

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

Dallas Oversight Division
1100 Commerce Street, Room 4C22
Dallas, TX 75242

Classification Appeal Decision
Under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code

Appellant: [appellant's name]

Agency classification: User Support Specialist
GS-0301-09

Organization: [organizational location]
Internal Revenue Service
Department of Treasury
[geographic location]

OPM decision: Computer Assistant
GS-335-09

OPM decision number: C-0335-09-04

/s/ Bonnie J. Brandon

Bonnie J. Brandon
Classification Appeals Officer

6/20/2002

Date

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).

Since this decision changes the classification of the appealed position, it is to be effective no later than the beginning of the fourth pay period after the date of this decision (5 CFR 511.702). The servicing personnel office must submit a compliance report containing the corrected position description and a Standard Form 50 showing the personnel action taken. The report must be submitted within 30 days from the effective date of the personnel action.

Decision sent to:

[appellant's address]

Chief, National Classification Center
Internal Revenue Service
U.S. Department of Treasury
401 W. Peachtree Street, NW
Atlanta, GA 30308-3539

National Director, Personnel Division
Internal Revenue Service
U.S. Department of Treasury
1111 Constitution Avenue, NW
Room 1408
Washington, D.C. 20224

Director, Office of Personnel Policy
Department of the Treasury
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
ATTN: Metropolitan Square
Room 6075
Washington, D.C. 20220

Introduction

On December 19, 2001, the Dallas Oversight Division of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a classification appeal from [appellant's name], an employee assigned to the [organizational location] Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Department of Treasury, [geographic location]. The appellant is currently classified as a User Support Specialist, GS-301-09, and given an organizational title of Functional Coordinator (FC). [appellant] believes his position should be classified as an Information Technology Specialist, GS-2210-11.

The appeal has been accepted and processed under section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code. This is the final administrative decision on the classification of the position subject to discretionary review only under the limited conditions and time outlined in part 511, subpart F, of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

In making our decision, we carefully considered all of the information contained in the written record. This includes information provided by the appellant and the agency personnel office. The record information was supplemented by several telephone interviews. We spoke individually with the appellant, his supervisor, the individual acting while the supervisor of record was absent for one 60-day period, and the Asset Management Section Chief from the Information Systems (IS) Division in the [city location] Service Center.

Position information

The appellant is assigned to a standard position description (PD) number [number]. According to the appellant and the supervisor, PD number [number] is a very concise and generic description of the appellant's duties. The appellant, his supervisor and a staff member from the National Classification Center have developed a draft PD which they believe more completely describes the appellant's duties. The agency has classified the draft PD but has not reassigned the appellant to this PD. OPM decides appeals based on the actual duties and responsibilities assigned by management and performed by the employee as described in their position description. We used the information in the draft PD, work samples provided by the appellant and supervisor and the list of Functional Coordinator duties issued by IS to [city location] Service Center managers to *clarify* duties found in PD number [number]. Therefore, we have evaluated the work actually assigned to and performed by the appellant in determining the appropriate series and grade for his position.

Since position descriptions must meet the standard of adequacy as discussed in the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards and the Classifier's Handbook, the appellant's agency must revise his PD to meet that standard.

The appellant is one of the eight-member Management Operations Team that provides support to the Examination Operation (EO) Division. The team is comprised of two Telecommunications Systems Analysts, GS-301-11; one Management and Program Analyst, GS-343-12; one Management and Program Analyst, GS-343-09; a Secretary, GS-318-05; and two GS-301-09, User Support Specialists. A Supervisory Analyst, GS-301-12, supervises the team which provides support to approximately 400 EO employees on two work shifts who utilize about 250

computer workstations and related peripheral equipment. The appellant's position is one of two User Support Specialist positions that provide technical support on hardware and software to all computer users in the Examination Operation branch.

The appellant's primary responsibilities include providing first point of contact user support, administering his assigned server systems, ensuring security of EO computers, maintaining the interface of EO equipment with the LAN network and coordinating contractor and vendor services and training provided to EO users.

Since we have utilized information from a combination of sources (PD number [number], the draft PD, interviews with the appellant and supervisor, work samples and IS's list of functional coordinator duties), the appellant's duties are summarized as follows. The appellant implements and maintains EO computer workstations, servers, scanners, printers, laptops, terminals and software. He responds to user-reported problems and issues on a daily basis. He works with users to identify the origin of the problem, troubleshoots hardware and software problems, and ensures the problem is resolved. He resolves common technical problems independently and serves as a technical resource to functional coordinators in other divisions. He performs hardware maintenance such as replacing inoperable keyboards, mice, and cables, vacuuming out equipment and replacing toner in printers. If the appellant is unable to correct the problem, he refers it to the appropriate source, i.e., the software application developer, the information systems help desk, the telecommunication system analyst or the network security office. Examples include: the appellant reports the failure of a workstation hard drive to IS and then coordinates the hard drive replacement with the vendor that IS contacted; and a user reports suspected virus infection, the appellant shuts down the system and reports the situation to the Network Security office.

According to the supervisor, the division of responsibilities between the information systems division and functional coordinators has been changing. These changes resulted in a reduction in the appellant's system administrator duties. The appellant is responsible for fewer servers and is no longer responsible for contacting vendors or for maintaining the EO equipment inventory. He helps resolve inventory problems by checking equipment serial numbers and their locations when IS has discrepancies in their records. The appellant's system administrator duties for his assigned servers are limited to duties such as: modifying user information for secure access to authorized users; reporting LAN network problems to the IS division or telecommunication analysts; maintaining servers by backing up the databases, resetting servers, changing tapes, updating virus software; and working with system administrators to modify and maintain computer databases. He also sets up the training environment on the training server when new users are trained on tax return examination processes.

The appellant serves as the Division Functional Security Coordinator. These responsibilities include ensuring permissions and passwords are requested and received, unlocking user accounts, monitoring security of IRS hardware, software and taxpayer data in EO, assisting users with prevention and eradication of viruses, and ensuring infected systems and files are properly isolated and cleaned. The appellant maintains records of security access requests for EO users sent to and approved by network security. He also conducts security orientations and annual security training and disperses security updates and information to EO users. The appellant resolves most security breaches by reporting them to the appropriate team manager. Security

breaches of a more sensitive nature are reported to the appellant's supervisor who contacts the team manager or division manager as appropriate. He notifies his supervisor when security incidents increase so the supervisor can discuss the issue at the next management meeting.

As requested by management, IS division and computer application developers, the appellant evaluates computer equipment and makes recommendations based on his knowledge of the EO work and processes and the computer systems currently in service. The appellant researches hardware specifications and pricing via the Internet and technical manuals as needed to respond to these requests. He determines where new equipment will be installed with input from management. Based on his knowledge of current EO equipment, he also makes recommendations for replacement of old and slower equipment. Although major workstation moves are contracted out, the appellant relocates workstations and peripheral equipment such as printers and scanners, as requested by management. These activities require the appellant to observe common electrical safety practices and lifting of equipment weighing 40 pounds or more.

The appellant assembles computer system components, connects workstations to the LAN and configures workstations based on type of user assigned to workstation using established configurations. He provides management and users with information on system limitations when moving workstations. When equipment is vendor installed, he coordinates the installation and schedules EO users for any vendor provided training.

The appellant, with supervisory concurrence, issues information bulletins to users regarding hardware and software problems as needed.

Series, title, and standard determination

The appellant disagrees with his agency's assignment of his position to the GS-301 series, which covers two-grade interval positions involving the performance, supervision, or management of nonprofessional work for which no other series is appropriate. Employees in this occupation exercise analytical ability, judgment, discretion, and knowledge of a substantial body of administrative or program principles, concepts, policies, and objectives.

The appellant believes the work he performs meets the criteria in the Information Technology Management Series, GS-2210, as described in the GS-2200 Job Family Standard for Administrative Work in the Information Technology Group. The GS-2210 series covers two-grade interval administrative positions that manage, supervise, lead, administer, develop, deliver, and support information technology (IT) systems and services. This series covers only those positions for which the *paramount requirement* is knowledge of IT principles, concepts, and methods; e.g., data storage, software applications, and networking. Information technology refers to systems and services used in the automated acquisition, storage, manipulation, management, movement, control display, switching, interchange, transmission, assurance, or reception of information. IT includes computers, network components, peripheral equipment, software, firmware, services, and related resources.

We find the appellant's position does not fully meet the requirements for assignment to the two-grade interval Information Technology Management Series, GS-2210. While he possesses and

applies a sound practical knowledge of hardware and software functions and capabilities in order to provide advice and assistance to computer users on various computer applications and interfaces with the LAN, troubleshoots and resolves hardware and software problems and maintains EO computer security, the appellant's duties do not require (1) the in-depth knowledge of IT principles, concepts, and methods sufficient to plan, analyze, design, develop, test, configure, implement and maintain computer workstations and servers nor (2) the knowledge sufficient to provide comprehensive customer support functions and services to the extent described in the standard for the GS-2210 series.

The appellant is responsible for monitoring the operation of networked systems, adding users, updating passwords, installing commercial off-the-shelf software, configuring hardware and software according to instructions, trouble shooting equipment and server problems based on established practices, and responding to user questions and problems according to existing procedures. These functions and similar ones do not meet the paramount knowledge criteria for coverage by the GS-2210 series and are excluded.

In distinguishing between specialist and assistant work, the GS-2210 series notes that specialist positions are established as developmental jobs with clear progression to higher grade levels as the specialist receives progressively more difficult assignments, requiring the application of a broad knowledge of IT principles, concepts, and methods. Assistant positions support the work of specialists, requiring the application of established methods and procedures, and practical knowledge, as opposed to conceptual knowledge, of the techniques and guidelines pertinent to the assignment area. The appellant's position supports and augments the work of several server systems administrators, software application developers, as well as specialists in the IS and network security functions. The JFS points out that specialist positions are established as developmental jobs. We found no evidence that management's intent in establishing the appellant's position was to make it a developmental position with clear progression to a higher graded specialist position. Another indication of assistant work is the use of established methods and procedures. The appellant operates with such guidance and if he encounters a technical problem that cannot be resolved by applying and/or making minor modifications to standard operating procedures and guidelines, he seeks assistance from computer specialists and/or application developers in the IS division, Network Security office, or regional office.

The appellant's position is assigned to the Computer Clerk and Assistant Series, GS-335. Based on the grade level analysis that follows, we find that the position should be titled *Computer Assistant*. We used the GS-335 standard to determine the grade of the appellant's position.

Grade determination

The GS-335 standard uses the Factor Evaluation System (FES), which employs nine factors. Under the FES, each factor level description in a standard describes the minimum characteristics needed to receive credit for the described level. Therefore, if a position fails to meet the criteria in a factor level description in any significant aspects, it must be credited at a lower level. Conversely, the position may exceed those criteria in some aspects and still not be credited at a higher level. Position factors that exceed or fall short of the described factor levels are compared to the Primary Standard which serves as the framework for each FES standard.

Each factor level has a corresponding point value. The total points are converted to a grade by use of the grade conversion chart in the standard. Our evaluation with respect to the nine factors follows.

Factor 1, Knowledge required by the position

This factor measures the nature and extent of information or facts which the employee 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 those knowledges. To be used as a basis for selecting a level under this factor, the knowledge must be required and applied.

At Level 1-5, employees carry out limited specialized projects and assignments using knowledge of fundamental data processing methods, practices and techniques in work involving development, test, implementation and modification of computer programs and operating procedures. Employees use the knowledges at this level as the bases for analysis and decision making in several functional settings when decisions are based on in-depth knowledge of the systems and programs.

At Level 1-6, the highest level described in the standard, in addition to the knowledge described at Level 1-5, employees use extensive knowledge of at least one multiprocessor and typically several single processor computer systems. They monitor processing work flow and diagnose and resolve error and problem conditions involving many program interrelationships and interlocking computer systems. The work at this level encompasses many of the problem solving aspects of computer specialist work concerned with effective program implementation and processing except those requiring programming corrections or equipment repair. This work requires extensive knowledge of computer equipment, internal computer processes, applications and utility programs and magnetic media. It also requires knowledge of a wide range of analytical and diagnostic methods, procedures and principles. In addition knowledge is required of some elements of programming, systems analysis and equipment operations. These knowledges are used to identify the nature and source of problems occurring during processing and to plan and implement solutions. Employees at this level commonly use these knowledges to advise specialists in setting run instructions and developing effective operating methods. Work at this level commonly involves taking action to order and interpret system dumps, order and implement back-up recovery procedures to replace faulty tapes or disks, reallocating equipment usage to work around equipment malfunctions, etc.

Level 1-6 is met because the appellant's work requires knowledge of a wide range of computer techniques, requirements, sources, and procedures. Extensive knowledge is needed of the current system software, operating systems and application software packages that are utilized in EO. The work also requires extensive knowledge and troubleshooting skills necessary to monitor, operate, and maintain the organization's information systems equipment. The equipment supported includes microcomputers, scanners, terminals, system file servers and a variety of printers. The appellant must possess sufficient knowledge and skills related to telecommunications, LAN connections, ports and switches in order to maintain and troubleshoot workstations interfacing with file servers and the LAN network. The appellant uses this knowledge to identify the sources of operational failures in the system and to take actions to

resolve problems and restore operations. This knowledge of the equipment and system requirements is used to coordinate the installation of new systems or the upgrading of system components or infrastructure. This knowledge is also used to develop and provide management officials with recommendations, within the framework established or imposed by IS at the installation or higher level, for the acquisition of new equipment. The appeal information contains no indications that the appellant's work requires the degree of knowledge and skill required to develop new methods, approaches, or procedures which would meet Level 1-7 of the Primary Standard. Responsibility for the development of new systems and methods used by the organization is delegated to a higher level within Internal Revenue Service.

We assign Level 1-6 (950 points)

Factor 2, Supervisory controls

This factor covers the nature and extent of direct and indirect controls exercised by the supervisor, the responsibility of the employee, and the degree to which work is reviewed by the supervisor.

At Level 2-2, the supervisor gives instructions for non-recurring work assignments, deviations from normal schedules or new procedures. Within established procedures the employee independently performs recurring work making adjustments to accommodate deviations in work methods based on experience and precedent actions. Unfamiliar situations or deviations from established practices are referred to the supervisor or computer specialist for resolution. Completed work is reviewed on the basis of system reports, customer comments, specialist or operator notification of problems during processing. Review is to determine that the employee has used proper procedures and methods, and that the work is completed within established deadlines.

At Level 2-3, the highest level described, the supervisor provides direction on objectives and priorities for new work, deadlines and deadline changes for new and established work. The employee identifies the work to be done, plans and carries out the steps required and submits completed work to users (programmers, operators, functional users) without supervisory review. The appellant independently deviates from instructions to provide for lower or higher priorities and other changes based on past experience and flexibility within processing specifications. The employee commonly adapts or develops new work procedures and instructions for application by self and others. The employee will seek supervisory assistance and discuss problems related to the work such as when processing requests appear to exceed system capacity or could have adverse effect on other processing requirements. Completed work is reviewed for conformity to deadlines and accepted practices on the basis of responses from technical and functional users regarding the quality and accuracy of work products. Work methods are not normally reviewed unless a recurring, common pattern of problems develops.

The appellant's position exceeds Level 2-2 and meets Level 2-3. The appellant's first priority is to provide computer support to avoid work stoppages in EO processing caused by computer hardware and/or software problems. Based on his expertise in his line of work, the appellant has significant latitude to independently plan and carry out his assignments, interpret policies, procedures and practices based on established objectives, and resolve the majority of conflicts

that arise. The appellant is responsible for determining the approaches to be taken and the methodology to be used in accomplishing his assignments. The appellant notifies the supervisor of potentially controversial issues and seeks supervisory assistance in those instances where a technical resource has not been established or is not available. The appellant briefs the supervisor monthly on work accomplished and work in progress. The review of completed work is in terms of feasibility, compatibility with other work, and effectiveness in meeting requirements or achieving expected results.

We assign Level 2-3 (275 points)

Factor 3, Guidelines

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

At Level 3-3, the highest level described in the standard, 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 adding new forms of input, allowing for flexible as opposed to fixed scheduling, adjusting to new or conflicting requirements, or adapting to a new hardware or software capability.

Guidance available to the appellant meets Level 3-3 and consists of handbooks, user manuals, training books, information available on the internet and procedural materials provided by hardware and software manufacturers or vendors. Much of the guidance available is of a general nature, lacks specificity and/or is outdated. The appellant is required to use judgment to interpret, adapt, and apply this guidance; to determine which is more appropriate for resolving local problems relating to computer workstations or system operations; and to integrate new hardware and software into existing systems to maintain compatibility and accomplish work.

Although the appellant's work requires judgment in interpreting and applying available guidance, the appeal record does not indicate that the development of new methods, criteria, or policies is a function of this position, as would be typical of a higher level. These functions are performed at higher levels in the agency.

We credit Level 3-3 (275 points)

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.

At Level 4-3, the employee performs a variety of tasks involving discrete methods and procedures, or a variety of related tasks that require a sequence of duties involving differing methods and procedures. The decision regarding what is to be done results from studying each job order, assignment or processing problem situation. The employee identifies the sequence of

standard and variable procedures and methods needed to prepare and process the request, or to resolve error conditions.

Level 4-4, the highest level described in the standard, is distinguished from the previous level by: (1) the variety and complexity of operating systems monitored; (2) the nature and variety of problems encountered and resolved; and (3) the nature of independent decisions made by the employee. Specifically, employees at this level perform problem solving duties involving a wide range of problem or error conditions in equipment, program data and processing methods and procedures. This diagnosis and resolution of error and problem conditions involves equipment configurations having different operating characteristics, a wide variety of data and programs and many different processes and methods to arrive at solutions or develop new procedures. Decisions regarding what needs to be done include assessing unusual circumstances or conditions, developing variations in approach to fit the specific problems or dealing with incomplete or conflicting data.

The appellant serves as the initial point of contact for troubleshooting the hardware and software problems of computer users within the EO. He resolves common technical problems independently, referring the more complex problems to the IS Division staff, software application developer, or the network security staff. He performs a wide variety of tasks from hardware maintenance on a variety of equipment to moving equipment among work stations. The appellant also serves as security coordinator for the division, ensuring that permissions and passwords are in order, ensuring the security of access to agency equipment and systems, and assisting users in prevention and eradication of viruses. While he is responsible for about 250 computer workstations, these stations are basically in two or three configurations and operating the same combination of system and programs. We find this most comparable to Level 4-3. While the appellant does perform a variety of tasks and resolves many problems, the work does not involve the level of variety and complexity of operating systems and the nature of independent decisions typical of Level 4-4.

We credit Level 4-3 (150 points)

Factor 5, Scope and effect

This factor covers the relationship between the nature of the work, e.g., the purpose, breadth, and depth of the assignment, and the effect of work products or services both within and outside the organization.

Level 5-2 describes work where employees perform a range of duties in computer support positions according to established procedures and methods. The results of the work are complete products or complete segments of other products or work processes. The work affects the accuracy of processing. Reliability and acceptability are affected by completion of the work within deadlines, ensuring against media and control related processing failures, and providing the requested output. The work also affects the reliability and acceptability of subsequent processes by providing the requested output within established deadlines.

Level 5-3, the highest level described in the standard, is distinguished from the next lower level by addition of requirements for solving problems and answering technical questions about

control, scheduling and/or direct support functions. The problems and error conditions encountered are conventional to data processing although solutions are not always covered by established or standardized procedures. Results of the work affect the efficiency of processing services, adequacy of products used in subsequent activities and processing procedures and methods.

The appellant's work meets Level 5-3 because his duties involve problem resolution and answering technical questions from computer users within the Examination Operation Division. Resolution for some problems and error conditions requires the appellant to adapt and/or make minor modification to established methods or procedures. Timeliness of the appellant's resolution of system and equipment problems reduces work stoppage and affects the efficiency of the division. The appellant's work does not affect computer operations outside the Examination Operation division, and as such, does not exceed the 5-3 level.

We credit Level 5-3 (150 points)

Factor 6, Personal contacts

This factor considers face-to-face and telephone contacts with persons not in the supervisory chain.

At Level 6-2, the highest level described in the standard, contacts are with specialists and recipients of services who are employees of the same agency but outside the data processing organization; with employees of other agencies who use the facility; or with contractors' representatives such as vendor repair technicians or customer engineers. These contacts are structured and routine, and the role of each participant is readily determined.

The appellant's primary contacts are comparable to those discussed at Level 6-2, i.e., employees and managers within the agency, typically outside the Management Operations Team, but within the Examination Operation Division in structured settings. Other contacts are with various levels within the agency such as regions, district offices, or other divisions at the same location. The appellant also has occasional contact with vendor technicians installing or repairing hardware or software. Contacts of this nature and at this level do not meet the intent of Level 6-3 as described in the Primary Standard.

We assign Level 6-2 (25 points)

Factor 7, Purpose of personal contacts

In General Schedule 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.

At Level 7-2, the highest level described in the standard, the purpose of personal 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; or to plan user participation, methodology, and deadlines for new projects.

The appellant's contacts, comparable to Level 7-2, are for the purpose of coordinating work, resolving hardware and software problems, providing technical advice and assistance to users, training new and existing users on new or upgraded systems hardware and software, and advising managers on issues related to automated systems, equipment and software acquisition. The appellant's contacts do not require motivating, interrogating or controlling parties who are fearful, skeptical or uncooperative as needed to meet Level 7-3 of the Primary Standard.

We credit Level 7-2 (50 points)

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 and physical exertion involved in the work.

At Level 8-2, the work requires extended periods of standing, walking, stretching, bending, stooping or carrying of loads of paper, tapes, or cards that may weigh as much as 45 pounds.

At Level 8-3, the work requires regular and recurring lifting and carrying of objects of heavy weight (over 50 pounds) and occasional lifting and carrying of heavier materials.

The appellant's position regularly involves moving computer workstations within the EO division requiring the disconnection and reinstallation of computer equipment and occasionally repositioning other equipment such as printers and fax machines. These duties require stooping, bending, crouching and/or kneeling as well as carrying heavier loads several times each month. This is comparable to Level 8-2.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 8-3 which involves routinely lifting and carrying objects weighing over 50 pounds.

We credit Level 8-2 (20 points)

Factor 9, Work environment

This factor considers the risks and discomforts in the employee's physical surroundings or the nature of the work assigned and the safety and occupational health regulations required.

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 normal clothing to compensate for minor discomfort.

At Level 9-2, some work 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 to bodily injury.

Level 9-2 is not met. The appellant is not routinely exposed to moderate risks requiring other than normal safety precautions. The appellant's work is generally performed in a typical office setting or in a computer room and is comparable to Level 9-1 of the standard.

We assign Level 9-1 (5 points)

Summary

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

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Points</i>
1. Knowledge required by the position	1-6	950 points
2. Supervisory controls	2-3	275 points
3. Guidelines	3-3	275 points
4. Complexity	4-3	150 points
5. Scope and effect	5-3	150 points
6. Personal contacts and	6-2	25 points
7. Purpose of contacts	7-2	50 points
8. Physical demands	8-2	20 points
9. Work environment	9-1	5 points
<i>Total</i>		1900 points

A total of 1900 points is credited. Using the grade conversion table in the GS-335 standard, 1900 points fall in the GS-09 range (1855-2100).

Decision

The position is properly classified as Computer Assistant, GS-335-09.