Pearl Meyer

ARTICLE | JUN 2026

Annual Incentive Plans for Nonprofit Organizations: Aligning Pay, Performance, and Mission

Mark Mundey

PRINCIPAL

This is the sixth installment in our Tax-Exempt Executive Compensation Essentials series—a resource for boards, compensation committees, and management teams of tax-exempt organizations.

Annual incentive plans are an increasingly common feature of tax-exempt executive compensation, and for good reason. When designed with purpose and discipline, they can focus leadership attention on what matters most, reinforce strategic priorities, and create a meaningful link between performance and pay. At the same time, tax-exemptincentive plans require a different lens than their for-profit counterparts—one that accounts for mission, stewardship, regulatory expectations, and public trust. Getting the design right begins with understanding what makes this context distinct.

Growing Prevalence: Why More Tax-Exempt Organizations Are Adding Incentive Pay

A recent survey of more than 500 tax-exempt organizations found that 42% include annual incentives or bonuses in executive director compensation packages—a number that has grown steadily over the past decade as organizations experience increasing organizational complexity, stronger competition for executive talent, and a desire by boards to create a more disciplined link between pay, performance, mission impact, and financial stewardship. The organizations driving that trend are large health systems, university foundations, national advocacy organizations, and complex social enterprises with leadership teams that could reasonably find employment in the private sector.

For these organizations, variable pay serves a practical purpose. Unlike base salary, an annual incentive does not permanently increase fixed compensation. A payout can be earned in a strong performance year, reduced in a modest one, or eliminated if financial conditions make it imprudent. This is a meaningful consideration in a sector where financial performance swings with grantmaking/program funding cycles, government reimbursement rates, and donor sentiment.

Key Differences: How Nonprofit Incentives Diverge from the For-Profit Model

Tax-exempt incentive plan design can be more complex than its for-profit counterpart. There are no shareholders, no stock price, and a year-end surplus is not in itself a measure of success, since it may simply reflect capacity left undeployed. The stakeholder map is broader: beneficiaries, donors, government funders, regulators, employees, and the communities the organization exists to serve all have legitimate interests in how the institution conducts itself.

Because Form 990 compensation data is publicly available and IRS “intermediate sanctions” rules require that executive pay be reasonable and well-documented, tax-exempt incentive plans also face a different and more highly public transparency standard than for-profit plans do. Media outlets often broadly publicize—and implicitly critique—executive compensation levels as disclosed in Form 990s, thereby widely distributing this information within the communities the tax-exempt organization serves.

Vague or purely discretionary arrangements can be more difficult to defend in this environment, whereas a plan that specifies in advance what is being measured and why generally holds up better under scrutiny and can be explained more readily when the board is questioned by external constituents, including the media.

Establishing Plan Purpose: Alignment, Competitiveness, and Recognition

Before selecting metrics or setting payout levels, the board should be clear about what the incentive plan is intended to accomplish.

Some organizations use the plan primarily as an alignment mechanism to translate a multi-year strategic plan into a focused set of annual priorities and help leadership distinguish what truly matters from business as usual. Others are driven by competitive positioning. Healthcare systems, university foundations, trade associations, and financial services nonprofits often compete for talent against for-profit institutions that pay meaningfully more, and some form of variable pay may be necessary to remain competitive. A third rationale is recognition—the ability to reward exceptional performance in a given year without permanently increasing fixed compensation costs, giving the board a structured way to differentiate between years when the organization met expectations and years when it genuinely exceeded them.

Performance Metrics: Balancing Mission, Strategy, and Financial Stewardship

Metric selection and metric weighting are among the most consequential design decisions in incentive plan design. Effective tax-exempt plans resist the temptation to build a comprehensive scorecard that covers every dimension of organizational performance, which can result in a plan that dilutes focus and is difficult to communicate. Most well-designed plans limit themselves to three to six measures drawn from the following categories and weighted to reflect relative importance to the organization's priorities:

- Financial sustainability: Measures like operating margin, budget performance, liquidity, reserve levels, and fundraising results, can help ensure that incentive payouts, if earned, do not come at the expense of financial health and stewardship.
- Mission and program outcomes: At least one measure should be directly tied to why the organization exists, such as individuals served, patient outcomes, housing placements, student completion rates, member engagement, or advocacy milestones.
- Strategic milestones: Particularly relevant when the organization is executing significant change like a capital campaign, merger, major technology initiative, or new program launch.
- People and culture: Employee retention, engagement results, and leadership development progress are appropriate when they reflect genuine organizational priorities and are measured with discipline.

Payout Mechanics: Calibrating Leverage for the Tax-Exempt Context

Most well-constructed plans use a three-level performance scale, which requires the board to define what constitutes strong performance before the year begins:

Level	Description
Threshold	The minimum level required for any payout
Target	Achievement of budgeted/planned performance level(s)
Maximum	Reserved for results that materially exceed expectations

Payout leverage should generally be more conservative in tax-exempt settings than in for-profit environments. Target opportunities are often modest as a percentage of base salary, and maximum payouts should not reach levels that would appear unreasonable to a donor reviewing the Form 990. Larger, more commercially oriented tax-exempt may use higher opportunities where they compete directly with investor-owned organizations for leadership talent. Still, the reasonableness standard remains a relevant constraint regardless of organizational complexity.

Every plan should also include a board-level affordability override or "trigger". Even when performance goals are fully achieved, circumstances—a funding shortfall, liquidity challenge, reputational event, or donor restriction—may make paying any bonus imprudent. That discretion should be built into the plan from the outset.

Governance and Compliance: Meeting the Reasonableness Standard

Incentive compensation is permissible for tax-exempt organizations, but it must be governed carefully. The IRS rebuttable presumption of reasonableness requires independent approval, contemporaneous documentation, and reliance on comparable market data. Incentive pay counts toward the total compensation figure that is subject to that standard. A board that approves a base salary within market range but layers on an incentive that pushes total compensation to the outer edge of the peer group may be technically compliant, while still creating unnecessary regulatory exposure.

Sound practice means the plan is approved before the performance period begins, year-end payouts are supported by documented evidence of goal achievement, and the board or compensation committee is evaluating total compensation—not the incentive in isolation.

One area that warrants particular care is fundraising. Development goals can be appropriate in an incentive plan, but commission-style arrangements tied to the volume of contributions raised are widely discouraged. They risk creating the appearance, and sometimes the reality, that charitable gifts are being used to fund transaction-based compensation. The board or compensation committee should be deliberate about how development performance is incorporated and ensure the approach is clearly defensible.

Conclusion: Intentional Design Produces Effective and Appropriate Incentive Plans

Annual incentive plans can be a valuable component of tax-exempt executive compensation when designed with clarity and purpose. The goal is not to replicate what a for-profit company would use, but to build a plan that advances mission, sustains the organization, reinforces accountability, and maintains the confidence of donors, regulators, and the communities served. Plans that are simple, measurable, affordable, and transparent are best positioned to achieve those outcomes.

The next installment of the Tax-Exempt Executive Compensation Essentials series will explore long-term incentive design for tax-exempt organizations.

About the Author

Mark has 15+ years of in-house and consulting compensation experience, advising on executive and broad-based pay, incentive and sales design, and regulatory compliance.

About Pearl Meyer

Pearl Meyer is the leading advisor to boards and senior management helping organizations build, develop, and reward great leadership teams that drive long-term success. Our strategy-driven compensation and leadership consulting services act as powerful catalysts for value creation and competitive advantage by addressing the critical links between people and outcomes. Our clients stand at the forefront of their industries and range from emerging high-growth, not-for-profit, and private organizations to the Fortune 500.