

## Board of Director Compensation Trends

---

*Across the banking industry, director compensation continues to be subject to regulatory and shareholder scrutiny. Increases in director pay have continued in recent years but the mix of pay has also continued to shift.*

### Year-Over-Year Changes


Total director compensation at public banks has continued to increase since 2013. This is the case on an individual director basis as well as for total aggregate director compensation. Director compensation increased for most public banks prior to 2013 following the recovery from the Great Recession and once executive compensation returned to market competitive levels. However, the mix of pay has continued to change since 2013 as equity now comprises a larger portion of total aggregate director compensation for most public banks.

Total compensation for an average director (excludes board chair, lead director, employee directors, and any individuals with unusual circumstances) remained fairly flat from 2013 to 2014 for public banks with assets less than \$10 billion. From 2015 to 2016, median average director total compensation increased year-over-year with the largest increases in banks with assets of \$10 billion and greater. (Exhibit 1)

Equity continues to be an important element of director compensation which is a result of the continued pressure to align the interests of shareholders and directors. As highlighted in exhibit 2, overall, from 2013 to 2016, the median value of annual equity grants increased for an average director serving on the boards of banks of all asset sizes. While the median value of equity awards increased for all banks over this period, median equity awards for directors at banks below \$50 billion in assets decreased or remained flat from 2014 to 2015. 2016 median award values increased again over 2015 for banks with assets below \$50 billion, and remained flat for the largest institutions.


Overall median cash compensation changes varied for an average director from 2013 to 2016 based on the bank's asset size. For banks with assets less than \$1, \$1 to \$4, and \$10 to \$50 billion, average director cash compensation increased slightly over this period. For those institutions with assets of \$4 to \$10, median cash compensation reduced; and for those larger than \$50 billion, it remained fairly flat over this period. Thus, any increase in median average director total compensation during this period was primarily due to increases in equity compensation.

### Exhibit 1: Average Director Total Compensation – median values



Information contained in this article is based on proxy statements filed by 497 public banks in 2017.

### Exhibit 2: Average Director Annual Equity Compensation – median values




Total aggregate director compensation reflects a firm’s total director compensation expense, and includes all elements of director compensation. Total aggregate director compensation changed in varying degrees for banks of different asset sizes from 2013 to 2016, as illustrated in exhibit 3. For banks with assets greater than \$50 billion, this grew most dramatically during this period. However, for these banks, median total aggregate director compensation increased the most from 2013 to 2014, and then continued to increase annually at a more gradual rate from 2014 to 2016; it increased 9% from 2013 to 2014 and a total of 15% increase over the entire period. For banks with assets less than \$50 billion, 2016 median total aggregate director compensation was higher than in 2013, but annual increases were not as dramatic over this period as in the larger institutions. For banks with \$4 to \$10 billion in assets, total aggregate director compensation increased from 2013 to 2014; but then decreased in 2015 and increased slightly from 2015 to 2016, with a total net increase of only 1% over this period. In banks with assets of \$10 to \$50, \$1 to \$4, and under \$1 billion in assets, median total aggregate director compensation increased 12%, 12% and 17%, respectively, from 2013 to 2016.


Median total aggregate annual equity grants for directors increased for all banks from 2013 to 2016. It is not surprising that the largest increase occurred at banks with assets greater than \$50 billion, where this increased only slightly, 4%, from 2013 to 2014, and then 30% from 2014 to 2016. (Exhibit 4)

Total median aggregate cash compensation increased most significantly at banks with assets greater than \$50 billion from 2013 to 2016. This decreased somewhat at banks with assets of \$4 to \$10 and \$10 to \$50 billion; and increased slightly for banks with assets less than \$4 billion during this same period.

### Exhibit 3: Aggregate Total Director Compensation – median values



### Exhibit 4: Aggregate Total Director Equity Compensation – median values



## 2016 Director Compensation Highlights

Director compensation continues to be scrutinized by regulatory bodies, shareholder advisory firms and shareholders. In 2016, while total aggregate and average director compensation for public banks increased at varying degrees over 2015 for most asset categories, other changes occurred to the make-up and mix of pay. These changes were influenced by shareholder scrutiny, pressure from shareholder advisory firms and the regulatory environment.

- **Cash Compensation:** Cash retainers continued to be prevalent, and per board meeting fees were less so, particularly at banks with assets below \$10 billion and where participation and engagement were not an issue. Using retainers rather than per meeting fees reduces administration and helps to manage total aggregate director compensation costs, especially in times when additional meetings are necessary.
- **Equity Compensation:** For directors, the most prevalent forms of equity granted were restricted stock and restricted stock units; stock options are no longer prevalent as a component of director compensation. Full value shares, which include restricted stock and restricted stock units, are thought to best align directors with shareholders and promote independent decision making. Across the industry, shares continue to vest over a short timeframe, one to three years in most cases. It continues to be a best practice that shares vest prior to the end of a director's term as equity grants are considered compensation for current service and not a retention tool. Director equity ownership guidelines continue to be evaluated and considered a best practice, but are not as prevalent at banks with assets less than \$4 billion. Ownership guidelines are typically stated as a multiple of the retainer, with cash retainers being the primary focus in smaller banks. Ownership guidelines typically range from three to seven times the annual retainer. Shareholder advisory firms vary in their approach to director stock ownership; some look to see if a guideline is in place while others do not evaluate it in their current scorecard.
- **Chair Fees:** 2016 board and committee chair fees continued to increase over 2015 levels as a result of increased workload, responsibilities, time commitment and liability. The gap between pay for Audit and Compensation committee chairs continued to narrow, especially in light of comparable levels of workload, liability and responsibility.
- **Benefits:** The prevalence of benefits for outside directors continued to decline from 2015 to 2016. One exception to this was the continued high prevalence of director deferred compensation or fee deferral plans. These benefit plans are provided to directors in a majority of public institutions.
- **Structure of Compensation:** Director compensation should not vary based on bank performance. Directors are not employees of the bank and are not eligible for incentive pay. Directors have a fiduciary responsibility to the shareholders and their role is to make sure that the bank is well run, safe and sound. Since directors do not typically receive incentive compensation, they are not subject to the clawback provisions covering incentive pay for executive officers.
- **Inside Director Compensation:** It remained a best practice in 2016 that inside directors were not paid for board service; such service is considered part of an executive's job duties and responsibilities. The prevalence of CEOs also serving as the board chair continues to be quite low; compensation to those executives was infrequent unless the executive was serving in the role of Executive Chair.

## Governance Issues

In 2016, there continued to be an expectation of heightened corporate governance on the part of directors. Regulators, shareholders, and shareholder advisory firms share this common expectation. This is still the case today and is anticipated to continue for the foreseeable future. While sections of the Dodd-Frank Act that could potentially impact compensation and corporate governance requirements remain in limbo, heightened corporate governance is one of the core principles of the interagency guidance, Sound Incentive Compensation Policies guidance, which affects all banks and became effective in June 2010.

Additionally, directors continue to be accountable for managing risks in incentive plan arrangements and aligning executive pay and performance. Regulatory agencies placed increased focus on this as a result of issues discovered in the industry in 2016 relative to retail incentive plan practices. As a result, regulators have increased requests to review retail incentive plan information as part of the scope of safety and soundness examinations at banks of all sizes. This is part of director oversight, particularly for those serving on compensation committees.

Shareholder advisory firms continue to evaluate corporate governance practices at public institutions. They can carry considerable weight such that if one of these firms does not agree with the compensation practices or decisions made by board members, and particularly those serving on the compensation committee, a recommendation for a NO vote for directors on the ballot for reelection may ensue. These firms do not have specific standards relative to amounts and types of director pay, but review proxy statements for governance practices, and to identify the policies and provisions in place and whether or not they are adhered to. Furthermore, shareholder advisory firm criticism and negative vote recommendations can potentially result in public relations issues and even shareholder lawsuits. Such lawsuits have been more prevalent outside of the banking industry, but have increased within the industry in recent years. Many of these lawsuits have focused on levels of director compensation and what has been termed “self-dealing”.

## Looking Ahead

While it is impossible to predict the future with any accuracy, it is clear that director compensation will remain under scrutiny for the foreseeable future. Director compensation should not be performance-based but needs to be established in light of market trends, regulations and industry best practices. Directors should expect to continue to adhere to strong corporate governance standards going forward. It is critical that directors remain informed about regulatory changes, industry standards and best practices; this supports good governance and should help to promote effective risk management. Future challenges are expected to continue to include aligning executive compensation with bank performance, and succession planning for board members. In today’s challenging environment, it is more important than ever to recruit experienced, high caliber directors that possess board experience and can navigate the waters of corporate liability, risk management, security issues and shareholder expectations.

To learn more about Board of Director Compensation Trends, please contact [gayle.appelbaum@mclagan.com](mailto:gayle.appelbaum@mclagan.com).

## Author Contact Information

### Gayle Appelbaum

Partner, McLagan

Aon Hewitt | Talent, Rewards & Performance

1.952.886.8242

[gayle.appelbaum@mclagan.com](mailto:gayle.appelbaum@mclagan.com)

## About McLagan

McLagan provides compensation consulting, operational benchmarking and best practice research across the financial industries. McLagan combines 50 years of thought leadership in strategy, performance, capital requirements and compensation regulations with fact-based advice to create a tailored solution specific to your organization. McLagan is part of Aon Hewitt, a business unit of Aon plc (NYSE: AON). For more information on McLagan, please visit [mclagan.aon.com](http://mclagan.aon.com).

## About Aon Hewitt

Aon Hewitt empowers organizations and individuals to secure a better future through innovative human capital solutions. We advise, design, and execute a wide range of solutions that enable our clients' success. Our teams of experts help clients achieve sustainable performance through an engaged and productive workforce; navigate the risks and opportunities to optimize financial security; redefine health solutions for greater choice, affordability, and wellbeing; and help their people make smart decisions on managing work and life events. Aon Hewitt is the global leader in human resource solutions, with nearly 34,000 professionals in 90 countries serving more than 20,000 clients worldwide across 100+ solutions. For more information on Aon Hewitt, please visit [aonhewitt.com](http://aonhewitt.com).

This article provides general information for reference purposes only. Readers should not use this article as a replacement for legal, tax, accounting, or consulting advice that is specific to the facts and circumstances of their business. We encourage readers to consult with appropriate advisors before acting on any of the information contained in this article.

The contents of this article may not be reused, reprinted or redistributed without the expressed written consent of McLagan. To use information in this article, please [write to our team](#).

© 2017 Aon plc. All rights reserved

## About AABD

The American Association of Bank Directors was founded in 1989 in the midst of the S&L crisis to meet the information, education and advocacy needs of individual bank and savings institution directors. Bank regulators expect financial institution Boards of Directors to make informed policy decisions and to act independently to supervise the institution. One way for CEOs and their Boards to demonstrate that the Board is both informed and independent is through membership in the American Association of Bank Directors (AABD)—the only banking trade association in the United States which exclusively serves individual directors rather than their financial institutions. For more information, contact David Baris, President, [dbaris@aabd.org](mailto:dbaris@aabd.org), or phone 1.202.473.4888.