

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

Philadelphia Oversight Division
600 Arch Street, Room 3400
Philadelphia, PA 19106-1596

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

Appellant:	[appellant's name]
Agency classification:	Computer Assistant GS-335-6
Organization:	Office of Information Management Division of Administration [name] National Historical Park National Park Service U.S. Department of the Interior [location], PA
OPM decision:	Computer Assistant GS-335-6
OPM decision number:	C-0335-06-02

Robert D. Hendler
Classification Appeals Officer

/s/ 6-3-99
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 (PCS's), appendix 4, section G (address provided in appendix 4, section H).

Decision sent to:

[appellant's name]
[appellant's address]

[name]
Personnel Officer
[name] National Historical Park
National Park Service
U.S. Department of Interior
[address]

Ms. Carolyn Cohen
Director of Personnel
U.S. Department of Interior
Mail Stop 5221
1849 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20240

Introduction

On October 7, 1998, the Philadelphia Oversight Division of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a classification appeal from [appellant's name]. Her position is classified currently as Computer Assistant, GS-335-6, Position Description (PD) #4450-023. The appellant, however, believes the proper classification should be Computer Assistant, GS-335-7. The position is in the Office of Information Management (OIM), Division of Administration, [name] National Historical Park, Northeast Field Area, National Park Service (NPS), U.S. Department of Interior, [locatin]. We have accepted and decided her appeal under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.).

General issues

The appellant works in OIM and assists one computer systems analyst, [name], who is also her supervisor. Though she states she has been performing automatic data processing duties since 1993, the appellant was detailed into her current position in 1996 and permanently reassigned into the position on September 1997. The appellant presented with her appeal a PD that had been previously submitted by her supervisor to the Personnel Officer for classification. The record shows it was classified as Computer Assistant, GS-335-7 on September 10, 1998. That this PD was not subsequently approved by the Division Chief, [name], precipitated the appellant's appeal and the belief that her position is "wrongly classified." In a letter dated October 20, 1998, the appellant adds that her position underwent "significant changes" as a result of:

1. ". . .working under pressure . . . to return . . . malfunctioning microcomputers, LAN components, or software to normal operation."
2. "[having to rely] on own expertise to schedule, plan and carry out work; resolve conflicts, and adopt approaches . . . within established policy . . . and keep Mr. Oates abreast of problems involving severe conflicts, system capacity overload, and unusual malfunctions."
3. "Work involves a depth of analysis . . . with . . . evolving technology."

The appellant did not certify to the accuracy of her official PD of record, dated January 29, 1999. Rather, in a letter dated February 4, 1999, the appellant states that her official PD is neither current nor complete and dismisses the "investigations and troubleshooting aspects" of her work. Further, the appellant raises concerns about the process by which her position was evaluated and the failure of management to acknowledge her outstanding manner of performance.

All positions subject to the Classification Law contained in 5 U.S.C., must be classified in conformance with published PCS's of OPM. The classification appeal process is a de novo review that includes a determination as to the duties and responsibilities assigned to the appellant's

position and performed by the appellant, and constitutes the proper application of PCS's to those duties and responsibilities. Therefore, the appellant's perceptions regarding the fact finding and other methods used by her employing agency in reaching its decision on the classification of the position are moot. In adjudicating this appeal, our only concern is to make our own independent decision on the proper classification of the work assigned to and actually performed in this position. Therefore, we have considered the appellant's statements only insofar as they are relevant to making that comparison. While the appellant discusses the outstanding manner in which she performs her duties, quality of work cannot be considered in determining the grade of a position (The Classifier's Handbook, Chapter 5).

Our analysis of the position is based on the information provided during an audit with the appellant and an interview with her immediate supervisor on March 1, 1999, a subsequent interview with Mr. Francis Connor on March 10, 1999, review of work logs and products provided by the appellant at our request, and on our independent review and analysis of the entire appeal record.

Position information

While the [name] Support Office, associated with the Northeast Regional Office of NPS, is located nearby, the park has been delegated the full responsibility to plan, develop, implement, and support its information system. The appellant supports computer operations within the park by assisting in the installation and maintenance of the system and provides technical support to the users. The park's Local Area Network (LAN) consists of five NETWARE servers and supports approximately 115 personal computers (PC's). A few users have stand alone systems that serve specific functions. The appellant provides support for a mixed environment with most workstations running Windows 95 or 98. Others are running DOS, Windows 3.X or Windows NT. The appellant also provides assistance for five additional PC's used by park associate support organizations (e.g., Friends of [name] National Historical Park and the [name] School Board). The appellant is responsible for servicing multiple locations within the park's campus environment that covers several city blocks.

The appellant responds to users' requests that generally are submitted through E-Mail to the OIM Help Desk. Some requests are presented in person or by telephone. The appellant obtains technical assistance from her supervisor when necessary. Both the supervisor and appellant agree that this activity occupies 75 to 80 percent of her work time. Because of the number of requests, the appellant must independently schedule and prioritize her service visits based on the criticality of the problem. Typical requests involve: (1) set-up of PC equipment and peripherals (e.g., printers, scanners, and photo cameras), installation and configuration of modems and network interface cards; and (2) installation (new, replacement or upgrade) and configuration (or re-configuration) of standard software (e.g., WORD, PKWare, cc:Mail, F-PROT Virus Protection, and Internet access). About 60 percent of help desk activity involves the installation of new and upgraded hardware and software required for ongoing E-Mail support. The appellant also responds to a variety of questions relating to accessing the LAN, printer problems, password access, error messages, "walk through" instruction on the use of software, and anomalies that

require some troubleshooting. The following are typical examples of the numerous E-mail messages received by the appellant that require her troubleshooting:

- Cannot access programs.
- Update of travel rates seems wrong.
- Printer problems with HP DeskJets and LaserJets.
- Problems with security password.
- Identify incompatible hardware and software; remove.
- Connectivity problems with server.
- Explain error messages.
- Problems with Spell Check.
- Computer locks up after clicking AFSII icon.
- Zip drive is not working.
- Identify why computer is running slow.
- Word Scan will not save or scan multiple pages.
- How to set margins and paginate in Word.

LAN operations occupy the remaining 20 to 25 percent of the appellant's work time and include the following duties: (1) perform scheduled system and E-mail backups; (2) implement, edit, and remove user and group permissions; (3) manage E-mail user files and directory; (4) configure remote client workstations for access to the LAN; and, (5) run the LAN maintenance programs once a month.

Neither the appellant nor her supervisor was willing to certify to the accuracy of the PD of record. Rather, it was certified by the division chief. Although the PD of record covers the major functions assigned to and performed by the appellant, it does not describe the grade controlling duties in sufficient detail to meet defined standards of PD accuracy [Introduction to the PCS's, section III, E].

Series, title, and guide determination

This position is characteristic of the kind of information technology (IT) positions that have evolved over the past decade. With the proliferation of desktop computers, virtually every general schedule (GS) position relies on the tools available within the PC to perform work. In most cases, the PC's are linked to the LAN or Wide Area Network (WAN) to enhance communications and share files. Users of this technology rely on staff members who possess a specialized knowledge of hardware, telecommunication, and software products. As the power of the computer expands, users continue to acquire sufficient expertise to "drive" the machine in order to perform their work, but they generally lack the skills and abilities to understand what happens "under the hood" for the system to work effectively. System administrators and help desk occupants have become the answer for easy access to this specialized body of information. They, including the appellant, typically confront, on a daily basis, a variety of questions and problems as numerous as the flexibilities engineered into every new application package.

The Handbook of Occupational Groups and Series lists four series that relate to nonprofessional scientific computer technology. The Office Automation Clerical and Assistance Series, GS-326 covers positions where the primary duties are to perform office automation work within the context of general office clerical support. Positions that require the specialized knowledge typical of IT positions are specifically excluded from this series. The Computer Operation Series, GS-332 covers positions that operate the controls of a digital computer system (or peripheral equipment when it is used directly in support of computer operations). Positions identified in this series address some of the LAN/WAN operating work performed by IT staff, but the PCS does not address much of the technical support work performed for the users of PC-based computer systems. The Computer Specialist Series, GS-334 is a two-grade interval series for positions with responsibility to plan, design, develop, acquire, document, test, implement, integrate, maintain, or modify computer systems. This work exceeds the level of work assigned to and performed by the appellant. The PD of the appellant's supervisor reflects responsibility for all GS-334 computer systems analysis and design for the park.

The duties and responsibilities of the appellant's position, summarized under position information, are characteristic of the kind of work described as Support to Computer Specialists in the Occupational Information section of the Computer Clerk and Assistant Series, GS-335, PCS.

Some computer assistants, among their tasks, perform duties much like those assigned to entry and trainee level computer specialists. They assist computer specialists in work that requires a knowledge of hardware, peripheral devices, and memory storage.

The appellant's position also contains aspects of work described within the PCS under Support to Subject Matter Users.

Some computer clerks and assistants provide computer support to users through networks. Work varies in difficulty ranging from highly structured and recurring tasks to very specialized tasks. Some employees discuss information requirements with users and give advice on how to access the data.

The work of the appealed position is to provide support and assistance to OIM in the installation, operation, and maintenance of the park's automated information system and to other park employees who use the information system applications and products. The agency has classified the position as Computer Assistant, GS-335. The appellant has not disagreed. We find that the position is properly classified to the GS-335 series. Based on the grade level analysis that follows, we find the position is properly allocated as Computer Assistant, GS-335.

The directly applicable GS-335 PCS (dated February 1980), however, must be read in concert with the more recent information contained in the November 1990 Office Automation Grade Evaluation Guide (OAGEG) that evaluates the use of office automation technology. The OAGEG is used in combination with other standards or guides to evaluate positions when office automation

duties are assigned to those positions. We have used the OAGEG to help describe the range of software supported in the appellant's LAN/WAN environment. The use of the guide does not affect current practice regarding series determination, but rather serves to clarify and assist in determining the grade of the position that is controlled by applying the GS-335 PCS. Finally, where appropriate we make reference to the Primary Standard (PS) [Introduction to the PCS's, Appendix 3]. This standard serves as a "standard-for-standards" for the Factor Evaluation System (FES). It serves as a basic tool for maintaining alignment across occupations.

Grade determination

Both the GS-335 PCS and OAGEG are written using the FES format. FES places positions in grades by comparing their duties, responsibilities and qualification requirements with nine factors. A point value is assigned to each factor based on a comparison of the position's duties with the factor level descriptions (FLD's) and/or the benchmark job descriptions in the standard. The factor point values mark the lower end of the ranges for the indicated levels. For a position factor to warrant a given point value, it must be fully equivalent to the overall intent of the selected FLD. If the position fails in any significant aspect to meet a particular FLD in the standard, the point value for the next lower factor-level must be assigned, unless the deficiency is balanced by an equally important aspect that meets a higher level. The total points assigned are converted to a grade by use of the grade conversion table in the standard. Our evaluation with respect the nine FES factors follows.

Factor 1, Knowledge required by the position

This factor measures the nature and extent of information or facts that the worker must understand to do acceptable work (e.g., steps, procedures, practices, rules, policies, theories, principles, and concepts) and the nature and extent of the skills needed to apply these knowledges. To be used as a basis for selecting a level under this factor, a knowledge must be required and applied.

Level 1-4 is met. Employees at this level perform a wide range of duties including preparing, advising, assisting, coding and procedure related problem solving using a knowledge of computer procedures and processing methods. The appellant advises, assists, and solves problems requiring a knowledge of hardware, software, and program capabilities and limitations. The position requires that the appellant be knowledgeable of PC operating systems and PC-based network operating systems. In addition, she performs scheduled backups, manages E-mail file and directory access, and monitors the security password system. The appellant must have a knowledge of computer components, applications, and operating systems to install standard software and equipment, recover from routine software malfunctions, and provide basic training for new users. Further, the appellant must provide fundamental technical guidance to users while serving as help desk consultant, e.g., interpret common error messages, resolve routine printing problems, and identify the source of problems where readily identified when computers do not boot or users cannot connect to the network.

Level 1-4 is the highest level described in the OAGEG and cites a knowledge of the capabilities, operating characteristics, and advanced functions of a variety of types of office automation software with a knowledge of the similarities, differences, and integration of the different software types. These are typical of the knowledge she applies in helping users by answering individual questions related to the use of different software applications like Word or Travel Manager.

The appellant applies knowledges that fall short of Level 1-5. At this level, employees carry out assignments involving the development, test, implementation and modification of computer programs and operating procedures. Employees prepare programs or write new program documentation and operating procedures. The appellant's position is located in a small IT unit that supports users of standard off-the-shelf software programs that are not modified. The appellant does not have responsibility for application program development. Further, any work equivalent to the development and modification of programs and procedures are vested with the supervisor whose responsibility is to develop, design, and implement the park's information system.

Factor 2, Supervisory controls

This factor covers the nature and extent of direct or indirect controls exercised by the supervisor, the employee's responsibilities, and the review of completed work. Controls are exercised by the supervisor in the way assignments are made, instructions are given to the employee, priorities and deadlines are set, and objectives and boundaries are defined. Responsibility of the employee depends on the extent to which the employee is expected to develop the sequence and timing of various aspects of the work, to modify or recommend modification of instructions, and to participate in establishing priorities and defining objectives. The degree of review of completed work depends upon the nature and extent of the review.

Level 2-3 is the highest level described in either the GS-335 PCS or the OAGEG. It is met, but not exceeded. At this level, the employee identifies the work to be done, plans and carries out the steps required and submits completed work to users without supervisory review. The employee commonly adapts or develops new work procedures and instructions for application by herself and others. The OAGEG, at this level, describes that the employee works independently to plan and carry out steps for completing assignments in accordance with established office instructions and practices for office automation. When current practices or deviations in an assignment cause problems, the incumbent uses her own initiative to resolve them and coordinates efforts with other employees involved or affected by the nonstandard procedures.

The appellant's supervisor provides minimal supervision. Work assignments are derived through problems that arise, through the normal course of planning and carrying out the work to be done, or through inquiries received at the help desk. The employee uses initiative in carrying out recurring assignments independently without specific instructions. Unusual situations are referred to the supervisor. For example, the appellant receives suggestions from her supervisor when confronted with unfamiliar error messages or when solutions to unfamiliar problems are needed

while testing new software/hardware. The supervisor is kept informed of progress and completed work is reviewed for conformity to deadlines and accepted practices and as a result of feedback from users about the quality and accuracy of the work.

Level 2-4, described in the PS, is characteristic of that performed by the appellant's supervisor, who is vested with the responsibility to independently plan and carry out projects and analyses of the organization's IT requirements, interpret policy, coordinate the work of others, and resolve most conflicts that arise.

Factor 3, Guidelines

This factor covers the nature of guidelines and the judgment needed to apply them.

Level 3-2 is met. The guidelines at this level are detailed and in the form of software resource kits, technical instructions, bulletins, equipment manuals and software documentation. The selection of an appropriate guideline is usually clear. However, the guidelines may provide for judgmental deviations in the work processed. Digression from guidelines that has not been established by experience and precedent actions are referred to the supervisor. The OAGEG also describes guidelines that include both detailed instructions for specific automation tasks and more general procedural guidelines in the form of manufacturers' manuals and tutorials. For tasks not covered, the employee must search more general guidelines. Judgment is required because of the number of guidelines and alternative procedures possible. The recurring nature of the assignments and user problems permits considerable additional reliance on established procedures and previous experience. For example, the appellant routinely sets-up Internet access for both remote and direct users. This requires that she select the appropriate protocol that applies to the specific location and software used.

Level 3-3 is not met. At this level, the employee works with new requirements or new applications for which only general guidelines are available. The employee uses judgment in adjusting the most appropriate guidelines to fit new processing requirements or develops new methods for accomplishing the work. Guidelines may require modification to provide for adapting to a new hardware/software capability. At this level, the OAGEG also describes that much of the work requires adaptation of available guides to meet requirements for new tasks or to solve processing problems.

While the appellant faces a changing technology that requires frequent upgrades, the process of periodically installing software and equipment on PC's and reconfiguring the systems to operate within the changed environment is a regular and routine part of the work. Established guidelines cover the work situation and do not require the employee to exercise the kind of judgment intended at Level 3-3. For example, when the appellant encounters problems running new software, hardware, or systems for which guidelines are not clear, she looks to the supervisor to recommend solutions based on his experience and understanding of computer software, hardware, and LAN administration.

Factor 4, Complexity

This factor covers the nature, number, variety, and intricacy of tasks, steps, processes, or methods in the work performed; the difficulty in identifying what needs to be done; and the difficulty and originality involved in performing the work.

Level 4-3 is met. At this level, the employee performs a variety of tasks involving discrete methods and procedures or a variety of related tasks that require a sequence of actions involving differing methods and procedures. The decision regarding what is to be done results from studying each assignment and identifying the sequence of procedures and methods needed to process each problem situation. Actions to be taken differ according to the equipment or application.

In work directly supporting specialists, employees may participate in each phase of a project ranging from testing and installation of hardware and software to resolving recurring operating problems. At Level 4-3, the OAGEG discusses judgment in considering and selecting from among many different software types in light of the range and peculiarities of the unit's information processing capabilities and requirements. The employee regularly develops methods and procedures for office automation tasks, and identifies and solves problems in existing methods or procedures.

The appellant performs a variety of distinct functions in support of the park's information management operation. As at Level 4-3, she assists and supports the OIM by testing and implementing new software requirements and LAN applications, including providing one-on-one coaching to the users. Through the help desk, the appellant is on call when users require assistance with basic hardware or software issues. Problems range from simple questions on how to use a word processing application to more complex, though recurring, issues on how to configure the PC for mainframe access.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 4-4, distinguished from Level 4-3 by the variety and complexity of the operating system monitored, the nature and variety of problems encountered and resolved, and the nature of independent decisions made by the employee. At this level, the diagnosis and resolution of problems involve configurations with dissimilar operating characteristics, a wide variety of data and programs, and many different processes and methods to arrive at solutions or develop new procedures. Though some of this complexity may be present in the appellant's work environment (i.e., DOS and multiple Windows systems), her work involves basic set up, configuration, and problem solving activity that lends itself to repetition. The appellant relies on the supervisor's technical guidance to arrive at solutions in new or complex situations.

Factor 5, Scope and effect

This factor covers the relationship between the nature of the work, i.e., the purpose, breadth, and depth of the assignment, and the effect of the work products or services both within and outside the organization. Only the effect of properly performed work is to be considered.

At Level 5-2, employees perform a range of duties in computer support positions according to established procedures and methods. Results of the work are complete products or complete segments of other products or work processes. Work at this level might include maintaining backup tapes and configuring PC's. The work also affects the reliability and acceptability of subsequent processes. This is also the highest level described under the OAGEG that describes work as performed in accordance with established rules, regulations, procedures, and office automation practices. The work affects the way in which other employees document, store, receive, or transmit information, and increases the availability and usefulness of the information involved.

The appellant's position meets Level 5-2 as she is responsible for several LAN administration functions including performing backups, managing E-mail user files and directory, and running LAN maintenance programs. Responding to help desk inquiries and solving routine problems, the appellant configures and maintains PC's to affect the reliability of individual users' access to the information system.

Level 5-3 is not met. This level is distinguished from Level 5-2 by the addition of requirements for solving problems and answering technical questions where solutions are not always covered by established or standardized procedures. The appellant's position uses standardized approaches in assisting individual PC users. Due to the limited range of applications supported and the recurring nature of user problems and solutions, assistance provided by the appellant's position falls short of the Level 5-3. OIM responsibilities, like identifying system solutions to address the user's information needs, are integral to the supervisor's duties. Further, while the appellant's work affects the individual access of users to system files and directories, her work does not affect the design or operation of the information system as a whole.

Factor 6, Personal contacts

This factor includes face-to-face contacts and telephone and radio dialogue with persons not in the supervisory chain. Levels described under this factor are based on what is required to make the initial contact, the difficulty of communicating with those contacted, and the setting in which the contact takes place. Above the lowest level, points should be credited under this factor only for contacts which are essential for successful performance of the work and which have a demonstrable impact on the difficulty and responsibility of the work performed.

Level 6-2 is the highest level described in either the GS-335 PCS or the OAGEG. At this level, contacts are with specialists and other recipients of services who are employees of the same

agency, but outside the data processing organization; or, contact with employees of other agencies or non-governmental organizations who use the facility; or, contacts with contractors representatives such as vendor repair technicians or customer engineers. The contacts are structured and routine and the role of each participant is readily determined.

The appellant's position meets, but does not exceed Level 6-2. Her primary contacts are with users within the park, IT and other staff members from the Region's Support Office, and vendors. The appellant's primary contacts are routine and the role and authority of each party are understood. At Level 6-3 in the PS, contacts are not established on a routine basis; the purpose and extent of each contact are different; and the role and authority of each party are identified and developed during the course of the contact. These demands are not typical of the appellant's contacts.

Factor 7, Purpose of contacts

In GS occupations, the purpose of personal contacts ranges from factual exchanges of information to situations involving significant or controversial issues and differing viewpoints, goals, or objectives. The personal contacts which serve as the basis for the level selected for this factor must be the same as the contacts which are the basis for the level selected for Factor 6.

At Level 7-1, the purpose is to obtain, clarify, or give facts or information regardless of the nature of those facts; i.e., the facts or information may range from easily understood to highly technical. The OAGEG cites such examples as to clarify terminology, determine priorities of projects, discuss additions or revisions, or discuss equipment capabilities. Level 7-1 is met. The appellant gathers information from users and responds to their questions, explaining information about work methods and procedures.

At Level 7-2, the highest level described in either the GS-335 PCS or the OAGEG, the purpose of contacts is to plan or coordinate changes in scheduling requirements or priorities due to data or equipment related problems; to participate with users in planning and coordinating new or modified requirements when the work fits generally within system options, schedules, etc.; or, to plan user participation, methodology and deadlines for new projects. The PS further clarifies the purpose of contacts by explaining that, at this level, the purpose is to plan, coordinate, or advise on work efforts or to resolve operating problems by influencing or motivating individuals or groups who are working toward mutual goals and who have basically cooperative attitudes. The appellant's position fails to meet this level since the installation and problem solving activities resulting from help desk inquiries do not regularly require that she influence or motivate the users to accept her interventions. Rather, contacts that seek to influence or motivate others is most appropriately made by the appellant's supervisor, who, as IT manager, seeks to influence policy and standards, establishes and coordinates projects, and resolves systemic problems.

Factor 8, Physical demands

This factor covers the requirements and physical demands placed on the employee by the work assignment. This includes physical characteristics and abilities (e.g., specific agility and dexterity requirements) and the physical exertion involved in the work (e.g., climbing, lifting, pushing, balancing, stooping, kneeling, crouching, crawling, or reaching). To some extent, the frequency or intensity of physical exertion must also be considered (e.g., a job requiring prolonged standing involves more physical exertion than a job requiring intermittent standing).

At Level 8-1, the work is generally sedentary, although there may be some nominal walking or standing for short periods of time, or carrying of light loads (i.e., paper, books, reports) that require only moderate physical ability and physical stress.

The appellant's position meets Level 8-1, but does not meet Level 8-2 that requires extended periods of standing, walking, stretching, bending, stooping, or carrying of loads that may weigh as much as 45 pounds. Although the appellant's position may at times cause her to walk several blocks within the campus to reach the user, carry heavier loads, or be in a position requiring stooping or bending, these occasions are too rare to meet the definition of extended periods of time. The majority of the appellant's time is spent sitting at a workstation.

Factor 9, Work environment

This factor considers the risk and discomforts in the employee's physical surroundings or the nature of the work assigned and the safety regulations required. Although the use of safety precautions can practically eliminate a certain danger or discomfort, such situations typically place additional demands upon the employee in carrying out safety regulations and techniques.

At Level 9-1, the work involves the common risks or discomforts, requiring normal safety precautions typical of offices, meeting rooms, libraries and the like. The work area is adequately lighted, heated, and ventilated. Employees in or adjacent to computer rooms may be within environmentally controlled areas and, although relatively cool, require only normally clothing to compensate for minor discomfort. The appellant's work environment consists of the everyday risks and discomforts of offices and similar work sites, and warrants evaluation at Level 9-1.

Though the appellant's position meets Level 9-1, it does not meet Level 9-2 that involves moderate risk requiring exercise of safety precautions when operating or working around equipment with exposed moving parts such as decollators, bursters and others. Special clothing or protective equipment is not normally required although there is moderate risk of bodily injury. The appellant's work environment is in an office and does not require Level 9-2 safety precautions.

Summary

In summary, we have evaluated the appellant's position as follows:

Factor	Level	Points
1. Knowledge required by the position	1-4	550
2. Supervisory controls	2-3	275
3. Guidelines	3-2	125
4. Complexity	4-3	150
5. Scope and effect	5-2	75
6. Personal contacts	6-2	25
7. Purpose of contacts	7-1	20
8. Physical demands	8-1	5
9. Work environment	9-1	5
Total points:		1230

A total of 1230 points falls within the GS-6 range of 1105-1350 points on the Grade Conversion Table in the GS-PCS.

Decision

The appellant's position is classified properly as Computer Assistant, GS-335-6.