

U.S. Office of Personnel Management
Division for Human Capital Leadership & Merit System Accountability
Classification Appeals Program

Atlanta Field Services Group
75 Spring Street SW., Suite 1018
Atlanta, GA 30303

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

Appellant: {name}

Agency classification: Electronics Mechanic Supervisor
WS-2604-11

Organization: Electronic Support Detachment
Electronic System Support Unit
Integrated Support Command{name}
Maintenance and Logistics Command
Atlantic
U.S. Coast Guard
Department of Homeland Security
[location]

OPM decision: Electronics Mechanic Supervisor
WS-2604-11

OPM decision number: C-2604-11-06

/s/ Robert D. Hendler

Robert D. Hendler
Classification and Pay Claims
Program Manager

March 28, 2006

Date

As provided in section S7-8 of the *Operating Manual: Federal Wage System* (FWS), 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's name and address}

Mr. Michael Stephanson
Human Resources Specialist
Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Coast Guard
2100 Second Street SW., Room 6215
Washington, DC 20593

Director, Human Capital Policy
and Program Innovations
Chief Human Capital Officer
1201 New York Ave. N.W., Attn: 13th floor
Washington, D.C. 20536

Introduction

The Atlanta Field Group of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a classification appeal on June 8, 2005 from [name] who is employed as an Electronic Mechanic Supervisor, WS-2604-11. His job is located in the Electronic Support Detachment (ESD) [location], Electronic System Support Unit (ESU), Integrated Support Command [name], Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic, U.S. Coast Guard (CG), Department of Homeland Security, [location]. The appellant believes his job should be graded as a WS-2604-12 or higher. He filed a job grading appeal with his agency and, on April 22, 2005, the agency sustained the current grading of the job. We received the complete appeal administrative report on November 3, 2005. This appeal was accepted and decided under section 5346 of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.).

General Information

The appellant states in his appeal letter that he disagrees with his agency's application of the Job Grading Standard (JGS) for Federal Wage System (FWS) Supervisors primarily due to the classifier's lack of detail and/or understanding of his duties. In adjudicating this appeal, our only concern 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. 5106, 5107, and 5112). 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 classification review process are not germane to this decision.

The appellant disagrees with the agency's evaluation of Factor I, Nature of Supervisory Responsibility, and believes he meets most, if not all, of the bulleted duties under each supervisory situation and deserves credit for doing so, even when it is not a regular and recurring part of his job. He indicates that there are many other duties and responsibilities assigned to his position that are not represented by the work situations found in the JGS, but should lend weight against any weakening elements within any of the Situation levels. In addition, the appellant disputes Factor III, Scope of Work Operations Supervised, Subfactors A and C.

In reaching our job grading decision, we have carefully considered all other information of record furnished by the appellant and the agency, including information obtained from telephone interviews with the appellant's supervisor. In addition, we conducted an on-site audit with the appellant on February 15, 2006, to gather additional information to assist us in our decision.

The appellant is assigned to job description (JD) number [number]. Both the appellant and his supervisor have certified the accuracy of the job description. We find that the JD of record contains the major duties and responsibilities assigned to and performed by the appellant and we incorporate it by reference into this decision. The JD and other material of record furnish much more information about the appellant's duties and responsibilities and how they are performed.

Job Information

The appellant supervises the ESD in [location], which is one of six support detachments operated by the ESU, [name], an independent CG command reporting to the Chief, Command and Control and Communications Division, Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic, located in Norfolk, Virginia. The CG's primary mission is coastline and port security, drug interdiction, and search and rescue.

In direct support of this mission, the appellant supervises the modification, maintenance, overhaul, troubleshooting, and installation of all communication systems, computers, and electronics used aboard CG cutters and shore commands facilities with the ESD [name]'s area of responsibility (AOR) consisting of over 300 miles of [state name] coastline extending from the [state name]state border to [city,state]. The primary function of the ESD Mayport is to respond "around the clock" to assistance calls, referred to as causality reports (CASREP), from CG customers with communication, computer, and/or electronic equipment and systems failure or malfunction problems. Items serviced include complex electronic equipment, radio transmitters and receivers, single side band and frequency shift keying radios, facsimile machines, radar navigation equipment, electronic countermeasures and Identification-Friend or Foe (IFF), sonar navigation equipment including scanning, underwater telephone, and depth finding; various navigation equipment including Long Range (LORAN) and Global Positioning Systems (GPS), navigation beacons, electronic cryptographic devices, and electromechanical servo systems; pneumatic, hydraulic, and mechanical and electric motor systems for antenna controls and other audio, power and test equipment, and various Very High Frequency (VHF) and UltraHF receivers. The appellant oversees the set up and operation of complex computerized automated test equipment to troubleshoot, repair, and calibrate the above referenced components and systems. Other equipment serviced by the ESD includes workstation servers, desk and laptop computers, telephone and public address (PA) systems, and local and wide area network hardware.

The appellant's detachment works with 6 separate CG commands to plan and coordinate work on 6 CG cutters (ranging from 75- to 210-foot), 2 coastal buoy tenders (175-foot), 2 coast patrol boats (87-foot), and approximately 27 smaller crafts including motor life, utility, and rigid-hull inflatable boats ranging in size from 17- to 47-feet. Land sites include eight national distress HF/VHF communication sites, a LORAN station, and two Differential Global Positioning System (DGPS) sites.

Although providing rapid response to equipment and system failures and malfunctions is the ESD's highest priority, the appellant's oversight responsibilities also include equipment repair, preventative maintenance, inventory control, and installation and relocation project work. Equipment repair is handled onsite by the electronics and information systems technicians. However, when the severity of the repair or the availability of staff dictates, the appellant will authorize the use of commercial repair facility. A regular and recurring part of the appellant's job is managing electronic engineering changes on CG vessels. Once higher command issues a change notice, the appellant is responsible for planning and coordinating the work among the various group operations, engineering units, and stations.

Preventative maintenance (PM) is a significant function of the ESD. The appellant directs the planning and scheduling of PM duties for all electronics equipment and systems in his AOR. This routine maintenance is planned and scheduled on a weekly, monthly, quarterly, semi-annually, and annual basis determined by manufacture's recommendation or requirement, local or higher directive, and/or by the direction of the appellant. The record shows that in an average year, the ESD Mayport provided over 2400 staff-hours to the PM program. In additionally, the ESD Mayport is responsible for maintaining and tracking inventory records for all installed and reserve electronics, computer hardware, and telecommunications equipment and property within the AOR. The appellant oversees the input and maintenance of inventory records in the Electronics Installation Record (EIR) System.

In addition to this work, the appellant is responsible for planning, directing, and administering electronics and communication installation and relocation projects assigned to him from ESU Miami or other commands. Projects usually involve new or existing shore side facilities or stations and include installation of telephone systems, radio equipment, PA systems, computer local and wide area networks, and desktop computer stations. This includes installing wiring and cabling for data and communication ports and outlets and switching stations and networking servers. Initial planning for such projects can take from weeks to months depending on the size and complexity of the assignment. The appellant is responsible for reviewing, and providing input to, blueprints, wiring diagrams, and installation and support plans. He makes suggestions on alternate methods of installation or construction to better accommodate the placement of communication and/or telecommunication systems or components. As projects are approved and issued to the ESD Mayport, the appellant and his crew works with project managers and procurement staff to secure the needed materials and components needed to complete the assignment.

To accomplish this work, the appellant supervises one civilian 2604 Electronic Mechanic job, 13 military positions, and oversees a number of military reservists. In addition to the primary Mayport location, the appellant is responsible for the Electronic Support Detachment Detail (ESDD) located at [city,state]. The military positions with civilian equivalency determined by the agency include:

<u>Military Title and Pay Grade</u>	<u>Civilian Equivalent Series and Grade</u>
<i>ESD Mayport</i>	
1 Electronics Technician Lead (E-7)	WL-2604-11
3 Electronics Technicians (E-5)	WG-2604-11
1 Electronic Technician (E-4)	WG-2604-10
1 Information Systems Technician (E-6)	GS-2210-9
1 Information Systems Technician (E-5)	GS-2210-7
1 Information Systems Technician (E-4)	GS-2210-5
<i>ESDD Cape Canaveral</i>	
1 Electronic Technician Supervisor (E-6)	WL-2604-11
1 Electronics Technicians (E-6)	WG-2604-11
1 Electronic Technician (E-4)	WG-2604-8

Pay System, Occupational Code, Title, and Standard Determination

The primary duty for the appellant's job is direction of workers in trades and craft occupations. The chief requirement of his job is knowledge and experience in that work. Consequently, his job is exempt from the General Schedule (GS) and falls under the FWS. The agency placed the appellant's job in the 2604 occupation in the 2600 Electronic Equipment Installation and Maintenance Family because the maintenance and repair of electronics equipment best reflects the overall nature of the work operations supervised in that the appellant supervises a civilian Electronics Mechanic and eight military Electronics Technicians. The job requires a broad practical knowledge of electronic, telecommunication principles, and their application to a wide variety of complex circuitry, systems, and equipment.

The JGS for Supervisors grades jobs involving the exercise of technical and administrative supervision of subordinate workers in accomplishing trades and labor work as a regular and recurring part of the job, and on a substantially full-time and continuing basis. The application of this JGS is required since the appellant's job meets supervisory coverage criteria. The occupational code for a FWS supervisory job is normally the same as the code for the kind of work supervised, and identified by the job title of the selected occupation followed by the title of Supervisor. Therefore, the appellant's job is properly allocated as Electronic Mechanic Supervisor, WS-2604.

Grade determination

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

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, the job must fully meet the situation. This means that a job must meet all of the bullets under the specific situation. 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 FWS

JG System, Part I, Section II.C.3, indicates that to affect the grade of the job, duties must be regular and recurring. Higher-level situations include the responsibilities described at the preceding levels.

The agency credited Situation #2. 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.

Much of the work that the appellant supervises is planned, directed, and administered in a manner consistent with Situation #1, i.e., the electronic and communication equipment and systems maintenance and repair work. This work flows from reported equipment and system failure and established maintenance practices and schedules generated primarily on a day-to-day and week-to-week manner reflective of the customary flow of work typical of Situation #1. However, the appellant's position minimally meets Situation #2 due the regular and recurring planning, directing, and administering electronic and communication projects that meets the work planning, coordination, and execution demand typical of Situation #2. As in Situation #2, the appellant participates in the initial planning of future work, providing input from his organization's point of view regarding resource and operational needs. For example, when providing input on new facilities such as the Coast Guard's [name] Station, the appellant made recommendations for optimum placement of electronic data ports and communication cables, prepared list of material requirements, and determined the number of workers needed to install the telephone system and computer Local and Wide Area Networks. The appellant established the work group's deadlines and work sequences based on established construction schedules. The appellant coordinates with other supervisors when planning day-to-day and project operations, e.g., scheduling equipment installation and maintenance around casualty reports.

Typical of situation #2, the appellant coordinates the work of the ESD between the [name] and [name] offices and the various work locations, i.e., cutters, boats, or shore locations to ensure installation and repair of computer and electronic equipment in a cost effective and timely manner. Work problems are resolved and corrected including finding solutions to staffing problems, engineering requirements; and work operations directed by other supervisors. For example, electronic engineering alterations or changes on boats or ships require significant coordination between the appellant's work unit, command and group operations, engineering, and stations. The appellant will recommend solutions to accommodate boat availability, i.e., rescheduling of work performed in order to ensure completion of work. Consistent with Situation #2, the appellant will determine the number and types of workers needed to accomplish projects. The appellant determines the number and types of workers needed to accomplish projects. This includes matching employees' skills with the particular equipment or systems installed or repaired. When the volume of troubleshooting and casualty reports increase, the appellant will redirect workers and resources to deal with the unexpected workload. Typical of Situation #2, the appellant prepares a bi-weekly report to ESU [name] detailing workload and status of on-going and upcoming projects including information on the need to revise original work estimates or schedules.

Comparable to Situation #2, the appellant has the full range of administrative and supervisory duties for the one civilian employee, and limited authority for the enlisted personnel that includes setting technical performance standards, assigning performance ratings; recommending disciplinary actions; promotion; counseling subordinates regarding performance and conduct; identifying training needs; and approving leave. The appellant believes the presence of military personnel complicates his supervisory and administrative duties, e.g., constant turnover precipitates additional training duties, permanent change of station issues, and the burden of dealing with “off duty” conduct issues such as alcohol abuse, and should warrant additional consideration. However, supervision of military personnel does not involve the full scope of duties associated with supervision of civilian personnel. For example, the appellant is not involved in recruiting, interviewing, or selecting replacements of military personnel. The CG Recruitment and Assignment Center located in Alexandria, Virginia performs these functions. The appellant’s administrative duties, including the demands of managing military personnel, are consistent with that found in Situation #2.

In contrast, supervisors in Situation #3 are responsible for supervising operations of such scope, volume, and complexity that they are carried out by subordinate supervisors in two or more separate organizational segments or groups, controlled through two or more levels of supervision. In addition to the functions performed in Situation #2, supervisors in Situation #3 perform the following:

Planning

- Plan on a quarterly or longer basis the overall use of subordinate personnel and other resources under their control;
- Determine resource requirements, materials, and the number of subordinates and the types of skill necessary to accomplish long-range work schedules;
- Allocate resources and distribute work to organizational segments or groups under their control;
- Analyze work plans developed by subordinate supervisors and monitor the status of their work in relation to the overall schedule requirements, including unanticipated or emergency requirements;
- Obtain prior approval of changes that would modify or deviate overall work schedules or affect work operations controlled by supervisors not under their control; and
- Provide information and advice to higher-level supervisors, management officials, and staff organizations on the feasibility of work assignments as scheduled, budget estimates, and workload data to assist in developing or reviewing proposed long-range schedules and work requirements, and may participate with superiors in planning conferences and meetings.

Work Direction

- Assign and explain work requirements and operating instructions to subordinate supervisors and set deadlines and establish the sequence of work operations to be followed;
- Maintain balanced workloads by shifting assignments, workers, and other resources under their control to achieve the most effective work operations;
- Review and analyze work accomplishments, cost, and utilization of subordinates to evaluate work progress, control costs, and anticipate and avoid possible problems by recommending corrective action to superiors;
- Participate with management officials and/or engineering personnel to develop qualitative and/or quantitative work standards;
- Evaluate work operations and review completed work and inspection reports to assure that standards are met; and
- Coordinate work operations with supervisors of other organizations and functions.

Administration

- Assure that subordinate supervisors effectively carry out policies to achieve management objectives;
- Recommend promotion or reassignment of subordinate supervisors, make formal appraisals of their performance, and determine their training needs;
- Schedule leave of subordinate supervisors, review personnel actions and performance appraisals initiated by them, and act on personnel problems referred by subordinate supervisors, and maintain administrative records; and
- Serve as a management representative at hearings, meetings, and negotiations involving labor relations issues.

Situation #3 is not met. The appellant does not oversee work operations that require using subordinate supervisors over two or more separate organizational segments or groups controlled by one or more levels of supervision. This terminology anticipates that work leaders and/or other senior staff because of scope of work operations overseen will assist such segments and groups directed by one level of supervision. Unlike Situation #3, the record shows the appellant is the primary supervisor over the ESD with a military senior petty officer E-7 functioning as a work leader for the [name] office and a military supervisor, equivalent to a work leader, at the ESDD. The relatively small size of workload, as attested to by the small size of the staff, and the nature of electronic system operations that require a mixture of daily, monthly, quarterly, annual and/or other periodic preventive maintenance and repair work does not reflect the more demanding work planning and control complexities contemplated in Situation #3. The fact that

all but one subordinate are military personnel precludes crediting all of administrative bullets described in Situation #3. Furthermore, the use of two work leaders to control work cannot be construed as equivalent to managing work through multiple supervisory jobs as required in Situation #3.

Because Situation #3 is not met, Situation #4 may not be considered or credited, and Situation #2 is credited.

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 nonsupervisory work to be credited under this factor, all substantive work, whether under the direction 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. The agency credited this factor as grade 11.

The record shows that the highest level of nonsupervisory work supervised by the appellant meeting the requirements of Factor II is grade 11. Therefore, this factor is credited as grade 11.

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 the 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.

The appellant's job meets but does not exceed Level A-2. The appellant has supervisory and decision authority over the ESD Mayport and a designated geographic area, i.e., AOR. The appellant functions within policies established at higher levels, e.g., ESU [name], and makes routine decisions regarding execution of that policy. Typical of Level A-2, the appellant uses his subordinate leaders to help direct day-to-day operations and he balances work when necessary, e.g., dispatching additional personnel to the [name] unit to cover casualty reports while special project work is completed.

Supervisors at Level A-3 have second level or higher supervisory and decision authority for work functions or a portion of a mission requirement, e.g., a specific program in a designated geographic location or a specific function. The scope of the mission or work functions at this level typically requires supervisors to utilize several subordinate supervisors and leaders through structured working relationships among subordinate groups of employees, formal procedures for scheduling and assigning work and work results, and the issuance of instructions through subordinate supervisors and leaders. At this level, supervisors make interpretive decisions within the program limits established at higher levels.

Level A-3 is not met. The appellant does not have the second level or higher supervisory and decision authority typical of this level, nor does the scope of work require the use of *several* subordinate supervisors *and* leaders.

This subfactor is evaluated at Level A-2 and credited with 45 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, for example, 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-4.

At Level B-3, supervisors at this level 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. Conversely, at Level B-5, supervisors direct the work of subordinates in accomplishing assigned functions that are performed in similar or related occupations at grades 14-15.

Level B-3 is met because the appellant directs the work of one or more similar or related occupations; i.e., WG 2604 Electronics Mechanic and WG-2502 Telecommunications Mechanic, in that both occupations require the application of related electrical and electronic knowledge and skill. The JGS states that the JGS is not used to grade the work of supervising other workers when such supervisory work does not have as the “paramount requirement” for its performance experience in and a knowledge of trades crafts or labor work. Four of the positions, determined by the agency as equivalent to GS-2210-11 Information Technology (IT) Specialist, perform both IT work approximately 80 percent of the time and FWS Telecommunications Mechanic work consistent with the 2502 occupation for 20 percent of the time. The appellant’s supervision over the GS work performed by these military positions is excluded from consideration under the JGS for Supervisors. Therefore, the IT work is not included in the workload calculations and is not subordinate work for purposes of applying the JGS to the appellant’s job. However, the appellant fully supervises the 2502 work performed by these positions and that portion of their work is taken into consideration in the following discussion.

This subfactor is evaluated at Level B-3 and credited with 50 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 disperse. 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 Level C-1.

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.

Level C-1 is met. The appellant supervises 13 employees in two different geographic locations. The [name] ESD consists of nine employees co-located with the appellant, while a small detail of four employees are located at Cape Canaveral. The total AOR for ESD [name] extends from [city, state] south to [city, state], a distance of approximately 300 miles. Within that area, ESDD Cape Canaveral’s AOR extends approximately 73 miles north from [name] to Station [name] near [name]. The work performed is primarily PM or repair on the communications equipment

at station facilities, aboard cutters or boats docked at the port location, or at one of several remote unmanned communications sites. Employees usually complete the required repair or service on the day of the visit to the site or within a few days or weeks. Very rarely are employees required to stay over night to complete the project or assignment.

At Level C-2, subordinate employees are located in work groups of varying sizes at numerous job sites within large military bases, e.g., air rework facilities, supply depots, shipyards, and comparable Federal facilities. Employees or work groups at the level may on occasion work outside of the commuting area or across State lines. Work assignments at this level are typically on an ongoing basis, accomplished within several weeks or months. For example, this would include employees who regularly repair, overhaul, and maintain ships in dry dock or aircraft at depots.

The appellant's job does not meet Level C-2. Even though the employees directed by the appellant repair and install equipment at various work sites within the AOR, casualty calls that are not ongoing and are of limited duration drive the assignments. In contrast to assignment length of time typical of Level C-2, the primary work must be performed and completed within a limited timeframe to ensure the equipment is operational and ready for use. While response calls are usually within the employee's respective commuting area, those outside the commuting area are within a reasonable driving distance that typically do not require overnight travel. Because the full intent of Level C-2 is not met, this subfactor is evaluated at Level C-1 and credited with 5 points.

This factor is credited with subfactor A-2 for 45 points, subfactor B-3 for 50 points, and subfactor C-1 for 5 points. A total of 100 points falls within the range of 70 to 110 points, which equates to Level B.

Tentative Grade Assignment

According to the Grading Table for Supervisory Situation #2, Level B coupled with a grade 11 level of work supervised equates to the grade 11 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.

The appellant's work situation does not exceed the level credited under Factor I and the base level of work under Factor II is the highest level of nonsupervisory FWS work for which he is technically responsible. Therefore, a grade adjustment based on borderline conditions is not appropriate.

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 11 supervisory level is indicated.

Decision

The appellant's job is properly graded as Electronics Mechanic Supervisor, WS-2604-11.