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Factor: N/A
Issue: Proper standard to apply for evaluation of preventive maintenance inspection work

Identification of the Classification Issue

This issue arose in an Office of Personnel Management region's consideration of a job grading appeal. The appellant requested that his job be upgraded, citing the job grading standard for Inspectors as the basis for his request. The appellant was responsible for preventive maintenance inspections of equipment that did not require a knowledge of specific trade practices. The appellant followed a preventive maintenance inspection schedule that stated the maintenance to be done. He was responsible for checking for and recognizing defects by means of visual examinations and operational tests. Repairs that required an application of electrical, air conditioning, plumbing, or pipefitting skills were referred to the appropriate trade shop; the appellant was himself responsible for making routine repairs and doing routine maintenance such as drilling holes; replacing wheels, casters, brackets, and blades; cleaning and lubricating parts; and tightening nuts and bolts.

Resolution

The Job Grading Standard for Inspectors is "used to grade nonsupervisory jobs that involve examining services, materials, and products that are processed, manufactured, or repaired by workers performing trade or craft work to determine that the physical and operating characteristics are within acceptable standards, specifications, or contractual requirements." Excluded from coverage of the standard are "nondestructive testing. . .and other examining work that does not require a comprehensive [i.e., journeyman or "full performance level"] knowledge of the trade or craft work process involved in making or repairing the items." Accordingly, the purpose of the work graded by use of the Inspector standard is to determine whether other trade and craft workers have made items, repaired items, or have performed services that meet
established standards and specifications. The summary of the appellant's job, however, indicated that he did not examine items to determine that trade or craft workers had made the items to meet acceptable standards or specifications, and his work did not require a comprehensive or full performance level of knowledge of any trade or craft work process. When the appellant identified a repair that he could not make, he described the defect in a work order that was sent to the appropriate trade shop but did not identify the standard not met nor the work and materials needed to correct the defect.

As there was no specific series that covered the appellant's job, a standard had to be found that could be applied to determine the grade.

In such a situation, the grade must be determined by comparison with standards for the most nearly related occupations. It was found that the Mobile Equipment Servicer, WG-5806, job grading standard was most nearly related to the appellant's job. Although automotive and mobile equipment explicitly covered by that job grading standard are different from the hospital and general building equipment that the appellant serviced, the maintenance and repair work were quite similar. In both cases, the work involved checking fluid levels, lubricating moving parts, performing minor repairs, and referring major work to other workers. While the equipment was dissimilar, the servicing and repair tasks were similar, and the grade of the job was determined by use of an ostensibly unrelated standard.