

UNITED STATES OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

# **Report on Senior Executive Pay and Performance Appraisal Systems**

Fiscal Year 2016



**Report on Senior Executive Pay  
and Performance Appraisal Systems for  
Fiscal Year (FY) 2016**

**Table of Contents**

	Executive Summary
Table 1	Performance Ratings for Career SES Members FY 2015 – FY 2016
Table 2	Performance Ratings for Career, Noncareer and Limited Term SES Members FY 2015 – FY 2016
Table 3	Career SES Compensation Distribution by Rating Level FY 2015 – FY 2016
Table 4	Salaries for Career, Noncareer and Limited Term SES Members FY 2015 – FY 2016
Table 5	Career SES Performance Awards FY 2015 – FY 2016
Table 6	Correlation of Career SES Ratings and Compensation Based on Ratings FY 2016
Table 7	Performance Awards for Career SES Members as a Percent of Aggregate Salary FY 2015 – FY 2016
Appendix	Guide to Agency Acronyms and Titles Used in this Report

## Executive Summary

The Senior Executive Service (SES) is comprised of the men and women charged with ensuring that the executive management of the Government of the United States is responsive to the needs, policies, and goals of the Nation. This dedicated corps of executives shares a commitment to public service and a set of democratic values grounded in the fundamental ideals of the Constitution. As the leaders of our Federal civilian workforce, Senior Executives strive to create a more citizen-centered, results-oriented Federal Government. Agencies are authorized to recognize and reward SES members' achievements and contributions using their performance-based pay systems.

This report reflects performance ratings, pay and awards data resulting from the application of each agency's SES appraisal system during Fiscal Year (FY) 2016. The tables in this report do not include agency and Governmentwide data on performance, pay and awards received by non-SES Federal employees, including General Schedule and Senior Level/Scientific or Professional (SL/ST) employees. Information on performance awards for non-SES Federal employees is presented in a different report, entitled *Federal Awards Statistics*, also issued annually by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM).

Although Federal agencies continue to operate within budgetary constraints, this year's report indicates that agencies made greater distinctions in SES performance, pay and awards than in the previous year. This was due in part to an increase in the budgetary awards limitation for SES awards—from 4.8 percent to 7.5 percent of aggregate career SES salaries. The report presents a number of important findings relating to FY 2016 executive performance ratings, pay adjustments and awards, included in the following summary of the key data components of the report:

- Agencies submitted data for 7,727 SES members (including SES members in Offices of Inspector General (OIG)). Agencies rated 93.2 percent of SES members, with 52.1 percent of those rated at the highest level (Level 5); some executives were not rated because they either retired, or were hired at the end of the appraisal period and had not worked long enough to meet the minimum appraisal period to be rated.
- This year, data for OIG SES members are included in the new category titled, "ALL OIGs." This data was previously included in the "ALL OTHERS" and "GOVERNMENTWIDE" categories in Tables 1-2, 4-5 and 7 of this report. The Inspector General Reform Act of 2008 established OIGs as separate agencies for all SES issues.
- Career members comprised 91.0 percent of the total SES population. Agencies rated 94.7 percent of their career SES members, with 51.7 percent of those receiving the highest rating level.
- Table 1 is a summary of the number and percentage of career SES members who received a performance rating at the highest rating level for their FY 2016 performance. This table reflects a net increase of 2.8 percentage points in FY 2016

for the percent of career SES members rated at the highest level compared to the previous year.

- Table 2 displays performance rating data for all SES members. The data reflect a net increase of 2.4 percentage points in FY 2016 for the number of SES members rated at the highest level compared to the previous year.
- Table 3 summarizes FY 2016 career SES member compensation distribution by performance rating level. The data indicate that, on average, higher-performing SES members receive higher pay adjustments and performance awards based on a summary performance rating.

Note: Effective with this FY 2016 report, Tables 3-5 and 7 reflect all executives eligible for a rating-based award, per applicable regulation, including those who did not receive an award because of their respective agency's awards policy. For example, some agencies' policies do not allow for an award to be distributed to executives with a rating below the Exceeds Fully Successful level (Level 4), thus executives rated at the Fully Successful level (Level 3) are not granted performance awards. Such \$0 award amounts are reflected in the data included in these tables.

Note 2: Data for executives who were ineligible for the payments, per applicable regulation (i.e., those who retired, left the agency, had rates of basic pay higher than the rate for the applicable level of the Executive Schedule, did not receive a performance rating, or were otherwise ineligible due to law or regulation), are not included in these tables.

- Table 4 shows the average salary and average adjustment for all SES members. The data indicate that, Governmentwide, the average pay adjustment for all SES members in FY 2016 increased by a net of 0.4 percentage points from the previous year.
- Table 5 summarizes the percentage of career executives who received performance awards, as well as the average award amount granted. Governmentwide, the average performance award in FY 2016 increased by \$3,667 from the previous year, and the number of SES members receiving a performance award in FY 2016 increased by 10.2 percentage points from the previous year.
- Table 6 lists the separate Pearson correlation coefficients by agency for pay adjustments and performance awards. OPM uses these metrics as indicators of the strength of the relationship between 1) executive summary level ratings and subsequent ratings-based pay increases, and 2) executive summary level ratings and subsequent performance awards. The Table 6 notation provides a more in-depth description of the Pearson correlation coefficient and its meaning, and it explains that the Pearson correlation coefficient is just one tool OPM uses to analyze agency ratings, pay and awards data as OPM recognizes there might be environmental factors that may affect an agency's distribution of pay and awards.

- Table 7 summarizes the number and percentage of career executives who received performance awards, as well as the average award amount granted, and the average performance award amount as a percent of aggregate salary of career executives. The table shows agencies are appropriately rewarding SES members within the authorized award limitation (7.5 percent of aggregate career SES salaries). Governmentwide, the amount of performance awards as a percent of salary increased by 1.9 percentage points.

TABLE 1

Performance Ratings for Career SES Members FY 2015 - FY 2016					
AGENCY	FY 2015		FY 2016		Net Change in Percentage Points FY 2015 - FY 2016
	Total Career SES Rated	Percent at Highest Level	Total Career SES Rated	Percent at Highest Level	
AGRICULTURE	299	48.2%	295	55.3%	7.1%
AID	23	69.6%	29	72.4%	2.8%
COMMERCE	258	47.7%	283	47.7%	0.0%
DEFENSE	1,111	35.5%	1,112	38.1%	2.6%
EDUCATION	60	66.7%	60	56.7%	-10.0%
ENERGY	379	44.6%	389	49.9%	5.3%
EPA	241	39.8%	240	42.5%	2.7%
GSA	73	21.9%	74	37.8%	15.9%
HHS	339	44.5%	358	47.2%	2.7%
DHS	495	63.6%	547	67.6%	4.0%
HUD	82	35.4%	79	43.0%	7.6%
INTERIOR	195	58.5%	207	61.8%	3.3%
JUSTICE*	345	80.6%	359	81.6%	1.0%
LABOR	143	55.9%	162	58.0%	2.1%
NASA	362	45.3%	379	49.1%	3.8%
NRC	138	35.5%	125	36.0%	0.5%
NSF	67	76.1%	69	75.4%	-0.7%
OMB	61	36.1%	61	42.6%	6.5%
OPM	45	13.3%	38	39.5%	26.2%
SBA	31	58.1%	34	73.5%	15.4%
SSA	125	45.6%	121	47.9%	2.3%
STATE	142	95.8%	145	57.2%	-38.6%
TRANSPORTATION	183	55.7%	169	59.2%	3.5%
TREASURY	388	52.6%	391	53.5%	0.9%
VA	312	10.9%	321	20.9%	10.0%
ALL OIGs	204	65.7%	216	59.7%	-6.0%
ALL OTHERS	400	58.5%	401	64.6%	6.1%
<b>GOVERNMENT</b>	<b>6,501</b>	<b>48.9%</b>	<b>6,664</b>	<b>51.7%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>

\*Data for Justice does not include FBI-DEA SES members, which are excluded from the SES under 5 U.S.C. 3132(a)(1).

Source: Agency electronic data submission forms

TABLE 2

Performance Ratings for Career, Noncareer and Limited Term SES Members FY 2015 - FY 2016					
AGENCY	FY 2015		FY 2016		Net Change in Percentage Points FY 2015 - FY 2016
	Total SES Rated	Percent at Highest Level	Total SES Rated	Percent at Highest Level	
AGRICULTURE	334	50.9%	337	59.6%	8.7%
AID	27	66.7%	32	75.0%	8.3%
COMMERCE	298	46.3%	324	43.5%	-2.8%
DEFENSE	1,178	34.6%	1,196	37.1%	2.5%
EDUCATION	75	66.7%	61	57.4%	-9.3%
ENERGY	408	45.6%	421	51.3%	5.7%
EPA	267	36.0%	266	38.3%	2.3%
GSA	77	20.8%	78	35.9%	15.1%
HHS	352	45.5%	418	54.1%	8.6%
DHS	541	64.5%	584	68.0%	3.5%
HUD	95	38.9%	94	50.0%	11.1%
INTERIOR	229	62.9%	230	65.2%	2.3%
JUSTICE*	403	83.1%	359	81.6%	-1.5%
LABOR	161	59.6%	185	62.7%	3.1%
NASA	370	45.1%	385	49.4%	4.3%
NRC	138	35.5%	125	36.0%	0.5%
NSF	75	77.3%	78	76.9%	-0.4%
OMB	75	29.3%	81	32.1%	2.8%
OPM	55	21.8%	45	46.7%	24.9%
SBA	39	46.2%	48	60.4%	14.2%
SSA	136	47.1%	127	48.8%	1.7%
STATE	172	84.9%	170	50.6%	-34.3%
TRANSPORTATION	192	57.3%	171	59.1%	1.8%
TREASURY	421	55.6%	407	55.0%	-0.6%
VA	318	11.6%	330	20.3%	8.7%
ALL OIGs	204	65.7%	216	59.7%	-6.0%
ALL OTHERS	431	60.3%	434	67.1%	6.8%
<b>GOVERNMENT</b>	<b>7,071</b>	<b>49.7%</b>	<b>7,202</b>	<b>52.1%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>

\*Data for Justice does not include FBI-DEA SES members, which are excluded from the SES under 5 U.S.C. 3132(a)(1).

Source: Agency electronic data submission forms

TABLE 3

Career SES Compensation Distribution by Rating Level FY 2015 - FY 2016							
AGENCY RATING LEVEL	Total Career SES Rated	Percent Rated by Level	Average Salary Before Adjustments	Average Performance Award	Average Performance Award as a Percent of Salary Before Adjustment	Average Salary Adjustment	Average Salary Adjustment as a Percent of Salary Before Adjustment
<b>FY 2015</b>							
<b>Rating Levels</b>	<b>6,501</b>						
OUTSTANDING or Equivalent (5)	3,176	48.9%	\$174,030	\$10,858	6.2%	\$3,741	2.1%
EXCEEDS FULLY SUCCESSFUL or Equivalent (4)	2,693	41.4%	\$169,774	\$6,759	4.0%	\$2,971	1.7%
FULLY SUCCESSFUL or Equivalent (3)	608	9.4%	\$167,817	\$966	0.6%	\$1,877	1.1%
MINIMALLY SATISFACTORY or Equivalent (2)	16	0.2%	\$167,116	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
UNSATISFACTORY or Equivalent (1)	8	0.1%	\$162,872	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
<b>FY 2016</b>							
<b>Rating Levels</b>	<b>6,664</b>						
OUTSTANDING or Equivalent (5)	3,443	51.7%	\$176,596	\$15,236	8.6%	\$4,287	2.4%
EXCEEDS FULLY SUCCESSFUL or Equivalent (4)	2,711	40.7%	\$171,302	\$9,366	5.5%	\$3,989	2.3%
FULLY SUCCESSFUL or Equivalent (3)	482	7.2%	\$169,969	\$2,231	1.3%	\$2,454	1.4%
MINIMALLY SATISFACTORY or Equivalent (2)	15	0.2%	\$167,127	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
UNSATISFACTORY or Equivalent (1)	13	0.2%	\$174,787	\$0	0.0%	-\$3,684	-2.1%

The table above includes average pay adjustment and award amounts for the entire executive population eligible for an adjustment and/or award, per applicable regulation. The data include \$0 amounts for awards and adjustments not granted due to respective agency policy (see Executive Summary for additional explanation), making the average award amounts appear to be below the statutory minimum award amount (i.e., 5 percent of rate of basic pay). It should be noted that, though the inclusion of \$0 award amounts decreases the averages reported, the data is not indicative of a lack of compliance with applicable award statute. \*Data for Justice does not include FBI-DEA SES members, which are excluded from the SES under 5 U.S.C. 3132(a)(1).

Source: Agency electronic data submission forms



TABLE 4

Salaries for Career, Noncareer and Limited Term SES Members FY 2015 - FY 2016							
AGENCY	FY 2015			FY 2016			Percentage Point Change FY15-FY16
	Average Rate of Basic Pay Before Salary Adjustment	Average Salary Adjustment	Average Salary Adjustment as a Percent of Salary Before Adjustment	Average Rate of Basic Pay Before Salary Adjustment	Average Salary Adjustment	Average Salary Adjustment as a Percent of Salary Before Adjustment	
AGRICULTURE	\$171,340	\$3,848	2.2%	\$174,793	\$3,563	2.0%	-0.2%
AID	\$167,985	\$4,052	2.4%	\$172,251	\$6,244	3.6%	1.2%
COMMERCE	\$170,524	\$3,880	2.3%	\$173,478	\$4,056	2.3%	0.0%
DEFENSE	\$168,075	\$2,022	1.2%	\$169,475	\$4,039	2.4%	1.2%
EDUCATION	\$171,688	\$3,161	1.8%	\$175,412	\$2,984	1.7%	-0.1%
ENERGY	\$173,338	\$3,662	2.1%	\$175,994	\$4,761	2.7%	0.6%
EPA	\$170,341	\$3,159	1.9%	\$172,610	\$2,835	1.6%	-0.3%
GSA	\$165,736	\$2,814	1.7%	\$167,173	\$3,595	2.2%	0.5%
HHS	\$173,975	\$3,708	2.1%	\$174,732	\$4,101	2.3%	0.2%
DHS	\$170,111	\$3,783	2.2%	\$172,358	\$4,492	2.6%	0.4%
HUD	\$174,502	\$916	0.5%	\$174,952	\$3,045	1.7%	1.2%
INTERIOR	\$166,668	\$4,777	2.9%	\$169,868	\$4,747	2.8%	-0.1%
JUSTICE*	\$175,017	\$3,533	2.0%	\$177,004	\$3,735	2.1%	0.1%
LABOR	\$170,857	\$4,513	2.6%	\$173,219	\$5,780	3.3%	0.7%
NASA	\$171,603	\$2,569	1.5%	\$173,436	\$2,553	1.5%	0.0%
NRC	\$169,931	\$2,484	1.5%	\$172,204	\$3,124	1.8%	0.3%
NSF	\$176,771	\$2,549	1.4%	\$178,992	\$2,369	1.3%	-0.1%
OMB	\$168,648	\$2,857	1.7%	\$170,908	\$4,415	2.6%	0.9%
OPM	\$170,054	\$3,084	1.8%	\$172,789	\$3,352	1.9%	0.1%
SBA	\$168,581	\$1,721	1.0%	\$168,977	\$6,072	3.6%	2.6%
SSA	\$172,482	\$3,894	2.3%	\$175,239	\$3,467	2.0%	-0.3%
STATE	\$167,935	\$3,622	2.2%	\$168,803	\$5,192	3.1%	0.9%
TRANSPORTATION	\$166,087	\$4,270	2.6%	\$170,173	\$4,601	2.7%	0.1%
TREASURY	\$171,274	\$4,152	2.4%	\$174,194	\$3,834	2.2%	-0.2%
VA	\$167,550	\$1,982	1.2%	\$170,014	\$3,292	1.9%	0.7%
ALL OIGs	\$173,725	\$3,186	1.8%	\$174,523	\$4,004	2.3%	0.5%
ALL OTHERS	\$171,299	\$3,426	2.0%	\$173,134	\$3,777	2.2%	0.2%
<b>GOVERNMENT</b>	<b>\$170,569</b>	<b>\$3,225</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>\$172,648</b>	<b>\$3,950</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>

The table above includes average adjustment data for the entire executive population eligible for an adjustment, per applicable regulation. Thus, the data include \$0 amounts for adjustments not granted due to respective agency policy (see Executive Summary for additional explanation). \*Data for Justice does not include FBI-DEA SES members, which are excluded from the SES under 5 U.S.C. 3132(a)(1).

Source: Agency electronic data submission forms

TABLE 5

Career SES Performance Awards FY 2015 - FY 2016						
AGENCY	FY 2015		FY 2016		Change in Average Award FY15-FY16	Percentage Point Change of Career SES Receiving Award FY15-FY16
	Average Award	Percent of SES Receiving Award	Average Award	Percent of SES Receiving Award		
AGRICULTURE	\$8,606	82.1%	\$12,686	93.4%	\$4,080	11.3%
AID	\$8,390	64.0%	\$14,396	72.2%	\$6,006	8.2%
COMMERCE	\$8,985	69.7%	\$13,739	91.5%	\$4,754	21.8%
DEFENSE	\$8,287	73.9%	\$12,819	88.1%	\$4,532	14.2%
EDUCATION	\$8,484	64.6%	\$13,363	88.5%	\$4,879	23.9%
ENERGY	\$8,631	77.8%	\$13,328	91.8%	\$4,697	14.0%
EPA	\$7,961	66.8%	\$9,822	74.2%	\$1,861	7.4%
GSA	\$7,007	60.7%	\$10,014	77.9%	\$3,007	17.2%
HHS	\$8,209	75.4%	\$13,123	92.8%	\$4,914	17.4%
DHS	\$8,796	82.0%	\$13,140	86.9%	\$4,344	4.9%
HUD	\$8,913	75.9%	\$12,688	81.3%	\$3,775	5.4%
INTERIOR	\$7,406	69.1%	\$13,474	87.2%	\$6,068	18.1%
JUSTICE*	\$8,745	55.7%	\$14,015	64.0%	\$5,270	8.3%
LABOR	\$8,270	69.9%	\$12,275	89.1%	\$4,005	19.2%
NASA	\$6,963	56.3%	\$6,886	56.8%	-\$77	0.5%
NRC	\$8,083	80.3%	\$12,481	93.1%	\$4,398	12.8%
NSF	\$8,616	61.0%	\$12,636	82.7%	\$4,020	21.7%
OMB	\$5,500	46.8%	\$6,309	50.8%	\$809	4.0%
OPM	\$8,731	75.5%	\$13,999	100.0%	\$5,268	24.5%
SBA	\$8,543	74.2%	\$13,236	97.1%	\$4,693	22.9%
SSA	\$8,832	69.2%	\$7,458	54.4%	-\$1,374	-14.8%
STATE	\$5,418	50.0%	\$8,606	83.9%	\$3,188	33.9%
TRANSPORTATION	\$8,469	88.3%	\$12,037	81.6%	\$3,568	-6.7%
TREASURY	\$8,680	63.2%	\$13,189	76.6%	\$4,509	13.4%
VA	\$8,157	74.3%	\$6,386	60.1%	-\$1,771	-14.2%
ALL OIGs	\$9,191	86.9%	\$12,049	84.5%	\$2,858	-2.4%
ALL OTHERS	\$8,167	74.4%	\$12,043	86.0%	\$3,876	11.6%
<b>GOVERNMENT</b>	<b>\$8,261</b>	<b>71.2%</b>	<b>\$11,928</b>	<b>81.4%</b>	<b>\$3,667</b>	<b>10.2%</b>

This table includes average performance award data for the entire executive population eligible for an award, per applicable regulation. Thus, the data include \$0 amounts for awards not granted due to respective agency policy (see Executive Summary for additional explanation). \*Data for Justice does not include FBI-DEA SES members, which are excluded from the SES under 5 U.S.C. 3132(a)(1).

Source: Agency electronic data submission forms

**TABLE 6**

Correlation of Career SES Ratings and Compensation Based on Ratings FY 2016		
AGENCY	Pearson <i>r</i> (Pay)	Pearson <i>r</i> (Awards)
AGRICULTURE	0.160	0.879
AID	0.137	0.744
COMMERCE	0.222	0.746
DEFENSE	0.235	0.803
EDUCATION	0.212	0.690
ENERGY	0.006	0.723
EPA	0.122	0.803
GSA	0.126	0.699
HHS	0.192	0.757
DHS	0.156	0.657
HUD	0.319	0.813
INTERIOR	0.256	0.742
JUSTICE*	0.022	0.464
LABOR	0.006	0.915
NASA	-0.086	0.723
NSF	-0.238	0.620
NRC	-0.124	0.674
OMB	0.265	0.634
OPM	-0.009	0.938
SBA	0.293	0.995
SSA	0.173	0.440
STATE	0.045	0.442
TRANSPORTATION	0.102	0.725
TREASURY	0.108	0.721
VA	0.280	0.609

\*Data for Justice does not include FBI-DEA SES members, which are excluded from the SES under 5 U.S.C. 3132(a)(1)

The **Pearson correlation coefficient (*r*)** is a measure of strength of the relationship between two variables. OPM uses the Pearson *r* metric as a tool to analyze separately the strength of the relationship between executives' performance ratings and subsequent ratings-based pay adjustments and between ratings and performance awards.

The higher the positive relationship between ratings and pay adjustments and ratings and performance awards the stronger the relationship between the factors. A perfect correlation is represented as (+1). This positive relationship generally indicates an agency is differentiating pay and award amounts based directly on executives' performance ratings, thus ensuring those ratings are the primary basis for determining pay adjustments and performance awards. A high correlation reflects differentiation resulting from executives with higher ratings receiving higher pay adjustments and larger performance awards.

If the relationship is random, the Pearson *r* will approach zero, indicating there is no relationship between performance ratings and pay adjustments or ratings and performance awards.

A negative coefficient indicates an inverse relationship (i.e., the metric will approach negative one (-1) if high ratings lead to low pay adjustments or smaller performance awards than those received by executives with lower ratings).

In calculating the correlation, OPM uses data submitted by agencies during the annual data call. OPM includes only the data for career executives and does not include awards that are not based on a final summary rating (such as Rank awards or Special Act awards). A correlation coefficient of (.5) represents a desirable threshold for the correlation coefficient because - statistically - it represents a strong relationship between pay adjustments or performance awards and the executive ratings upon which they are based.

The Pearson correlation coefficient is just one tool OPM uses to analyze agency ratings, pay and awards data as OPM recognizes there are environmental factors that may limit agencies' flexibility in distributing pay and awards, making it unrealistic to expect agencies to achieve a perfect positive correlation (+1). At the same time, in some cases a correlation coefficient of more than (.5) may indicate a strong statistical correlation between ratings and performance awards or ratings and pay adjustments while the agency's data still contains areas of concern regarding pay and award differentiation.

TABLE 7

Performance Awards for Career SES Members as a Percent of Aggregate Salary FY 2015 - FY 2016									
AGENCY	FY 2015				FY 2016				Percentage Point Change in Performance Award as a Percentage of Salary FY15-FY16
	Total Career Members	Percent Receiving Performance Award	Performance Award Average	Performance Award as a Percent of Salary	Total Career Members	Percent Receiving Performance Award	Performance Award Average	Performance Award as a Percent of Salary	
AGRICULTURE	308	82.1%	\$8,606	4.8%	305	93.4%	\$12,686	6.9%	2.1%
AID	25	64.0%	\$8,390	4.6%	36	72.2%	\$14,396	6.7%	2.1%
COMMERCE	274	69.7%	\$8,985	4.8%	294	91.5%	\$13,739	7.5%	2.7%
DEFENSE	1,154	73.9%	\$8,287	4.7%	1,138	88.1%	\$12,819	7.3%	2.6%
EDUCATION	65	64.6%	\$8,484	4.5%	61	88.5%	\$13,363	7.5%	3.0%
ENERGY	387	77.8%	\$8,631	4.7%	402	91.8%	\$13,328	7.2%	2.5%
EPA	241	66.8%	\$7,961	4.5%	240	74.2%	\$9,822	5.6%	1.1%
GSA	89	60.7%	\$7,007	3.2%	86	77.9%	\$10,014	5.0%	1.8%
HHS	346	75.4%	\$8,209	4.6%	362	92.8%	\$13,123	7.3%	2.7%
DHS	529	82.0%	\$8,796	4.8%	573	86.9%	\$13,140	7.2%	2.4%
HUD	87	75.9%	\$8,913	4.6%	80	81.3%	\$12,688	6.6%	2.0%
INTERIOR	204	69.1%	\$7,406	4.2%	218	87.2%	\$13,474	7.4%	3.2%
JUSTICE*	361	55.7%	\$8,745	4.7%	389	64.0%	\$14,015	7.3%	2.6%
LABOR	146	69.9%	\$8,270	4.6%	165	89.1%	\$12,275	6.8%	2.2%
NASA	421	56.3%	\$6,963	3.5%	417	56.8%	\$6,886	3.6%	0.1%
NRC	147	80.3%	\$8,083	4.4%	130	93.1%	\$12,481	7.0%	2.6%
NSF	82	61.0%	\$8,616	4.0%	75	82.7%	\$12,636	6.5%	2.5%
OMB	62	46.8%	\$5,500	3.0%	61	50.8%	\$6,309	3.5%	0.5%
OPM	49	75.5%	\$8,731	4.4%	38	100.0%	\$13,999	7.9%	3.5%
SBA	31	74.2%	\$8,543	4.8%	35	97.1%	\$13,236	7.5%	2.7%
SSA	143	69.2%	\$8,832	4.3%	149	54.4%	\$7,458	3.3%	-1.0%
STATE	150	50.0%	\$5,418	2.9%	155	83.9%	\$8,606	4.7%	1.8%
TRANSPORTATION	188	88.3%	\$8,469	4.7%	206	81.6%	\$12,037	5.7%	1.0%
TREASURY	402	63.2%	\$8,680	4.8%	398	76.6%	\$13,189	7.3%	2.5%
VA	335	74.3%	\$8,157	4.4%	353	60.1%	\$6,386	3.1%	-1.3%
ALL OIGs	238	72.3%	\$9,191	4.4%	233	84.5%	\$12,049	6.3%	1.9%
ALL OTHERS	434	74.4%	\$8,167	4.2%	435	86.0%	\$12,043	6.2%	2.0%
<b>GOVERNMENT</b>	<b>6,898</b>	<b>71.2%</b>	<b>\$8,261</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>7,034</b>	<b>81.4%</b>	<b>\$11,928</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	1.9%

The table above includes average award amounts that appear to be below the statutory minimum award amount (i.e., 5 percent of rate of basic pay) because the entire executive population eligible for an award, per applicable regulation, is represented in the table. Thus, the data include \$0 amounts for awards not granted due to respective agency policy (see Executive Summary for additional explanation). It should be noted that, though the inclusion of \$0 award amounts decreases the averages reported, the data is not indicative of a lack of compliance with applicable award statute. \*Data for Justice does not include FBI-DEA SES members, which are excluded from the SES under 5 U.S.C. 3132(a)(1).

Source: Agency electronic data submission forms

**Appendix**  
**Guide to Agency Acronyms and 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
DEA	Drug Enforcement Administration
Defense	Department of Defense
Education	Department of Education
Energy	Department of Energy
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
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
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NSF	National Science Foundation
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OPM	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
All OIGs	Agency Offices of Inspector General
All Others	Agencies <i>not</i> reported in the Agency and OIG categories above
Government	All Agencies, including those identified in the Agency, OIG and All Others categories above



**U.S. Office of Personnel Management**

Employee Services

1900 E Street, NW, Washington, DC 20415

**OPM.GOV**