

UNITED STATES OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT



**REPORT ON SENIOR EXECUTIVE  
PAY AND PERFORMANCE  
APPRAISAL SYSTEM FOR  
FISCAL YEAR 2009**

July 2010

*A New Day for the Civil Service*

**Report on Senior Executive Service  
Pay and Performance Appraisal System for  
Fiscal Year 2009**

**Table of Contents**

Summary of Tables, and Appendices	
Table 1	Career SES Performance Ratings FYs 2006 – 2009
Table 2	Ratings for Career, Non-Career and Limited-Term SES Members FYs 2006 – 2009
Table 3	Career SES Pay Distribution by Rating Level FY 2009
Table 4	Salaries for Career, Non-Career and Limited-Term SES Members for FYs 2008 – 2009
Table 5	Career SES Performance Awards for FYs 2006 – 2009
Table 6	Correlation of SES Ratings and Pay Based on Ratings for FY 2008 and FY 2009
Appendix I	Background
Appendix II	List of Certified Performance Appraisal Systems
Appendix III	Guide to Agency Acronyms and Titles Used in This Report

## Summary of Tables and Appendices

This report on Senior Executive Service (SES) pay and performance appraisal ratings for fiscal year 2009 indicates that Federal agencies are continuing to develop rigorous appraisal systems enabling rating officials and Performance Review Boards to make meaningful distinctions in performance and pay. All of the selected agencies in this report have appraisal systems certified by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), with concurrence from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). With certified appraisal systems, agencies have the authority to increase the base salary of their superior performing SES members above Executive Schedule level III, up to level II.

The following are notes and a summary of Fiscal Year 2009 executive ratings and pay:

- The Offices of the Inspector General (OIGs) governmentwide submitted rating and pay data for 181 OIG SES members. OIGs rated 93.9 percent of their members, with 63.5 percent of OIG SES members rated at the highest level (that is, Outstanding or equivalent). The average OIG SES performance award was \$15,335 and was awarded to 83 percent of the OIG SES members. The average pay adjustment for OIG SES members was \$4,757. Data for OIG SES members are excluded from Tables 1 through 6 of this report.
- Agencies submitted data for 7,436 SES members. Career members were 92 percent of the total SES population. Ninety-seven percent of career members received a performance rating.
- Table 1 is a summary of the number and percent of career SES members who received a performance rating at the highest available performance level. The increase in percentage of executives rated at the highest level from the previous year was less than six tenths of one percent.
- Table 2 includes all SES members whereas Table 1 displays performance rating data for career SES members only. The percent of all SES members rated at the highest level decreased by one tenth of one percent from 2008.
- Table 3 summarizes career SES member pay distribution by performance rating level. The data indicate that many career SES members covered by performance appraisal systems consisting of five levels (H Pattern) and who were rated Fully Successful and therefore eligible for a performance award, did not receive one in 2009. However, agencies with four-level performance appraisal systems (F Pattern) awarded their Fully Successful performers with performance awards.
- Table 4 shows the average salary and average salary adjustment for all SES members. In 2009, SES members received an average salary increase of 2.7 percent.

- Table 5 summarizes the percent of career executives who received performance awards and the average award amount given. Governmentwide, the average performance award decreased by one tenth of one percent from 2008, but the number of members receiving a performance award increased by two percent. In other words, overall, more executives received performance awards in 2009 but the award amounts were smaller.
- Table 6 lists the Pearson correlation coefficient metric by agency for 2008 and 2009. OPM uses the metric as an indicator of the strength of the relationship between an agency's executive performance compensation (that is, pay adjustments and performance awards) and its executive performance ratings. (The Table 6 notation provides a more in depth description of the metric and its meaning.) Table 6 shows that most agencies have a strong, positive correlation between executive ratings and performance compensation.

**TABLE 1**

**Career SES Performance  
FY 2006-FY 2009**

AGENCY	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		Percent Change FY 2008-FY 2009
	Career SES Rated	Percent at Highest Level	Career SES Rated	Percent at Highest Level	Career SES Rated	Percent at Highest Level	Career SES Rated	Percent at Highest Level	
AGRICULTURE	307	39.4%	307	40.4%	280	43.9%	304	48.4%	4.4%
AID	19	52.6%	19	57.9%	16	62.5%	21	85.7%	23.2%
COMMERCE	247	42.9%	249	53.4%	254	53.2%	273	55.7%	2.5%
DEFENSE	1,068	31.4%	1,084	31.0%	1,136	27.7%	1,168	28.5%	0.8%
EDUCATION	68	42.7%	64	53.1%	68	45.6%	65	58.5%	12.9%
ENERGY	360	34.2%	368	37.2%	383	40.5%	402	38.1%	-2.4%
EPA	266	34.2%	266	35.0%	253	41.9%	255	40.8%	-1.1%
GSA	69	23.2%	68	48.5%	76	43.4%	78	44.9%	1.5%
HHS	340	59.1%	355	63.7%	354	72.6%	357	68.9%	-3.7%
DHS	239	53.6%	300	52.3%	361	49.0%	413	51.8%	2.8%
HUD	72	43.1%	76	57.9%	72	56.9%	78	48.7%	-8.2%
INTERIOR	211	22.3%	213	22.5%	217	31.0%	221	35.8%	4.8%
JUSTICE	563	62.9%	601	66.9%	634	67.0%	657	68.7%	1.7%
LABOR	144	38.2%	144	38.2%	151	47.0%	150	49.3%	2.3%
NASA	382	55.5%	415	59.0%	430	59.5%	424	65.8%	6.3%
NSF	75	62.7%	77	66.2%	71	73.2%	76	81.6%	8.4%
NRC	149	9.4%	144	29.2%	143	31.5%	158	29.8%	-1.8%
OMB	53	7.5%	47	10.6%	55	10.9%	51	33.3%	22.4%
OPM	36	27.8%	43	23.3%	40	32.5%	43	30.2%	-2.3%
SBA	28	28.6%	31	41.9%	35	42.9%	38	44.7%	1.9%
SSA	141	64.5%	127	63.8%	126	69.0%	129	71.3%	2.3%
STATE	111	69.4%	113	69.0%	119	57.1%	121	60.3%	3.2%
TRANSPORTATION	175	30.3%	176	40.9%	179	40.8%	170	38.8%	-2.0%
TREASURY	371	44.7%	374	43.8%	386	49.2%	390	44.4%	-4.8%
VA	270	57.0%	277	58.1%	278	55.8%	277	40.1%	-15.7%
ALL OTHERS	366	49.3%	370	49.2%	371	58.0%	347	60.8%	2.8%
<b>GOVERNMENTWIDE</b>	<b>6,130</b>	<b>43.4%</b>	<b>6,308</b>	<b>47.0%</b>	<b>6,488</b>	<b>48.1%</b>	<b>6,666</b>	<b>48.7%</b>	<b>0.6%</b>

**TABLE 2**  
**Ratings for Career, Non-Career and Limited Term SES Members**  
**FY 2006-FY 2009**

AGENCY	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		Percent Change FY 2008-FY 2009
	SES Rated	Percent at Highest Level	SES Rated	Percent at Highest Level	SES Rated	Percent at Highest Level	SES Rated	Percent at Highest Level	
AGRICULTURE	350	44.9%	353	46.5%	323	51.4%	338	47.6%	-3.8%
AID	19	52.6%	19	57.9%	17	64.7%	21	85.7%	21.0%
COMMERCE	282	43.3%	290	54.1%	295	53.9%	295	57.9%	4.0%
DEFENSE	1,173	30.8%	1,199	32.1%	1,233	27.9%	1,225	29.3%	1.4%
EDUCATION	81	39.5%	76	51.3%	78	43.6%	70	60.0%	16.4%
ENERGY	398	34.7%	405	37.5%	414	41.7%	416	39.2%	-2.5%
EPA	289	37.7%	288	39.2%	276	45.7%	264	42.4%	-3.2%
GSA	86	22.1%	85	47.1%	93	44.1%	80	45.0%	0.9%
HHS	392	61.2%	405	66.1%	401	73.1%	401	72.3%	-0.8%
DHS	294	55.4%	368	55.4%	427	52.0%	463	52.7%	0.7%
HUD	90	53.3%	91	62.6%	87	62.1%	86	48.8%	-13.3%
INTERIOR	239	21.8%	244	21.7%	244	33.2%	242	40.9%	7.7%
JUSTICE	612	65.2%	647	69.1%	676	68.7%	704	70.5%	1.8%
LABOR	170	45.9%	168	43.4%	178	54.5%	152	50.0%	-4.5%
NASA	397	55.9%	427	59.0%	439	60.1%	431	65.9%	5.8%
NSF	83	61.5%	86	68.6%	79	73.4%	83	80.7%	7.3%
NRC	149	9.4%	144	29.2%	144	31.9%	158	29.8%	-2.2%
OMB	66	7.6%	57	8.7%	55	10.9%	51	33.3%	22.4%
OPM	42	31.0%	49	20.4%	45	33.3%	48	33.3%	0.0%
SBA	38	28.9%	42	45.2%	44	52.3%	47	48.9%	-3.4%
SSA	149	64.4%	134	63.4%	132	68.4%	135	71.1%	2.7%
STATE	147	70.7%	147	70.7%	152	56.6%	128	60.9%	4.3%
TRANSPORTATION	196	30.6%	205	43.9%	208	46.2%	178	41.6%	-4.6%
TREASURY	394	46.2%	400	44.5%	409	50.9%	411	44.8%	-6.1%
VA	278	57.9%	286	59.4%	286	56.3%	285	39.7%	-16.6%
ALL OTHERS	393	48.6%	401	50.4%	397	60.5%	375	61.6%	1.1%
<b>GOVERNMENTWIDE</b>	<b>6,807</b>	<b>44.7%</b>	<b>7,016</b>	<b>48.2%</b>	<b>7,132</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>7,087</b>	<b>49.9%</b>	<b>-0.1%</b>

**TABLE 3**  
**Career SES Pay Distribution by Rating Level**  
**FY 2009**

(Rating Patterns Pursuant to 5 CFR 430.208(d))

AGENCY	SES Rated	Percent Rated at Level	Average Salary Before Adjustment	Average Performance Award	Average Salary Adjustment	Average Performance Award as a Percent of Salary Before Adjustment	Average Salary Adjustment as a Percent of Salary Before Adjustment	Average Salary Adjustment + Average Performance Award as a Percent of Salary Before Adjustment	Average Performance Award as a Percent of Average Salary + Average Salary Adjustment + Average Performance Award
<b>H Pattern</b>									
<b>Rating Levels</b>	<b>6,263</b>								
Outstanding or Equivalent (5)	3,089	49.3%	\$166,613	\$15,209	\$5,013	9.1%	3.0%	12.0%	8.1%
Exceeds Expectations (4)	2,557	40.8%	\$161,236	\$9,609	\$4,715	6.0%	2.9%	9.0%	5.5%
Fully Successful (3)	601	9.6%	\$160,116	\$4,402	\$3,191	2.8%	2.0%	5.0%	2.6%
Minimally Successful (2)	15	0.2%	\$154,314	\$0	\$0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Unacceptable (1)	1	0.0%	\$153,443	\$0	\$0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>F Pattern</b>									
<b>Rating Levels</b>	<b>403</b>								
Outstanding or Equivalent (5)	154	38.2%	\$168,347	\$20,923	\$5,249	12.4%	3.1%	15.6%	10.8%
Fully Successful (3)	249	61.8%	\$162,454	\$9,194	\$4,949	5.7%	3.1%	8.7%	5.2%
Minimally Successful (2)	0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Unacceptable (1)	0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

TABLE 4

**Salaries for Career, Non-Career and Limited-Term SES Members  
FY 2008-FY 2009**

AGENCY	FY 2008				FY 2009			
	Average Rate of Basic Pay Before Salary Adjustment	Average Rate of Basic Pay After Salary Adjustment	Average Salary Adjustment	Average Salary Adjustment as Percent of Basic Pay Before Adjustment	Average Rate of Basic Pay Before Salary Adjustment	Average Rate of Basic Pay After Salary Adjustment	Average Salary Adjustment	Average Salary Adjustment as Percent of Basic Pay Before Adjustment
AGRICULTURE	\$160,723	\$167,024	\$6,301	3.9%	\$163,431	\$168,279	\$4,847	3.0%
AID	\$156,162	\$162,277	\$6,115	3.9%	\$161,877	\$167,763	\$5,886	3.6%
COMMERCE	\$155,353	\$160,139	\$4,786	3.1%	\$160,097	\$165,698	\$5,601	3.5%
DEFENSE	\$156,093	\$161,727	\$5,634	3.6%	\$161,973	\$166,223	\$4,239	2.6%
EDUCATION	\$160,182	\$167,747	\$7,565	4.7%	\$170,009	\$172,275	\$2,266	1.3%
ENERGY	\$158,789	\$164,688	\$5,898	3.7%	\$164,520	\$169,432	\$4,912	3.0%
EPA	\$162,825	\$169,044	\$6,220	3.8%	\$168,374	\$172,379	\$3,879	2.3%
GSA	\$155,138	\$159,639	\$4,501	2.9%	\$158,717	\$163,062	\$4,345	2.7%
HHS	\$160,145	\$166,217	\$6,072	3.8%	\$165,457	\$170,614	\$5,157	3.1%
DHS	\$155,209	\$161,704	\$6,495	4.2%	\$160,318	\$166,357	\$6,054	3.8%
HUD	\$160,360	\$167,620	\$7,260	4.5%	\$165,608	\$172,429	\$6,829	4.1%
INTERIOR	\$157,820	\$164,580	\$6,760	4.3%	\$161,925	\$165,727	\$3,922	2.4%
JUSTICE	\$159,368	\$165,580	\$6,212	3.9%	\$165,215	\$169,797	\$4,150	2.5%
LABOR	\$161,678	\$165,437	\$3,759	2.3%	\$166,941	\$168,944	\$2,004	1.2%
NASA	\$155,897	\$161,295	\$5,398	3.5%	\$160,697	\$164,633	\$3,936	2.4%
NSF	\$165,153	\$170,106	\$4,953	3.0%	\$169,970	\$173,167	\$3,202	1.9%
NRC	\$156,479	\$161,791	\$5,312	3.4%	\$161,215	\$166,213	\$4,998	3.1%
OMB	\$158,402	\$165,273	\$6,871	4.3%	\$164,631	\$169,710	\$5,079	3.1%
OPM	\$157,518	\$164,549	\$7,031	4.5%	\$163,443	\$167,326	\$3,883	2.4%
SBA	\$161,192	\$167,460	\$6,268	3.9%	\$166,060	\$169,897	\$3,837	2.3%
SSA	\$157,734	\$162,318	\$4,584	2.9%	\$161,819	\$165,600	\$3,781	2.3%
STATE	\$160,223	\$166,823	\$6,600	4.1%	\$167,767	\$172,401	\$4,464	2.7%
TRANSPORTATION	\$154,634	\$159,331	\$4,697	3.0%	\$158,345	\$162,470	\$4,387	2.8%
TREASURY	\$157,064	\$163,165	\$6,100	3.9%	\$162,417	\$168,051	\$5,633	3.5%
VA	\$158,011	\$163,608	\$5,597	3.5%	\$162,082	\$165,948	\$3,866	2.4%
ALL OTHERS	\$157,702	\$163,674	\$5,972	3.8%	\$165,308	\$168,885	\$3,665	2.2%
GOVERNMENTWIDE	\$157,937	\$163,764	\$5,827	3.7%	\$163,210	\$167,731	\$4,485	2.7%



**TABLE 5**  
**Career SES Performance Awards**  
**FY 2006 - FY 2009**

AGENCY	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		Change in Percent Receiving Awards FY 2008-FY 2009
	Average Award	Percent of SES Receiving Awards	Average Award	Percent of SES Receiving Awards	Average Award	Percent of SES Receiving Awards	Average Award	Percent of SES Receiving Awards	
AGRICULTURE	\$13,905	88.9%	\$13,745	87.3%	\$15,093	90.4%	\$11,967	95.1%	4.7%
AID	\$10,859	52.6%	\$11,300	23.8%	\$11,500	29.4%	\$11,750	47.6%	18.2%
COMMERCE	\$12,588	82.6%	\$12,267	84.5%	\$13,197	84.8%	\$11,603	87.8%	3.1%
DEFENSE	\$11,988	91.0%	\$13,939	88.4%	\$14,537	93.0%	\$16,686	93.3%	0.2%
EDUCATION	\$12,691	74.0%	\$15,846	80.6%	\$17,911	73.5%	\$17,955	83.1%	9.6%
ENERGY	\$9,417	64.7%	\$14,116	79.3%	\$15,617	89.3%	\$15,502	87.7%	-1.6%
EPA	\$10,795	67.7%	\$11,477	68.0%	\$11,992	73.5%	\$12,370	70.6%	-2.9%
GSA	\$12,806	97.1%	\$14,101	82.7%	\$13,850	93.7%	\$14,558	96.2%	2.5%
HHS	\$13,436	86.2%	\$13,629	88.6%	\$15,000	86.0%	\$14,831	93.6%	7.5%
DHS	\$14,937	70.3%	\$13,450	74.1%	\$14,873	79.5%	\$13,725	86.9%	7.4%
HUD	\$11,008	93.1%	\$13,036	93.7%	\$14,472	98.6%	\$11,621	97.4%	-1.2%
INTERIOR	\$12,628	55.9%	\$13,119	65.3%	\$12,792	73.1%	\$11,847	73.6%	0.5%
JUSTICE	\$15,172	56.1%	\$16,648	53.5%	\$15,610	58.5%	\$16,844	60.2%	1.7%
LABOR	\$13,959	91.7%	\$14,258	96.5%	\$14,829	92.1%	\$14,614	95.3%	3.3%
NASA	\$17,139	56.5%	\$16,611	55.6%	\$17,271	51.7%	\$15,764	57.8%	6.1%
NSF	\$18,759	67.5%	\$20,419	68.4%	\$19,853	79.0%	\$16,851	82.3%	3.3%
NRC	\$16,716	83.9%	\$17,917	86.9%	\$17,772	80.9%	\$16,828	95.0%	14.1%
OMB	\$11,909	41.5%	\$11,375	48.0%	\$11,423	47.3%	\$11,026	52.9%	5.7%
OPM	\$15,442	97.2%	\$14,765	95.4%	\$16,106	97.6%	\$12,029	86.1%	-11.5%
SBA	\$9,236	89.3%	\$9,477	83.9%	\$9,734	80.0%	\$13,622	74.4%	-5.6%
SSA	\$14,487	75.2%	\$15,175	57.3%	\$15,522	56.6%	\$13,792	65.4%	8.8%
STATE	\$11,025	53.2%	\$11,034	46.8%	\$11,000	46.5%	\$10,984	47.3%	0.8%
TRANSPORTATION	\$8,793	78.3%	\$9,628	76.0%	\$9,855	78.6%	\$9,573	78.9%	0.2%
TREASURY	\$15,724	70.4%	\$16,074	70.0%	\$16,764	70.2%	\$17,471	73.2%	3.0%
VA	\$16,626	82.2%	\$17,736	74.0%	\$17,257	73.2%	\$15,060	72.8%	-0.5%
ALL OTHERS	\$11,765	59.8%	\$11,910	66.9%	\$12,911	63.3%	\$12,899	49.6%	-13.7%
<b>GOVERNMENTWIDE</b>	<b>\$13,290</b>	<b>74.6%</b>	<b>\$14,221</b>	<b>74.5%</b>	<b>\$14,815</b>	<b>76.5%</b>	<b>\$14,802</b>	<b>78.5%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>

Table 6		
AGENCY	FY 2008 Pearson Correlation Coefficient*	FY 2009 Pearson Correlation Coefficient*
<b>Agriculture</b>	<b>0.535</b>	<b>0.372</b>
<b>AID</b>	<b>0.651</b>	<b>0.395</b>
<b>Commerce</b>	<b>0.799</b>	<b>0.607</b>
<b>Defense</b>	<b>0.743</b>	<b>0.773</b>
<b>Education</b>	<b>0.782</b>	<b>0.741</b>
<b>Energy</b>	<b>0.781</b>	<b>0.658</b>
<b>EPA</b>	<b>0.711</b>	<b>0.697</b>
<b>GSA</b>	<b>0.686</b>	<b>0.646</b>
<b>HHS</b>	<b>0.702</b>	<b>0.671</b>
<b>DHS</b>	<b>0.628</b>	<b>0.553</b>
<b>HUD</b>	<b>0.486</b>	<b>0.447</b>
<b>Interior</b>	<b>0.688</b>	<b>0.662</b>
<b>Justice</b>	<b>0.539</b>	<b>0.491</b>
<b>Labor</b>	<b>0.695</b>	<b>0.703</b>
<b>NASA</b>	<b>0.607</b>	<b>0.597</b>
<b>NSF</b>	<b>0.687</b>	<b>0.703</b>
<b>NRC</b>	<b>0.637</b>	<b>0.505</b>
<b>OMB</b>	<b>0.697</b>	<b>0.679</b>
<b>OPM</b>	<b>0.527</b>	<b>0.936</b>
<b>SBA</b>	<b>0.483</b>	<b>0.889</b>
<b>SSA</b>	<b>0.613</b>	<b>0.635</b>
<b>State</b>	<b>0.847</b>	<b>0.705</b>
<b>Transportation</b>	<b>0.672</b>	<b>0.628</b>
<b>Treasury</b>	<b>0.627</b>	<b>0.619</b>
<b>VA</b>	<b>0.668</b>	<b>0.609</b>

\* The **Pearson correlation coefficient (r)** is a measure of strength of relationship. OPM uses the Pearson r metric to analyze the strength of the relationship between executives' pay adjustments and performance awards and their ratings.

- A high positive relationship between ratings and pay based on those ratings will approach (+1). This positive relationship indicates the executives' summary ratings are the primary bases for determining their pay adjustments and performance awards, with high ratings resulting in higher total pay.
- If the relationship is random, the Pearson r will approach zero, indicating there is no relationship between executive ratings and pay adjustments and performance awards.
- If the coefficient is negative, it indicates an inverse relationship (that is, if the high ratings lead to low pay adjustments and performance awards, the metric will approach negative one (-1)).

In calculating the correlation, OPM used the data submitted by agencies during the annual data call. OPM included only the data for career executives and did not include awards that were not based on a final summary rating (such as Rank awards or Special Act awards). OPM selected .5 as the desirable threshold for the correlation coefficient because statistically this represents at least 75 percent of pay adjustments and performance awards are directly associated with executive ratings. OPM recognizes there are other

legitimate influences on pay determinations and therefore it is unrealistic to expect agencies to achieve a perfect positive correlation (+1).

## Appendix 1

### Background

In 2004, the Federal Government implemented pay-for-performance for its senior executives. Congress also provided for the certification of their appraisal system for its Senior Executive Service (SES) members. This certification was established in law and is regulated jointly by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). For agencies to be able to pay their executives above the Executive level III, up to level II, and up to the higher aggregate pay level, agencies first must have their pay-for-performance systems certified by OPM, with concurrence by OMB. In order to achieve certification, agency systems must meet the following criteria:

- **Accountability.** SES appraisal systems require, and member performance plans contain, a critical element that holds executives accountable for the performance management of their subordinates and alignment of subordinate performance plans.
- **Alignment.** SES appraisal systems require that SES member performance plans clearly link with and support organizational goals established in strategic plans, annual performance plans, or other organizational planning or budget documents.
- **Measurable Results.** SES appraisal systems require, and member performance plans hold members accountable for, achieving measurable results, crediting measurable results as at least 60 percent of the summary rating.
- **Balance.** SES appraisal systems require, and member performance plans provide for, balance, so that in addition to measuring expected results, the performance plans include appropriate measures or indicators of the uses of employee and customer/stakeholder feedback.
- **Consultation.** SES appraisal systems require, and member performance plans indicate, executives are involved in the development of their performance plans.
- **Organizational Assessment and Guidelines.** Appropriate organizational performance assessments are made, results are communicated to members, rating officials and Performance Review Boards (PRB), and guidelines are provided by the head of the agency or designee on incorporating organizational performance into the appraisal, pay, and awards process.
- **Oversight.** The head of the agency or designee has oversight of the results of appraisals, pay adjustments, and awards, ensures the system operates effectively and efficiently, and ensures appraisals, pay adjustments, and awards are based on performance.
- **Training.** The agency has trained its executives on the design and implementation, and communicated the results, of its pay-for-performance system. This includes informing executives of the ratings distributions and average pay adjustments and awards granted.
- **Performance Differentiation.** The appraisal system includes a summary level that reflects Outstanding (or equivalent) performance to appraise and rate performance, performance requirements are established that describe and allow for differentiating levels of performance, the rating distribution indicates meaningful performance differentiations are made, and the rating distribution appropriately reflects organizational performance.

Appendix II

**List of Certified Senior Employee  
Performance Appraisal Systems**

As of June 7, 2010

**Certified Senior Executive Service (SES) Systems, excluding Offices of  
Inspector General (OIG)**

Note: 30 out of 44 (75%) certified SES systems have full certification

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Effective Date</b>	<b>Expiration Date</b>
Advisory Council for Historic Preservation	10/1/2009	9/30/2010
Broadcasting Board of Governors	1/1/2009	12/31/2010
Consumer Product Safety Commission	3/30/2010	3/29/2011
Department of Agriculture	12/8/2009	9/30/2010
Department of Commerce	1/1/2009	12/31/2010
Department of Defense	1/1/2009	12/31/2010
Department of Education	1/1/2009	12/31/2010
Department of Energy	10/4/2009	9/30/2010
Department of Health and Human Services	3/31/2008	6/30/2011
Department of Homeland Security	11/19/2008	9/30/2010
Department of Housing and Urban Development	10/1/2009	9/30/2011
Department of the Interior	8/02/2010	8/01/2011
Department of Justice	9/18/2009	9/30/2010
Department of Labor	7/30/2010	7/29/2011
Department of State	9/10/2009	9/30/2010
Department of Transportation	1/1/2009	12/31/2010
Department of the Treasury	1/1/2009	12/31/2010
Department of Veterans Affairs	7/22/2010	7/21/2012
Environmental Protection Agency	10/1/2009	9/30/2011
Federal Communications Commission	1/1/2009	12/31/2010
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	1/1/2009	12/31/2010
Federal Trade Commission	8/15/2010*	8/14/2012
General Services Administration	11/26/2008	12/31/2010

Merit System Protection Board	9/9/2008	9/9/2010
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	1/1/2009	12/31/2010
National Capital Planning Commission	9/3/2009	9/30/2010
National Endowment of the Arts	8/09/2010	8/8/2012
National Labor Relations Board	10/1/2010*	9/30/2012
National Science Foundation	9/10/2009	9/9/2011
National Transportation Safety Board	7/31/2009	9/30/2011
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	9/10/2010*	9/9/2012
Office of Government Ethics	1/1/2009	12/31/2010
Office of Management and Budget	9/9/2009	9/30/2010
Office of National Drug Control Policy	10/3/2008	10/3/2010
Patent and Trademark Office/Department of Commerce	1/1/2009	12/31/2010
Railroad Retirement Board	1/1/2011*	12/31/2012
Small Business Administration	9/17/2008	9/17/2010
Social Security Administration	1/1/2009	12/31/2010
Surface Transportation Board	9/24/2008	9/24/2010
U.S. Agency for International Development	10/1/2009	9/30/2010
U.S. Chemical Safety Board	9/8/2010*	9/7/2012
U.S. International Trade Commission	1/22/2010	1/15/2011
U.S. Office of Personnel Management	8/22/2010	8/21/2012
U.S. Trade Representatives	7/6/2010	7/5/2011

**\*This date represents the effective date of the most recent certification. The system is still covered by its previous certification, with no gap in certification status.**

Appendix III

**Guide to Agency Acronyms or Titles Used in this Report**

<b>AGENCY</b>	<b>Name of Agency</b>
Agriculture	Department of Agriculture
AID	U.S. Agency for International Development
Commerce	Department of Commerce
Defense	Department of Defense
Education	Department of Education
Energy	Department of Energy
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
GSA	General Services Administration
HHS	Department of Health and Human Services
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
HUD	Department of Housing and Urban Development
Interior	Department of the Interior
Justice	Department of Justice
Labor	Department of Labor
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NSF	National Science Foundation
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OPM	U.S. Office of Personnel Management
SBA	Small Business Administration
SSA	Social Security Administration
State	Department of State
Transportation	Department of Transportation
Treasury	Department of the Treasury
VA	Department of Veterans Affairs



UNITED STATES  
OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT  
Employee Services  
1900 E Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20415