



THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS HEALTH SCIENCE CENTER AT SAN ANTONIO REPORT ON INFORMATION REGARDING STAFF COMPENSATION

In compliance with *Texas Government Code Sec. 659.026*, INFORMATION REGARDING STAFF COMPENSATION, the following information is made available:

- I. the number of full-time equivalent employees employed by the agency;

	Fiscal Year 2016
Full-time equivalent employees	5,399.0

Source: Quarterly FTE reports filed with the Texas State Auditor’s Office and based on four-quarter average.

- II. the amount of legislative appropriations to the agency for each fiscal year of the current state fiscal biennium;

	Fiscal Year 2016	Fiscal Year 2017
Total Appropriation All Funds	\$154,177,201	\$154,265,148

Source: 84th Legislative Session, *General Appropriations Act*, Article III. The amounts shown include direct appropriations from all funds.

- III. the agency’s methodology, including any employment market analysis, for determine the compensation of executive staff employed by the agency, along with the name and position of the person who selected the methodology;

The U. T. System Board of Regents has adopted *Regents’ Rules and Regulations*, Rule 20203, relating to compensation for key executives. Key executives are defined as the Chancellor, Deputy Chancellor, General Counsel to the Board, Chief Audit Executive, Executive Vice Chancellors, presidents of each of the U. T. System academic and health institutions, and Vice Chancellors. Rule 20203 states that the elements of compensation for key employees “may include and are limited to base salary; short and long-term incentive pay; supplemental retirement plans, such as deferred compensation plans; one-time merit pay; special provisions necessary to recruit an individual to a key executive position, such as salary supplement for a limited time or one-time relocation payment as necessary and prudent to recruit the top talent for the position; and perquisites such as memberships, parking privileges, and provision of or allowance for cell phone and/or other mobile communication devices as determined necessary for business purposes and as covered in individual agreements.”

Rule 20203, Section 2 outlines procedures for the Office of the Board of Regents to oversee and conduct a comprehensive survey and analysis to obtain current and reliable market data on total compensation of key executives in comparable positions at peer institutions. Market data

is adjusted using cost of living information related to a respondent's geographic region. The survey is conducted every three years. In non-survey years, the Office of the Board of Regents is to obtain information concerning general changes in executive compensation in the marketplace, and the comprehensive survey is to be adjusted accordingly.

In August 2016, a Report of Executive Compensation was prepared by Buck Consultants related to key executive compensation and presented to the U. T. System Board of Regents. The Office of the Board of Regents selected Buck Consultants through a competitive process to prepare the compensation analysis. The survey indicated that U. T. System maintains a competitive position relative to compensation practices in its primary markets (comparable public and private higher education systems and institutions).

For other institutional executives, the institution provides a total cash compensation opportunity, including base salary and performance-based incentive plans, that are competitive within the academic, research and/or clinical markets. Base pay levels are competitive within the areas of academic, research and/or clinical missions in order to be successful in attracting and retaining executive leaders. Performance-based incentives are tied to expected outcomes. The market review process (selecting/reviewing benchmark jobs, analyzing market data, and adjusting pay levels) is conducted on an annual basis for the purposes of benchmarking our aggregate compensation performance against the market. On an individual basis, we review the base salary for other institutional executives as required (i.e. at least annually) and may adjust any discrepancies at any time during the year.

An annual incentive plan is the primary vehicle to promote a pay-for-performance environment. An incentive plan rewards employees for the annual achievement of pre-defined individual and institution performance objectives. Measurable performance objectives, or goals, are established annually and correlate with the goals of the institution. Performance objectives are challenging to achieve and do not mirror the job duties identified in the position description.

The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio uses multiple sources in analyzing market compensation data for other institutional executives. As other institutional executives are recruited, the University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio engages a search firm and establishes compensation levels for these individuals based on recommendations made by the search firm according to pre-defined roles, responsibilities and anticipated achievements.

Source: Buck Consultants; U. T. System Regents' *Rules and Regulations*; CUPA Administrative; Mercer Executive; Mercer IHN Healthcare Systems and Hospital Compensation Survey Suite; Mercer Benchmark Database; Towers Watson CSR General Industry Reports Package U.S.; Towers Watson Health Care Reports Package U.S.; Towers Watson Top Management; Warren HMO; Western Management EduComp; Western Management CompBase; Werling Texas Society for Healthcare Human Resources Administration and Education Wage & Benefit; AAHC Salary Survey of Academic Health Center Senior Officials.

IV. whether executive staff are eligible for a salary supplement;

The President is the only individual receiving a salary supplement meeting the requirements of the *General Appropriations Act (GAA)*, Article IX, Section 3.02. The President is eligible for a salary supplement per the *GAA*, Article III, Special Provisions, Section 5, Paragraph 2. It is not the current policy of the U. T. System to accept gifts, grants, donations, or other consideration specifically designated by a donor for salary supplements.

- V. the market average for compensation of similar executive staff in the private and public sectors;

An analysis was performed by Buck Consultants of peer institutions and this analysis found that the president’s total direct compensation as it relates to the study period was found to be at the 75th percentile of peers. A market analysis of peer institutions for other executive positions was performed and found:

Title	Total Cash Placement vs. Market
Senior Executive VP & Chief Operating Officer	Between 50 th and 75 th
Vice President – Academic, Faculty & Student Affairs	Below 25 th
Vice President & Chief Information Officer	Between 50 th and 75 th
Vice President & Chief Financial Officer	Between 50 th and 75 th
Vice President – Governmental Relations	Between 25 th and 50 th
Executive VP – Facilities Planning and Operations	Between 50 th and 75 th
Vice President – Human Resources	Between 50 th and 75 th
Vice President – Institutional Advancement	Between 50 th and 75 th
Vice President & Chief of Staff	Between 50 th and 75 th
Vice President – Research	Between 50 th and 75 th
Vice President & Chief Marketing and Communications Officer	Between 25 th and 50 th
Dean, School of Medicine	Above the 90 th
Dean, Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences	Above the 90 th
Dean, School of Dentistry	Between 50 th and 75 th
Dean, School of Nursing	Between 75 th and 90 th
Dean, School of Health Professions	Above the 90 th

Source: Buck Consultants; U. T. System Regents’ *Rules and Regulations*; CUPA Administrative; Mercer Executive; Mercer IHN Healthcare Systems and Hospital Compensation Survey Suite; Mercer Benchmark Database; Towers Watson CSR General Industry Reports Package U.S.; Towers Watson Health Care Reports Package U.S.; Towers Watson Top Management; Warren HMO; Western Management EduComp; Western Management CompBase; Werling Texas Society for Healthcare Human Resources Administration and Education Wage & Benefit; AAHC Salary Survey of Academic Health Center Senior Officials.

- VI. the average compensation paid to employees employed by the agency who are not executive staff; and

Fiscal Year 2016

Average compensation paid to staff

\$47,144

Source: Texas State Auditor Workforce Summary Document using self-reported information from the institution (note: institutions may find this report at <http://www.hr.sao.state.tx.us/Publications/wfsummaries.aspx> - current data will need to be obtained from your HR Office)

VII. the percentage increase in compensation of executive staff for each fiscal year of the five preceding fiscal years and the percentage increase in legislative appropriations to the agency each fiscal year of the five preceding fiscal years.

Executive Staff	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
President	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	13.0% ⁵	21.8% ⁵
Senior Executive VP & Chief Operating Officer	11.0% ²	0.0%	0.0%	24.5% ^{2,5}	14.9% ^{2,5}
Vice President – Academic, Faculty & Student Affairs	0.0%	Vacant ⁴	0.0%	-22.6% ¹	12.7% ^{2,5}
Vice President & Chief Information Officer	0.0%	Vacant ⁴	0.0%	8.9% ⁵	8.2%
Vice President & Chief Financial Officer	0.0%	5.0%	9.1% ²	16.4% ^{2,5}	7.0%
Vice President – Governmental Relations	0.0%	0.0%	0%	14.2% ⁵	-12.5% ⁶
Executive VP – Facilities Planning and Operations	0.0%	2.0%	6.1% ²	17.7% ^{2,5}	0.4%
Vice President – Human Resources	-0.1% ¹	5.7%	8.1% ²	9.2% ^{2,5}	25.4% ^{2,5}
Vice President – Institutional Advancement	0.0%	11.0% ²	0.0%	19.9% ^{2,5}	1.5%
Vice President & Chief of Staff**	0.0%	12.0% ^{2,3}	0.0%	19.1% ⁵	1.0%
Vice President – Research*	0.0%*	0.0%*	0.0%*	Vacant ⁴	0.0%
Vice President & Chief Marketing and Communications Officer**	n/a**	n/a**	n/a**	Vacant ⁴	0.0%
Dean – School of Medicine	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0% ²	2.7%
Dean – Dental School	0.0%	Vacant ⁴	0.0%	8.4% ⁵	2.7%
Dean – Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences*	0.0%*	0.0%*	0.0%*	0.0%*	-6.2%
Dean – School of Nursing	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1% ⁵	-2.0%
Dean – School of Health Professions	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant ⁴	0.0%	19.5% ⁵

Note: Percentage of salary increases are based on salaries for positions on September 1st of each year. Some administrators have academic appointments. The percentage changes presented are reflective only of their administrative appointments.

* In FY 2011, the roles of Dean – Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences and the Vice President for Research were combined into one title, with that position held by the same individual and compensation remaining flat. In May 2014, the roles were separated again into two separate roles with separate individuals holding each title. However, the Vice President for Research role was not filled until April 2015.

** Prior to FY 2015, the institution did not have a Chief Marketing Officer. In March 2015, the Chief Marketing Officer was filled. In December 2015, the Chief Marketing Officer was expanded to Vice President & Chief Marketing and Communications Officer; the Vice President Communications & Chief of Staff job title changed to Vice President & Chief of Staff, accordingly.

1. Reflects Change in leadership.
2. Reflects adjustment to align compensation to market levels.
3. Reflects assumption of additional scope of responsibilities.
4. Position filled after September 1st.
5. Reflects increase in incentive payment from prior year.
6. Ceased participation in the executive leadership incentive pool.

Legislative Appropriations	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Percent Increase in Total Appropriation All Funds	-12.08%	-0.09%	7.31%	0.07%	-6.16%

Source: *General Appropriations Act* from Legislative Appropriations from each biennium's and includes direct appropriations from all funds net of legislatively mandated reductions.