

**U.S. Office of Personnel Management
Classification Appeal Decision
Under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code**

Appellants: [Appellant]

Agency classification: Information Technology Specialist
GS-2210-12

Organization: [Name]
[Organization/Location]
[Organization]
Bureau of Prisons
Department of Justice
[Location]

OPM decision: Information Technology Specialist
GS-2210-12

OPM decision number: C-2210-12-02

Judith A Davis for

Robert D. Hendler
Classification and Pay Claims
Program Manager
Merit System Audit and Compliance

2/16/2011

Date

As provided in section 511.612 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this decision constitutes a classification certificate which 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 5 CFR 511.605, 511.613, and 511.614, as cited in the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards (Introduction)*, appendix 4, section G (address provided in appendix 4, section H).

Decision sent to:

[Name]
[Address]
[Location]

[Name]
Human Resources Director
Bureau of Prisons
320 1st Street, NW
Room 716
Washington, DC 20534

Director, Human Resources
U. S. Department of Justice
JMD Human Resources, Suite 9W300
145 N. Street, NE
Washington, DC 20530

Introduction

On October 13, 2010, Philadelphia Oversight of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a classification appeal from [Appellant]. The appellant's position is currently classified as an Information Technology Specialist, GS-2210-12, and is located in the [Name], [Organization], [Location], [Location], Bureau of Prisons (BOP), Department of Justice (DOJ) in [Location]. The appellant believes his position warrants a higher-grade level. We received the complete agency administrative report on November 17, 2010, and have accepted and decided this appeal under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.).

To help decide this appeal, we conducted telephone interviews with the appellant on December 21, 2010 and his supervisor on December 29, 2010, respectively. In reaching our classification decision, we have carefully considered all of the information obtained from the interviews, as well as all information of record provided by the appellant and his agency.

General issues

The appellant raises concerns about the agency's classification review process (e.g., revising his PD and receiving no response to his request for a desk audit). He also alludes to classification inconsistency based on the grade of another position. The appellant states he performs the few duties which appear in a DOJ standardized GS-2210-13 PD which are not in his PD, such as functioning as the Information Security Officer (ISO) overseeing electronic and printed information security needs; implementing Office of Information Systems (OIS) technical bulletins and meeting their deadlines; coordinating National Crime Information Center (NCIC) training and control for local staff; and serving as the ISO for the correctional complex

By law, we must make our decision solely by comparing the appellant's current duties and responsibilities to OPM standards and guidelines (5 U.S.C. 5106, 5107, and 5112). Since comparison to OPM standards and guidelines is the exclusive method for classifying positions, we cannot compare the appellant's current duties to other positions which may or may not be classified properly as a basis for deciding his appeal. Therefore, the claimant's rationale based on reference to this other position will not be addressed further.¹ In adjudicating this appeal, our responsibility is to make our own independent decision on the proper classification of his position. Because our decision sets aside all previous agency decisions, the agency's classification review process is not germane to this decision.

The appellant does not agree PD#[number], dated September 27, 2001, accurately describes the duties and responsibilities of his position. The appellant states the PD does not include the level of information technology (IT) service provided to inmates and their lawyers regarding their ability to review case discovery material nor IT services provided to the [Name/Organization/Location] which moved to [Organization/Location] in 2004. His current supervisor certified the accuracy of the PD.

¹ We also note there are material differences between several of the factor-level descriptions in the appellant's PD of record and the GS-13 PD the appellant cites in his appeal rationale.

A PD is the official record of the major duties and responsibilities assigned to a position or job by an official with the authority to assign work. A position is the duties and responsibilities which make up the work performed by the employee. Classification appeal regulations permit OPM to investigate or audit a position and decide an appeal based on the actual duties and responsibilities currently assigned by management and performed by the employee. An OPM appeal decision classifies a real operating position and not simply the PD. This decision is based on the work currently assigned to and performed by the appellant.

A PD must contain descriptive information about the major duties and responsibilities assigned to the position which, when supplemented by other information about the organization's structure, mission, and procedures, can be classified by one's knowledge of the occupational field involved and the application of pertinent position classification standards (PCSs), principles, and practices. It is not meant to be a task list of every function performed. After careful review, we find the appellants PD meets the standards of PD accuracy for classification purposes as discussed in section III.E of the *Introduction* and we incorporate it by reference into our decision.

The appellant alludes to the amount of work he performs by having to provide IT servicing to the [Location/Organization/Name] as well as managing the video conferencing units. However, volume of work cannot be considered in determining the grade of a position (*The Classifier's Handbook, Chapter 5*).

Position information

The mission of the Federal BOP is to protect society by confining offenders in the controlled environments of prisons and community-based facilities that are safe, humane, cost-efficient, and appropriately secure, and that provide work and other self-improvement opportunities to assist offenders in becoming law-abiding citizens. The [Organization/Location] opened in the early 1990s and was built to hold one thousand male and female inmates. It holds prisoners awaiting arraignments or trials in Federal courts. The center mainly serves the Federal courts of the [Location].

The appellant is responsible for directing the activities of the [Name] at [Organization/Location]. He provides IT services to the East Building, which contains three file servers, and the West Building; an off-site staff housing complex located five miles from the [Organization/Location]; an off-site power house with a remote monitoring system for a boiler/generator/cooling system; and the [Location/Name] located within the East Building.

The appellant oversees the implementation of new system hardware and software and develops operating procedures. He oversees the configuration and installation of network equipment and changes the components of existing equipment for efficient operation; develops and maintains procedures for networks, systems operations, product assembly, and installation; leads network operating system and/or application software projects and ensures current releases of software products are in use; conducts testing to ensure operability, efficiency, and compliance with existing standards; oversees functional tests of hardware/software to resolve technical problems;

and resolves problems, including taking corrective action to recover and restore operational service.

The appellant analyzes equipment and software reliability and utilization reports for equipment and software systems to identify and correct problem areas and to establish computer and telecommunications performance levels. He surveys and evaluates network usage, user complaints, traffic interruptions, hardware/software capabilities, and other relevant factors; identifies adverse trends, ineffective practices or procedures, equipment shortcomings, etc; recommends methods and procedures and coordinates corrective action to optimize utilization of present equipment; and develops proposals involving specialized systems and state-of-the-art enhancements designed to meet unique local requirements and improve operational efficiency.

The appellant serves as a security project officer. He plans, develops, and implements local security techniques, procedures, and guidance to ensure user access control and other security requirements are in place; works with security officers, users, and computer operators to ensure security regulations are followed and that installation, and agency security standards are met; serves as team leader or participant in agency risk analysis, security tests, and evaluations; and develops training for user support personnel and functional users on security policies and procedures.

The appellant performs feasibility studies in order to develop or modify information systems to meet user network and/or telecommunication requirements. He examines and evaluates alternative means of satisfying user requirements and suggests technically feasible approaches and makes recommendations regarding the most effective and efficient automation approaches.

The appellant performs in-depth analysis of automated and manual systems related to networks and/or telecommunications to accomplish design assignments. He specifies inputs and outputs, appropriate data structure, module interface plans, and detailed layout of files and test plans; familiarizes himself with the design of database physical structures considering factors such as access methods, frequency of access, storage media, data volatility, and search strategies to be employed; and performs research to determine common and unique requirements, establishes standardized terms and data elements for uniform identification by all users, and selects and develops a system design to service users.

The appellant prepares testing and implementation plans. He establishes test criteria and data for network interoperability to ensure all program modules and outputs for assigned projects are tested for completeness and accuracy; coordinates interface with programmers and functional area specialists and advises them on problem resolution; oversees the evaluation of test results and ensures corrective actions are taken; and develops and executes procedures to periodically monitor the logical/physical integrity of data.

The appellant performs staff assignments related to program planning, monitoring, and coordination of the systems analysis and programming functions related to networks and/or telecommunications. He provides advice to decision makers in setting program goals and establishing priorities to support the organizational mission; develops organizational policy and procedures to implement guidance from BOP and DOJ; monitors, evaluates, and coordinates

assigned functions and briefs management on program status; directs the preparation of or prepares a variety of program reports; assists higher level management officials in the evaluation of fiscal requirements for validity and sufficiency; reviews the acquisition of materials from central funds for approval/disapproval; evaluates the impact of new technologies on current systems and policies; and assesses the performance and effectiveness of new or substantially modified systems.

The appellant performs supervisory work which requires accomplishment of work through the combined technical and administrative direction of subordinate employees. The PD shows supervisory work to encompass at least 25 percent of the appellant's time. However, our fact finding revealed this work occupies 10 percent of his time. Since only duties occupying at least 25 percent of an employee's time can affect the grade of a position (*Introduction to the Position Classification Standards*, section III.J), we will not evaluate the appellant's supervisory duties in this decision.

Series, title and standard determination

The appellant does not question the series or title of his position or the use of the Job Family Standard (JFS) for Administrative Work in the Information Technology Group, 2200 to evaluate his position and, based on a review of the record, we concur. Based on the mandatory titling requirements of the 2200 JFS, the appellant's position is allocated as Information Technology Specialist, GS-2210.

Grade determination

The 2200 JFS uses the Factor Evaluation System (FES) under which factor levels and accompanying point values are assigned for each of the nine factors, with the total then being converted to a grade level by use of the grade-conversion table provided in the JFS. Under the FES, each factor-level description in a PCS 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 aspect, it must be credited at a lower level unless the deficiency is balanced by an equally important aspect that meets a higher level. Conversely, the position may exceed those criteria in some aspects and still not be credited at a higher level.

The appellant disagrees with his agency's assignment of Levels 2-4, 4-4, 7-B and 8-1, but agrees with the agency's crediting of Levels 1-7, 3-4, 5-4, 6-3 and 9-3. After careful review, we concur with the agency's assignment of the undisputed factors and have credited the position accordingly. Therefore, our evaluation will focus on Factors 2, 4, 7, and 8.

Factor 2, Supervisory Controls

This factor covers the nature and extent of direct or indirect controls exercised by the supervisor, the employee's responsibility, and the review of completed work.

In his rationale, the appellant states he meets Level 2-5 because his immediate supervisor is not involved to any great degree with his day-to-day work. The appellant states the majority of work

directives and projects are provided by BOP Central Office and DOJ for policy compliance and security requirements. The appellant further states he works under the general direction of an Associate Warden who provides administrative direction in terms of a broadly defined mission and objectives; he makes independent decisions and plans; and he is considered the technical authority and subject matter expert; and his work is accepted without change.

At Level 2-4, the supervisor establishes overall objectives and available resources for the work, and the employee and supervisor together develop the scope, timeframes, stages and possible approaches to accomplish the work. The employee determines the approach to take, degree of intensity, depth of research, and the most appropriate principles, practices, and methods to apply in each phase of the assignments. The employee also independently interprets and applies regulations; applies new methods to resolve complex, intricate, unique and/or controversial problems; resolves most conflicts that arise; and keeps the supervisor informed of progress and potentially sensitive and/or controversial issues. Completed work is reviewed from an overall standpoint for soundness of approach, feasibility, compatibility with other projects and effectiveness in meeting requirements and producing expected results. At this level the supervisor does not usually review the methods used by the employee to complete assignments.

At Level 2-5, the supervisor provides only policy and administrative direction in terms of broadly defined missions or functions of the agency. The employee is responsible for a significant agency-led IT program or function, interprets and applies policies established by senior authorities above his supervisor's level, independently plans and carries out the work to be done, and is a recognized technical authority regarding the work. At this level, the supervisor reviews the work for its potential impact on broad agency-level program goals and policy objectives, and the work is normally accepted without significant change or technical review.

The appellant's position meets Level 2-4. Similar to that level, the appellant determines the most appropriate principles, practices, and methods to apply in all phases of assignments. OIS releases Technical Bulletins throughout the year to all BOP [Name] Department Heads and the vast majority of them require mandatory action. Even though standard directions are provided, OIS relies on the appellant to either identify deficiencies or tailor the instructions to his local environment in regards to the system installs, configurations, or modifications listed in the Technical Bulletin. The appellant works independently and requests assistance if needed. The appellant further meets Level 2-4 by keeping his supervisor informed of progress on projects, and discusses with him policy requirements and potentially controversial matters to include pre-testing and setting up video conferencing equipment at a judge's request to hold a hearing with a high profile inmate when it is not possible to bring the inmate into the court room or when testing the software/external hard ware holding the discovery information an inmate needs to review for his/her case for compatibility with existing [Organization/Location] IT security requirements.

The record shows the appellant's position exceeds Level 2-4 in some respects. Similar to Level 2-5, the appellant's immediate supervisor provides administrative and policy direction. The supervisor considers the appellant to be an IT subject matter expert; and states the appellant interprets BOP and DOJ policies to see how they affect the [Organization/Location] and seeks assistance with policy interpretation if needed. The appellant's supervisor further states he rarely

reviews his work due to its level of highly technical IT duties. Even though the appellant's position meets these particular aspects of Level 2-5, his position is responsible for a local IT program, not a significant agency or equivalent level program which is required to support Level 2-5. Level 2-5 represents not only increased independence of action over Level 2-4, but also a corresponding increase in the level of responsibility assigned to the employee largely as a function of the nature of the assignment. Level 2-5 is predicated on a significant degree of program authority which provides the context for the degree of supervisory controls described, i.e., administrative direction defined in terms of broadly defined programs or functions. The appellant's local program functions within the confines of substantial policy and program controls exercised at the BOP level which limits both the programmatic and technical decisions that can be made at the BOP activity level. This is distinguished from the responsibilities described at Level 2-5, where the employee has the authority to determine the overall framework of the IT program or function assigned, subject only to broader, policy-oriented review.

Thus, the various supervisory controls described by the appellant as meeting the requirements of Level 2-5, such as being considered an IT subject matter expert and having an immediate supervisor provide only administrative and policy direction, are inadequate since the appellant is in charge of a local IT program, which does not meet the Level 2-5 requirement of directing an agency-level IT program with agency-level responsibilities. Neither the absence of immediate supervision in day-to-day operations, nor the fact that technical recommendations are normally accepted, serves to support a level above 2-4. Since Level 2-5 is not fully met, Level 2-4 must be assigned.

This factor is evaluated at Level 2-4 and 450 points are assigned.

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.

In his rationale, the appellant states his work meets Level 4-5 because he performs all the tasks and responsibilities listed in the GS-2210-13 PD the BOP developed for [Name] Managers located at Federal prison complexes. The appellant further states analyzing the complexities of [Organization/Location] shows it is not much different from a prison complex in which the physical plant has been compressed into a "smaller footprint" due to the institutions vertical nature of high-rise buildings. The appellant bases this on [Organization/Location] having two separate buildings with independent control centers; a prison camp located within the [Organization] with over 380 designated cadre inmates; staff housing comprised of four apartment buildings with a Local Area Network (LAN); an off-site power house with a network for remote monitoring; and support and servicing for a [Name] Management office. The 2200 JFS does not classify positions based on the number of buildings or the customers/computer terminals serviced. Therefore, we will not address this part of the appellant's rationale further.

At Level 4-4, work consists of a variety of duties that involve many different and unrelated processes and methods pertinent to the IT field. Employees decide what needs to be done by

evaluating unusual circumstances, considering different approaches, and dealing with incomplete and conflicting data. At this level, employees use judgment and originality by interpreting data, planning the work, and refining the methods and techniques being used. An illustration provided at this level describes a work situation where the employee coordinate systems design, implementation and support of new and modified systems in response to client requirements. The employee defines client requirements based on analysis of business needs and practices, assists in planning and coordinating systems design, acquisition, testing, installation, and support, and serves as the client's primary liaison relating to systems operations and support. The employee evaluates and determines optimal systems development approaches; integrates a variety of systems development activities; solves a wide range of operational and support problems and issues; and ensures changes in client requirements are addressed.

At Level 4-5, work consists of various duties requiring the applications of many different and unrelated processes and methods to a broad range of IT activities or to the in-depth analysis of IT issues/problems. Employees make decisions that involve major uncertainties regarding the most effective approach or methodology to be applied and work assignments typically result from continuing changes in customer business requirements or rapidly evolving technology in the specialty areas. At this level, employees develop new standards, methods, and techniques; evaluate the impact of technological change; and/or develop solutions to highly complex technical issues. The work frequently involves integrating the activities of multiple specialty areas.

An illustration is provided at this level describes a work situation where an employee plans and coordinates projects that involve multiple stages in the systems development life cycle management process, e.g., systems analysis, software development, database administration, and customer support. The employee defines overall project requirements; plans and coordinates systems design, development, and implementation; oversees support of installed systems and services; and resolves a wide range of technical and management issues. The employee exercises judgment, originality, and resourcefulness in ensuring that systems and services are developed and delivered in accordance with customer requirements and current technology.

Like Level 4-4, the appellant's work consists of a variety of duties involving many different and unrelated processes and methods. He evaluates unusual circumstances, considers different approaches and deals with incomplete/conflicting data. The appellant completes the action(s) required in Technical Bulletins released by OIS with the majority of them requiring mandatory action. Even though standard directions are provided, the appellant must either identify deficiencies or tailor the instructions to his local environment in regards to the system installs, configurations, or modifications required in the Technical Bulletin, to include GroupWise 8.0.2 server agent upgrades (which also upgrades BlackBerry Enterprise Servers), and conversion to Open Fox Messenger for NCIC access (which provides NCIC users with a user-friendly graphical interface). The appellant reviews and conducts tests of draft bulletins for OIS prior to BOP-wide distribution by testing the software and the provided instructions for clarity and ease of use. For example, he tested BigFix software and reported no issues detected with the software but recommended to make changes to the instructions provided by OIS. The appellant also reviewed and tested the procedures for Novell's Universal Password and recommended OIS modify the pathway. [Organization/Location] served as one of the first institutions to convert

from a Novell Network operating system to Linux OES 2 earlier last year. The appellant tested the procedures and processes developed by Central Office for clarity and ease of use. He worked with Central Office personnel and provided them feedback daily on how the migration installation was progressing forward. At least monthly, the appellant's IT systems are scanned by Central Office and DOJ utilizing industry standard intrusion tools. A report is generated and forwarded to the appellant for action. He is given thirty days to provide corrective action or at least report a corrective action plan. The corrective action may be to apply security patches or may involve modifying systems configuration. The appellant's position further meets Level 4-4 since it requires data interpretation, work planning and refinement of the methods and techniques being used. For example, he works with court judges, lawyers and inmates so that the inmate can review case discovery information in preparation for trial. The appellant tests the compatibility of the software or external hard drives holding the discovery information to ensure the IT security of [Organization/Location] is upheld and not compromised. He also provides instruction to the inmate to ensure he/she properly accesses the discovery material.

Unlike Level 4-5, the appellant does not define overall project requirements, plan and coordinate system design, development, and implementation; oversee support of installed systems and services; or resolve a wide range of technical and management issues. These actions are performed by OIS personnel who also make decisions on the most effective approach or methodology to be applied for meeting BOP IT requirements. Unlike Level 4-5, the appellant receives Technical Bulletins from OIS for which a set of standard directions have already been developed. Typical of Level 4-4, the appellant often must adapt these directions to his local environment but the initial analysis was already completed by OIS personnel. This is also the case when the appellant conducts tests of draft bulletins for OIS prior to BOP-wide distribution. The appellant is testing software and corresponding instructions that had been developed by OIS personnel. Once the testing is completed, the appellant makes recommendations for improvements to OIS. Other BOP [Name] Managers are also asked to conduct these tests and provide recommendations. It is up to OIS personnel to analyze the recommendations received and determine which, if any to incorporate into the bulletin prior to BOP-wide distribution. These examples also show the appellant does not meet the illustration provided above for Level 4-5.

This factor is evaluated at Level 4-4 and 225 points are assigned.

Factors 6 and 7, Personal contacts and Purpose of contacts

These factors measure the types of personal contacts that occur in the work and the purpose of these contacts. These factors include face-to-face contacts and telephone dialogue with persons not in the supervisory chain. Levels described under these factors are based on what is required to make the initial contact, the difficulty of communicating with those contacted, how well the employee and those contacted recognize their relative roles and authorities, the reason for the communication, and the context or environment in which the communication takes place.

These factors are interdependent. The same contacts selected for crediting Factor 6 must be used to evaluate Factor 7. The appropriate level for personal contacts and the corresponding level for purpose of contacts are determined by applying the point assignment chart for Factors 6 and 7.

Factor 7, Purpose of contacts

In his rationale, the appellant states he meets Level 7-C because the evaluation statement for this factor completely ignored what was stated in the PD as follows: "Contacts with inmates are primarily to attempt to change their undesirable attitudes and behavior patterns." He further states the purpose of daily contacts with inmates is to influence, motivate, and exercise control over them.

The record shows the appellant has contact with inmates daily when he provides relief to correctional officers during their lunch break, and during monthly recall relief so the correctional officers can attend all hands meetings, as well as serving as an emergency responder during an emergency at [Organization/Location] along with all other staff members. These are not the appellant's personal contacts for purposes of his 2210 work and cannot be used in determining the level which can be assigned for this factor

At Level 7-B, the purpose of the contacts is to plan, coordinate, or advise on work efforts, or to resolve issues or operating problems by influencing or persuading people who are working toward mutual goals and have basically cooperative attitudes. Contacts typically involve identifying options for resolving problems.

At Level 7-C, the purpose of the contacts is to influence and persuade employees and managers to accept and implement findings and recommendations. The employee may encounter resistance as a result of issues such as organizational conflict, competing objectives, or resource problems. He/she must be skillful in approaching contacts to obtain the desired effect; e.g., gaining compliance with established policies and regulations by persuasion or negotiation.

The appellant's position meets Level 7-B. His contacts are made to exchange technical information and resolve problems having to do with such issues as resolving trouble tickets submitted by [Organization/Location] employees for computers not booting up, loss of access to computer software or drives, or loss of access to programs through desk top icons etc.; implementing OIS issued Technical Bulletins; pre-testing draft bulletins prior to BOP-wide distribution; setting up video conferencing equipment; and assisting lawyers and inmates with viewing case discovery material. The appellant verified the inmates are polite and cooperative when he assists them with accessing their case discovery material, which meets the intent of Level 7-B. Through influence and persuasion, the appellant convinces staff, and managers to accept his IT recommendations and/or implement BOP and DOJ policies and guidelines. Thus, like Level B those contacted have basically cooperative attitudes and are working toward the same goals.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 7-C. Unlike that level, the purpose of the appellant's contacts is not to persuade others to accept his recommendations in situations where there are competing interests thus creating resistance resulting from issues such as organizational conflict or resource problems. As previously discussed, the appellant's work contacts do not require him to negotiate on a regular and recurring basis to gain compliance with policies and regulations. Thus, Level 7-B is properly assigned.

The combined factors are evaluated at Levels 3B and 110 points are assigned.

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, e.g., specific agility and dexterity requirements, and the physical exertion involved in the work, e.g., climbing, lifting, pushing, balancing, stooping, kneeling, crouching, crawling, or reaching. To some extent the frequency or intensity of physical exertion must also be considered, e.g., a job requiring prolonged standing involves more physical exertion than a job requiring intermittent standing.

In his rationale, the appellant states he meets Level 8-3 because he is required to respond to any emergency which occurs when he is at [Organization/Location] and failure to do so may result in disciplinary action being taken. The appellant further states he is required to perform as a first responder in a medical emergency, to include performing Cardio Pulmonary Resuscitation (CPR), use physical force to defend himself and other staff members, and be able to handle fire arms such as a 9mm hand gun, 12-gauge shot gun, and a sub machine gun/M16 assault rifle. The appellant states it does not matter how infrequently the above mentioned skills are used and they are so important they are conditions of employment.

At Level 8-1, work is performed primarily while sitting, requiring occasional periods of standing, walking, bending, or carrying light objects. In contrast, work at Level 8-2 requires long periods of standing, walking, or bending or requires recurring lifting of materials of moderate weight (under 50 pounds). At Level 8-3, work requires frequent climbing of tall ladders, lifting heavy objects over 50 pounds, crouching or crawling in restricted areas, and defending oneself or others against physical attack.

The appellant's position meets Level 8-1 in that is IT duties require exertion typical of an office setting. The appellant works out of the [Name] main offices located in the East Building and is located near other offices such as Legal Services, Medical Services, and Correctional Services along with Unit Management. The appellant performs his duties within the East Building offices but often has to physically go to other locations within [Organization/Location] to respond to IT issues, to include setting up video teleconferencing equipment, or conducting a physical examination of a workstation when computer software failures occur. The physical characteristics and exertion requirements are minimal for this position and meet the intent of Level 8-1.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 8-2 or 8-3. The record shows this position does not involve physical exertion on a regular and recurring basis such as long periods of standing or walking, or frequent climbing of tall ladders, lifting heavy objects, or crouching or crawling in restricted areas, and defending oneself or others against physical attack. In his rationale, the appellant states being required to respond to emergencies, performing as a first responder in a medical emergency and being able to use physical force in self-defense or in defense of others meets Level 8-3. The appellant's examples of physical demands placed on the employee by the work assignment do not match the requirements of either Level 8-2 or 8-3 as listed above. The

dangers he describes have been fully and properly considered under Factor 9. Thus, Level 8-1 must be assigned.

This factor is evaluated at Level 8-1 and 5 points are assigned.

Summary

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Points</i>
1. Knowledge Required by the Position	1-7	1250
2. Supervisory Controls	2-4	450
3. Guidelines	3-4	450
4. Complexity	4-4	225
5. Scope and Effect	5-4	225
6 & 7 Personal Contacts and Purpose of Contacts	6-3 7-B	110
8. Physical Demands	8-1	5
9. Work Environment	9-3	<u>50</u>
<i>Total Points</i>		2765

The total points assigned to the appellants' position equals 2765. According to the 2200 JFS grade-conversion table, positions with total point values between 2755 and 3150 are properly graded at the GS-12 level.

Decision

The appellants' position is properly classified as Information Technology Specialist, GS-2210-12.