellant supervises a subordinate staff including 2 civilian employees: an Exhibits Specialist/Designer and a Collections Manager; and 4 military personnel: an Associate Curator who handles the administrative work, an exhibits builder, a conservationist, and a general aid (currently vacant). He plans work to be accomplished, interprets policy and procedures, establishes priorities, and provides close technical supervision, particularly over preservation/conservation work. He assigns work, evaluates performance, and provides advice, counsel and guidance to subordinates. He interviews candidates for positions and recommends appointments, promotions, or reassignments for such positions. He hears and resolves complaints and grievances presented by employees and refers unresolved problems to a higher level supervisor. He takes disciplinary actions, such as warnings and reprimands, or recommends disciplinary action in more serious cases. He identifies developmental and training needs and makes training provisions to meet those needs; promotes sound position management principles and programs; and participates with the personnel office in conducting position and/or personnel management surveys. He carries out occupational safety and health program responsibilities and furthers Equal Employment Opportunity. The agency has determined that the appellant spends 25 percent of his time on supervisory duties.

The appellant works under the administrative supervision of the Director for Community Activities. The supervisor provides the scope and objectives of assignments. Policy guidance and technical guidance for museum operation are established and provided by the United States Army Center for Military History. Based on instructions from his supervisory and the Center for Military History concerning the scope and objectives of the museum program, the appellant independently sets work plans, establishes the parameters of assignments and accomplishes work according to professional standards. Work is reviewed for completeness of coverage, soundness of conclusions, and adherence to agency policy. The appellant is personally responsible for adequacy of presentations and conformance to professional standards.

## **Standards determination**

Museum Curator, GS-1015, February 1962.  
General Schedule Supervisory Guide, April 1998.

## **Series determination**

The appellant does not question the accuracy of the series determination. The agency has determined that the appellant's position is best covered by the Museum Curator Series, GS-1015. We agree.

This series includes all classes of positions the primary duties of which are to administer, supervise or perform professional work related to research, collections and exhibits in Federal museums, when such work is not classifiable in other professional, scientific, or historical series.

## **Title determination**

The title *Museum Curator* is designated for positions in this series. Subject-matter parenthetical titles are used to denote the specialized knowledge required of the position to facilitate selective factors in the processes of recruitment, transfer or promotions. The appellant is responsible for scholarly research in the area of technology and development of highly technical [subject matter] equipment, as well as curating of records, objects and materials related to the history of the [branch]. The agency has determined that the position is properly titled *Museum Curator (Science and Technology)*.

In addition, the appellant is responsible for the administrative and technical supervision of subordinate employees. He spends 25 percent of his time performing supervisory duties that meet the minimum definition of supervisor as defined in the General Schedule Supervisory Guide. Therefore, the *Supervisory* designation is included in the title.

The correct title of the appellant's position is, therefore, *Supervisory Museum Curator (Science and Technology)*.

## **Grade determination**

The appellant's curatorial duties are evaluated by reference to the Museum Curator, GS-1015, standard. The supervisory duties are evaluated by reference to the General Schedule Supervisory Guide.

### ***Museum Curator, GS-1015, Standard***

The grading criteria in Part II of the GS-1015 standard is used for Museum Curator positions at the first level of independent professional responsibility, GS-11 and above. Part II uses two classification factors: *Research Function* and *Curatorial Function*. Each function is measured against an evaluation scale which is divided into five equidistant degrees, designated as A, B, C, D and E.

Definitions are provided for A, C and E. Whenever a function is determined to fall between the defined degrees, B and D are to be used. Our evaluation with respect to these factors follows:

*Factor I: The Research Function*

The agency evaluated this factor at Degree B. The appellant disagrees with their findings.

The GS-1015 standard groups research into three general categories: *Scholarly research*, *Technical research* and *Applied research*.

Scholarly research is that study and investigation which contributes to the sum of Man's knowledge. In museums, this type of research is typically (though not necessarily) related to the collections of objects, artifacts or specimens which distinguish museums from other types of research institutions. In other instances, the collection material is used as one of the sources of data for research in a scientific or historical area of investigation; and, in still others, the expanding of the size and significance of the collection may be a corollary of scholarly research. However, it is characterized by the use of accepted scholarly methodology and it frequently results in the publication of "learned" papers.

Technical research is the study and innovation necessary to the restoration and preservation of specimens, artifacts, or objects of the collection. The need for technical research varies greatly. Some objects require very little care, and in some instances, the best preservation methods have long since been established. For many collections, however, problems of halting deterioration and of restoring and preserving valuable or rare objects represent a major consideration and involve difficult and imaginative research. Research of this kind is significant and often results in the publication of technical articles, but often it is of such a pragmatic nature and of such limited interest that the results are simply put to work on the problem which inspired it.

Applied research, as used in the standard, refers to all of the investigation, collection and arrangement of information necessary to support the educational and public service responsibilities of museums. Such research rarely adds to the store of information on the frontiers of Man's knowledge. Its basic function is the distribution of knowledge to many minds. It is the searching for and arranging of information which supports the labels and explanatory material that accompanies each museum exhibit; the digging for and synthesizing of facts which will answer a public inquiry or identify an artifact or specimen; the locating and organizing of data which is incorporated into popular publications, articles and pamphlets. Such activities entail not only command of the sources of information and facility with the methods of orderly research, but ability to translate scientific language and concepts into clear and readable "layman" English.

The agency determined that the appellant performed scholarly research work. We find that the appellant's work involves applied research.

At Degree A, research assignments are usually projects of limited scope with readily definable objectives. They may be small independent studies, or they may represent a segment of a large structure of related investigations, but in either case they are expected to result in a publishable addition to the body of knowledge related to the field of inquiry, or to a comparable contribution to the development of new or recognizably improved technique for the preservation or restoration of valuable and/or rare collection material. Typically, the project assigned by a supervisor includes general instructions as to scope and objectives, and direction and guidance in the problem definition and planning stages. However, researchers receiving such assignments are expected to be fully independent professionals and to assume responsibility for the thoroughness and adequacy of the planning and for the scholarly completion of the work with only occasional technical reference to the supervisor or consultation with senior staff members. Research usually builds on a foundation of earlier scholarship which developed basic theory and principles. For example, the existing taxonomic system may be fairly well established and universally accepted or related historical developments may be well documented and understood.

At Degree C, research projects undertaken characteristically involve systematic research attack on a problem area of considerable scope. Such problem areas usually must be approached through a series of complete and conceptually related studies and typically result in a series of publishable contributions, or in a single major publication, which may be definitive of a specific topic area. Typically, researchers at this level work with substantial freedom within the area of their primary interest in identifying, defining, and selecting specific problems for study and determining the most fruitful investigations and approaches to the problem area. As mature professional scholars, they are expected to conduct and complete research projects with little more than occasional professional consultation with colleagues and administrative guidance from supervisors. Scholarship at this level frequently involves the formulation of new principles or major adjustments in existing concepts. For example, expansion or a fundamental refinement in an important taxonomic system or the documentation and interpretation of a previously unrecorded historical development of major significance would be typical. Such work requires a high degree of originality from the initial difficulty in defining a complex area of study to the final understanding, interpreting and relating the significance of results to other research findings. Typically, incumbents of positions at this level are substantial contributors to their particular fields of scholarship.

The appellant's research exceeds Degree A but does not fully meet Degree C. Based on the information in the appeal record, the appellant's research has resulted in one significant contribution, a directory of radio equipment and components. There are no other published documents on this subject specifically. The work is a combination of individual research projects that took over eight years to complete and consists of a wealth of historical facts and information relating to the [equipment] identification and technological and scientific description in terms of design, development, specifications and manufacturing significance in the [subject matter] industry, as well as its use, importance and placement in the history of the agency. This research is key to understanding [subject matter] equipment of the United States Army from 1907-1953. Equipment he has researched and obtained includes: [various examples]. The appellant's compilation of this directory is considered by the command's museum expert to be an important contribution to the

history of [subject matter]. Although the appellant states that the majority of his research involves rare pieces of equipment, how they are used, and what parts make up the system, some of which may be one-of-a-kind or limited to two or three in the entire world, the individual research performed on these different pieces of equipment is comparable to the type of research described at Degree A. It is the combination of independent projects which evolved into a major project of considerable scope and complexity over a period of years along with the level of independence necessary for the appellant to decide what to research and how to authenticate and record the historical significance of [subject matter] equipment which exceeds Degree A.

The appellant is the museum system's expert on [subject matter] artifacts. We consulted expert Steve Lubar, Supervisor, Division of Technology, Department of History, Smithsonian National Museum of American History for further verification. According to Mr. Lubar, there are no experts in this area at the Smithsonian museum. The Smithsonian has a broader and more general focus on military history and technology, whereas the appellant's museum has a narrower and more specialized focus on the subject matter. Thus, the research performed on artifacts in the appellant's museum collection provides an educational resource for civilian and military students, writers, museum curators, scientists and engineers, researchers, film makers and authors. Over the past year, the appellant's reference library and collections were studied by 90 researchers, most spending 3-5 days in the collections and stacks area. However, other than a book on the history of the [branch] written by historian Helen Raines, there is no other evidence in the appeal record that shows the appellant's research to significantly contribute to the work of scholars. The fact that researchers used the facility does not provide sufficient evidence that their work resulted in learned papers, nor is there any evidence that the type of research the appellant normally conducts has resulted in any scholarly papers written by him personally.

The appellant states that he developed a taxonomic system for classifying the artifacts in the collection. Documents in the appeal record indicate that the procedures to be used to classify artifacts are governed by agency regulations. What the appellant believes to be a new taxonomy system is in fact a major expansion or a fundamental refinement to the existing system. Furthermore, the appellant used the agency guidelines to add the [subject] category to the system.

The appellant's remaining research projects include examples such as monographs of military aviation which cover the period from 1912 to 1947 that resulted in a 23 page document and includes one hundred and thirteen footnotes, and a [publication], a booklet on [branch] history that is given to students. None of this work, including the research that he performed for General Colin Powell or Admiral Brown, public broadcasting television stations, and films, has resulted in significant contributions to the subject in terms of published documents, learned papers or undocumented historical development which characterize the level and impact of research described at Degree C.

This factor is evaluated at Degree B, for 20 points



*Factor II: The Curatorial Function*

At Degree A, the collection is relatively stable, and there is only a limited need for effort to expand or develop it; or responsibility for such effort is limited to the most routinized activities or done under close supervision. Problems related to the lending and borrowing of collection material are either not difficult or else these activities are routinized by procedure and practice. Identification and authentication of collection items are usually dependent upon available precedent and obscure determinations or controversial judgments are normally subject to supervisory or higher professional approval.

Planning and design functions are limited to background research and suggestions. More demanding duties are typically performed under immediate supervision and are subject to review and approval.

Lecturing duties in the nature of docent activities within the museum exhibit areas and talks in connection with film showings are typical of this level, as are routine correspondence and arrangements for providing available informational material.

At Degree C, assignments are characterized by long range and often complex museum programs and responsibility for important museum installations or organizational segments, with considerable latitude for administrative action and broad professional authority. The following conditions are typical of curatorial work at this level:

There is a continuing responsibility for the development and maintenance of a balanced collection. This may involve concerted efforts of expansion requiring knowledge, professional judgments and imagination in selectivity and location of sources, and sometimes, demanding public relations skills; or it may demand considerable knowledge, taste and judgment in problems of selective disposal of collection material. Frequent use of the collection by scholars involves an active program of exchange of objects, ideas and information with other museums or collections. Problems of identification and authentication of collection material are encountered regularly, and sometimes require authoritative determinations on very obscure or unusual specimens or objects.

Responsibility for the development of over-all exhibit plans and for the review and technical approval of exhibit designs is limited only by administrative controls such as time schedules and budgets, and by agency policy. The development of exhibit plans and the attendant research and documentation, and the provision of technical consultation during exhibit construction are typical of this level.

Public service and education assignments at this level include extensive and/or demanding correspondence, a heavy lecturing program, administration of elaborate facilities for slides, film strips, and other visual aid materials, preparation of popular articles and informational pamphlets, conduct of formal class instruction of children or adults, or similar duties.

The appellant's collection responsibilities exceed Degree A in that the appellant is responsible for the overall management of the museum that contains technical and scientific communication equipment,

a collection of over 10,000 objects and artifacts, and has an extensive library and archive of information (over 21,000 pieces of reference material). According to the appellant's position description, he authenticates obscure and rare objects and may authenticate objects for other museums, and it has taken him over three years to balance his collection. There is little evidence of expansion, and in fact, the museum is currently being relocated to a smaller space. While the appellant may be interested in obtaining rare objects that the museum does not presently own, he indicated that much of what is added is found by individuals who alert him of their findings so he can pursue acquisition if he desires or through the agency exchange program. For example, over the past year, the appellant added several major artifacts to the collection and in the past has received significant donations or exchanged artifacts with other museums, including the satellite dish from the NASA museum. He has had to turn down objects for lack of space. The museum is sometimes visited by researchers and scholars. However, there is no evidence in the appeal record that the appellant is required to be actively involved in the exchange of objects, ideas, and information to accommodate scholars. Artifacts are the property of the agency and all loan/exchange programs in agency museums are subject to approval. Thus, the collections program does not fully meet Degree C and Degree B is assigned.

The exhibits responsibilities of the appellant's position meet Degree C. Exhibit policy is established by the United States Army Center for Military History. Within the policy guidelines and certification standards, the appellant independently develops the overall exhibit plans (i.e., the concept, story boards, displays), is responsible for the research and documentation, and has technical approval of exhibit designs for a small museum housing a collection that deals with a limited subject matter. The exhibits are very stable and for the most part, are seldom changed. Due to the large number of artifacts in the collection and the limited space available to the museum, the appellant had to determine what artifacts to display that most effectively tell the story of the [branch]. Administrative controls (i.e., budget, space) do limit the appellant's exhibit plans.

The appellant's public service responsibilities slightly exceed Degree A but do not meet Degree C. He frequently provides educational programs to students from the local schools and conducts a 2-hour block of classroom instructions on [subject matter] equipment and history to military personnel attending training at [base]. The information he provides is basically a history of the [branch] and development of technology. The student information may be adjusted in accordance with the level of the students in attendance, however, the appellant has developed material which provides the bases for the presentation and this material is essentially used with each group as appropriate. The same concept is applied to the 2-hour blocks of instruction provided to the military students. There are several slightly different but well-established courses used routinely with the different military classes being trained at [base] (e.g., basic training, officer training, warrant officer training). The classroom facility consists of a small room with the usual equipment found in a typical classroom setting such as overhead projector, slide projector, television with VCR, and computer. This facility is not considered elaborate. The appellant responds to inquiries in writing, by telephone and through the Internet. Much of his correspondence involves requests for schematics, help with identifying pieces of equipment, and information on sources of further information. He has established a vertical file of standard information which his assistant can use in responding to many of the inquiries. He does

receive some inquiries which are of a technical or unusual nature requiring him to conduct thorough and time-consuming research. The appellant states that often he can narrow his search based on his knowledge (e.g., of materials used during a certain time period, familiarity with specific components) which helps him then select which reference manuals to check first. Inquiries such as these, while clearly requiring a high level of expertise in the field, are not of such volume to be considered extensive and demanding as intended at Degree C.

The appellant has prepared several pamphlets which provide basic information on the [branch] subjects. While the appellant does have a Website, the information provided generally discusses the [museum], provides basic information on [subjects], and provides a means for the public to forward inquiries to the appellant and obtain further information. Providing information on a Website does not meet the intent of Degree C, and there is no other evidence that the appellant regularly publishes articles in his field. Although he states that he lectures at the college level, those presentations are not part of his official duties. He does occasionally make presentations at meetings, e.g., with other museum curators, but not with the frequency necessary to be considered a heavy lecturing program. The appellant's public service and education assignments are more limited than those described at Degree C, and Degree B must be credited.

### *Summary*

The appellant's collection responsibilities are credited with Degree B, his exhibit responsibilities with Degree C, and his public relations responsibilities with Degree B. Overall, the appellant's curatorial function most closely matches Degree B, for 20 points.

Factor I is evaluated at Degree B for 20 points, and Factor II is evaluated at Degree B for 20 points. The total of 40 points falls within the range of GS-12, 30-40 points, according to the conversion table in the standard.

### ***General Schedule Supervisory Guide***

The General Schedule Supervisory Guide is used to determine the grade of General Schedule (GS or GM) supervisory positions in grades GS-5 through GS-15. The Guide employs a factor-point evaluation method that assesses six factors common to all supervisory positions. To grade a position, each factor is evaluated by comparing the position to the factor-level descriptions for that factor and crediting the points designated for the highest factor-level which is fully met, in accordance with the instructions specific to the factor being evaluated. The total points accumulated under all factors are then converted to a grade by using the point-to-grade conversion table in the Guide.

The agency determined that the appellant's position was equivalent to grade GS-12. We agree with that determination; however, we differ in the assignment of the level for Factor 6. Since the supervisory duties do not impact the grade of the position, Factor 6 will be briefly discussed and a summary evaluation of the remaining factors will be provided.

### Factor 6. Other Conditions

This factor measures the extent to which various conditions contribute to the difficulty and complexity of carrying out supervisory duties, authorities, and responsibilities. To evaluate Factor 6, two steps are used. First, the highest level that a position substantially meets is initially credited. Then, if the level selected is either 6-1, 6-2, or 6-3, the Special Situations listed after the factor level definitions are considered. If a position meets three or more of the situations, then a single level is added to the level selected in Step 1. If the level selected under Step 1 is either 6-4, 6-5, or 6-6, the Special Situations may not be considered in determining whether a higher factor level is creditable.

The General Schedule Supervisory Guide describes two situations, either of which meets Level 6-3. The first situation involves coordination, integration, or consolidation of administrative, technical, or complex technician or other support work comparable to GS-9 or 10, or work at the GS-7 or 8 level where the supervisor has full and final technical authority (i.e., is responsible for all technical determinations arising from the work without technical advice or assistance from others or further review of the work). Directing work at this level requires consolidation or coordination to ensure consistency of product, service, interpretation, or advice; or conformance with the output of other units, with formal standards, or agency policy. This situation also covers direction of analytical, interpretive, judgmental, evaluative, or creative work where the supervisor must resolve conflicts and maintain compatibility of interpretation, judgment, logic, and policy application. The second situation covers positions which direct subordinate supervisors over positions in grades GS-7 or 8, requiring consolidation or coordination to ensure consistency of product, service, interpretation, or advice; or conformance with the output of other units, with formal standards, or agency policy.

The Guide describes two situations, either of which meets Level 6-4, 1120 points. The first situation involves substantial coordination and integration of a number of major work assignments, projects, or program segments of professional, scientific, technical, or administrative work comparable to the GS-11 level. This coordination involves work such as identifying and integrating internal and external program issues affecting the organization; integrating the work of a team or group where each member contributes a portion of the analyses, facts, information, proposed actions or recommendations, and/or ensuring compatibility and consistency of interpretation, judgment, logic, and policy application; recommending resources to devote to particular projects or to allocate among program segments; leadership in developing, implementing, evaluating, and improving processes and procedures to monitor the effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity of the program segment or organization; or reviewing and approving the substance of reports, decisions, case documents, contracts, or other action documents, to assure that they accurately reflect the policies and position of the organization and the views of the agency. The second situation under Level 6-4 involves directing subordinate supervisors or contractors who each direct substantial workloads comparable to the GS-9 or GS-10 level. This work requires coordination similar to that described in paragraph a of Level 6-3.

The agency credited Level 6-4a; however, we believe Level 6-3 is appropriate. To credit Level 6-4a, there must be substantial coordination and integration of a number of major work assignments,

projects, or program segments of professional, scientific, technical, or administrative work comparable in difficulty to the GS-11 work. Because of the relative stability of the collections, the small size of the workforce, the fact that preservation/restoration work can be managed according to available resources, etc., the degree of coordination and integration necessary to supervise major work assignments is limited. The next lower factor level, 6-3, must, therefore, be credited. There are no special situations applicable to this position.

Factor Level 6-3 is credited for 975 points.

<b>SUMMARY</b>		
<b>FACTOR</b>	<b>LEVEL</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
1. Program Scope and Effect	1-2	350
2. Organizational Setting	2-1	100
3. Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised	3-2	450
4. Personal Contacts		
A. Nature of Contacts	4A-2	50
B. Purpose of Contacts	4B-2	75
5. Difficulty of Typical Work Directed	5-6	800
6. Other Conditions	6-3	975
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2800</b>

A total of 2800 points equates to GS-12, 2755 to 3150 points, according to the point-to-grade conversion chart in the Guide.

### **Decision**

The curatorial duties equate occupy 75 percent of the appellant's time and equate to GS-12. The supervisory duties occupy 25 percent of his time and equate to GS-12. This position is correctly classified as Museum Curator (Science and Technology), GS-1015-12.