



Pearl Meyer & Partners  
*Comprehensive Compensation®*

# ON POINT

TIMELY, ACCURATE, INSIGHTFUL

## **PM&P On Point: 2011 CEO Succession Planning Survey Banking Edition**

## Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Key Highlights	4
Demographics – Firm Characteristics	6
Demographics – Respondent Characteristics	7
Experience with a CEO Succession	8
Challenges in CEO Succession Process	10
Involvement in CEO Succession Process	12
CEO Succession Process	15
Internal versus External Candidates	16
Communication and Preparation/Grooming Process	17
Emergency Plan	18
About Pearl Meyer & Partners	19

## Introduction

CEO succession planning has emerged as one of the most critical responsibilities of the Board of Directors, given that changes in leadership are frequent and, in some cases, unpredictable. Experience has demonstrated that the costs and negative impact can be high if companies fail to put in place an effective succession process that is ready to be implemented when needed.

Pearl Meyer & Partners' **On Point: CEO Succession Planning Survey Banking Edition** is designed to provide insight into how banking institutions and other companies are approaching the succession planning process, along with the key talent management and compensation issues that support a successful change of leadership.

The survey was conducted online between June 13, 2011 and July 25, 2011. There were 153 participants across numerous industries. Roughly 25% or 39 participants were from banking institutions, including 15 board members, 8 chief executive officers and 16 human resources professionals or other employees. The survey addressed topics such as:

- Key CEO succession challenges companies are facing
- Who participates in the succession planning process
- The time horizon for succession planning
- Consideration of internal versus external CEO candidates
- Development of potential internal CEO candidates
- Retention of internal CEO candidates who aren't selected
- The relative importance of an external market search
- Communication about CEO succession plans with the Board and internal candidates

We hope that you find this information useful. If you would like to discuss any aspect of these findings further, please contact:

**Laura Hay**  
Managing Director

Email: [laura.hay@pearlmeyer.com](mailto:laura.hay@pearlmeyer.com)  
Phone: (704) 844-0437

**Katherine Mahlum**  
Vice President

Email: [katherine.mahlum@pearlmeyer.com](mailto:katherine.mahlum@pearlmeyer.com)  
Phone: (415) 651-4565

## Key Highlights

The following summarizes key highlights from our Banking Edition Survey, including areas where banking participants' responses varied from other industry participants.

### Frequency of CEO Succession

- 46% of banking survey participants experienced a CEO succession within the past five years.

### Challenges in the CEO Succession Process

- The following situations were viewed as either *Very Challenging* or *Somewhat Challenging* succession scenarios among banking participants:
  - 44% identified *Possible loss of candidates not chosen*.
  - 41% identified *No viable internal candidates*.
  - 33% identified *Iconic CEO is difficult to replace*.
- Despite expressing concern about the loss of “runner up” candidates, many banking participants – similar to other industry respondents – said they did not experience a retention issue. Among banking participants who experienced a CEO succession within the past five years:
  - 67% said their key internal candidates remained with the bank; 50% said key internal candidates stayed at the bank, with no adjustments to position or pay; and 17% said key internal candidates stayed at the bank but their pay and/or position were adjusted.
  - 28% said key internal candidates left the bank to work for another organization or retired.

### Involvement in CEO Succession Planning

Lead roles in CEO succession planning often were fulfilled by the Board of Directors or a designated Board Committee:

- The full Board of Directors most frequently took the lead in the CEO succession planning process (40% of banking participants).
- Alternatively, a Board Committee led the process, typically the Compensation Committee (29%) or the Nominating/Governance Committee (15%).
- The Chairman of the Board (non-CEO) also served in a lead role (24%) as well as the Lead or Presiding Director (12%).

### Time Horizon for Planning an Eventual CEO Succession

Ideally, the CEO succession plan was discussed at least annually in executive session by the Board, even if a new CEO has just been named. The planning process may consider succession scenarios over multiple time horizons (e.g., emergency, near-term, mid-term, long-term), as well as ongoing leadership development planning for the senior team.

- 56% of banking participants reviewed the CEO succession plan at least once a year.
- They were more likely to review succession on an as-needed basis (41.2%) than other industries (26.9%).
- Over half (57%) of banking participants looked 4-6 years into the future. Banking participants also looked at shorter- and longer-term horizons; 29% looked at 1-3 years and 23% looked at 7-10 years into the future. About a third of the banks considered an emergency plan.
- Compared to other industries, banks were slightly less likely to consider emergency transitions. Banks generally do not plan successions more than 10 years down the road.

### **Internal versus External CEO Candidates**

- While 73% of banking participants preferred internal candidates, only half of the banks that experienced a CEO succession in the past five years actually selected an internal candidate.
- Banking participants typically considered two (29%) or three (19%) internal candidates as part of their CEO succession planning process; 16% responded that they did not consider any internal candidates.
- Despite Board preferences for internal candidates, 61% of banking participants believed an external market search is “very” or “moderately” necessary, even when there are strong internal candidates.
  - Only 9% of banking participants reviewed external candidates at least annually.
  - 38% never reviewed external candidates outside of an active search.

### **Communication and Preparation/Grooming Process for Internal Candidates**

- More than half (53%) of banking participants had not told their internal candidates they are under consideration as a potential CEO successor.
  - The two most common techniques for developing potential CEO successors were *more leadership roles* (94%) and *more exposure to the Board of Directors* (91%).
  - Banks were less likely to use the following techniques than other industry participants: *job rotation* (15% versus 37%) or *more exposure to the public* (36% versus 52%).
- Banking participants were more likely than other respondents to provide frequent “face time” with the Board outside of a formal selection process, with 84% indicating such meetings took place at least four times a year.

### **New CEO Pay**

- New CEO target pay for banking participants that experienced a CEO succession in the past five years was the same or less than the previous CEO’s target pay at 88% of banking respondents, compared to 72% of other industry participants.
- Most banking survey participants that experienced a CEO succession in the past five years and chose an internal candidate did not immediately bump up the new CEO’s regular pay package to market median, compared to 23% of respondents from other industries that did so.
- For internal CEO promotions:
  - 50% of banks did not bridge the gap.
  - 50% bridged the gap over a specified number of months, of which 60% bridged the gap over 12 months and 40% over 24 months.

### **Designated Emergency CEO**

- Banking participants were more likely than other industry participants to have identified an emergency “interim” CEO replacement (82% versus 63%), and to have communicated their choice to that individual (93% versus 76%).
- Among both banking participants and other industry respondents, at least half considered the interim CEO as a candidate.

**Demographics - Firm  
Characteristics**

	Summary	Industry Group	
	All Firms	Banking	All Other Participants
Number of Firms	153	39	114
<b>Revenue Category</b>			
Under \$100 million	11.8%		15.8%
\$100 million to less than \$300 million	9.2%	2.6%	11.4%
\$300 million to less than \$1 billion	15.0%	12.8%	15.8%
\$1 billion to less than \$3 billion	29.4%	48.7%	22.8%
\$3 billion to less than \$10 billion	19.6%	28.2%	16.7%
\$10 billion or greater	15.0%	7.7%	17.5%
<b>Industry Group</b>			
Indust / Matl	15.7%		21.1%
Consumer Discr / Staples	13.7%		18.4%
Health / Equip / Pharm	2.6%		3.5%
Financials / Insurance / Health	39.2%	97.4%	19.3%
Info Tech / Tele Svcs	8.5%		11.4%
Energy / Utilities	11.8%		15.8%
NFP / Tax Exempt / Govt Chartered	8.5%	2.6%	10.5%
<b>Form of Ownership</b>			
Publicly Held - For Profit	64.1%	69.2%	62.3%
Closely Held/Family Held - For Profit	5.2%	2.6%	6.1%
Privately Held - For Profit	11.8%	5.1%	14.0%
Mutual, Cooperative, or membership organization	10.5%	20.5%	7.0%
Tax Exempt or Government Chartered, including 501(c)(3), FFRDC	8.5%	2.6%	10.5%

**Demographics - Respondent Characteristics**

	Summary	Industry Group	
	All Firms	Banking	All Other Participants
Number of Firms	153	39	114
<b>Type of Respondent</b>			
Employee of the Firm	55.6%	61.5%	53.5%
Outside Director	44.4%	38.5%	46.5%
<b>Role of Respondent</b>			
Chief Executive Officer	9.2%	20.5%	5.3%
Chief Financial Officer	0.0%		
Head of Human Resources	15.0%	25.6%	11.4%
Head of Compensation function	9.8%	5.1%	11.4%
General Counsel	4.6%	2.6%	5.3%
Other member of the executive team	2.0%	2.6%	1.8%
Other member of the Compensation function	7.8%	2.6%	9.6%
Member of Human Resources outside the Compensation function	1.3%		1.8%
Other employee of the firm	5.9%	2.6%	7.0%
Chair of the Compensation Committee	11.8%	7.7%	13.2%
Other member of the Compensation Committee	4.6%		6.1%
Non-Executive Chair of the Board	7.2%	7.7%	7.0%
Other member of the Board	20.9%	23.1%	20.2%

**Experience with a CEO Succession\***

	Summary	Industry Group	
	All Firms	Banking	All Other Participants
Number of Firms	153	39	114
Number of Firms With Prior Succession	73	18	55
<b>Has the firm experienced a CEO succession within past 5 years?</b>			
Yes	47.7%	46.2%	48.2%
No	52.3%	53.8%	51.8%
<b>Did key internal candidates leave prior to CEO selection?</b>			
No	71.0%	94.4%	62.7%
Yes, this was a major issue	8.7%		11.8%
Yes, this was not a major issue	14.5%	5.6%	17.6%
Our organization considered only external candidates	5.8%		7.8%
<b>Did CEO candidates receive any special changes in compensation before a new CEO was announced?</b>			
Revised employment agreement	8.6%	11.1%	7.7%
Increased annual cash compensation	10.0%	11.1%	9.6%
Increased annual equity compensation	10.0%	0.0%	13.5%
Provided additional/special cash award	4.3%	5.6%	3.8%
Provided additional/special equity award	2.9%	0.0%	3.8%
Enhanced benefits and/or perquisites	1.4%	5.6%	0.0%
Other	5.7%	5.6%	5.8%
None	72.9%	72.2%	73.1%
<b>Did you choose an internal or external candidate as the new permanent CEO?</b>			
Internal	53.6%	50.0%	54.9%
External	40.6%	44.4%	39.2%
Other	5.8%	5.6%	5.9%
Interim CEO - permanent new CEO not yet selected	0.0%		

\* Note: Figures reflect only those respondents who experienced a CEO succession within the past 5 years

**Experience with a CEO Succession  
(Continued)\***

	Industry Group		
	Summary	Banking	All Other Participants
	All Firms		
Number of Firms	153	39	114
Number of Firms With Prior Succession	73	18	55
<b>For promotions, how quickly did organization bridge gap between pay for new CEO and pay at market median for CEOs?</b>			
Bridged gap within specified number of months	46.9%	50.0%	45.8%
Did not bridge gap	53.1%	50.0%	54.2%
<b>Number of months to bridge gap</b>			
0	16.7%		23.1%
12	22.2%	60.0%	7.7%
14	5.6%		7.7%
18	11.1%		15.4%
24	27.8%	40.0%	23.1%
36	16.7%		23.1%
<b>How does new CEO target pay level compare to previous CEO target pay?</b>			
Significantly lower than previous CEO	14.1%	23.5%	10.6%
Slightly lower	26.6%	23.5%	27.7%
About the same	35.9%	41.2%	34.0%
Slightly higher	12.5%	11.8%	12.8%
Significantly higher	10.9%		14.9%
<b>What happened to key internal CEO candidates not chosen?</b>			
Stayed at organization, with no adjustments to position or pay	33.8%	50.0%	27.7%
Stayed at organization, but position was adjusted	18.5%	11.1%	21.3%
Stayed at organization, but pay level was adjusted	12.3%	5.6%	14.9%
Left the organization to work for another organization	21.5%	11.1%	25.5%
Retired	10.8%	16.7%	8.5%
Other	21.5%	16.7%	23.4%

\* Note: Figures reflect only those respondents who experienced a CEO succession within the past 5 years

**Challenges in CEO Succession Process**

	Summary	Industry Group	
	All Firms	Banking	All Other Participants
Number of Firms	153	39	114
<b>Possible loss of candidates not chosen</b>			
Very Challenging	12.1%	5.9%	14.4%
Somewhat Challenging	37.9%	38.2%	37.8%
Not Challenging	29.8%	38.2%	26.7%
NA (Situation Does Not Exist)	20.2%	17.6%	21.1%
<b>Difficulty holding onto key candidates prior to selection</b>			
Very Challenging	3.2%	2.9%	3.3%
Somewhat Challenging	24.2%	20.6%	25.6%
Not Challenging	47.6%	50.0%	46.7%
NA (Situation Does Not Exist)	25.0%	26.5%	24.4%
<b>Possibility that current CEO will retire/quit sooner than anticipated</b>			
Very Challenging	7.3%	2.9%	9.0%
Somewhat Challenging	23.6%	23.5%	23.6%
Not Challenging	35.0%	23.5%	39.3%
NA (Situation Does Not Exist)	34.1%	50.0%	28.1%
<b>CEO and next candidates are close in age and experience</b>			
Very Challenging	5.8%	8.8%	4.6%
Somewhat Challenging	23.1%	20.6%	24.1%
Not Challenging	29.8%	23.5%	32.2%
NA (Situation Does Not Exist)	41.3%	47.1%	39.1%
<b>Primary succession candidate is much younger or much less experienced</b>			
Very Challenging	2.4%		3.4%
Somewhat Challenging	26.8%	14.7%	31.5%
Not Challenging	26.8%	41.2%	21.3%
NA (Situation Does Not Exist)	43.9%	44.1%	43.8%
<b>Iconic CEO is difficult to replace</b>			
Very Challenging	12.3%	9.1%	13.5%
Somewhat Challenging	29.5%	24.2%	31.5%
Not Challenging	21.3%	27.3%	19.1%
NA (Situation Does Not Exist)	36.9%	39.4%	36.0%

**Challenges in CEO Succession Process (continued)**

	Summary	Industry Group	
	All Firms	Banking	All Other Participants
Number of Firms	153	39	114
<b>Owner/Founder CEO is difficult to replace</b>			
Very Challenging	4.9%		6.7%
Somewhat Challenging	9.8%	8.8%	10.1%
Not Challenging	4.1%	5.9%	3.4%
NA (Situation Does Not Exist)	81.3%	85.3%	79.8%
<b>CEO does not want to be replaced</b>			
Very Challenging	9.0%	8.8%	9.1%
Somewhat Challenging	15.6%	11.8%	17.0%
Not Challenging	18.0%	17.6%	18.2%
NA (Situation Does Not Exist)	57.4%	61.8%	55.7%
<b>Too many candidates</b>			
Very Challenging	0.0%		
Somewhat Challenging	6.5%	2.9%	7.9%
Not Challenging	22.8%	20.6%	23.6%
NA (Situation Does Not Exist)	70.7%	76.5%	68.5%
<b>No viable internal candidates</b>			
Very Challenging	7.3%	8.8%	6.7%
Somewhat Challenging	30.9%	32.4%	30.3%
Not Challenging	18.7%	23.5%	16.9%
NA (Situation Does Not Exist)	43.1%	35.3%	46.1%
<b>Potential adverse impact of succession-related compensation or program design actions</b>			
Very Challenging	0.8%		1.1%
Somewhat Challenging	29.3%	26.5%	30.3%
Not Challenging	26.8%	23.5%	28.1%
NA (Situation Does Not Exist)	43.1%	50.0%	40.4%
<b>Other</b>			
Very Challenging	5.4%	8.3%	4.5%
Somewhat Challenging	5.4%		6.8%
Not Challenging	3.6%		4.5%
NA (Situation Does Not Exist)	85.7%	91.7%	84.1%

**Involvement in CEO Succession Process**

	Summary	Industry Group	
	All Firms	Banking	All Other Participants
Number of Firms	153	39	114
<b>Full Board of Directors</b>			
Lead Role	37.0%	40.0%	35.9%
Primary Participant	37.8%	40.0%	37.0%
Support Role	20.5%	20.0%	20.7%
Not Involved	1.6%		2.2%
NA (Function Does Not Exist)	3.1%		4.3%
<b>Compensation Committee</b>			
Lead Role	22.2%	29.4%	19.6%
Primary Participant	30.2%	17.6%	34.8%
Support Role	35.7%	47.1%	31.5%
Not Involved	4.0%	5.9%	3.3%
NA (Function Does Not Exist)	7.9%		10.9%
<b>Nominating/Governance Committee</b>			
Lead Role	21.6%	15.2%	23.9%
Primary Participant	28.0%	24.2%	29.3%
Support Role	22.4%	27.3%	20.7%
Not Involved	14.4%	27.3%	9.8%
NA (Function Does Not Exist)	13.6%	6.1%	16.3%
<b>Other Board committee</b>			
Lead Role	7.4%	6.3%	7.8%
Primary Participant	4.9%	12.5%	2.2%
Support Role	18.0%	18.8%	17.8%
Not Involved	41.8%	43.8%	41.1%
NA (Function Does Not Exist)	27.9%	18.8%	31.1%
<b>Non-CEO Board Chair</b>			
Lead Role	19.0%	24.2%	17.0%
Primary Participant	27.3%	36.4%	23.9%
Support Role	9.1%	6.1%	10.2%
Not Involved	5.0%	9.1%	3.4%
NA (Function Does Not Exist)	39.7%	24.2%	45.5%

**Involvement in CEO Succession  
Process (continued)**

	Summary	Industry Group	
	All Firms	Banking	All Other Participants
Number of Firms	153	39	114
<b>Lead or Presiding Director</b>			
Lead Role	14.6%	12.1%	15.6%
Primary Participant	24.4%	15.2%	27.8%
Support Role	13.0%	18.2%	11.1%
Not Involved	4.1%	6.1%	3.3%
NA (Function Does Not Exist)	43.9%	48.5%	42.2%
<b>Current CEO</b>			
Lead Role	24.4%	30.3%	22.2%
Primary Participant	34.1%	24.2%	37.8%
Support Role	25.2%	27.3%	24.4%
Not Involved	9.8%	12.1%	8.9%
NA (Function Does Not Exist)	6.5%	6.1%	6.7%
<b>Top Human Resource Executive</b>			
Lead Role	9.5%	8.8%	9.8%
Primary Participant	15.9%	5.9%	19.6%
Support Role	50.0%	55.9%	47.8%
Not Involved	14.3%	26.5%	9.8%
NA (Function Does Not Exist)	10.3%	2.9%	13.0%
<b>Other HR Executive(s)</b>			
Lead Role	0.8%		1.1%
Primary Participant	1.6%	3.0%	1.1%
Support Role	25.8%	15.2%	29.7%
Not Involved	37.9%	36.4%	38.5%
NA (Function Does Not Exist)	33.9%	45.5%	29.7%
<b>Other non-CEO/non-HR Executive(s)</b>			
Primary Participant	4.0%	6.1%	3.3%
Support Role	30.4%	27.3%	31.5%
Not Involved	37.6%	36.4%	38.0%
NA (Function Does Not Exist)	28.0%	30.3%	27.2%

**Involvement in CEO Succession  
Process (continued)**

	Summary	Industry Group	
	All Firms	Banking	All Other Participants
Number of Firms	153	39	114
<b>Executive Recruiter/Search Consultant</b>			
Lead Role	8.1%	12.5%	6.5%
Primary Participant	12.1%	15.6%	10.9%
Support Role	25.8%	25.0%	26.1%
Not Involved	29.0%	25.0%	30.4%
NA (Function Does Not Exist)	25.0%	21.9%	26.1%
<b>Succession Expert</b>			
Lead Role	1.6%	6.1%	
Primary Participant	0.8%	3.0%	
Support Role	16.8%	33.3%	10.9%
Not Involved	34.4%	24.2%	38.0%
NA (Function Does Not Exist)	46.4%	33.3%	51.1%
<b>External Compensation Consultant</b>			
Lead Role	1.6%	6.3%	
Primary Participant	4.0%	6.3%	3.3%
Support Role	41.1%	46.9%	39.1%
Not Involved	27.4%	21.9%	29.3%
NA (Function Does Not Exist)	25.8%	18.8%	28.3%
<b>Other</b>			
Lead Role	3.9%	10.0%	2.4%
Primary Participant	2.0%		2.4%
Support Role	5.9%	10.0%	4.9%
Not Involved	17.6%	40.0%	12.2%
NA (Function Does Not Exist)	70.6%	40.0%	78.0%

**CEO Succession Process**

	Summary	Industry Group	
	All Firms	Banking	All Other Participants
Number of Firms	153	39	114
<b>Time horizon for planning an eventual CEO succession</b>			
Emergency plan (immediate)	35.4%	31.4%	36.8%
Near-term (1-3 years)	39.2%	28.6%	43.2%
Mid-term (4-6 years)	57.7%	57.1%	57.9%
Long-term (7-10 years)	18.5%	22.9%	16.8%
10+ years plan	3.1%	5.7%	2.1%
<b>How frequently is CEO succession plan reviewed by Board of Directors or Board committee?</b>			
Never	3.9%	2.9%	4.3%
As needed	30.7%	41.2%	26.9%
Every two years	2.4%		3.2%
Annually	52.0%	44.1%	54.8%
2 or 3 times annually	11.0%	11.8%	10.8%
4 or more times annually	0.0%		
<b>How many internal candidates are currently part of the CEO succession planning process?</b>			
Average number of candidates (excluding 0s)	2.4	2.9	2.2
0	19.5%	16.1%	20.7%
1	14.4%	9.7%	16.1%
2	34.7%	29.0%	36.8%
3	21.2%	19.4%	21.8%
4	5.1%	12.9%	2.3%
5	4.2%	12.9%	1.1%
6	0.8%		1.1%

**Internal versus External Candidates**

	Summary	Industry Group	
	All Firms	Banking	All Other Participants
Number of Firms	153	39	114
<b>Prefer internal or external CEO candidates?</b>			
Strongly prefer internal candidate	39.2%	45.5%	37.0%
Moderately prefer internal candidate	36.0%	27.3%	39.1%
No preference either way	19.2%	18.2%	19.6%
Moderately prefer external candidate	3.2%	6.1%	2.2%
Strongly prefer external candidate	2.4%	3.0%	2.2%
<b>How important is an external market search (even if there are strong internal candidates)?</b>			
Very necessary	29.8%	24.2%	31.9%
Moderately necessary	31.5%	36.4%	29.7%
Neither necessary nor unnecessary	22.6%	18.2%	24.2%
Moderately unnecessary	8.9%	15.2%	6.6%
Very unnecessary	7.3%	6.1%	7.7%
<b>How often do you identify and evaluate potential external CEO candidates outside of a search process?</b>			
Never	31.2%	37.5%	29.0%
As needed	58.4%	53.1%	60.2%
Annually	9.6%	9.4%	9.7%
Two times annually	0.0%		
More than twice annually	0.8%		1.1%
<b>Do you have a plan for retaining internal candidates who are not ultimately selected for CEO?</b>			
Yes	40.5%	36.4%	41.9%
No	59.5%	63.6%	58.1%

**Communication and Preparation /  
Grooming Process**

	Summary	Industry Group	
	All Firms	Banking	All Other Participants
Number of Firms	153	39	114
<b>Are internal candidates explicitly made aware they are considered a potential CEO successor?</b>			
Yes	55.3%	46.9%	58.2%
No	44.7%	53.1%	41.8%
<b>How are potential CEO successors developed?</b>			
Job rotation	31.3%	15.2%	36.8%
More leadership roles	85.9%	93.9%	83.2%
More exposure to the Board of Directors	83.6%	90.9%	81.1%
More exposure to the public	47.7%	36.4%	51.6%
Executive coach	29.7%	27.3%	30.5%
Board member acts as a mentor	12.5%	6.1%	14.7%
Other	4.7%	3.0%	5.3%
No formal development or coaching provided	13.3%	9.1%	14.7%
<b>How often do key CEO successor candidates have "face time" with the Board outside of a formal selection process?</b>			
Never	3.2%		4.3%
Every two years	4.0%		5.4%
Annually	7.2%	9.4%	6.5%
2 or 3 times annually	19.2%	6.3%	23.7%
4 or more times annually	66.4%	84.4%	60.2%

**Emergency Plan**

	Summary	Industry Group	
	All Firms	Banking	All Other Participants
Number of Firms	153	39	114
<b>Has the organization identified an emergency CEO replacement to serve on an interim basis if necessary?</b>			
Yes	68.3%	81.8%	63.4%
No	31.7%	18.2%	36.6%
<b>Is the interim CEO replacement also likely to be considered as a CEO candidate?</b>			
Yes	50.6%	51.9%	50.0%
No	49.4%	48.1%	50.0%
<b>Does every Board member know the identity of the interim CEO replacement?</b>			
Yes	87.1%	88.9%	86.2%
No	12.9%	11.1%	13.8%
<b>Is that person aware that s/he would be the interim CEO replacement?</b>			
Yes	81.2%	92.6%	75.9%
No	18.8%	7.4%	24.1%

## About Pearl Meyer & Partners

For more than 20 years, PM&P has served as a trusted independent advisor to Boards and their senior management in the areas of compensation governance, strategy and program design. The firm provides comprehensive solutions to complex compensation challenges through the development of programs that align rewards with business goals to create long-term value for all stakeholders: shareholders, executives and employees. The firm maintains offices in New York, Atlanta, Boston, Charlotte, Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles, San Francisco and San Jose.

## About our Community Banking Expertise

Our banking practice is headed in our Boston office where we provide consulting services and administer compensation surveys for bank executives, employees and board of directors. We have a team of consultants exclusively dedicated to serving the banking industry. For information on PM&P banking surveys or consulting services, please contact your local office.

## Contact Us

For other information and guidance on compensation issues, or to learn more about Pearl Meyer & Partners' services, please feel free to contact any of our offices listed on the next page.

**Please note:** This survey and its contents are confidential and proprietary and should not be provided to other parties outside the firm for which the data was reported (non-participating firms) without the express written consent of Pearl Meyer & Partners.



Pearl Meyer & Partners  
*Comprehensive Compensation*<sup>®</sup>

[www.pearlmeyer.com](http://www.pearlmeyer.com)

**NEW YORK**

570 Lexington Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
(212) 644-2300  
[newyork@pearlmeyer.com](mailto:newyork@pearlmeyer.com)

**ATLANTA**

One Alliance Center  
3500 Lenox Road, Suite 1708  
Atlanta, GA 30326  
(770) 261-4083  
[atlanta@pearlmeyer.com](mailto:atlanta@pearlmeyer.com)

**BOSTON**

132 Turnpike Road, Suite 300  
Southborough, MA 01772  
(508) 460-9600  
[boston@pearlmeyer.com](mailto:boston@pearlmeyer.com)

**CHARLOTTE**

3326 Siskey Parkway, Suite 330  
Matthews, NC 28105  
(704) 844-6626  
[charlotte@pearlmeyer.com](mailto:charlotte@pearlmeyer.com)

**CHICAGO**

123 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 860  
Chicago, IL 60606  
(312) 242-3050  
[chicago@pearlmeyer.com](mailto:chicago@pearlmeyer.com)

**HOUSTON**

Three Riverway, Suite 1575  
Houston, TX 77056  
(713) 568-2200  
[houston@pearlmeyer.com](mailto:houston@pearlmeyer.com)

**LOS ANGELES**

550 S. Hope Street, Suite 1600  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
(213) 438-6500  
[losangeles@pearlmeyer.com](mailto:losangeles@pearlmeyer.com)

**SAN FRANCISCO**

455 Market Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
(415) 651-4560  
[sanfrancisco@pearlmeyer.com](mailto:sanfrancisco@pearlmeyer.com)

**SAN JOSE**

2880 Zanker Road, Suite 203  
San Jose, CA 95134  
(408) 954-7399  
[sanjose@pearlmeyer.com](mailto:sanjose@pearlmeyer.com)

