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## Executive Summary

This information was prepared for purposes of compliance with Cal. Insurance Code reporting requirements and should not be used or disseminated outside of that intended purpose.

## Executive summary

## Aggregate findings are shown in the table below:

| Analysis Market | Pay Component | State Fund vs. Aggregate |  |  | Aggregate |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | vs. P25 | vs. P50 | vs. P75 |  |
| General Market | Base Salary | $-4 \%$ | $-20 \%$ | $-32 \%$ | P25 |
|  | Target Total Cash | $-8 \%$ | $-29 \%$ | $-45 \%$ | P25 |
|  | Target TDC | $-26 \%$ | $-45 \%$ | $-61 \%$ | $<$ P25 |
|  | Benefits | $78 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $-6 \%$ | P75 |
|  | Target Total R | $-18 \%$ | $-40 \%$ | $-57 \%$ | $<$ P25 |
| INS | Base Salary | $9 \%$ | $-9 \%$ | $-22 \%$ | P25-P50 |
|  | Target Total Cash | $6 \%$ | $-17 \%$ | $-35 \%$ | P25 |
|  | Target TDC | $-12 \%$ | $-32 \%$ | $-49 \%$ | $<$ P25 |

- Cash - In aggregate, State Fund's base pay and total cash trend from P25 - P50 in the insurance market but are positioned closer to P25 in the general market
- Benefits - The organization is above market median in aggregate
- Total Remuneration - The combination of cash and benefits creates an overall total remuneration position that in aggregate is below P25 in both the General Market and INS market


## Process \& Methodology Overview

## Introduction

## The California State Compensation Insurance Fund (State Fund) engaged Korn Ferry Hay Group (KFHG) to conduct a comprehensive review of total remuneration for the exempt team

## State Fund engaged KFHG to:

- Review State Fund's total remuneration competitiveness (base salary + incentives + benefits value) relative to the reward philosophy
- Present our conclusions on the overall competitiveness of State Fund's exempt positions
- KFHG compared State Fund's compensation and benefits to the following markets: General Market (GM), Insurance and Financial Services (INS)


## This report outlines the findings of these studies for State Fund's exempt team, consisting of 15 positions

- President \& CEO
- Chief Operations Officer
- Chief Claims Operations Officer
- General Counsel
- Chief Information Officer
- Chief Financial Officer
- Chief Risk Officer
- SVP of Insurance Services
- Chief of Internal Affairs
- Chief Medical Officer
- EVP of Corporate Claims
- EVP of Strategic Planning
- Chief Actuary
- Chief Underwriting Officer
- Pricing Actuary


## Methodology

## Data Gathering and Review

- KFHG consultants reviewed organizational and individual data provided by State Fund including: current compensation levels and benefits/perquisites


## Job Evaluations

- State Fund's positions were sized (reflected in points) using KFHG's proprietary job evaluation methodology. Job size reflects how State Fund's positions compare to similar jobs at other organizations in terms of breadth and depth of responsibility and impact
- Market comparisons were made based upon the job evaluations for State Fund's incumbents:
- Jobs were compared to the various comparator markets based on Hay Points and job title when appropriate
- Based on Economic Research Institute's Alameda County differential, a 15\% premium was placed on the market data (see Appendices for more detail)


## Comparator group

- Given State Fund's strategy and goals, KFHG used the following comparator groups from KFHG's database to make comparisons and determine market total remuneration competitiveness:
- General Market (comprised of 1,249 organizations)
- Insurance and Financial Services
- Appendices provide a complete list of the comparator companies in the Insurance and Financial Services group


## Methodology (cont'd)

## State Fund incumbents were compared to market P25 (25th percentile), P50 (50th percentile or median), and P75 (75th percentile) for the following components of remuneration:

- Base Salary
- Target Total Cash (base salary + retention bonus and at-risk differential)
- Target Total Direct Compensation (Target Total Cash + LTI)
- State Fund does not offer long-term incentives so total direct compensation is equal to Total Cash
- Total Benefits
- Target Total Remuneration (target total direct compensation + total benefits)
- State Fund total remuneration consists of target total cash + total benefits
- KFHG considers pay element comparisons (incumbent pay divided by market comparison point) to be "competitive" (within range of a quartile market level) if the pay element is within $+/-10 \%$ of a market quartile for cash and benefits, and is within $+/-15 \%$ of a market quartile for total direct compensation/total remuneration


## Summary of State Fund job hierarchy and compensation

| Title |  | Base <br> Salary <br> ("Base") | Bonus /Short- <br> term Incentive <br> ("STI") | Total Cash <br> ("TC") | Total <br> Remuneration <br> ("Total R") |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Target | Target | Target |  |  |
| President \& CEO | 28 | $\$ 475$ | $\$ 173$ | $\$ 648$ | $\$ 731$ |
| Chief Operations Officer | 26 | $\$ 392$ | $\$ 118$ | $\$ 510$ | $\$ 591$ |
| Chief Claims Operations Officer | 25 | $\$ 375$ | $\$ 113$ | $\$ 488$ | $\$ 569$ |
| General Counsel | 25 | $\$ 375$ | $\$ 94$ | $\$ 469$ | $\$ 550$ |
| Chief Information Officer | 25 | $\$ 358$ | $\$ 133$ | $\$ 491$ | $\$ 572$ |
| Chief Financial Officer | 25 | $\$ 320$ | $\$ 151$ | $\$ 471$ | $\$ 551$ |
| Chief Risk Officer | 25 | $\$ 310$ | $\$ 102$ | $\$ 412$ | $\$ 492$ |
| SVP of Insurance Services | 24 | $\$ 326$ | $\$ 98$ | $\$ 423$ | $\$ 503$ |
| Chief of Internal Affairs | 24 | $\$ 310$ | $\$ 62$ | $\$ 372$ | $\$ 451$ |
| Chief Medical Officer | 23 | $\$ 368$ | $\$ 74$ | $\$ 441$ | $\$ 522$ |
| EVP of Corporate Claims | 23 | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 60$ | $\$ 360$ | $\$ 440$ |
| EVP of Strategic Planning | 23 | $\$ 276$ | $\$ 55$ | $\$ 331$ | $\$ 410$ |
| Chief Actuary | 22 | $\$ 280$ | $\$ 56$ | $\$ 336$ | $\$ 413$ |
| Chief Underwriting Officer | 22 | $\$ 221$ | $\$ 44$ | $\$ 265$ | $\$ 332$ |
| Pricing Actuary | 20 | $\$ 193$ | $\$ 39$ | $\$ 231$ | $\$ 293$ |

## General Market Target Total Remuneration Analysis

## GM analysis - summary

The table below outlines market competitiveness for incumbents by pay element

| Title | Grade | Base <br> Salary | TC | TDC | Benefits | TR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Target | Target |  | Target |
| President \& CEO | 28 | <P25 | <P25 | <P25 | P50 | <P25 |
| Chief Operations Officer | 26 | <P25 | <P25 | <P25 | P50-P75 | <P25 |
| Chief Claims Operations Officer | 25 | P25 | P25 | <P25 | P75 | <P25 |
| General Counsel | 25 | <P25 | <P25 | <P25 | P75 | <P25 |
| Chief Information Officer | 25 | P25 | P25 | <P25 | P75 | <P25 |
| Chief Financial Officer | 25 | <P25 | <P25 | <P25 | P50-P75 | <P25 |
| Chief Risk Officer | 25 | <P25 | <P25 | <P25 | P50-P75 | <P25 |
| SVP of Insurance Services | 24 | P25-P50 | P25-P50 | <P25 | P75 | P25 |
| Chief of Internal Affairs | 24 | P25 | P25 | <P25 | P75 | P25 |
| Chief Medical Officer | 23 | P75 | P50-P75 | P25-P50 | P75 | P50 |
| EVP of Corporate Claims | 23 | P50 | P25-P50 | P25 | P75 | P25 |
| EVP of Strategic Planning | 23 | P25-P50 | P25 | <P25 | P75 | P25 |
| Chief Actuary | 22 | P50-P75 | P50 | P25-P50 | P75+ | P50 |
| Chief Underwriting Officer | 22 | P25 | P25 | <P25 | P75 | P25 |
| Pricing Actuary | 20 | P50-P75 | P50 | P50 | P75 | P50-P75 |

- The majority of State Fund's incumbents trend from market P25 - P50 in Target Total Cash, but their positioning against the market is more conservative in Target Total Direct Compensation due to lack of a long-term incentive element
- 6 incumbents positioned at, or above, market P25 in Target Total Cash are below market P25 in Target Total Direct Compensation (Chief Claims Operations Officer, CIO, SVP Insurance Services, Chief of Internal Affairs, EVP of Strategic Planning, Chief Underwriting Officer)


## GM analysis - summary

## Target Compensation

The following chart illustrates State Fund's overall market position by pay component (measured by the number of incumbents) - base salary, total cash (target), total direct compensation (target), benefits, and total remuneration (target)


## GM analysis - base salary

## (000s)

| Title | State Fund <br> Base Salary |  | General Market Base Salary |  | State Fund vs. Market |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | P25 | P50 | P75 | vs. P25 | vs. P50 | vs. P75 |  |
| President \& CEO | $\$ 475$ | $\$ 669$ | $\$ 744$ | $\$ 949$ | $-29.0 \%$ | $-36.2 \%$ | $-49.9 \%$ |
| Chief Operations Officer | $\$ 392$ | $\$ 518$ | $\$ 696$ | $\$ 776$ | $-24.2 \%$ | $-43.6 \%$ | $-49.4 \%$ |
| Chief Claims Operations Officer | $\$ 375$ | $\$ 347$ | $\$ 422$ | $\$ 508$ | $7.9 \%$ | $-11.2 \%$ | $-26.1 \%$ |
| General Counsel | $\$ 375$ | $\$ 439$ | $\$ 489$ | $\$ 604$ | $-14.6 \%$ | $-23.3 \%$ | $-37.9 \%$ |
| Chief Information Officer | $\$ 358$ | $\$ 380$ | $\$ 505$ | $\$ 567$ | $-5.7 \%$ | $-29.1 \%$ | $-36.9 \%$ |
| Chief Financial Officer | $\$ 320$ | $\$ 463$ | $\$ 506$ | $\$ 561$ | $-31.0 \%$ | $-36.8 \%$ | $-43.0 \%$ |
| Chief Risk Officer | $\$ 310$ | $\$ 347$ | $\$ 422$ | $\$ 508$ | $-10.8 \%$ | $-26.6 \%$ | $-38.9 \%$ |
| SVP of Insurance Services | $\$ 326$ | $\$ 296$ | $\$ 358$ | $\$ 427$ | $9.9 \%$ | $-9.2 \%$ | $-23.8 \%$ |
| Chief of Internal Affairs | $\$ 310$ | $\$ 296$ | $\$ 358$ | $\$ 427$ | $4.6 \%$ | $-13.5 \%$ | $-27.5 \%$ |
| Chief Medical Officer | $\$ 368$ | $\$ 253$ | $\$ 304$ | $\$ 359$ | $45.5 \%$ | $21.0 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ |
| EVP of Corporate Claims | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 253$ | $\$ 304$ | $\$ 359$ | $18.8 \%$ | $-1.2 \%$ | $-16.4 \%$ |
| EVP of Strategic Planning | $\$ 276$ | $\$ 253$ | $\$ 304$ | $\$ 359$ | $9.1 \%$ | $-9.3 \%$ | $-23.2 \%$ |
| Chief Actuary | $\$ 280$ | $\$ 216$ | $\$ 258$ | $\$ 301$ | $29.6 \%$ | $8.5 \%$ | $-7.1 \%$ |
| Chief Underwriting Officer | $\$ 221$ | $\$ 216$ | $\$ 258$ | $\$ 301$ | $2.1 \%$ | $-14.5 \%$ | $-26.9 \%$ |
| Pricing Actuary | $\$ 193$ | $\$ 159$ | $\$ 187$ | $\$ 212$ | $20.9 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $-9.3 \%$ |
| OVERALL |  |  |  |  | $-4.5 \%$ | $-20.2 \%$ | $-32.4 \%$ |

## Overall, State Fund incumbents are near the P25 of market base salary

## GM analysis - target total cash

(000s)

|  | State Fund |  |  | General Market TTC |  |  | State Fund vs. Market |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Title | Base Salary | Target <br> Bonus | Target <br> Total Cash | P25 | P50 | P75 | vs. P25 | vs. P50 | vs. P75 |
| President \& CEO | \$475 | \$173 | \$648 | \$1,004 | \$1,190 | \$1,898 | -35.5\% | -45.6\% | -65.9\% |
| Chief Operations Officer | \$392 | \$118 | \$510 | \$678 | \$1,044 | \$1,296 | -24.7\% | -51.1\% | -60.6\% |
| Chief Claims Operations Officer | \$375 | \$113 | \$488 | \$461 | \$597 | \$768 | 5.7\% | -18.3\% | -36.5\% |
| General Counsel | \$375 | \$94 | \$469 | \$615 | \$733 | \$996 | -23.8\% | -36.1\% | -52.9\% |
| Chief Information Officer | \$358 | \$133 | \$491 | \$531 | \$742 | \$862 | -7.5\% | -33.8\% | -43.0\% |
| Chief Financial Officer | \$320 | \$151 | \$471 | \$649 | \$810 | \$937 | -27.4\% | -41.8\% | -49.7\% |
| Chief Risk Officer | \$310 | \$102 | \$412 | \$461 | \$597 | \$768 | -10.7\% | -30.9\% | -46.4\% |
| SVP of Insurance Services | \$326 | \$98 | \$423 | \$381 | \$488 | \$619 | 11.2\% | -13.3\% | -31.7\% |
| Chief of Internal Affairs | \$310 | \$62 | \$372 | \$381 | \$488 | \$619 | -2.3\% | -23.7\% | -39.9\% |
| Chief Medical Officer | \$368 | \$74 | \$441 | \$315 | \$400 | \$500 | 39.9\% | 10.2\% | -11.8\% |
| EVP of Corporate Claims | \$300 | \$60 | \$360 | \$315 | \$400 | \$500 | 14.2\% | -10.1\% | -28.0\% |
| EVP of Strategic Planning | \$276 | \$55 | \$331 | \$315 | \$400 | \$500 | 4.9\% | -17.4\% | -33.9\% |
| Chief Actuary | \$280 | \$56 | \$336 | \$263 | \$331 | \$407 | 27.7\% | 1.6\% | -17.3\% |
| Chief Underwriting Officer | \$221 | \$44 | \$265 | \$263 | \$331 | \$407 | 0.6\% | -20.0\% | -34.9\% |
| Pricing Actuary | \$193 | \$39 | \$231 | \$186 | \$229 | \$271 | 24.0\% | 0.8\% | -14.8\% |
| OVERALL |  |  |  |  |  |  | -8.4\% | -28.8\% | -45.0\% |

Overall, State Fund incumbents are near the P25 of market target total cash (base salary + retention bonus + at-risk differential)

## GM analysis - target total direct compensation

(000s)

| Titite | State Fund |  | General Market TIDC |  | State Fund vs. Market |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Target <br> Total Cash | Target TDC | P25 | P50 | P75 | vs. P25 | vs. P50 | vs. P75 |
| President \& CEO | $\$ 648$ | $\$ 648$ | $\$ 1,205$ | $\$ 1,451$ | $\$ 2,340$ | $-46.3 \%$ | $-55.4 \%$ | $-72.3 \%$ |
| Chief Operations Officer | $\$ 510$ | $\$ 510$ | $\$ 883$ | $\$ 1,403$ | $\$ 1,912$ | $-42.2 \%$ | $-63.6 \%$ | $-73.3 \%$ |
| Chief Claims Operations Officer | $\$ 488$ | $\$ 488$ | $\$ 639$ | $\$ 909$ | $\$ 1,303$ | $-23.8 \%$ | $-46.4 \%$ | $-62.6 \%$ |
| General Counsel | $\$ 469$ | $\$ 469$ | $\$ 747$ | $\$ 964$ | $\$ 1,393$ | $-37.2 \%$ | $-51.4 \%$ | $-66.4 \%$ |
| Chief Information Officer | $\$ 491$ | $\$ 491$ | $\$ 663$ | $\$ 973$ | $\$ 1,259$ | $-25.9 \%$ | $-49.5 \%$ | $-61.0 \%$ |
| Chief Financial Officer | $\$ 471$ | $\$ 471$ | $\$ 781$ | $\$ 1,041$ | $\$ 1,334$ | $-39.7 \%$ | $-54.7 \%$ | $-64.7 \%$ |
| Chief Risk Officer | $\$ 412$ | $\$ 412$ | $\$ 593$ | $\$ 828$ | $\$ 1,165$ | $-30.5 \%$ | $-50.2 \%$ | $-64.6 \%$ |
| SVP of Insurance Services | $\$ 423$ | $\$ 423$ | $\$ 512$ | $\$ 719$ | $\$ 1,016$ | $-17.4 \%$ | $-41.1 \%$ | $-58.4 \%$ |
| Chief of Internal Affairs | $\$ 372$ | $\$ 372$ | $\$ 473$ | $\$ 650$ | $\$ 899$ | $-21.4 \%$ | $-42.8 \%$ | $-58.6 \%$ |
| Chief Medical Officer | $\$ 441$ | $\$ 441$ | $\$ 374$ | $\$ 504$ | $\$ 681$ | $17.8 \%$ | $-12.5 \%$ | $-35.2 \%$ |
| EVP of Corporate Claims | $\$ 360$ | $\$ 360$ | $\$ 374$ | $\$ 504$ | $\$ 681$ | $-3.9 \%$ | $-28.5 \%$ | $-47.1 \%$ |
| EVP of Strategic Planning | $\$ 331$ | $\$ 331$ | $\$ 374$ | $\$ 504$ | $\$ 681$ | $-11.7 \%$ | $-34.4 \%$ | $-51.4 \%$ |
| Chief Actuary | $\$ 336$ | $\$ 336$ | $\$ 294$ | $\$ 385$ | $\$ 504$ | $14.2 \%$ | $-12.7 \%$ | $-33.3 \%$ |
| Chief Underwriting Officer | $\$ 265$ | $\$ 265$ | $\$ 294$ | $\$ 385$ | $\$ 504$ | $-10.1 \%$ | $-31.3 \%$ | $-47.5 \%$ |
| Pricing Actuary | $\$ 231$ | $\$ 231$ | $\$ 186$ | $\$ 229$ | $\$ 271$ | $24.0 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $-14.8 \%$ |
| OVERALL |  |  |  |  |  | $-25.6 \%$ | $-45.4 \%$ | $-60.8 \%$ |

## Overall, State Fund's target total direct compensation (target total cash + longterm incentives) position trends below market P25

- State Fund's target total direct compensation is equal to target total cash due to the lack of a long-term incentive
*Note that TTDC is not the sum of TTC and LTI; many companies do not report LTI and TTDC captures compensation for companies that report LTI and those that do not report any LTI awards; in the case of CEO and COO, GM data for TTDC is less than TTC + LTI


## GM analysis - total benefits

## (000s)

| Title | State Fund <br>  <br>  <br> Total Benefits |  | General Market Total Benefits |  | State Fund vs. Market |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\$ 8$ | P50 | P75 | vs. P25 | vs. P50 | vs. P75 |  |
| President \& CEO | $\$ 84$ | $\$ 55$ | $\$ 80$ | $\$ 125$ | $52.4 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $-33.0 \%$ |
| Chief Operations Officer | $\$ 81$ | $\$ 48$ | $\$ 67$ | $\$ 99$ | $68.7 \%$ | $21.9 \%$ | $-18.3 \%$ |
| Chief Claims Operations Officer | $\$ 81$ | $\$ 46$ | $\$ 61$ | $\$ 89$ | $78.5 \%$ | $32.8 \%$ | $-9.2 \%$ |
| General Counsel | $\$ 81$ | $\$ 46$ | $\$ 61$ | $\$ 89$ | $78.5 \%$ | $32.8 \%$ | $-9.2 \%$ |
| Chief Information Officer | $\$ 81$ | $\$ 46$ | $\$ 61$ | $\$ 89$ | $76.9 \%$ | $31.6 \%$ | $-10.0 \%$ |
| Chief Financial Officer | $\$ 80$ | $\$ 46$ | $\$ 61$ | $\$ 89$ | $75.7 \%$ | $30.7 \%$ | $-10.6 \%$ |
| Chief Risk Officer | $\$ 80$ | $\$ 46$ | $\$ 61$ | $\$ 89$ | $75.2 \%$ | $30.3 \%$ | $-10.8 \%$ |
| SVP of Insurance Services | $\$ 80$ | $\$ 43$ | $\$ 57$ | $\$ 81$ | $85.0 \%$ | $41.5 \%$ | $-1.2 \%$ |
| Chief of Internal Affairs | $\$ 79$ | $\$ 43$ | $\$ 57$ | $\$ 81$ | $83.1 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ | $-2.2 \%$ |
| Chief Medical Officer | $\$ 81$ | $\$ 41$ | $\$ 53$ | $\$ 74$ | $95.8 \%$ | $53.9 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ |
| EVP of Corporate Claims | $\$ 80$ | $\$ 41$ | $\$ 53$ | $\$ 74$ | $92.0 \%$ | $50.9 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ |
| EVP of Strategic Planning | $\$ 79$ | $\$ 41$ | $\$ 53$ | $\$ 74$ | $90.6 \%$ | $49.8 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ |
| Chief Actuary | $\$ 77$ | $\$ 40$ | $\$ 49$ | $\$ 68$ | $93.1 \%$ | $55.6 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ |
| Chief Underwriting Officer | $\$ 68$ | $\$ 40$ | $\$ 49$ | $\$ 68$ | $70.3 \%$ | $37.3 \%$ | $-0.1 \%$ |
| Pricing Actuary | $\$ 62$ | $\$ 37$ | $\$ 44$ | $\$ 59$ | $66.3 \%$ | $40.2 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ |
| OVERALL |  |  |  |  | $78.2 \%$ | $35.2 \%$ | $-6.1 \%$ |

Overall, State Fund's total benefit position approximates the $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile

- Market position for benefits is driven by the competitive retirement and health care programs provided through CalPERS


## GM analysis - target total remuneration <br> \section*{(000s)}

| Title | State Fund |  |  | General Market Target Total Remuneration |  |  | State Fund vs. Market |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Target TDC | Total Benefits | Target Total R | P25 | P50 | P75 | vs. P25 | vs. P50 | vs. P75 |
| President \& CEO | \$648 | \$84 | \$731 | \$1,260 | \$1,532 | \$2,465 | -42.0\% | -52.3\% | -70.3\% |
| Chief Operations Officer | \$510 | \$81 | \$591 | \$931 | \$1,470 | \$2,012 | -36.5\% | -59.8\% | -70.6\% |
| Chief Claims Operations Officer | \$488 | \$81 | \$569 | \$685 | \$970 | \$1,393 | -17.0\% | -41.4\% | -59.2\% |
| General Counsel | \$469 | \$81 | \$550 | \$792 | \$1,025 | \$1,483 | -30.6\% | -46.4\% | -62.9\% |
| Chief Information Officer | \$491 | \$81 | \$572 | \$709 | \$1,034 | \$1,348 | -19.3\% | -44.7\% | -57.6\% |
| Chief Financial Officer | \$471 | \$80 | \$551 | \$826 | \$1,102 | \$1,424 | -33.3\% | -50.0\% | -61.3\% |
| Chief Risk Officer | \$412 | \$80 | \$492 | \$639 | \$889 | \$1,255 | -23.0\% | -44.7\% | -60.8\% |
| SVP of Insurance Services | \$423 | \$80 | \$503 | \$556 | \$775 | \$1,097 | -9.4\% | -35.1\% | -54.1\% |
| Chief of Internal Affairs | \$372 | \$79 | \$451 | \$517 | \$707 | \$980 | -12.6\% | -36.1\% | -54.0\% |
| Chief Medical Officer | \$441 | \$81 | \$522 | \$416 | \$557 | \$755 | 25.5\% | -6.2\% | -30.8\% |
| EVP of Corporate Claims | \$360 | \$80 | \$440 | \$416 | \$557 | \$755 | 5.7\% | -21.0\% | -41.8\% |
| EVP of Strategic Planning | \$331 | \$79 | \$410 | \$416 | \$557 | \$755 | -1.5\% | -26.4\% | -45.7\% |
| Chief Actuary | \$336 | \$77 | \$413 | \$334 | \$434 | \$572 | 23.6\% | -5.0\% | -27.8\% |
| Chief Underwriting Officer | \$265 | \$68 | \$332 | \$334 | \$434 | \$572 | -0.5\% | -23.5\% | -41.8\% |
| Pricing Actuary | \$231 | \$62 | \$293 | \$224 | \$273 | \$330 | 31.0\% | 7.2\% | -11.1\% |
| OVERALL |  |  |  |  |  |  | -18.0\% | -39.8\% | -56.8\% |

## Overall, State Fund target total remuneration (target total direct compensation + total benefits) trends below market P25

- State Fund's target total remuneration consists of target total cash + total benefits only
*Note that TTR is not the sum of TTC plus benefits plus LTI; many companies do not report LTI and TTR captures compensation for companies that report LTI and those that do not report any LTI awards; in the case of CEO and COO, GM data for TTR is less than $T T C$ + benefits + LTI


## GM analysis - target pay mix

## The pay mix charts below compare State Fund's mix of pay to the general market

- In the general market, long-term incentive pay (LTI) is prevalent



## INS Target Total Direct Compensation Analysis

## INS analysis - summary

The table below outlines market competitiveness for incumbents by pay element

| Title | HRL | Base | TC | TDC |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Salary | Target | Target |
| President \& CEO | 28 | $<$ P25 | $<$ P25 | $<$ P25 |
| Chief Operations Officer | 26 | P25 | P25 | $<$ P25 |
| Chief Claims Operations Officer | 25 | P50 | P25-P50 | P25 |
| General Counsel | 25 | P75+ | P50-P75 | P25 |
| Chief Information Officer | 25 | P50-P75 | P75 | P25-P50 |
| Chief Financial Officer | 25 | P25 | P25-P50 | P25 |
| Chief Risk Officer | 25 | P25 | P25 | $<$ P25 |
| SVP of Insurance Services | 24 | P50 | P50 | P25 |
| Chief of Internal Affairs | 24 | P25-P50 | P25 | $<$ P25 |
| Chief Medical Officer | 23 | P75+ | P75 | P50 |
| EVP of Corporate Claims | 23 | P50 | P50 | P25 |
| EVP of Strategic Planning | 23 | P50 | P25 | P25 |
| Chief Actuary | 22 | P75 | P50-P75 | P50 |
| Chief Underwriting Officer | 22 | P25-P50 | P25 | P25 |
| Pricing Actuary | 20 | P50 | P50 | P50 |

- The majority of State Fund's incumbents trend between P25 and P50 of the insurance and financial services industry in target total cash and target total direct compensation


## INS analysis - summary <br> Target compensation

The following chart illustrates State Fund's overall market position by pay component (measured by the number of incumbents) - base salary, total cash (target), and total direct compensation (target)


## INS analysis - base salary

| (000s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Title | State Fund Base Salary | INS Market Base Salary |  |  | State Fund vs. Market |  |  |
|  |  | P25 | P50 | P75 | vs. P25 | vs. P50 | vs. P75 |
| President \& CEO | \$475 | \$598 | \$863 | \$1,053 | -20.6\% | -44.9\% | -54.9\% |
| Chief Operations Officer | \$392 | \$397 | \$459 | \$514 | -1.1\% | -14.5\% | -23.7\% |
| Chief Claims Operations Officer | \$375 | \$340 | \$394 | \$445 | 10.2\% | -4.9\% | -15.7\% |
| General Counsel | \$375 | \$288 | \$306 | \$340 | 30.4\% | 22.6\% | 10.2\% |
| Chief Information Officer | \$358 | \$284 | \$330 | \$365 | 26.0\% | 8.5\% | -1.8\% |
| Chief Financial Officer | \$320 | \$302 | \$384 | \$524 | 5.8\% | -16.7\% | -39.0\% |
| Chief Risk Officer | \$310 | \$340 | \$394 | \$445 | -8.9\% | -21.4\% | -30.3\% |
| SVP of Insurance Services | \$326 | \$294 | \$342 | \$388 | 10.6\% | -4.7\% | -16.0\% |
| Chief of Internal Affairs | \$310 | \$294 | \$342 | \$388 | 5.3\% | -9.2\% | -20.0\% |
| Chief Medical Officer | \$368 | \$252 | \$293 | \$334 | 45.9\% | 25.3\% | 10.2\% |
| EVP of Corporate Claims | \$300 | \$252 | \$293 | \$334 | 19.1\% | 2.3\% | -10.0\% |
| EVP of Strategic Planning | \$276 | \$250 | \$290 | \$330 | 10.4\% | -4.9\% | -16.5\% |
| Chief Actuary | \$280 | \$215 | \$251 | \$288 | 30.2\% | 11.7\% | -2.6\% |
| Chief Underwriting Officer | \$221 | \$205 | \$239 | \$274 | 7.7\% | -7.8\% | -19.4\% |
| Pricing Actuary | \$193 | \$155 | \$183 | \$214 | 24.0\% | 5.3\% | -10.0\% |
| OVERALL |  |  |  |  | 9.2\% | -9.1\% | -21.8\% |

Overall, State Fund's base salary position trends between market P25 - P50

## INS analysis - target total cash

(000s)

|  |  | tate Fund |  |  | Market |  |  | und vs. M |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Title | Base Salary | Target <br> Bonus | Target <br> Total Cash | P25 | P50 | P75 | vs. P25 | vs. P50 | vs. P75 |
| President \& CEO | \$475 | \$173 | \$648 | \$885 | \$1,527 | \$2,107 | -26.8\% | -57.6\% | -69.3\% |
| Chief Operations Officer | \$392 | \$118 | \$510 | \$552 | \$646 | \$797 | -7.5\% | -21.1\% | -36.0\% |
| Chief Claims Operations Officer | \$375 | \$113 | \$488 | \$454 | \$533 | \$655 | 7.4\% | -8.6\% | -25.6\% |
| General Counsel | \$375 | \$94 | \$469 | \$382 | \$428 | \$517 | 22.6\% | 9.5\% | -9.4\% |
| Chief Information Officer | \$358 | \$133 | \$491 | \$351 | \$436 | \$512 | 40.1\% | 12.8\% | -4.0\% |
| Chief Financial Officer | \$320 | \$151 | \$471 | \$402 | \$576 | \$871 | 17.1\% | -18.3\% | -45.9\% |
| Chief Risk Officer | \$310 | \$102 | \$412 | \$454 | \$533 | \$655 | -9.3\% | -22.8\% | -37.1\% |
| SVP of Insurance Services | \$326 | \$98 | \$423 | \$379 | \$446 | \$545 | 11.7\% | -5.1\% | -22.4\% |
| Chief of Internal Affairs | \$310 | \$62 | \$372 | \$379 | \$446 | \$545 | -1.8\% | -16.6\% | -31.8\% |
| Chief Medical Officer | \$368 | \$74 | \$441 | \$313 | \$370 | \$449 | 40.8\% | 19.1\% | -1.9\% |
| EVP of Corporate Claims | \$300 | \$60 | \$360 | \$313 | \$370 | \$449 | 15.0\% | -2.8\% | -19.9\% |
| EVP of Strategic Planning | \$276 | \$55 | \$331 | \$312 | \$377 | \$462 | 6.0\% | -12.2\% | -28.4\% |
| Chief Actuary | \$280 | \$56 | \$336 | \$259 | \$313 | \$373 | 29.6\% | 7.2\% | -9.8\% |
| Chief Underwriting Officer | \$221 | \$44 | \$265 | \$254 | \$301 | \$361 | 4.2\% | -12.2\% | -26.8\% |
| Pricing Actuary | \$193 | \$39 | \$231 | \$178 | \$213 | \$259 | 29.9\% | 8.4\% | -11.0\% |
| OVERALL |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.5\% | -16.9\% | -34.7\% |

## Overall, State Fund's target total cash position approximates market P25 (6.5\% above)

- The majority of State Fund's incumbents trend from P25 to P50 in target total cash


## INS analysis - target total direct compensation

|  | State | Fund |  | Market |  | Sta | und vs. | ket |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Title | Target Total Cash | Target TDC | P25 | P50 | P75 | vs. P25 | vs. P50 | vs. P75 |
| President \& CEO | \$648 | \$648 | \$1,268 | \$1,543 | \$2,484 | -49.0\% | -58.0\% | -73.9\% |
| Chief Operations Officer | \$510 | \$510 | \$667 | \$839 | \$1,065 | -23.5\% | -39.2\% | -52.1\% |
| Chief Claims Operations Officer | \$488 | \$488 | \$541 | \$679 | \$861 | -9.8\% | -28.2\% | -43.4\% |
| General Counsel | \$469 | \$469 | \$497 | \$649 | \$777 | -5.8\% | -27.8\% | -39.7\% |
| Chief Information Officer | \$491 | \$491 | \$423 | \$575 | \$676 | 16.1\% | -14.5\% | -27.3\% |
| Chief Financial Officer | \$471 | \$471 | \$523 | \$853 | \$1,271 | -10.0\% | -44.8\% | -62.9\% |
| Chief Risk Officer | \$412 | \$412 | \$541 | \$679 | \$861 | -23.8\% | -39.3\% | -52.1\% |
| SVP of Insurance Services | \$423 | \$423 | \$441 | \$553 | \$698 | -4.1\% | -23.5\% | -39.4\% |
| Chief of Internal Affairs | \$372 | \$372 | \$441 | \$553 | \$698 | -15.7\% | -32.7\% | -46.7\% |
| Chief Medical Officer | \$441 | \$441 | \$354 | \$442 | \$553 | 24.7\% | -0.2\% | -20.3\% |
| EVP of Corporate Claims | \$360 | \$360 | \$354 | \$442 | \$553 | 1.8\% | -18.5\% | -34.9\% |
| EVP of Strategic Planning | \$331 | \$331 | \$325 | \$424 | \$538 | 1.9\% | -22.0\% | -38.5\% |
| Chief Actuary | \$336 | \$336 | \$280 | \$351 | \$434 | 19.8\% | -4.3\% | -22.6\% |
| Chief Underwriting Officer | \$265 | \$265 | \$267 | \$331 | \$409 | -0.8\% | -20.1\% | -35.3\% |
| Pricing Actuary | \$231 | \$231 | \$178 | \$213 | \$259 | 29.9\% | 8.4\% | -11.0\% |
| OVERALL |  |  |  |  |  | -12.0\% | -31.6\% | -48.5\% |

## Overall, State Fund's target total direct compensation position trends below market P25 (12.0\% below)

- The majority of State Fund's incumbents approximate market P25 in target total cash
*Note that TTDC is not the sum of TTC and LTI; many companies do not report LTI and TTDC captures compensation for companies that report LTI and those that do not report any LTI awards; in the case of the CEO, INS data for TTDC is less than TTC + LTI


## INS analysis - target pay mix

- In the INS market, $42 \%$ of target total direct compensation is variable compensation ( $24 \%$ STI and $18 \%$ LTI) whereas $23 \%$ of State Fund's target total direct compensation is variable compensation
- The pay mix charts below compare State Fund's mix of pay to the INS market



## General Market Individual Market Analysis

## President \& Chief Executive Officer


*Note that TTR is not the sum of TTC plus benefits plus LTI; many companies do not report LTI and TTR captures compensation for companies that report LTI and those that do not report any LTI awards; in the case of CEO and COO, GM data for TTR is less than
TTC + benefits + LTI
This information was prepared for purposes of compliance with Cal. Insurance Code reporting requirements and should not be used or disseminated outside of that intended purpose.

## Chief Operations Officer


*Note that TTR is not the sum of TTC plus benefits plus LTI; many companies do not report LTI and TTR captures compensation for companies that report LTI and those that do not report any LTI awards; in the case of CEO and COO, GM data for TTR is less than $T T C+$ benefits $+L T I$

## Chief Claims Operations Officer



## General Counsel



## Chief Information Officer



## Chief Financial Officer



## Chief Risk Officer



## SVP of Insurance Services



## Chief of Internal Affairs



## Chief Medical Officer



## EVP of Corporate Claims




## EVP of Strategic Planning



## Chief Actuary



## Chief Underwriting Officer




## Pricing Actuary



INS Individual Market Analysis

This information was prepared for purposes of compliance with Cal. Insurance Code reporting requirements and should not be used or disseminated outside of that intended purpose.

## President \& Chief Executive Officer


*Note that TTDC is not the sum of TTC and LTI; many companies do not report LTI and TTDC captures compensation for companies that report LTI and those that do not report any LTI awards; in the case of the CEO, INS data for TTDC is less than TTC + LTI
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## Chief Operations Officer



## Chief Claims Operations Officer



## General Counsel



## Chief Information Officer



## Chief Financial Officer




## Chief Risk Officer



## SVP of Insurance Services
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## Chief of Internal Affairs



## Chief Medical Officer



## EVP of Corporate Claims



## EVP of Strategic Planning



## Chief Actuary



## Chief Underwriting Officer



## Pricing Actuary



## Appendices

This information was prepared for purposes of compliance with Cal. Insurance Code reporting requirements and should not be used or disseminated outside of that intended purpose.

## Comparator organizations - INS

- ACUITY
- American Century Investments (Insurance \& Financials)
- American Express
- American Family Insurance Group
- Ameriprise Financial
- Anonymous
- Anonymous
- Arch Insurance
- Arthur J. Gallagher
- Boston Financial Data Services
- Capital Group Companies
- Caterpillar Financial Services
- Charles Schwab
- Citizenm Financial Holding B.V.
- Colorado PERA
- Coverys
- Dollar Financial Group
- EBSCO Industries -- Real Estate Division
- EBSCO Industries -- SS Nesbitt
- Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas
- Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City
- Fidelity Investments
- First Data
- FM Global (Industrial)
- Harford Mutual Insurance
- Hillwood Development
- Horace Mann Services Corporation
- Kansas City Life Insurance
- LL Global
- Loews Corporation
- Louisiana Workers' Compensation
- Main Street America Group
- Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance -OppenheimerFunds
- MasterCard International
- Member's First Credit Union
- Menlo Equities
- Montana State Fund
- Munich American Reassurance
- New York Life Insurance Company
- Ohio Mutual Insurance Group
- Penn National Insurance
- Penn National Insurance -- Inservco
- Preferred Mutual Insurance
- Simmons First National
- SKYGEN USA
- State Farm Insurance


## Comparator organizations - INS (continued)

- State Farm Insurance (Call Center Survey)
- Stork B.V.
- Swiss Re
- T. Rowe Price
- TD AmeriTrade Holding
- Texas Mutual Insurance
- Toyota Financial Services
- TransUnion
- Tribal Lending Enter -- Upper Lake Processing Services(ULPS)
- Tribal Lending Enterprises
- Tribal Lending Enterprises -- ArrowShade
- Tuscarora Wayne Group of Companies
- Vanguard Group
- Verve Credit Union
- Western Union Financial Services
- Wills Group
- Workers Compensation Fund
- Regency Finance
- Resolution Life
- Securian
- Security Finance
- Security Finance Corp of Spartanburg -- Prof Financial Srvcs


## Methodology - Hay Benefit Valuation Methodology

- KFHG utilizes a proprietary actuarial valuation methodology to evaluate benefit plans in terms of the cash equivalence of the benefits
- In establishing a program's overall market competitiveness the Hay Benefit Valuation model uses "standard cost assumptions", instead of a company's specific costs, which eliminates the impact of such cost variables as demographics, geography, funding method, or purchasing power, etc.
- The common cost approach is illustrated below using life insurance

|  | Basic Life <br> Insurance <br> Benefit | Salary Level | Actual Cost <br> per month | Actual Cost <br> Per year | Common <br> Cost Rate | Common <br> Cost per <br> Year or <br> VALUE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Client | $1 \times$ pay | $\$ 200 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ .20 / \$ 1000$ | $\$ 480$ | $\$ .1875 / \$ 1000$ | $\$ 450$ |
| Market | $2 \times$ pay | $\$ 200 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ .10 / \$ 1000$ | $\$ 480$ | $\$ .1875 / \$ 1000$ | $\$ 900$ |

- If value is based on actual costs, then these benefits would be equal. By using the common cost approach i.e., eliminating the impact of company specific costs, the $2 \times$ pay benefit has more value than the $1 \times$ pay benefit


## Methodology - Hay Benefit Valuation Methodology

- The utilization of "standard or common cost assumptions" provides a uniform quantitative evaluation method which produces values based solely on the level of the benefit provided
- The valuation model places a relative value on each specific feature of a benefit program. The value for each plan is then compiled to produce an overall program value appropriate for market comparison. In general, the more generous a particular feature is the higher the relative value
The valuation method is applied to a full range of employee benefits including:
- Healthcare Insurance (medical, dental, RX, vision, physical exams);
- Retirement Plans (defined benefit and defined contribution plans);
- Death Benefits (employer paid and voluntary life insurance plans);
- Disability and Sick Leave (sick leave, short-term, long-term disability plans); and
- Other benefits such as Tuition Reimbursement, Flex Plans, Statutory Benefits, etc.


## Methodology - Hay Benefit Valuation Methodology

- Benefit values are calculated on an "Employer-paid" basis. Employer-paid benefit values are discounted to reflect the relationship of any required employee contributions to the program's total value. For fully employee-paid plans, the discount is $95 \%$ (some value remains due to such things as group purchasing power, etc.). For fully employer-paid plans, there is no discount, and for cost shared plans, a pro-ration is applied
- Using 401(k) plans as an example, the table below compares three match formulas:

|  | Match Formula | Salary Level | Maximum <br> Match | Discount | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Client | $100 \%$ of $6 \%$ of pay | $\$ 200,000$ | $\$ 12,000$ | $3 \%$ | $\$ 11,640$ |
| Market 1 | $100 \%$ of $3 \%$ of pay and <br> $50 \%$ of next $2 \%$ of pay | $\$ 200,000$ | $\$ 8,000$ | $7.5 \%$ | $\$ 7,424$ |
| Market 2 | $50 \%$ of $6 \%$ of pay | $\$ 200,000$ | $\$ 6,000$ | $13 \%$ | $\$ 5,234$ |

- The discount rate reflects the likelihood employees will maximize their contribution to receive the full employer match. In the example, employees are more likely to contribute $6 \%$ under Client's plan because the match potential is $100 \%$, whereas under the Market 1 plan the match potential is $80 \%$. Under the Market 2 plan the match potential is only $50 \%$, but of a higher 6\% contribution


## Geographic Salary Levels

- The table below illustrates the salary level in Alameda County, relative to national average
- A $15 \%$ premium was applied to the market data, given that the salaries of State Fund's exempt team are nearest the high end of the following base salary range

| Comparison City vs. United <br> States Average | $\$ 75,000$ | $\$ 100,000$ | $\$ 150,000$ | $\$ 200,000$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alameda County, California | 121.7 | 121.3 | 117.9 | 115.2 |

*Source: Economic Research Institute


[^0]:    This information was prepared for purposes of compliance with Cal. Insurance Code reporting requirements and should not be used or disseminated outside of that intended purpose.

[^1]:    This information was prepared for purposes of compliance with Cal. Insurance Code reporting requirements and should not be used or disseminated outside of that intended purpose.

