

**CLASSIFICATION APPEAL DECISION**

issued by:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Washington, D.C. 20240

**APPELLANT:**

[REDACTED]

**POSITION:**

Maintenance Mechanic Supervisor (MVO), WS-4749-15

**ORGANIZATION:**

Department of the Interior  
National Park Service  
National Capital Region

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**DECISION:**

Maintenance Mechanic Supervisor, WS-4749-15  
(Appeal denied)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Carolyn Cohen  
Director of Personnel Policy  
Office of Personnel

10/20/18  
\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

\_\_\_\_\_  
Copy of Decision Transmitted to:

[REDACTED]

Human Resources Manager  
National Park Service

Personnel Officer  
National Capital Region

## INTRODUCTION

On April 4, 1998, [REDACTED] filed a job grading appeal with the Director of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior. [REDACTED] is employed as a Maintenance Mechanic Supervisor (MVO), WS-4749-15, in the National Park Service, National Capital Region, [REDACTED]. He serves as the Chief, Branch of Facility Maintenance. [REDACTED] has appealed for an upgrade of his job to the WS-16 level.

This is the final administrative decision within the Department of the Interior. The appellant may appeal the grading of his position to the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). Information about submitting an appeal to OPM is included in the decision letter to the appellant.

## SOURCES OF INFORMATION

In deciding this appeal, we considered information from the following sources:

1. The appellant's memorandum of appeal and attachments, including the current position description, evaluation statement, and the Branch organization chart.
2. The material submitted by the Administrative Officer, [REDACTED] including the organization/staffing chart for the Maintenance Division, SF-50 (Notification of Personnel Action), strategic plan for the park, the appellant's performance plan, and the position description and evaluation statement for the position held by the appellant's supervisor.
3. Onsite audit of the appellant's position and interview with his supervisor, [REDACTED] Facility Manager and Chief of Maintenance for the park, on September 23, 1998. At the time of the audit, [REDACTED] furnished additional material about his duties and responsibilities.

## POSITION INFORMATION

The Branch of Facility Maintenance is responsible for all of the park's buildings and utilities, roads, trails, and bridges, the automotive and mower shop, and the sign crew operations. Within the [REDACTED] the appellant's Branch is referred to as the Support Division. However, the official title of the organization supervised by the appellant, Branch of Facility Maintenance, is used in this evaluation.

As Chief of the Branch, the appellant supervises and manages the operations of the Branch, provides technical assistance to the Chief of Maintenance, plans and establishes long-range work requirements and schedules, and serves as the highest level blue collar subject matter expert for the work performed under his direction, including four shops or crews.

1. The Buildings and Utilities Crew is supervised by a Maintenance Mechanic Supervisor (MVO), WS-4749-12, who supervises the following:
  - Maintenance Mechanic, WG-4749-10

- Wood Crafter, WG-4605-10
- Three Carpenters, WG-4607-9
- Painter, WG-4102-9
- Two Maintenance Workers, WG-4749-6
- Maintenance Mechanic Supervisor (MVO), WS-4749-10, who supervises

- Maintenance Mechanic (MVO), WG-4749-11
- Maintenance Mechanic, WG-4749-10
- Pipefitter, WG-4204-10
- Electrician, WG-2805-10
- Maintenance Mechanic, WG-4749-9
- Maintenance Worker, WG-4749-8
- Laborer, WG-3502-3

2. The Roads and Trails Crew (also referred to as the Roads and Bridges Crew) is supervised by a Roads Maintenance Supervisor (MVO), WS-5716-11, who supervises the following:

- Motor Vehicle Operator, WG-5703-8
- Four Motor Vehicle Operators, WG-5703-7
- Two Maintenance Workers, WG-4749-7
- Engineering Equipment Operator Supervisor (MVO), WS-5716-10, who supervises

- Three Engineering Equipment Operators, WG-5716-10
- Road Sweeper Operator, WG-5706-7
- Laborer, WG-3502-3

3. The Automotive/Mower Shop is supervised by an Automotive Worker Supervisor (MVO), WS-5823-10, who supervises the following:

- Automotive Mechanic, WG-5823-10
- Mobile Equipment Metal Mechanic, WG-3809-10
- Welder, WG-3703-10
- Two Automotive Workers, WG-5823-9
- Two Agriculture Equipment Mechanics, WG-5801-9
- Automotive Worker, WG-5823-8

4. The Sign Crew is supervised by a Maintenance Worker Supervisor (MVO), WS-4749-6, who supervises the following:

- Three Maintenance Workers, WG-4749-7
- Motor Vehicle Operator, WG-5703-6

## CODE AND TITLE DETERMINATION

According to the Job Grading Standard for Supervisors, the occupational code of a supervisory job is normally the same as the code for the kind of work that is supervised. When work of more than one occupation is supervised, the occupational code for the supervisory job is the same as the code of the occupation which best reflects the overall nature of the work operations supervised and/or is the most important for recruitment, selection, placement, and other purposes. Usually, but not always, this is the occupational code appropriate for the highest level of nonsupervisory work supervised.

The appellant supervises more than one occupation. The current occupational code for his job, WG-4749, is appropriate because it best reflects the multiple trades and crafts occupations he supervises and it represents, along with other occupations, the highest level work supervised. According to the Job Grading Standard for Maintenance Mechanic, WG-4749, Maintenance Mechanic is the appropriate title for jobs at WG-9 and above. The JGS for Supervisors specifies that supervisory jobs are identified by the job title of the occupation followed by the title, Supervisor. Therefore, the appellant's job is correctly titled Maintenance Mechanic Supervisor. The addition of the parenthetical title motor vehicle operator (MVO) is not necessary, but may be used at the discretion of management.

## GRADE DETERMINATION

The grade of the job is determined by application of the Job Grading Standard for Supervisors (JGS), which is used to grade the jobs of supervisors who, as a regular and recurring part of their job, and on a substantially full-time and continuing basis, exercise technical and administrative supervision over subordinate workers in accomplishing trades and labor work. The standard uses three factors for grading supervisory jobs: I. Nature of Supervisory Responsibility, II. Level of Work Supervised, and III. Scope of Work Operations Supervised. After the appropriate levels are determined for these factors, the grade of the position is determined by use of the appropriate grading table in the standard and then adjusting that grade, if warranted, to reflect weakening and strengthening situations.

The appellant agrees with the factor levels assigned to his position by his servicing personnel office with one exception: the level credited under Factor III, Subfactor A: Scope of Assigned Work Function and Organizational Authority.

### Factor I, 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 which depict successively higher levels of supervisory responsibility and authority for scheduling work operations, planning use of resources to accomplish scheduled or unscheduled work, directing subordinates in performing work assignments, and carrying out administrative

duties. The JGS describes four Situations, or levels, for this factor. The servicing personnel office has evaluated the appellant's job at Situation 4.

In Situation 4, supervisors differ from supervisors in Situation 3 in the nature of their participation with other management officials in (1) the planning and establishment of long-range work requirements and schedules, (2) the authority deriving from their responsibilities as the highest level "blue-collar" subject matter expert for work accomplished under their direction, and (3) the work activities and functions under their direction are typically controlled through two or more levels of supervision. The JGS describes typical planning and administration responsibilities in Situation 4. Work direction responsibilities in Situation 4 are the same as those in Situation 3.

The appellant is responsible for planning and establishing long-range work requirements and schedules for four shops/crews comprising approximately 45 employees (about 39 of the positions are currently filled). The nature of his planning responsibilities is discussed further below. The appellant is the highest level blue collar supervisor/manager for the functions under his supervision. He reports to the Chief of Maintenance, whose position is in the General Schedule. In addition, the appellant directs approximately one-third of the nonsupervisory employees under his supervision through two levels of subordinate supervisors, and directs the remaining employees through one level of subordinate supervisors. Thus, the appellant's position meets the basic criteria for crediting Situation 4. More detailed criteria for crediting Situation 4 are discussed below.

### **Planning**

Supervisors in Situation 4 exercise a variety of long-range and resource allocation planning responsibilities for the functions under their supervision. These include the following:

- Provide direct input or participate in meetings and/or conferences with engineering, production control, and other personnel involving the initial analysis of long-range work requirements (typically, six months or longer in advance of the beginning of work operations);
- Review the immediate and long-range requirements of the organizational segments and groups supervised based on workload forecasts, and develop, for approval by their superiors, plans for meeting long-range resource requirements;
- Plan the allocation of resources and the distribution of work to subordinate supervisors, and determine the internal plan to be followed by the subordinate supervisors in applying those resources to accomplish work operations;
- Evaluate resources required to accomplish the proposed work "packages" or program(s) in relation to the resources committed to ongoing and previously scheduled work operations and recommend changes to superiors concerning previously planned work schedules; and

-- Participate fully with higher-level management officials and staff organizations in studying and developing recommendations concerning changes in specifications requirements, work techniques, and standards; revision of organizational structures, responsibilities, and work relationships; and improvement or modernization of equipment, facility layout, and workflow.

The appellant participates in the parkwide planning sessions for park program and development, as well as in the planning and programming of the maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and new construction of facilities, grounds, and roadways. He develops plans for the Branch a year in advance and also participates with higher-level management in preparation of the five-year plan. More specifically, he develops the annual plan for the Branch consistent with the multi-year program, management objectives, and vision statements. The plan allocates resources, distributes work to subordinate supervisors, and determines the internal plan to be followed by supervisors in utilizing those resources to accomplish work operations. He provides information and advice to higher-level management on changes in production techniques and standards, specification requirements, organizational structure and responsibilities, ability to accomplish work as planned and scheduled, and improvement of equipment, facility layout, and workflow. He also plans for rearrangement of work sites and facilities for more functional and better operational uses. These responsibilities for planning and resource allocation are consistent with the planning criteria described in the JGS for Situation 4.

### **Work Direction**

The work direction in Situation 4 is the same as that described in Situation 3. At this level, responsibilities for work direction are as follows:

-- 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 for 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 the supervisors of other organizations and functions.

The appellant assigns work requirements and instructions to his subordinate supervisors and sets deadlines. He reassigns personnel, balances workload capacity, and coordinates work to maintain work progress to meet schedules and deadlines. This responsibility also includes coordination of work and sharing of employees with other supervisors and managers, including the grounds supervisor. The appellant also evaluates production, costs, and work progress and takes appropriate corrective action to achieve the most efficient work operations. He inspects completed work for quality and quantity and keeps his immediate supervisor informed on any potential or actual work delays. He evaluates design, construction, and alteration projects from the standpoint of future maintenance simplicity. He participates with the park's engineers to develop both quantitative and qualitative work standards for each project, e.g., what is to be accomplished, what the time schedules are, what the inspection points are, and how it will be evaluated. These responsibilities for work direction meet Situation 3 and, therefore, Situation 4.

### **Administration**

The JGS lists criteria concerning responsibility for internal procedures and long-range training for Situation 4. They are as follows:

- Develop and establish internal procedures (e.g., meetings, content, and timing of reports) to be followed by subordinate supervisors to assure effective control and direction of work activities, organizations, and personnel supervised; and
- Identify long-range training needs for all levels of subordinate supervisors and workers and submit justification and funding requests to superiors and arrange for the accomplishment of the training.

The appellant maintains an effective line of communication with his immediate superior and subordinate supervisors and workers by establishing and analyzing a variety of procedures that assure effective control and direction of work activities, organizations, and personnel supervised. This includes, for example, daily staff briefings, daily work plans from subordinate supervisors, biweekly work schedules, weekly reports, biweekly management meetings, and individual shop/crew meetings. The appellant also identifies immediate and long-range training needs for all levels of subordinate supervisors and employees, submits justification and funding requests to superiors, and arranges for the accomplishment of training for all employees. Thus, the appellant's administration responsibilities are consistent with Situation 4.

In summary, the appellant meets the basic requirements for crediting Situation 4 and is assigned planning, work direction, and administration duties and responsibilities that are consistent with this level. Therefore, Situation 4 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. The level of work supervised is determined through a two-step process: (1) identify the occupation(s) directly involved in accomplishing the work assignments and projects which reflect the main purpose or mission of the work operations for which the supervisor is accountable, and (2) determine the grade of the highest level of nonsupervisory work accomplished by subordinates who, under normal job controls, perform the work of one or more of the occupations identified in step (1). All substantive work for which the supervisor is technically accountable is considered, whether it is under the supervisor's direct or indirect supervision.

As detailed above, there are four shops or crews reporting to the appellant through other supervisors. On the Buildings and Utilities Crew, there are five positions at the WG-10 level which reflect the main purpose of the work operations of the unit: two maintenance mechanics, a pipefitter, an electrician, and a wood crafter. The unit also has one maintenance mechanic (MVO), WG-11. Because the JGS cautions that a single job will seldom, if ever, serve as the basis for a base level grade determination, the WG-11 job is not considered for this factor, and WG-10 is credited as the level supervised for the Buildings and Utilities Crew.

The Roads and Trails Crew has three engineering equipment operators at the WG-10 level, and no jobs at a higher level. The work assigned to the WG-10 jobs reflects the main purpose of the unit, and it is therefore credited as the level supervised for the Roads and Trails Crew.

The Automotive/Mower Shop has two jobs at the WG-10 level that reflect the main purpose of the unit: an automotive mechanic and a mobile equipment metal mechanic. The welder, WG-10, performs support work and is therefore not considered under this factor. There are no jobs at a level above WG-10 in this unit. Therefore, WG-10 is credited as the level supervised for the Automotive/Mower Shop.

The highest level jobs on the Sign Crew are three maintenance workers, WG-7. Therefore, WG-7 is credited as the level supervised on the Sign Crew.

In summary, for three of the shops or crews which report to the appellant, WG-10 is credited as the level of work supervised. There is only one WG-11 job under the appellant, and it is not creditable for base level grade determination. Therefore, Factor II, Level of Work Supervised, is evaluated at the WG-10 level.

(Note: This evaluation does not include a review of the appropriateness of the grades of the jobs under the appellant's supervision.)

### 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

subordinate employees. The factor is divided into three subfactors, which are in turn subdivided into levels, with points assigned to each level. A total point value for the factor is determined by totaling the points assigned to the three subfactors.

*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 decisions. The servicing personnel office has credited Level A-3, and the appellant contends that Level A-4 should be credited.

At Level A-3, supervisors 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.

The appellant is responsible, as a second-level supervisor for some functions and as a third-level supervisor for other functions, for facility maintenance for the park. He utilizes six subordinate supervisors through structured working relationships, formal procedures for scheduling and assigning work, and issuing instructions. In addition, he makes decisions within program limits established by the Chief of Maintenance, Deputy Superintendent, and Superintendent. Work function and authority of this scope match Level A-3.

At Level A-4, supervisors have supervisory authority for major work functions or missions. The scope and diversity of work at this level require supervisors to utilize a large group of subordinate supervisors and leaders typically through two or more levels of supervision to control and manage work functions or missions. Supervisors at this level exercise planning and programming decision authority for the execution of policy made at higher organizational levels. At this level, supervisors must continually evaluate and improve operational effectiveness by studying the work structure and methods, examining various alternatives, calculating benefits to be achieved, and recommending basic changes.

The scope of the appellant's work and authority does not meet this level. Although the JGS does not define "major work functions or missions," the appellant's responsibility for the park's facility maintenance is consistent with responsibility for work functions or a portion of a mission requirement, as described at Level A-3. His responsibility for the park's facility maintenance includes a group of functions that are a portion of the overall maintenance function. In addition, the number of subordinate supervisors who report to him (six) is consistent with the Level A-3 criterion of "several subordinate supervisors and leaders," and is not consistent with the

requirement for supervision of “a large group of subordinate supervisors and leaders,” at Level A-4. He does supervise approximately one-third of the nonsupervisory workforce through two levels of supervision, and this responsibility is consistent with Level A-4, which calls for “typically” two levels of subordinate supervisors. However, while the appellant evaluates and improves the operational effectiveness of the facility maintenance function, he is not called upon to execute policy or “continually” to evaluate and improve operational effectiveness by studying work structure and methods, calculating benefits to be achieved, or recommending basic changes as contemplated at Level A-4. The functional and organizational structure within which the appellant operates does not lend itself to making these types of demands on the appellant. The types of work under his supervision, such as automotive maintenance and repair, sign placement and repair, road and trail construction and repair, and building and utilities work do not normally involve policy decisions or the continual evaluation and restructuring of work methods and organization, as required at Level A-4. Thus, while the appellant’s job meets one of the criteria specified for Level A-4, it does not meet the other criteria or the overall intent for this level. Level A-3 is assigned, and 75 points are credited.

#### *Subfactor B. Variety of Function*

This subfactor evaluates the difficulties of technical supervision of work functions which may vary from being essentially similar to markedly dissimilar. Subfactor levels are based on the similarity or dissimilarity of subordinate jobs and the level of difficulty of those jobs.

The appellant supervises work of subordinates in dissimilar occupations, such as automotive mechanic, mobile equipment metal mechanic, maintenance mechanic, pipefitter, electrician, and engineering equipment operator. The full performance levels of the nonsupervisory subordinates typically are WG-9 and WG-10. Supervision of such positions matches Level B-4, at which supervisors direct the work of subordinates in dissimilar or unrelated occupations at grades 8 through 13. Level B-4 is assigned, and 60 points are credited.

#### *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 located together 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.

The appellant’s employees work out of a contiguous complex of nine buildings in the park and perform work at numerous work sites throughout the park. Work assignments vary in duration, but normally last no more than a few weeks.

This level of dispersion matches Level C-1, at which 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 multifloor buildings and support facilities. Work assignments vary in terms of duration; however, most assignments at this level are of a limited duration (e.g., a few days or weeks).

The dispersion of the workforce reporting to the appellant does meet Level C-2. At this level, subordinate employees are located in work groups of varying sizes at numerous job sites within large military bases or comparable facilities. Employees or work groups at this 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 and are accomplished within several weeks or months. For example, this level would include employees who regularly repair, overhaul, and maintain ships in dry dock or aircraft at depots. Although the appellant's employees work at a number of work sites, the work they perform does not meet this level in terms of the duration of projects, frequency of dispersion, or the necessity to monitor and coordinate the work. His employees are assigned to a limited number of buildings and are sent to the various work sites for projects of fairly short duration. Therefore, Level C-1 is assigned, and 5 points are credited.

The total number of points credited for Factor III is 140. This total converts to Level D (140-160 points) according to the point conversion chart in the standard.

#### Grade Determination

In summary, the appellant's job is evaluated as follows:

Factor I. Nature of Supervisory Responsibility	Situation 4
Factor II. Level of Work Supervised	WG-10
Factor III. Scope of Work Operations Supervised	Level D

Reference to the grading tables in the JGS shows that the initial grade of a supervisory job with this factor level combination is WS-15.

The JGS discusses a number of job aspects that may be considered for adjusting the initial grade up or down. The only one of these considerations that potentially applies to the appellant's job involves supervisory positions that have full technical responsibility for nonsupervisory work that is above the level credited in Factor II, Level of Work Supervised. There is one job above the base level of WG-10 under the appellant's supervision: a maintenance mechanic (MVO), WG-4749-11, in the Buildings and Utilities Crew. However, the appellant is the third-level supervisor over the WG-11 maintenance mechanic. Therefore, the presence of this job does not affect the grade of the appellant's job because the appellant's job difficulty is not significantly affected by the responsibility for technical supervision of the incumbent. The burden of technical supervision of the WG-11 position falls mainly on the first-level supervisor.

In addition, the WG-11 job would not be sufficient for addition of a grade to the appellant's job because the JGS calls for addition of a grade for technical supervision of work above the base

level to be warranted only if another significant strengthening condition is present. That is, the supervisory job being graded must also substantially exceed the supervisory situation which was credited in applying Factor I. The appellant's job is credited with the highest level under Factor I. Therefore, no grade adjustment is warranted, and the initial grade is the final grade, WS-15.

#### DECISION

For the reasons given above, the authorized classification of the appealed position is Maintenance Mechanic Supervisor, WS-4749-15.