



**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
SERVICE**

Classification Appeal Decision

This Page Has Been Accessed (since November 16, 1998)

DOD Decision:	Tools and Parts Attendant, WG-6904-05
Initial classification:	Tools and Parts Attendant, WG-6904-05
Organization:	Navy Aviation Depot Production Engineering Department Operations Support Maintenance Branch
Date:	November 27, 1995

INFORMATION CONSIDERED

1. Information submitted by appellants through their servicing personnel office.
2. The official position description number and the evaluation statement that reflects the classifier's application of published position classification standards.
3. The appellants' performance standards.
4. The position description for the appellants' supervisor.
5. Organizational charts and functional statement pertaining to the appealed position.
6. Telephone interviews with the appellants and supervisor.

BACKGROUND AND POSITION INFORMATION

The appellants contend that their position should be classified at the WG-6 level because other employees were classified at that level. However, the WG-6 level position was eliminated in the base closure process. We would also add that position to position comparison is not a basis for appeal. Further, no assumption can be made that the former WG-6 level position operated

in the same manner as the appealed position or that it was correctly classified.

The appealed position is located in the Central Tool and Tool Control Section, Operations Support Maintenance Branch, Engineering Division, Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP). The purpose of the position has changed since it was established. Initially it was established to receive, inventory, issue, maintain and store tools and protective equipment utilized in a variety of production shops in support of the NADEP mission. However, since NADEP, is, the position is now primarily concerned with collecting tools and equipment from various shops when notified that the shop is closing, removing serial numbers, annotating the inventory data base, preparing items for shipment, and ensuring tools are serviceable prior to shipment. The appellants use a forklift, warehouse type tractors, and the like in the performance of their work. Because of the on-going nature of the assignments employees work with relatively little supervision.

The appellants and the supervisor certified that the position description is accurate.

TITLE AND SERIES DETERMINATION

The appellants do not contest the series or title of their position which is correctly included in the Tools and Parts Attendant Series, WG-6904. The currently designated title of Tools and Parts Attendant is correct.

GRADE LEVEL DETERMINATION

The OPM standard for the Tools and Parts Attendant Series, WG-6904, dated April 1971, contains four factors: Skill and Knowledge, Responsibility, Physical Effort, and Working Conditions. These factors are evaluated below.

Skill and Knowledge

This factor considers the breadth and depth skill in using trade methods, techniques and tools to accomplish the work.

The appealed position is comparable to criteria at the WG-5 level which describe skill and knowledge necessary to obtain items from stock in a manner similar to WG-4 level attendants (e.g., checking the name and/or number of items against information shown on receiving reports). Additionally, at the WG-5 level, attendants verify shortage, overage, and damaged conditions of incoming stock by opening, counting, and visually checking the contents of containers. WG-5 level attendants are skilled in searching likely locations for missing items and know the procedures for reporting such discrepancies.

The appealed position is comparable to the WG-5 level criteria in that the incumbents of the position, while still issuing tools to shops which remain open, are primarily concerned with collecting tools and equipment, removing serial numbers, annotating the inventory data base, preparing items for shipment, and ensuring tools are serviceable prior to shipment. The

position description also indicates that incumbents assist supervisors in completing lost tool reports.

The incumbents' position does not meet criteria at the WG-6 level which describes greater skill and knowledge in setting up and shifting storage locations, identifying and insuring that project-assigned items are separated from regular items.

Responsibility

This factor evaluates the effect of various degrees of control over the work. It includes consideration of the amount and kind of supervision received and extent to which guidelines are appropriate to and govern the conduct of the work.

At the WG-5 level, the standard indicates that the supervisor assigns work through oral and written instructions. The work is then carried out independently using accepted practices. In-process work is not usually reviewed at this level but unusual problems are brought to the attention of the supervisor.

These criteria are comparable to the appellants' position. The position description indicates that the appellants receive oral and written instructions on overall assignments. It also indicates that the appellants work either alone or with others in carrying out assignments within the framework of oral and written instructions and accepted trade practices and that the supervisor is available on unusual problems. Because of the on-going nature of the assignments employees work with relatively little supervision. The appellants' supervisor's position description indicates that work is spot-checked to ensure conformance with instructions and that the supervisor initiates action to obtain tools and/or recommend suitable substitutes.

The appealed position does not match criteria at the WG-6 level which describe more independent judgment and decision-making on the part of the worker as well as greater leeway in methods and procedures for accomplishing assignments of greater complexity. E.g., workers at this level are responsible for independently setting up and maintaining storage locations, identifying substitutes for tools and parts, and the like, requiring more difficult decision making and judgment.

Physical Effort

This factor evaluates the way in which positions vary as to the nature, degree, frequency, and duration of muscular effort or physical strain experienced in work performance.

The physical effort required is the same at the different grade levels in this standard; the grade level of the position would only be affected if the position significantly differed from the description. Work typical of these grades involves standing, stooping, bending, reaching; and frequent handling of objects weighing 10 to 40 pounds. The heavier items are moved by weight handling equipment or assistance from other workers. The physical effort required of the appellants is comparable to that described in the standard, and therefore this factor does not impact on the grade-level determination.

Working Conditions

This factor evaluates the hazards, physical hardships, and working conditions to which workers are exposed in performing assigned work.

Again, conditions are the same for each grade level, and this factor would only affect the grade level if a position was significantly different than the standard description. Work typical of these grades is performed inside in areas that are well lighted, heated, and ventilated. The attendant may occasionally work inside in areas that are drafty and may be noisy and dirty. The attendant is frequently exposed to the possibility of cuts, scrapes, and bruises. The appellants' working conditions are comparable to this description, and therefore, this factor does not affect the grade level determination.

DECISION

The appealed position is correctly classified as Tools and Parts Attendant, WG-5.