Job Grading Appeal Decision
Under section 5346 of title 5, United States Code

Appellant:	[appellant]
Agency classification:	Maintenance Mechanic Supervisor WS-4749-9
Organization:	Mechanical Maintenance Systems Maintenance and Operation Section Veterans Affairs Medical Center [location] Department of Veterans Affairs [location]
OPM decision:	Maintenance Mechanic Supervisor WS-4749-9
OPM decision number:	C-4749-09-03

/s/ Robert D. Hendler

_____

Robert D. Hendler
Classification and Pay Claims
Program Manager
Center for Merit System Accountability

February 28, 2007

_____

Date

As provided in section S7-8 of the *Operating Manual: Federal Wage System*, this decision constitutes a certificate that is mandatory and binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting officials of the Government. There is no right of further appeal. This decision is subject to discretionary review only under conditions specified in section 532.705(f) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (addressed provided in the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards, appendix 4, section H).

Decision sent to:

[appellant]
[address]

[name]
Human Resources Manager
Veterans Affairs Medical Center
[address]

Deputy Assistant Secretary for
Human Resources Management (05)
Department of Veterans Affairs
810 Vermont Avenue, NW, Room 206
Washington, DC 20420

Team Leader for Classification
Office of Human Resources Management
and Labor Relations
Compensation and Classification Service (055)
Department of Veterans Affairs
810 Vermont Ave, NW, Room 240
Washington, DC 20420

Introduction

On August 31, 2006, the Philadelphia Field Services Group of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a job grading appeal from [appellant]. His job is currently graded as Maintenance Mechanical Supervisor, WS-4749-9, which the appellant believes should be upgraded to WS-4749-12. We received the initial agency administrative report (AAR) on September 26, 2006, and the complete AAR on October 24, 2006. The job is located in Mechanical Maintenance Systems (MMS), Maintenance and Operation Section (MOS), Engineering Section (ES), Veterans Affairs Medical Center (VAMC) [location], Department of Veterans Affairs, [location].

Background

The appellant appealed the grade of his job to his agency in April 2005, requesting it be upgraded to WS-4749-12. The agency decision, dated August 2, 2005, found the job properly graded as WS-4749-9. The ES was subsequently reorganized. The appellant's supervisor is the Chief, MOS Branch and Assistant Chief, Engineering (Supervisory General Engineer, GS-801-12). An Electronic Integrated Systems Mechanic, WG-2610-12, job was also added to his unit. On February 7, 2006, after the organizational changes, the appellant again appealed to his agency requesting his job be upgraded to WS-4749-12. The agency's March 23, 2006, letter stated the changes did not warrant assignment of a higher grade. It also informed the appellant of his right to file an appeal with OPM, but failed to inform him Federal Wage System (FWS) appeals must be filed within 15 calendar days of the day the appellant receives the agency's final decision, title 5 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 532.705(a)(1)(ii). As a result, he did not file his appeal with OPM in a timely manner. We contacted the agency and appellant regarding this matter, and both said they were unaware of the FWS filing deadline. We extended the time limit for filing the appeal in accordance with 5 CFR § 532.705(a)(2), and have accepted and decided this appeal under section 5346 of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.).

General Information

The appellant disagrees with his agency's application of the Job Grading Standard (JGS) for FWS) Supervisors to grade his position for a number of reasons. In adjudicating this appeal, our responsibility is to make our own independent decision on the proper grading of the job. By law, we must make that decision solely by comparing his current duties and responsibilities to OPM standards and guidelines (5 U.S.C. 5346). Therefore, we have considered the appellant's statements only insofar as they are relevant to making that comparison. Because our decision sets aside all previous agency decisions, the appellant's concerns regarding his agency's job grading review process are not germane to this decision.

A job description (JD) is the official record of the major duties and responsibilities assigned to a job by an official with the authority to assign work. A job is the duties and responsibilities that make up the work performed by the employee. Job grading appeal regulations permit OPM to investigate or audit a job and decide an appeal on the basis of the actual duties and responsibilities currently assigned by management and performed by the employee. An OPM appeal decision grades a real operating job, and not simply the JD.

In reaching our job grading decision, we have carefully reviewed and considered all information of record furnished by the appellant and his agency. To help decide the appeal, we also conducted telephone interviews with the appellant on December 29, 2006, and his immediate supervisor on January 9, 2007.

The appellant is assigned to JD [number]. Both the appellant and his supervisor have certified the accuracy of the JD. We find the JD of record contains the major duties and responsibilities assigned to and performed by the appellant and incorporate it by reference into this decision.

Job Information

The Engineering Section has three major components: the Projects, Biomedical and Maintenance and Operation Sections. The Projects Section includes Projects Administration and Structural/Construction units. It develops plans and specifications for all VAMC station level projects, including non-recurring and minor/miscellaneous projects and performs building structural maintenance and repair work. The Biomedical Section maintains and repairs biomedical equipment and instrumentation, and maintains and repairs freestanding computer systems and hardware/peripherals. The MOS includes the Electrical, Boiler plant, Garage/Grounds, and MMS units.

The appellant's immediate supervisor is responsible for the effective/efficient operation and maintenance of all buildings, grounds and facilities at the VAMC. His position description shows he: makes decisions regarding his subordinate organization structure, budget and resources utilization; assists and supports the Engineering Chief regarding the establishment of local facilities policies, operational plans and major alteration, improvement and/or addition projects; is responsible for the management and control of all real property at the VAMC; plans and directs programs for preventive maintenance and recurring and non-recurring maintenance to upgrade the physical plant; and is responsible for all training within Engineering.

As MMS supervisor, the appellant is responsible for the maintenance and repair of all heating and steam, air conditioning and refrigeration, water, pipes and plumbing, and medical gas systems within and between VAMC buildings, with the exception of centralized boiler and chiller plant operating systems. He provides technical and administrative supervision to nine subordinates; administratively supervises and oversees the work of an Electronic Industrial Control Mechanic WG-2606-11 job; and provides general oversight and guidance to a compensated work therapy (CWT) worker assigned to the wheelchair assembly and repair area. The appellant's unit is structured as follows:

- 1 Supervisory Mechanic Supervisor, WS-4749-9 (appellant)
- 3 Pipefitter, WG-4204-10 (steam/heating, medical gas, water distribution and plumbing)
- 1 Industrial Equipment Mechanic, WG-5352-10 (wheelchair assembly and repair) - *and a CWT worker (to assist in wheelchair shop for work experience/therapy)*

- 1 Industrial Equipment Mechanic, WG-5352-10 (general mechanical equipment repair and maintenance)

- 1 Air Conditioning (A/C) Equipment Mechanic Leader, WL-5306-10 (team – responsible for air conditioning, refrigeration and controls systems)

- 1 Electronic Industrial Control Mechanic, WG-2606-11 (currently vacant)

- 2 A/C Equipment Mechanic, WG-5306-10

- 1 A/C Equipment Mechanic Helper, WG-5306-7

The appellant's subordinates work from four separate shop locations in three different buildings. The appellant's office is located in Building [number] in close proximity to the pipefitting and A/C shops where eight of the ten employees work. One Industrial Equipment Mechanic works out of Building [number], and the other works in the wheelchair shop in Building [number] with the CWT worker. Buildings [number] and [number] are joined by an enclosed corridor and the three buildings are situated within 1000 to 1500 feet of each other. The Industrial Equipment Mechanics physically report to the appellant in his office each morning prior to going to their respective shops. Most wheelchair assembly or repair operations are performed within the shop area. The other employees perform maintenance and repair work both within their respective shop areas and throughout the VAMC complex.

The majority of the MMS's work is performed in response to specific work orders (WOs) for the 20 buildings at the VAMC. Routine daily communications between coworkers and/or the supervisor are maintained using two-way radios. Once or twice a month work orders involve repairs at one of the five off-site facilities serviced by the section, i.e., four off-site clinics and the [name] Building. Such repairs typically take one day or less to complete and employees remain in contact with co-workers and/or the supervisor, as needed, by telephone or other means.

WOs account for two thirds of the unit's overall workload. Seventy-five percent are for routine, day-to-day repairs associated with plumbing problems, A/C or heating issues and/or general equipment repairs that can be completed in an hour or two, while twenty-five percent require the appellant to coordinate with other trades supervisors and/or operational area supervisors to minimize disruption of in the work area where the repairs are to be performed. The appellant prioritizes WOs and makes arrangements/adjustments as needed to ensure appropriate personnel, skills and materials are available for repairs.

WOs are initiated and tracked using a computer system designed for this purpose. They are typically expected to be completed within 90 days or less, and appellant tracks and reports on WO status/close-outs at 30 and 60 day intervals. The appellant uses the system to capture data regarding labor and materials/parts costs associated with the WOs and to generate required monthly, annual and other reports. He also responds to WO requestors via personal computer concerning anticipated delays, reasons for disapproving requests, etc.

The appellant is responsible for replenishing commonly needed supplies, parts and materials to ensure sufficient stock is available to carry out MMS assigned activities. To this end, he tracks usage, reorders materials as needed, and justifies unusually large or unique purchase requests as required. The appellant provides input to the Engineering Section's annual budget on projected MMS work and associated funding requirements.

Most of the remaining MMS work involves preventive maintenance inspections and the associated parts replacement/repairs. The appellant plans and coordinates such activities with other affected VAMC activities on a recurring/cyclic basis, establishing specific arrangements from three weeks to two months in advance. MMS personnel participate in special projects as directed/approved by the appellant's immediate supervisor or the Chief Engineer as members of local "construction crews" staffed with trades specialties (electrical, pipefitting, structural, etc.) to carry out limited VAMC facilities renovations.

Large installation and/or repair projects are contracted out to private sector companies. The appellant participates in the VAMC review of contractor proposals. He provides input on anticipated impact and potential issues arising within his assigned areas of responsibility based on projected contractor activities. He reviews ongoing contractor activities from a quality control perspective and interacts with contractor personnel through the VAMCs designated contracting officer's technical representative, or the Chief Engineer to address and resolve identified issues/problems.

The appellant oversees seven contracts annually involving such activities as semi-annual hood grease cleaning; semi-annual laminar flow hood inspections; quarterly medical air, oxygen and vacuum testing; alarm panel certifications; annual fire pump testing; annual High Efficiency Particulate Air filter certification; annual water tower and cathode protection system inspections, etc. to ensure they are properly completed and documented.

The VAMC contracts with a local, private sector company to service/maintain their on-site [company name / system] building (energy/environmental controls) management system. The appellant wrote a job description for a VAMC job to provide in-house [software] Graphics and [system] technical capability. The job is intended to monitor, test, troubleshoot, maintain, repair and improve building environmental equipment, hardware, controls and systems and provide locally designed/standardized management/graphic reports. The incumbent is expected to repair, align and calibrate all [system] operational systems and interfaces ensuring they worked properly as an integrated system and participate in transitioning the VAMC [system] to a web based/accessible system. This job was initially graded as Electronics Integrated Systems Mechanic, WG-2610-12, on December 20, 2005, by the servicing Human Resources Office (HRO). The vacancy was announced and candidates interviewed, but no selection was made. The job's duties and responsibilities were subsequently reviewed and modified by the Chief Engineer and graded by the HRO, as Electronic Industrial Control Mechanic WG-2606-11. The job remains vacant. The appellant is expected to provide direction regarding desired or required outcomes and monitor the work to ensure final products meet stated requirements. In essence, the work is to be reviewed from an overall customer satisfaction perspective and verification that [system] equipment/hardware and software interactivity operates properly and sufficiently to meet desired results.

The appellant develops and maintains performance standards and prepares and signs performance appraisals for his subordinates; counsels employees regarding performance; recommends awards; hears and informally responds to employee complaints and grievances referring more serious matters to his supervisor, takes informal disciplinary measures such as verbal warnings; performs fact finding and recommends appropriate action for more serious offences; tracks and ensures subordinates receive mandated annual training, e.g., Occupational Safety and Health training, etc.; arranges for specialized training/briefings by contractor personnel, as needed, for newly installed equipment, and may occasionally recommend training courses available on-line or those being given near the VAMC considering associated costs; recommends subordinate selections, promotions and/or reassignments; and schedules, approves and tracks leave usage to ensure adequate coverage.

The appellant receives direction from, and provides input to his supervisor regarding his assignments during weekly supervisory meetings within the ES, as well as through routine day to day interaction.

Occupational Code, Title, and Standard Determination

The agency allocated the appellant's job as Maintenance Mechanic Supervisor, WG-4749, and graded it using the FWS JGS for Supervisors with which the appellant did not disagree. Based on careful review of the record, we concur.

Grade determination

The FWS JGS for Supervisors grading plan consists of three factors: *Nature of Supervisory Responsibility*; *Level of Work Supervised*; and *Scope of Work Operations Supervised*.

The appellant states his "main point of contention with the rating" concerns his agency's evaluation of Factor I, Nature of Supervisory Responsibility at Situation #1. He believes his job meets Situation #2 and many of the elements for Situation #3. He states "…the dispute is not with the highest level of non-supervisory work…" i.e., WG-10 for Factor II, Level of Work Supervised, but that the agency has not properly evaluated Factor III, Scope of Work Operations Supervised, based on the actual size of the facility, nature/complexity of his work, variety of trades supervised or the physical dispersion of his subordinates throughout three different buildings. The appellant also contends the agency did not adequately consider strengthening aspects in the overall assessment of his job prior to arriving at a final grade determination.

Factor 1, Nature of Supervisory Responsibility

This factor considers the nature of the supervisory duties performed, and the type and degree of responsibility for control over the work supervised. The factor describes four basic supervisory situations. These, in sequence, depict successively higher levels of supervisory responsibility and authority for scheduling work operations, planning use of resources; i.e., subordinate workers, equipment, facilities, materials, and tools to accomplish scheduled or unscheduled work, directing subordinates in performing work assignments, and carrying out administrative

duties. In order for a job to be credited at a level, it must meet all of the bullets under that specific situation, otherwise, it must be credited at the next lower level. The situations are only intended to reflect different levels of supervisory authority and responsibility. They are not comprehensive or detailed descriptions of supervisory jobs. Consequently, in comparing a supervisory job being graded with the supervisory situations, there usually will be duties or other aspects of the job that have not been mentioned in the descriptions of the supervisory situations. Such duties or other aspects of the job, which have been omitted from the descriptions of the supervisory situation, cannot be considered or credited in determining whether the job meets or exceeds the level represented by the description of a particular supervisory situation.

The agency credited Situation #1, at which supervisors are primarily responsible for supervising workers, either directly or through subordinate leaders, in accomplishing trades and labor work operations in a segment of an organization, a group, or work shift. Supervisors at Situation #1 perform the following:

Planning

- Plan the use of workers, equipment, facilities, materials, and tools on a day-to-day or project-by-project basis;
- Adhere to work priorities, project schedules, resources, and detailed work plans established by higher level supervisors;
- Follow customary work cycles and sequences in planning work assignments;
- Track and report progress on work assignments and request authority to adjust worker assignments and to use overtime, equipment, and materials to meet schedules; and
- Recommend changes to schedules, priorities, and work sequences as necessary and make minor deviations in procedures or redirect resources under their control to overcome problems such as equipment failure, material delays, or unplanned absences.

Work Direction

- Assign work to individuals and provide technical direction and/or help in accomplishing difficult work steps and processes;
- Observe work in progress to anticipate and resolve problems, reassign personnel within group supervised, and coordinate work among workers and other supervisors to maintain work progress to meet schedules;
- Inspect completed work for quality and work order requirements; and
- Report possible or actual work delays to their supervisors.

Administration

- Support and explain management programs to their subordinates;
- Recommend performance ratings, training, disciplinary actions, changes in performance standards, and the most suitable applicants for vacancies;
- Advise and counsel workers on how to improve their performance and explain new work techniques;

- Investigate grievances and complaints, resolve them informally, and notify supervisors of those of sufficient importance or seriousness;
- Assure safety and housekeeping practices are observed; and
- Maintain work reports and records and assist supervisors in planning overall leave schedules.

In Situation #2, supervisors are responsible for supervising workers directly or through subordinate leaders *and/or* supervisors in accomplishing the work of an *organizational segment or group*. Supervisors in Situation #2 differ from supervisors in Situation #1 primarily in planning work operations of greater scope and complexity; determining the sequence, priority, and time for the performance of particular operations within the limits of broader work schedules and time limits; and exercising greater administrative authority. In addition to the duties described in Situation #1, supervisors in Situation #2 perform the following:

Planning

- Plan use of subordinate workers, equipment, facilities, and materials on a week-to-week or month-to-month basis;
- Establish deadlines, priorities, and work sequences, and plan work assignments based on general work schedules, methods, and policies set by higher level supervisors;
- Coordinate work with supporting or related work functions controlled by other supervisors;
- Determine the number and types of workers needed to accomplish specific projects;
- Redirect individual workers and resources to accomplish unanticipated work, e.g., work resulting from *open and inspect* types of work orders;
- Inform higher level supervisors of the need to revise work schedules and re-estimate labor and other resources; and
- Participate with their superiors in the initial planning of current and future work schedules, budget requests, staffing needs, estimates, and recommendations as to scheduling projected work.

Work Direction

- Investigate work related problems such as excessive costs or low productivity and determine causes;
- Implement corrective actions within their authority to resolve work problems; and
- Recommend solutions to staffing problems, engineering requirements, and work operations directed by other supervisors.

Administration

- Plan and establish overall leave schedule;
- Determine training needs of subordinates and arrange for its accomplishment, set performance standards, and make formal appraisals of subordinate work performance; and
- Initiate recommendations for promotion or reassignment of subordinates.

The appellant supervises a small workforce of ten subordinates including one designated leader and the work is typically planned on a day-to-day or week to week basis, although occasionally limited longer term planning and coordination is required. As described previously, most MMS work results from routine WOs or requirements for regular and recurring maintenance. The record shows the appellant is not significantly involved in planning or recommending projected work or future work schedules, determining/reassessing staffing needs, or developing the types of estimates found at Situation #2. The planning aspects of the appellant's duties meet Situation #1.

The record shows the appellant identifies and implements appropriate corrective actions within his delegated authority to resolve work problems. However, he does not investigate issues such as excessive costs or low productivity, and the record does not show he regularly recommends solutions to work operations directed by other supervisors, or recommends solutions to staffing problems. While he did write the JD for the new Electronic Industrial Control Mechanic, WG-2606 job, the need for such work is extremely limited due to the size and composition of the subordinate workforce, and nature of MMS work. The work direction characteristics of the appellants duties meet, but do not exceed Situation #1.

As described previously, and verified in our discussion with the appellant's supervisor, the appellant's delegated administrative authorities and responsibilities are comparable to those of Situation #2. Because of the threshold nature of the FWS JGS for Supervisors, since the appellant's job does not fully meet Situation #2, it must be evaluated at Situation #1. Since Situation #2 is not met, Situation #3 is precluded.

Factor II, Level of Work Supervised

This factor concerns the level and complexity of the work operations supervised, and their effect on the difficulty and responsibility of the supervisor's job. In determining the level of non-supervisory work to be credited under this factor, all substantive work, whether under the direct or indirect supervision of the position being graded, for which the supervisor is technically accountable, must be considered. Substantive work is that which directly carries out the main purpose or mission of the work operations supervised and primarily determines the technical qualifications required to effectively carry out the responsibilities of the supervisory job being graded. Technical accountability is responsibility for the quantity and quality of the work performed by subordinates, requiring the application by the supervisor of knowledge of the methods, techniques, procedures, tools, materials, and practices of the involved occupation. Credit is not given under this factor for work operations involving only administrative supervision by the supervisor.

Two steps are taken to identify the proper grade level for Factor II. The first is to identify the occupation or various occupations directly involved in accomplishing the work projects that reflect the main purpose of operations/mission for which the supervisor is accountable. The second is to determine the highest level of nonsupervisory work performed under normal job controls in that occupation or occupations which reflect the difficulty and responsibility of the supervisor's job. The agency determined the Pipefitter, WG-10 work to be the occupation and

grade level that best represents MMS work operations. We do not agree. As the appellant contends, three occupations performed at the WG-10 level (i.e., Industrial Equipment Mechanic, WG-5352; A/C Equipment Mechanic, WG-5306; and Pipefitter, WG-4204) represent the main purpose of MMS work operations and serve as the basis to select WG-10 as the appropriate grade level for Factor II.

As described above, the appellant believes the new Electronic Industrial Control Mechanic, WG-2606-11 job should warrant consideration of a higher grade for his job. However, both the appellant and his supervisor indicate he would not fully technically supervise this job as described under Factor II, so it cannot be considered in determining the grade level for this factor. Furthermore, as stated in the FWS JGS for Supervisors:

> *Seldom, if ever, should a single job serve as a basis for a base level determination*. Usually, the work aspects of a single job fail to provide valid indicators as to the actual level and complexity of work operations supervised and their effect on difficulty and responsibility of the supervisor's job.

The record shows that the highest level of non-supervisory work supervised by the appellant meeting the requirements of Factor II is grade 10.

Factor III, Scope of Work Operations Supervised

This factor considers the scope of the job's supervisory responsibility in terms of: (1) the scope of the assigned work function and organizational authority; (2) the variety of functions the job is required to supervise; and (3) the physical dispersion, work coordination, and location of subordinates. This factor is divided into three subfactors, which are in turn subdivided into levels with points assigned to each level. An appropriate level is selected for each subfactor and the corresponding point values are totaled. The total points are then converted to specific levels under Factor III using the conversion chart at the end of the factor.

Subfactor A. Scope of Assigned Work Function and Organizational Authority

This subfactor measures the scope of the assigned work function or mission, i.e., the purpose of the job in the organization, the extent and nature of the job's authority in relation to the organizational assignment, and the importance of the job's decision.

Supervisors at Level A-1 have first-level supervisory and decision authority over a single work function. Decisions made at this level are clearly defined or virtually automatic since higher-level management has already established a course of action and a methodology for implementation.

At Level A-2, supervisors have first- or second-level supervisory and decision authority over an organizational segment, which typically has been established based on being a distinct work function or mission; or a designated geographic location or work area. Supervisors make routine decisions regarding execution of policy that has been interpreted or established by the next higher level. At this level, subordinate supervisors and/or leaders may be necessary to

accomplish work operations. Supervisors at this level react to variations in the workplace and maintain a balanced workload between subordinate work groups, making adjustments in workload as necessary. Decisions typically involve the work or assignments and how they are completed.

MMS is the lowest officially recognized organizational level on the ES organizational chart with a supervisor. The appellant exercises first level decision authority over a small organizational unit comprised of ten subordinates, only one of whom is a leader. In contrast, the scope of supervisory work indicative of Level A-2 involves significant assignments which may require multiple subordinate supervisors or leaders in order to direct and control work operations. The appellant assigns work based on the trade specialties of his subordinates, and their designated areas of responsibility which means there is little or no need to maintain a balanced workload between subordinate work groups. As described previously, programmatic, resource utilization and budgetary responsibility for facilities maintenance reside with the appellant's supervisor and the Engineering Chief, and it is at this level that decisions/commitments are made regarding the execution of policy. Decisions at the appellant's level typically relate to day to day WO issues, establishing plans to accomplish recurring/cyclical maintenance, reviews and repairs, and participating in and providing input to larger projects as they relate to his assigned areas of responsibility.

On the surface certain aspects of the appellant's job such as exercising first level supervisory authority and making decisions on MMS work assignments and how/when they are to be completed may seem similar to the description of work at Level A-2, however, a careful assessment of his actual assigned supervisory authorities and responsibilities shows that level is not met. Because Level A-2 is not met, Level A-3 cannot be considered.

This subfactor is evaluated at Level A-1 and credited with 30 points.

Subfactor B. Variety of Function

This subfactor evaluates the difficulties of technical supervision of work functions that may vary from being essentially similar to markedly dissimilar. Similar or related work functions have a common or related body of knowledges, skills, work procedures, and tools, e.g., pipefitting and plumbing, carpentry and woodworking, aircraft mechanic and aircraft engine mechanic, or machining and machine tool operating. Supervision of dissimilar or unrelated work functions requires broader technical knowledges and planning and coordination skills than those required for supervision of similar work functions. The agency credited Level B-3.

At Level B-3, supervisors direct the work of subordinates in one or more similar or related occupations at grades 8-13.

At Level B-4, supervisors direct work of subordinates in dissimilar or unrelated occupations at grades 8-13.

Level B-4 is met because the appellant directs the work of dissimilar occupations performed at the grade 10 level. Subordinate WG-5306 A/C Equipment Mechanic and WG-5352 Industrial Equipment Mechanic functions are in the same job family (i.e., WG-5300), however, WG-4204,

Pipefitter work requires application of a distinctly different body of knowledge, tools and work procedures. This subfactor is evaluated at Level B-4 and credited with 60 points.

Subfactor C. Workforce Dispersion

This subfactor evaluates the varying levels of difficulty associated with monitoring and coordinating the work of nonsupervisory and supervisory personnel who vary from being collocated to widely dispersed. Dispersion of workforce considers the duration of projects, number of work sites, frequency of dispersion, and the necessity to monitor and coordinate the work. It is possible to have no points credited for this subfactor if subordinate employees are located in the same contiguous work area with the supervisor, when dispersion occurs infrequently, or when dispersion is inherent, and the work is performed in the absence of direct supervision, e.g., operating a motor vehicle. The agency credited no points for Level C.

At Level C-1, subordinate employees are located in several buildings or at work sites within a defined location such as a military base, National Park, or large Federal complex consisting of many multi-floor buildings and support facilities. Work assignments vary in terms of duration; however, most assignments at this level are of limited duration; i.e., assignments are typically accomplished within a few days or weeks. In addition, this level also includes off base, i.e., within the local commuting area facility support and maintenance assignments.

On the surface, the appellant's work approaches Level C-1. His subordinates are located in three different buildings at the VAMC, their work assignments vary in duration, and they occasionally travel to provide repair services at the four off-site clinics and [name] Building. However, as described above, these factors have little or no affect on the level of difficulty associated with monitoring and coordinating the work of his non-supervisory subordinates. Dispersion of the workforce is an inherent aspect of providing maintenance and repair services for the VAMC; travel to off-site activities occurs infrequently; most of the subordinates are long term, fully trained employees who typically accomplish their assignments without the need for supervisory intervention or oversight; most assignments take a few hours to a day to complete; and two way communications are readily available. Because the full intent of Level C-1 is not met, no points are credited at Level C.

Tentative Grade Assignment

According to the Grading Table for Supervisory Situation #1, a grade 10 level of work supervised, coupled with Level B equates to the grade 9 supervisory level.

Grade Level Adjustment

Both upward and downward changes from the tentative grade are required based on certain circumstances. A situation requiring a downward adjustment is offset by an upward adjustment. Grade level adjustments may not exceed one grade level.

Downward

A downward adjustment is indicated when the tentative grade would be the same grade as the supervisor's superior. This situation does not apply to the appellant's job.

Upward

Upward grade adjustments are indicated for borderline jobs and work situations that impose special or unusual demands on the supervisor.

Borderline Jobs

An upward adjustment is indicated when the supervisory job substantially exceeds the situation credited under Factor I and the base level of work determined under Factor II is not the highest level of subordinate work for which the supervisor has full technical responsibility.

As described above, the appellant's delegated administrative duties and responsibilities exceed Situation #1 as credited under Factor I. However, the base level of work credited under Factor II is the highest level of subordinate work for which the supervisor has *full* technical responsibility. Therefore, a grade adjustment based on borderline conditions is not warranted.

Special or Unusual Demands

In some situations, special staffing requirements may impose a substantially greater than normal responsibility for job design, job engineering, work scheduling, training, counseling, motivating, and maintaining security. This may occur under special employment programs and at correctional institutions having *exceptionally* difficult attitudinal, motivational, control, and security problems. An upward grade adjustment is indicated when exceptional conditions affect the majority of the subordinate workforce and (1) are permanent and continuing, require the tailoring of assignments, tasks, training, security, and other supervisory actions to individuals, and (2) require regular and recurring counseling and motivational activities. These conditions are not present in the appellant's job.

Neither a downward nor an upward adjustment to the tentative grade 9 supervisory level is indicated.

Decision

The appellant's job is properly graded as Maintenance Mechanic Supervisor, WS-4749-9.