

II-VI INC  
Form DEF 14A  
September 21, 2012

**UNITED STATES**  
**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

**Washington, D.C. 20549**

**SCHEDULE 14A**

**Proxy Statement Pursuant to Section 14(a) of the**  
**Securities Exchange Act of 1934**

- Filed by the Registrant
- Filed by a Party other than the Registrant

Check the appropriate box:

- Preliminary Proxy Statement
- Confidential, for Use of the Commission Only (as permitted by Rule 14a-6(e)(2))
- Definitive Proxy Statement
- Definitive Additional Materials
- Soliciting Material Pursuant to 167;240.14a-12

**II-VI INCORPORATED**

Edgar Filing: II-VI INC - Form DEF 14A

(Name of Registrant as Specified In Its Charter)

(Name of Person(s) Filing Proxy Statement, if other than the Registrant)

Payment of Filing Fee (Check the appropriate box):

No fee required.

Fee computed on table below per Exchange Act Rules 14a-6(i)(4) and 0-11.

1) Title of each class of securities to which transaction applies:

2) Aggregate number of securities to which transaction applies:

3) Per unit price or other underlying value of transaction computed pursuant to Exchange Act Rule 0-11 (set forth the amount on which the filing fee is calculated and state how it was determined):

4) Proposed maximum aggregate value of transaction:

Edgar Filing: II-VI INC - Form DEF 14A

5) Total fee paid:

.. Fee paid previously with preliminary materials.

.. Check box if any part of the fee is offset as provided by Exchange Act Rule 0-11(a)(2) and identify the filing for which the offsetting fee was paid previously. Identify the previous filing by registration statement number, or the Form or Schedule and the date of its filing.

1) Amount Previously Paid:

2) Form, Schedule or Registration Statement No.:

3) Filing Party:

4) Date Filed:

**375 Saxonburg Boulevard**  
**Saxonburg, Pennsylvania 16056**

**Notice of Annual Meeting of Shareholders**  
**to be held on November 2, 2012**

TO THE SHAREHOLDERS OF

II-VI INCORPORATED:

The Annual Meeting of Shareholders of II-VI Incorporated will be held at our world headquarters, located at 375 Saxonburg Boulevard, Saxonburg, Pennsylvania 16056, on Friday, November 2, 2012, at 1:30 p.m. local time to consider and act upon the following matters:

1. Election of the three (3) directors nominated by the Board of Directors for a three-year term to expire in 2015;
2. Election of one (1) director nominated by the Board of Directors for a one-year term to expire in 2013;
3. Non-binding advisory vote to approve the compensation paid to our named executive officers, as disclosed in this Proxy Statement;
4. Approval of the II-VI Incorporated 2012 Omnibus Incentive Plan; and
5. Ratification of the Audit Committee's selection of Ernst & Young LLP as the Company's independent registered public accounting firm for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013.

The shareholders will also be asked to consider such other matters as may properly come before the meeting.

The Board of Directors has established the close of business on September 4, 2012 as the record date for determination of shareholders entitled to notice of, and to vote at, the Annual Meeting.

Edgar Filing: II-VI INC - Form DEF 14A

IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND THE MEETING, WE URGE YOU TO VOTE YOUR PROXY. YOU HAVE THREE VOTING OPTIONS:

Over the Internet, which we encourage if you have Internet access, at the address shown on your proxy card;

By telephone, through the number shown on your proxy card; or

By mail, by completing, signing and returning the enclosed proxy card in the enclosed envelope.

BY ORDER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Robert D. German, *Secretary*

September 21, 2012

**375 Saxonburg Boulevard**

**Saxonburg, Pennsylvania 16056**

**PROXY STATEMENT FOR THE ANNUAL MEETING  
OF SHAREHOLDERS**

**November 2, 2012**

This Proxy Statement is being furnished to the shareholders of II-VI Incorporated, a Pennsylvania corporation (the "Company"), in connection with the solicitation by the Board of Directors (also sometimes referred to hereinafter as the "Board") of the Company of proxies to be voted at the annual meeting of shareholders (the "Annual Meeting") scheduled to be held on Friday, November 2, 2012, at 1:30 p.m. local time at our world headquarters, located at 375 Saxonburg Boulevard, Saxonburg, Pennsylvania 16056. Please see the Company's website at [www.ii-vi.com](http://www.ii-vi.com) for directions to the Company's world headquarters and its annual meeting of shareholders. This Proxy Statement was first made available to shareholders on or about September 21, 2012.

Pursuant to the rules adopted by the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "SEC"), we are providing access to this Proxy Statement and our Annual Report to Shareholders over the Internet. Accordingly, we are sending an Important Notice Regarding the Availability of Proxy Materials (the "Notice") to many of our shareholders instead of a paper copy of these proxy materials. All shareholders who do not receive the Notice will receive a paper copy of these proxy materials along with a proxy card by mail. All shareholders will have the ability to access our Proxy Statement and Annual Report to Shareholders on the Internet at [www.proxyvote.com](http://www.proxyvote.com) or to request to receive a printed set of the proxy materials, including a proxy card. Instructions on how to access our proxy materials over the Internet or to request a printed copy may be found on the Notice. In addition, shareholders may request to receive proxy materials in printed form by mail or electronically by e-mail on an ongoing basis.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THESE PROXY MATERIALS AND VOTING**

**Why am I receiving these proxy materials?**

## Edgar Filing: II-VI INC - Form DEF 14A

We have made these proxy materials available to you on the Internet or, upon your request, delivered printed versions of these materials to you by mail, in connection with our Board of Directors' solicitation of your proxy vote for use at our Annual Meeting to be held on November 2, 2012. We request that you cast your vote on each of the proposals described in this Proxy Statement. You are invited to attend the Annual Meeting in person, but you do not need to attend in person to vote your shares.

If you have received a printed copy of these proxy materials by mail, you may simply complete, sign and return your proxy card or vote by proxy over the telephone or the Internet as instructed. If you did not receive a printed copy of these materials by mail and are accessing them on the Internet, you may simply follow the instructions to submit your proxy on the Internet.

We intend to mail a printed copy of this Proxy Statement, Proxy Card and the Company's Annual Report to our registered shareholders on or about September 21, 2012. All other shareholders will receive a Notice, which we intend to mail on or about September 21, 2012.

**What items will be voted on at the Annual Meeting?**

There are five matters scheduled for a vote:

The election of Marc Y. E. Pelaez, who has served as a director of the Company since 2002, Howard H. Xia, who has served as a director of the Company since 2011, and Vincent D. Mattera, a former director from 2000 to 2002 and a current Executive Vice-President of the Company, who is a nominee of the Board of Directors, as Class One Directors with terms to expire in 2015;

The election of Wendy F. DiCicco, who has served as a director since 2006, as a Class Two Director with a term to expire in 2013.

Non-binding advisory vote to approve the compensation paid to our named executive officers, as disclosed in this Proxy Statement;

Approval of the II-VI Incorporated 2012 Omnibus Plan; and

The ratification of the Audit Committee's selection of Ernst & Young LLP as the Company's independent registered public accounting firm for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013.

**Fiscal Year.**

The Company's fiscal year begins each year on July 1 and ends on the following June 30. Any reference to a year in this Proxy Statement is to a fiscal year. For example, references to 2012 or fiscal year 2012 mean the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2011 and ending June 30, 2012.

**Who can vote at the Annual Meeting?**

Only shareholders of record as of the close of business on September 4, 2012 (the Record Date) are entitled to notice of and to vote at the Annual Meeting and any adjournment thereof. The outstanding capital stock of the Company on that date consisted of 63,449,702 shares of Common Stock, no par value (Common Stock), each entitled to one vote per share.

**What is the quorum requirement?**

A quorum of shareholders is necessary to hold a valid meeting. A quorum will be present if at least 31,724,852 shares, a majority of the shares outstanding on the Record Date, are represented at the meeting in person or by proxy. Your shares will be counted towards the quorum only if you submit a valid proxy vote or vote in person at the meeting. Abstentions and broker non-votes (which are explained below) will be counted towards the quorum requirement. If there is no quorum, the holders of a majority of shares present at the meeting or in person represented by proxy may adjourn the meeting to another date.



## Edgar Filing: II-VI INC - Form DEF 14A

### **Why did I receive a Notice in the mail regarding the Internet availability of proxy materials instead of a full set of proxy materials?**

Pursuant to rules adopted by the SEC, we provide shareholders access to our proxy materials via the Internet. On or about September 21, 2012, we sent a Notice to our shareholders of record and beneficial owners. All shareholders will have the ability to access the proxy materials on the website referred to in the Notice. Shareholders may request to receive a full set of printed proxy materials by mail. Instructions on how to access the proxy materials on the Internet or request a printed copy may be found in the Notice.

### **What does it mean if I receive more than one Notice?**

If you receive more than one Notice, your shares may be registered in more than one name or in different accounts. Please follow the voting instructions on each Notice to ensure that all of your shares are voted.

**How will my shares be voted?**

All shares represented by valid proxies received by the Company prior to the Annual Meeting will be voted as specified in the proxy. If no specification is made, the shares will be voted as described below under the caption Recommendation of the Board of Directors. Unless otherwise indicated by the shareholder, the proxy card also confers discretionary authority on the Board-appointed proxies to vote the shares represented by the proxy on any matter that is properly presented for action at the Annual Meeting.

*Proposal 1 (The Election of three Class One Directors)* With respect to Proposal 1, you may vote FOR all nominees named herein, you may vote AGAINST any nominee that you specify or all nominees or you may ABSTAIN from voting on this proposal.

*Proposal 2 (The Election of one Class Two Director)* With respect to proposal 2, you may vote FOR the nominee, you may vote AGAINST the nominee or you may ABSTAIN from voting on this proposal.

*Proposal 3 (The Non-Binding Advisory Vote to Approve the Compensation Paid to our Named Executive Officers)* With respect to the non-binding advisory vote to approve the compensation paid to our named executive officers, as disclosed in this Proxy Statement (Proposal 3), you may vote FOR or AGAINST Proposal 3, or you may ABSTAIN from voting on this proposal.

*Proposal 4 (The Approval of the II-VI Incorporated 2012 Omnibus Incentive Plan)* With respect to the approval of the II-VI Incorporated 2012 Omnibus Incentive Plan (Proposal 4), you may vote FOR or AGAINST Proposal 4, or you may ABSTAIN from voting on this proposal.

*Proposal 5 (The Ratification of the Audit Committee's Selection of Ernst & Young LLP as the Company's Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm for fiscal year 2013)* With respect to the ratification of the Audit Committee's selection of Ernst & Young LLP (Proposal 5), you may vote FOR or AGAINST Proposal 5, or you may ABSTAIN from voting on this proposal.

**How many votes are needed to approve each proposal?**

*Proposal 1 (The Election of three Class One Directors)* A nominee will be elected to the Board of Directors as a Class One Director if the votes cast for such nominee by the shareholders entitled to vote in the election exceeds the votes cast against such nominee's election.

*Proposal 2 (The Election of one Class Two Director)* The nominee will be elected the Board of Directors as a Class Two Director if the votes cast for such nominee by the shareholders entitled to vote in the election exceeds the votes cast against such nominee's election.

*Proposal 3 (The Non-Binding Advisory Vote to Approve the Compensation Paid to our Named Executive Officers)* To be approved by the shareholders on a non-binding advisory basis, the number of votes cast FOR the proposal must represent over 50% of the total outstanding shares of Common Stock that are present at the Annual Meeting and entitled to vote on this matter.

## Edgar Filing: II-VI INC - Form DEF 14A

*Proposal 4 (The Approval of the II-VI Incorporated 2012 Omnibus Incentive Plan)* To be approved by the shareholders, the number of votes cast FOR the proposal must represent over 50% of the total outstanding shares of Common Stock that are present at the Annual Meeting and entitled to vote on this matter.

*Proposal 5 (The Ratification of the Audit Committee's Selection of Ernst & Young LLP as the Company's Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm for fiscal year 2013)* To be approved, the number of votes cast FOR the proposal must represent over 50% of the total outstanding shares of Common Stock that are present at the Annual Meeting and entitled to vote on this matter.

**How are abstentions and broker non-votes counted?**

With regard to the election of directors (Proposals 1 and 2), shareholders may cast their vote in favor of a nominee, against a nominee or they may choose to abstain. Since directors are elected by a majority of votes cast, abstentions will have no effect on the election of directors. With respect to Proposals 3 through 5, the affirmative vote of shareholders entitled to cast at least a majority of the votes which all shareholders present at the meeting in person or by proxy are entitled to cast is required for shareholder approval of the matter. For Proposals 3 through 5, abstentions will have the same effect as a vote AGAINST such proposal.

If your shares are held by a broker (in street name), the broker will ask you how you want your shares to be voted. If you give the broker instructions, your shares will be voted as you direct. If you do not give instructions, one of two things will happen, depending on the proposal. For the ratification of the selection of the auditors (Proposal 5), which is considered a routine matter, the broker may vote your shares in its discretion. For the election of directors and the other proposals (Proposals 1 through 4), which are considered non-routine matters, the broker may not vote your shares in its discretion. This results in a broker non-vote with respect to such matter. Broker non-votes will have no effect on any of the proposals because by definition they do not represent shares entitled to be voted.

**How do I revoke my proxy?**

A shareholder giving a proxy has the power to revoke it any time prior to its exercise by delivering to the Company a written revocation or a duly executed proxy bearing a later date (although no revocation shall be effective until notice thereof has been given to the Secretary of the Company), or by attending the meeting and voting such shareholder's shares in person.

**What is the difference between holding shares as a stockholder of record and as a beneficial owner of shares held in street name?**

*Shareholder of Record:* If, on the Record Date, your shares were registered directly in your name with our transfer agent, American Stock Transfer & Trust Company, LLC, then you are a shareholder of record with respect to those shares.

*Beneficial Owner of Shares Held in Street Name:* If, on the Record Date, your shares were held in an account at a brokerage firm, bank, broker-dealer or other similar organization, then you are the beneficial owner of shares held in street name, and the Notice was forwarded to you by that organization. The organization holding your account (or its nominee) is considered the shareholder of record for purposes of voting at the Annual Meeting. As a beneficial owner, you have the right to direct the shareholder of record on how to vote the shares held in your account.

**If I am a shareholder of record of II-VI shares, how do I vote?**

If you are the shareholder of record, you may vote in person at the Annual Meeting or by proxy.

To vote in person, come to the Annual Meeting and cast your vote prior to the start of the Annual Meeting.

## Edgar Filing: II-VI INC - Form DEF 14A

If you do not wish to vote in person or if you will not be attending the Annual Meeting, you may vote by proxy. You can vote by proxy over the Internet, by mail or by telephone by following the instructions provided in the Notice.

### **If I am a beneficial owner of II-VI shares held in street name, how do I vote?**

If you are a beneficial owner of shares registered in the name of your broker, bank, dealer or other similar organization, and you wish to vote in person at the Annual Meeting, you should obtain a valid proxy from the

organization that holds your shares. If you do not wish to vote in person or you will not be attending the Annual Meeting, you should have received a proxy card and voting instructions with these proxy materials from that organization rather than from us. Please follow the voting instructions provided by your broker, dealer or other similar organization to ensure that your vote is counted.

**How can I find out the voting results of the Annual Meeting?**

The preliminary voting results will be announced at the Annual Meeting. The final voting results will be tallied by the judges of elections after the Annual Meeting and published in a Current Report on Form 8-K that will be filed with the SEC shortly after the Annual Meeting and available on our website.

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**The Board of Directors of the Company unanimously recommends a vote FOR each of the Board's nominees named below for election as director (Proposals 1 and 2), FOR, on a non-binding advisory basis, the compensation paid to our named executive officers, as disclosed in this Proxy Statement (Proposal 3), FOR the approval of the II-VI Incorporated 2012 Omnibus Incentive Plan (Proposal 4) and FOR the ratification of the Audit Committee's selection of Ernst & Young LLP as the independent registered public accounting firm of the Company for the fiscal year 2013 (Proposal 5).**

---

## ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

The Company's By-Laws provide that the Board of Directors shall establish the number of directors, which shall be not less than five nor more than eleven members. The By-Laws also provide for a board of directors of three classes, each class consisting of as nearly an equal number of directors as practicable, as determined by the Board. At present, the number of directors is eight. The Board of Directors of the Company, however, has determined that the number of directors should be increased from eight to nine at the Annual Meeting, consisting of three directors in Classes One, Two and Three. In order to ensure an appropriate balance of experience and independence within each class of directors, the Board of Directors has determined that it is necessary to make certain reallocations among the director classes.

Accordingly, three directors are to be elected to Class One (including Dr. Mattera, as a new member) and one director, Ms. DiCicco, a current Class One Director, is to be reelected to Class Two, each to hold office for terms of three years and one year, respectively, or until such time as their respective successors are elected and qualified, subject to the right of the shareholders to remove any director as provided in the By-Laws. A vacancy in the office of a director may be filled by the remaining directors then in office, even if less than a quorum, or by the sole remaining director. Any director elected by the Board of Directors to fill a vacancy shall serve until his or her successor is elected and qualified, or until his or her death, resignation or removal. If the Board of Directors increases the number of directors, any vacancy so created may be filled by the Board of Directors.

Pursuant to the Company's By-Laws, each of the incumbent director nominees (Messrs. Pelaez and Xia and Ms. DiCicco) has submitted an irrevocable conditional resignation to be effective if the nominee receives a greater number of votes AGAINST than votes FOR such person's election. If this occurs, such incumbent director will continue as a director of the Company for a term ending in 2015, in the cases of Messrs. Pelaez and Xia, and 2013, in the case of Ms. DiCicco, but the Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee will make a recommendation to the Board of Directors as to whether to accept or reject the resignation previously tendered by such director or whether other action should be taken. The Board of Directors will act on the tendered resignation, taking into account the committee's recommendation, and publicly disclose (by a press release, a filing with the SEC or other broadly disseminated means of communication) its decision regarding the tendered resignation and the rationale behind the decision within 90 days from the date of the certification of the election results.

The professional and personal backgrounds, experience, qualifications attributes and skills of each of the director nominees, which are described below, reflect the qualities that the Company seeks in its Board members. In addition to the specific examples set forth below, the Board and the Company believe that the broad-based business knowledge, commitment to ethical and moral values, personal and professional integrity, sound business judgment and commitment to corporate citizenship demonstrated by the nominees make them exceptional candidates for these positions.

The persons named as proxies on the proxy card were selected by the Board of Directors and have advised the Board of Directors that, unless authority is withheld, they intend to vote the shares represented by them at the Annual Meeting as follows: for the election of Marc Y. E. Pelaez, who has served as a director of the Company since 2002, Howard H. Xia, who has served as a director of the Company since 2011, Vincent D. Mattera, Jr., Executive Vice-President of the Company, who served as a former director of the Company from 2000 through 2002, and Wendy F. DiCicco, who has served as a director of the Company since 2006.

The Board of Directors knows of no reason why each nominee for director would be unable to serve as director. If at the time of the Annual Meeting any of the named nominees is unable or unwilling to serve as a director of the Company, the persons named as proxies intend to vote for such substitute as may be nominated by the Board of Directors. The following sets forth certain information concerning each nominee for election as a director of the Company and each director whose term of office will continue after the meeting.

---

**ELECTION OF CLASS ONE DIRECTORS**

**(PROPOSAL 1)**

**Nominees for Class One Directors Whose Terms will Expire in 2015**

**Marc Y.E. Pelaez**, 66, has served as a director of the Company since 2002. Mr. Pelaez is a Rear Admiral, United States Navy (retired). Rear Admiral Pelaez is currently a private consultant to defense and commercial companies. He was Vice President of Engineering and later Vice President of Business and Technology Development for Newport News Shipbuilding from 1996 until 2001, when it was acquired by Northrop Grumman Corporation. From 1993 to 1996, Rear Admiral Pelaez served as Chief of Naval Research. He served as the Executive Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development, and Acquisition) from 1990 to 1993. From 1968 to 1990, he held numerous positions, including command assignments in the United States Navy. He is a graduate of the United States Naval Academy. Mr. Pelaez has a broad background and understanding of technology and technology development, an understanding of military procurement practices, as well as management leadership and consulting skills developed throughout his military and civilian careers. All of these factors make him a valuable member of our Board of Directors.

**Howard H. Xia**, 51, has served as a director of the Company since 2011. Dr. Xia has served as General Manager of Vodafone China Limited, a wholly-owned company of Vodafone Group Plc, a publicly traded telecommunication company, since 2001. From 1994 to 2001, he served as a Director-Technology Strategy for Vodafone AirTouch Plc and AirTouch Communications, Inc. He served as a Senior Staff Engineer at Telesis Technology Laboratory from 1992 to 1994 and was a Senior Engineer at PacTel cellular from 1990 to 1992. Dr. Xia holds a B.S. in Physics from South China Normal University, an M.S. in Physics and Electrical Engineering and a Ph.D. in Electrophysics from Polytechnic Institute of New York University. Dr. Xia's extensive knowledge of and experience in the telecommunications industry, his knowledge of international business including that with China, and strong leadership skills make him a valuable member of our Board of Directors. In particular, his experience and knowledge of telecommunications in Asia contributes to the Board's breadth of knowledge in this area.

**Vincent D. Mattera, Jr.**, 56, has been nominated by the Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee of the Board of Directors to serve as a director. Dr. Mattera previously served as a director of the Company from 2000 through 2002. Dr. Mattera has been employed by the Company since 2004 as a Vice-President and has been its Executive Vice President since 2010. Dr. Mattera served in various executive roles in product development at Lucent Technologies from 1995 to 2004. From 1984 to 1995, he held management positions with AT&T Bell Laboratories. Dr. Mattera holds B.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Chemistry from the University of Rhode Island and Brown University, respectively. Dr. Mattera's educational background, his extensive industry experience and his history with the Company would make him a valuable member of our Board of Directors. For all of these reasons, our Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee and Board have concluded that Dr. Mattera should be nominated to serve as a director. Dr. Mattera was identified through an internal search process.

**The Board of Directors of the Company unanimously recommends a vote FOR each of the Board's nominees named above for election as director.**



**ELECTION OF CLASS TWO DIRECTOR**

**(PROPOSAL 2)**

**Nominee for Class Two Director Whose Term will Expire in 2013**

**Wendy F. DiCicco**, 45, has served as a director of the Company since 2006. Ms. DiCicco has served as Chief Financial Officer of Nuron Biotech, Inc., a privately held biotech company since 2012. From 2010 to 2011, Ms. DiCicco served as Chief Financial Officer of Quench USA, a privately held company providing purified water. From 2008 to 2009, Ms. DiCicco served as Chief Financial Officer of Globus Medical, Inc., a medical technology company. From 1998 to 2008, Ms. DiCicco served as Chief Financial Officer of Kensey Nash Corporation, a medical technology company. From 1996 to 1998, she was Controller of Kensey Nash Corporation. She was an Accounting and Audit Manager with Deloitte & Touche from 1994 to 1996. From 1990 to 1994, she held positions of Staff Accountant and Senior Accountant with Deloitte & Touche. Ms. DiCicco graduated from Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science with a B.S. degree in Accounting. Ms. DiCicco is a Certified Public Accountant in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and is a member of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Pennsylvania Institute of Certified Public Accountants and Financial Executives International. Ms. DiCicco is a National Association of Corporate Directors (NACD) Governance Fellow. Ms. DiCicco adds financial reporting and management skills as a result of her career, including her experience with a large public accounting firm, and further enhances the Board's knowledge base with respect to accounting, financial and other matters which makes her a valuable member of our Board of Directors.

**The Board of Directors of the Company unanimously recommends a vote FOR the Board's nominee named above for election as director.**

---

**CONTINUING DIRECTORS**

**Existing Class Two Directors Whose Terms Expire in 2013**

**Peter W. Sognefest**, 71, has served as a director of the Company since 1979. Mr. Sognefest is President, Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of Seamoc, Inc., a private consulting firm. From 2002 to 2003, Mr. Sognefest was Vice-Chairman of Xymox Technologies, Inc. ( Xymox ), a manufacturer of membrane switches. From 1996 to 2002, he was President and Chief Executive Officer of Xymox. From 1994 until 1996, he was President and Chief Executive Officer of LH Research, Inc. From 1992 until 1994, he was President and Chief Executive Officer of IRT Corporation. From 1984 to 1992, Mr. Sognefest was Chairman of Digital Appliance Controls, Inc. (DAC), which he founded in 1984. Mr. Sognefest was Vice President and General Manager of the Industrial Electronics Division of Motorola, Inc. ( Motorola ) from 1982 to 1984, having joined Motorola in 1977. From 1967 to 1977, he was with Essex Group, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of United Technologies Corporation, where he held the position of General Manager of Semi-Conductor Operations. Mr. Sognefest holds B.S. and M.S. degrees in Electrical Engineering from the University of Illinois. Mr. Sognefest brings to our Board leadership skills developed through his extensive executive management experience. In particular, his experience and knowledge of manufacturing in Asia contributes to the Board's breadth of knowledge in this area.

**Francis J. Kramer**, 63, has served as a director of the Company since 1989. Mr. Kramer has been employed by the Company since 1983, has been its President since 1985, and has been its Chief Executive Officer since 2007. Previously, Mr. Kramer served as the Company's Chief Operating Officer from 1985 to 2007. Mr. Kramer joined the Company as Vice President and General Manager of Manufacturing and was named Executive Vice President and General Manager of Manufacturing in 1984. Prior to his employment by the Company, Mr. Kramer was the Director of Operations for the Utility Communications Systems Group of Rockwell International Corp. Mr. Kramer graduated from the University of Pittsburgh with a B.S. degree in Industrial Engineering and from Purdue University with a M.S. degree in Industrial Administration. Mr. Kramer provides the Board with insight into the Company's business operations, opportunities and challenges. In addition, Mr. Kramer's history with the Company, laser industry experience and business background support his leadership skills and contributions to the Board.

**Existing Class Three Directors Whose Terms Expire in 2014**

**Carl J. Johnson**, 70, has served as a director of the Company since 1971. Dr. Johnson was a co-founder of the Company in 1971. He retired as an employee in May 2010. Dr. Johnson serves as Chairman of our Board. He served as President of the Company from 1971 until 1985, as Chief Executive Officer from 1985 until 2007, and in the executive position of Chairman from 2007 to 2010. From 1966 to 1971, Dr. Johnson was Director of Research & Development for Essex International, Inc., an automotive electrical and power distribution products manufacturer. From 1964 to 1966, Dr. Johnson worked at Bell Telephone Laboratories as a member of the technical staff. Dr. Johnson completed his Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering at the University of Illinois. He holds B.S. and M.S. degrees in Electrical Engineering from Purdue University and Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), respectively. His scientific knowledge along with his technological vision and operational know-how provide strategic direction to the Company and the Board of Directors.

**Thomas E. Mistler**, 70, has served as a director of the Company since 1977. Mr. Mistler was an operating partner for Buckingham Capital Partners, a private investment firm, from 2003 through 2009. Mr. Mistler was President, Chief Executive Officer and a director of ESCO Holding Corp. and Engineered Arresting Systems Corporation, a manufacturer of aircraft and vehicle arresting systems, from 1999 to 2003. Previously, he was Senior Vice President of Energy Systems Business for Westinghouse Electric Corporation ( Westinghouse ), where he was employed from 1965 to 1998. Mr. Mistler served in various engineering, marketing and general management capacities with Westinghouse including serving as President of Westinghouse Saudi Arabia Limited from 1981 to 1984. Mr. Mistler graduated from Kansas State University with B.S. and M.S. degrees in



Engineering. Mr. Mistler possesses executive management, operational and corporate governance experience, which contribute greatly to our Board. In addition, his engineering background and the international business experience he has developed throughout his career make him a valuable member of our Board of Directors.

**Joseph J. Corasanti**, 48, has served as a director of the Company since 2002. Mr. Corasanti has served as President and Chief Executive Officer of CONMED Corporation ( CONMED ), a publicly traded medical technology company, since 2006. From 1999 to 2006, he served as President and Chief Operating Officer of CONMED. From 1998 to 1999, he was Executive Vice President/General Manager of CONMED. He served as General Counsel and Vice President-Legal Affairs for CONMED from 1993 to 1998. From 1990 to 1993, he was an Associate Attorney with the Los Angeles office of the law firm of Morgan, Wenzel & McNicholas. Mr. Corasanti holds a B.A. degree in Political Science from Hobart College and a J.D. degree from Whittier College School of Law. He is a director of CONMED. Mr. Corasanti's current executive position and his service on another publicly traded company's board have provided him with leadership skills and experience in a variety of matters which he contributes to the Company's Board. His experience and skill set, including his legal background and acquisition experience, make him a valuable member of our Board of Directors.

---

## DIRECTOR INDEPENDENCE AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

The listing standards of NASDAQ provide that a majority of the Company's Board of the Directors must be comprised of independent directors (as defined therein). Our Corporate Governance Guidelines further provide that, in accordance with II-VI Incorporated's long-standing policy, a substantial majority of the members of the Company's Board of Directors must qualify as independent directors (as defined by the NASDAQ listing standards). The Board of Directors has determined that none of the continuing directors or nominees for election as director, other than Carl J. Johnson, Francis J. Kramer and Vincent D. Mattera, Jr. (solely as a result of Dr. Johnson's employment history with the Company and Mr. Kramer's and Dr. Mattera's current employment by the Company), has a material relationship with the Company (other than as director) and is therefore independent within the meaning of the current listing standards of NASDAQ. In its annual review of director independence, the Board of Directors considers all commercial, banking, consulting, legal, accounting or other business relationships any director may have with the Company. The Board of Directors considers a material relationship to be one that impairs or inhibits, or has the potential to impair or inhibit, a director's exercise of critical and disinterested judgment on behalf of the Company and its shareholders. When assessing the materiality of a director's relationship with the Company, the Board of Directors considers all relevant facts and circumstances not only from the standpoint of the director in his or her individual capacity, but also from the standpoint of the persons to whom the director is related and organizations with which the director is affiliated.

### Code of Business Conduct and Ethics

The Board of Directors has approved and adopted a Code of Business Conduct and Ethics applicable to all directors, officers and employees of the Company and its subsidiaries. In addition, the Company has adopted an additional Code of Ethics for Senior Financial Officers. These documents are available on the Company's website at [www.ii-vi.com](http://www.ii-vi.com). The Company will promptly disclose on its website (i) any amendments or waivers with respect to a director's or executive officer's compliance with the Code of Business Conduct and Ethics and (ii) any amendments or waivers with respect to any provision of the Code of Ethics for Senior Financial Officers. Employees are required and encouraged to report violations of the Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, and such reports may be made anonymously. Anonymous reports are forwarded for review by the Audit Committee.

### Board's Role in the Oversight of Risk Management

The Audit Committee of the Board of Directors has been designated to take the lead in overseeing risk management at the Board level. Accordingly, the Audit Committee schedules time for periodic review of risk assessment and activities being undertaken by management throughout the year, in addition to its other duties. In this role, the Audit Committee receives reports from management, internal audit, and other advisors, and strives to generate serious and thoughtful attention to the Company's risk management process and system, the nature of the material risks the Company faces, and the adequacy of the Company's policies and procedures designed to respond to and mitigate these risks. Although the Audit Committee leads these efforts, risk management is periodically reported on at the full Board level and feedback is sought from each director as to the most significant risks that the Company faces. This is principally accomplished through Audit Committee reports to the Board and discussions with management.

In addition to the formal compliance program, the Board and the Audit Committee encourage management to promote a corporate culture that understands risk management and incorporates it into the overall corporate strategy and day-to-day business operations of the Company. The Company's risk management structure also includes an ongoing effort to assess and analyze the most likely areas of future risk for the Company and to address them in its long-term planning process.

### **Review and Approval of Related Person Transactions**

The Company does not maintain a separate policy regarding the review, approval or ratification of transactions with related persons; instead, the policies and procedures for handling related person transactions are set forth in the Company's Code of Business Conduct and Ethics.

The Company's Code of Business Conduct and Ethics requires that all of the Company's directors, officers and employees refrain from activities that might involve a conflict of interest. Additionally, the Company's Code of Business Conduct and Ethics provides that each of the Company's directors, officers and employees must openly and honestly handle any actual, apparent or potential conflict between that individual's personal and business relationships and the Company's interests. Before making any investment, accepting any position or benefit, participating in any transaction or business arrangement or otherwise acting in a manner that creates or appears to create a conflict of interest, such person must make a full disclosure of all relevant facts and circumstances to, and obtain the prior written approval of the Company. Waivers under the Code for any of the Company's executive officers or directors shall be granted only by the Board of Directors or a properly designated committee of the Board. It is expected that only those matters that are in the best interests of the Company would be approved or waived under this Code.

### **Nomination of Candidates for Director**

The Company may consider candidates for director identified by several sources including existing directors, members of the Company's management team, shareholders and third-party search firms.

The Company's By-Laws describe the procedures to be followed by a shareholder in recommending nominees for director to be considered at an annual meeting. In general, such nominations can only be made by a shareholder entitled to notice of, and to vote at, at the annual meeting at which directors are to be elected, must be in writing and must be received by the Chairman of the Board of Directors no later than the close of business on the 120<sup>th</sup> day nor earlier than the close of business on the 150<sup>th</sup> day before the anniversary date of the mailing date of the Company's proxy statement in connection with the previous year's annual meeting. In addition, the nominations must include certain information regarding the nominating shareholder and the nominee for director, including, without limitation, their relationship and any understanding between such persons regarding such nomination, the shares owned by the nominating shareholder and information concerning the proposing shareholder and/or such nominee that would be required in a proxy statement filed with the SEC. In addition, to be eligible to be a nominee for election or reelection as a director of the Company, the nominee must deliver (in accordance with the time periods prescribed for delivery of the notice described above) a written questionnaire with respect to the background and qualifications of such person and the written representation and agreement described in the Company's By-Laws (in a form to be provided by the Secretary upon written request).

The Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee considers a variety of factors when determining whether to recommend a nominee for election to the Board of Directors, including those factors set forth in the Company's Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee Charter. In general, candidates nominated for election or re-election to the Board of Directors should possess the following qualifications:

High personal and professional ethics, integrity, practical wisdom and mature judgment;

Broad training and experience in policy-making decisions in business;

Expertise that is useful to the Company and complementary to the background and experience of our other directors;

## Edgar Filing: II-VI INC - Form DEF 14A

Willingness to devote the amount of time necessary to carry out the duties and responsibilities of a director;

Commitment to serve on the Board of Directors over a period of several years in order to develop knowledge about the Company's principal operations; and

Willingness to represent the best interests of all shareholders and objectively appraise management performance.

Potential candidates are screened and interviewed by the Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee of the Board of Directors. Although the Board of Directors does not have a formal diversity policy, the Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee's practice is to review the skills and attributes of individual Board members and candidates for the Board within the context of the current make-up of the full Board, to ensure that the Board of Directors as a whole is composed of individuals who, when combined, provide a diverse portfolio of experience, knowledge, talents and perspectives that will serve the Company's governance and strategic needs. Candidates are also evaluated as to their broad-based business knowledge and contacts, prominence, commitment to ethical and moral values, personal and professional integrity, sound reputation in their respective fields as well as a global business perspective and commitment to corporate citizenship.

All members of the Board of Directors may interview the final candidates. The same identifying and evaluating procedures apply to all candidates for director nomination, including candidates submitted by shareholders.

### **Size of the Board**

As provided in the Company's By-Laws, the Board of Directors is comprised of no less than five and no more than eleven members. The exact number of directors is determined by the Board based on its current composition and requirements.

### **Board Structure and Lead Independent Director**

The role of Chairman of the Board is currently held by Carl J. Johnson, while the role of Chief Executive Officer is held by Francis J. Kramer. Our Board believes that the separation of these roles helps to ensure oversight of the Company by the Chairman of the Board, while enabling our Chief Executive Officer to focus his energies on the management of the Company and its day-to-day operations.

Dr. Johnson served as Executive Chairman of our Board from 1985 until 2010, when he officially retired from employment with the Company. He continues to serve as Chairman of our Board, albeit in a non-executive capacity. During the time that Dr. Johnson served as Executive Chairman, our Board determined that it was appropriate to appoint a Lead Independent Director, in order to ensure that the Board of Directors served in a capacity which was independent of management and that the directors had an independent leadership contact. Thomas E. Mistler was appointed by the Board of Directors to fill this position and continues to hold this position. Despite the fact that Dr. Johnson no longer serves as Chairman in an executive capacity, our Board has determined that it is appropriate to maintain the positive attributes of the Lead Independent Director position.

In general, the major responsibilities of the Lead Independent Director include:

Chairing executive sessions of the independent directors conducted at each Board of Directors meeting;

Chairing meetings of the Board of Directors in the absence of the Chairman; and

Carrying out other duties as requested by the Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee and the Board of Directors.



**Compensation of Directors**

The Board of Directors sets the level of compensation for directors, based on the recommendation of the Compensation Committee, taking into account the impact of compensation on director independence. Directors who are also current employees of the Company receive no additional compensation for their service as directors.

The Compensation Committee periodically reviews the amount and form of compensation paid to directors, taking into account the compensation paid to directors of other comparable companies. The Committee conducts

its review with the assistance of its outside independent compensation consultant, Mercer (US) Inc. ( Mercer ). See Director Compensation in this Proxy Statement for more information regarding the compensation paid to our directors.

### **Stock Ownership Program**

In order to further align the directors and executive officers interests with those of II-VI Incorporated s shareholders, the Board of Directors has established a stock ownership program that requires each director to own at least 4,000 shares of the Company s Common Stock. The Board of Directors has also established a stock ownership program that requires the Chief Executive Officer to own Company Common Stock having a value of at least three times his annual base salary and all other named executive officers to own Company Common Stock having a value that is at least equal to their annual base salary. A director who does not comply with this program would not be permitted to stand for re-election. As of the date of this Proxy Statement, all directors and executive officers currently meet or exceed this requirement.

### **Director Mandatory Retirement**

The Board of Directors has adopted a retirement policy for directors. Under this policy, directors must retire and/or resign from the Board of Directors upon reaching the age of 75. There are no directors retiring under this provision at the Annual Meeting.

### **Standing Board Limits**

Board members are limited to serving on a maximum of three public company boards (excluding the Company). All directors currently comply with this requirement.

### **Change in Director Occupation**

Pursuant to a policy adopted by the Board of Directors, when a director s principal occupation or business association changes substantially during his or her tenure as a director, that director should tender his or her resignation for consideration by the Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee. The Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee will recommend to the Board the action, if any, to be taken with respect to the resignation.

### **Access to Independent Advisors**

The Board of Directors and its committees have the right to retain independent outside financial, legal or other advisors, as necessary and appropriate. The Company bears the cost of retaining such advisors.

### **Executive Sessions of Independent Directors**

Executive sessions of independent directors, consisting of all directors other than Carl J. Johnson and Francis J. Kramer (and Dr. Mattera in the event he is elected as a director), are regularly scheduled and held at each meeting of the Board of Directors. The Lead Independent Director presides over these meetings.

**Self-Evaluation, Self-Assessment and Director Continuing Education**

The Board of Directors has a process whereby the full board and its members are subject to periodic self-evaluation and self-assessment. This process was most recently completed during fiscal year 2011.

The Board of Directors works with management to schedule new director orientation programs and customizes director continuing education programs given the Board member's individual background, expertise,

tenure on the Board, and current committee responsibilities. The orientation programs are designed to familiarize new directors with the Company's businesses, strategies and challenges, and to assist new directors in developing and maintaining skills necessary or appropriate for the performance of their responsibilities. Continuing education programs for board members may include a mix of in-house and third-party presentations and programs.

### **Meetings of the Board**

The Board meets regularly on previously determined dates. Board meetings are held at least quarterly. Each Board member is expected to attend Board meetings and meetings of the committees on which the director serves either in person or by telephone, and to attend in person the Annual Meetings of Shareholders.

### **Board Materials and Presentations**

The agenda for each meeting is provided in advance of the meeting, together with written materials on matters to be presented for consideration, for the directors' review prior to the meeting. As a general rule, written materials are provided in advance on all matters requiring Board action. Written materials are designed to provide concise summaries of the relevant information to create a foundation for the Board's discussion of key issues and to make the most efficient use of the Board's meeting time. Directors may request from the Company any additional information they believe to be necessary to perform their duties.

### **Director Attendance at Annual Meeting of Shareholders**

Directors are expected to attend the Annual Meeting of Shareholders. All of the incumbent directors attended last year's annual meeting.

### **Communications with Directors**

Shareholders wishing to communicate with the Company's Board of Directors may do so by sending a written communication addressed to the Lead Independent Director or to any member of the Board of Directors individually in care of II-VI Incorporated, 375 Saxonburg Boulevard, Saxonburg, Pennsylvania 16056. Any communication addressed to a director that is received at the Company's principal executive offices will be delivered or forwarded to the individual director as soon as practical except for advertisements, solicitations or other matters unrelated to the Company. The Company will forward all communications received from its shareholders that are simply addressed to the Board of Directors to the chairperson of the committee of the Board of Directors whose purpose and function is most closely related to the subject matter of the communication.

## **MEETINGS AND COMMITTEES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

The Company's Board of Directors held four (4) meetings during fiscal year 2012. Certain meetings were held over a two-day period. Each director attended 100% of the meetings of the Board of Directors and any committee of which he or she was a member during the period for

## Edgar Filing: II-VI INC - Form DEF 14A

which such person has served as a director and as a member of such committee. The Board of Directors has the authority to hire independent advisors to help fulfill its duties.

The Board of Directors has four standing committees: Audit; Compensation; Corporate Governance and Nominating; and Subsidiary. The table below shows the current committee memberships as well the number of meetings held by the committees during fiscal year 2012.

	Audit Committee	Compensation Committee	Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee	Subsidiary Committee
<b>Non-Employee Directors:</b>				
JOSEPH J. CORASANTI	Member	Member	Member	Member
WENDY F. DiCICCO	Chair	Member	Member	Member
CARL J. JOHNSON				Member
THOMAS E. MISTLER	Member		Chair	Member
MARC Y.E. PELAEZ		Member		Chair
PETER W. SOGNEFEST		Chair	Member	Member
HOWARD H. XIA				Member
<b>Employee Director:</b>				
FRANCIS J. KRAMER				
<b>Number of Meetings in Fiscal Year 2012</b>	4	5	3	3

### Audit Committee

The Board has an Audit Committee comprised solely of independent directors. The Audit Committee's duties, which are set forth in a written charter (a current copy of which is available on the Company's website at [www.ii-vi.com](http://www.ii-vi.com)) include monitoring performance of the Company's business plan, reviewing the Company's internal accounting methods and procedures and reviewing certain business strategies. The Audit Committee has the authority to hire independent advisors to help it fulfill its duties. The Audit Committee has established procedures for the receipt, retention and treatment of complaints received by the Company regarding accounting, internal accounting controls or auditing matters, and the confidential, anonymous submission by employees of concerns regarding accounting or auditing matters. The Board of Directors has determined that Wendy F. DiCicco qualifies as an audit committee financial expert, as such term is defined by the SEC, and that she has the requisite level of financial sophistication required by the listing standards of NASDAQ. Each member of the Audit Committee is also independent as that term is defined under Rule 10A-3(b)(1)(ii) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and the applicable listing standards of NASDAQ.

### Compensation Committee

The Board has a Compensation Committee comprised solely of independent directors. The Compensation Committee is responsible for determining, in accordance with its written charter (a current copy of which is available on the Company's website at [www.ii-vi.com](http://www.ii-vi.com)), the compensation of the Company's directors and executive officers. The Compensation Committee's duties also include administering and interpreting the Company's 2009 Omnibus Plan (the "2009 Omnibus Plan"). The Compensation Committee selects from eligible employees those persons to whom awards will be granted and determines the type of award, the number of shares to be included in any stock-based award, any restrictions on the exercise or vesting of the shares subject to a stock-based award, or any portion thereof, and the exercise price, in the case of stock option awards. In addition, the Compensation Committee is authorized, subject to limited exceptions, to make any amendments or modifications to the 2009 Omnibus Plan, to suspend the operation of the 2009 Omnibus Plan, and to make all other determinations necessary to the administration of the 2009 Omnibus Plan, including the appointment of individuals to facilitate the day-to-day operation thereof. The Compensation Committee also oversees the administration of the II-VI Incorporated Deferred Compensation Plan and certain bonus plans covering executive officers and other employees (as described hereinafter). The Compensation Committee has the authority to hire independent advisors to help it fulfill its duties.

For a description of the Compensation Committee's processes and procedures in connection with its consideration and determination of executive compensation, see "Compensation Discussion and Analysis" and, for director compensation, see "Director Compensation."



### **Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee**

The Board has a Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee comprised solely of independent directors. The Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee, in accordance with its written charter (a current copy of which is available on the Company's website at [www.ii-vi.com](http://www.ii-vi.com)), develops and implements policies and processes regarding corporate governance matters, assesses board membership needs and makes recommendations regarding potential director candidates to the Board of Directors. The Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee has the authority to hire independent advisors to help it fulfill its duties. For additional information regarding the skills and qualifications our Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee consider with respect to potential director nominees, see Nomination of Candidates for Director.

### **Subsidiary Committee**

The Board has a Subsidiary Committee comprised of independent and non-employee directors. The Subsidiary Committee, in accordance with its written charter (a current copy of which is available on the Company's website at [www.ii-vi.com](http://www.ii-vi.com)), oversees the activities of the Company's operating subsidiaries, as directed from time to time by the Board of Directors. Members of the Subsidiary Committee are requested to attend selected quarterly meetings of the Company's operating subsidiaries and report back to the Board on material developments. The Subsidiary Committee has the authority to hire independent advisors to help fulfill its duties.



## DIRECTOR COMPENSATION

The Company uses a combination of cash and share-based equity compensation to attract and retain qualified candidates to serve on the Company's Board of Directors. In setting director compensation, the Company considers the significant amount of time that directors expend in fulfilling their duties as well as the skill-level required for members of the Company's Board of Directors. Directors are subject to the Company's minimum share ownership requirement of 4,000 shares of Common Stock. A director who does not comply with this requirement would not be permitted to stand for re-election. As of the date of this Proxy Statement, all directors currently meet or exceed this requirement.

The compensation program for our non-employee directors is reviewed annually by our Compensation Committee to ensure the program remains competitive. As part of the Compensation Committee's review, the types and levels of compensation offered to our non-employee directors are compared to those offered by a select group of comparable companies. The companies comprising this group are the same comparator group utilized for the Company's named executive officers (the Comparator Group) and are listed in Compensation Discussion and Analysis.

The Compensation Committee strives to set director compensation at levels that are competitive with our Comparator Group. Currently, the overall compensation level of the Company's directors approximates the median of compensation provided by the Comparator Group. The Compensation Committee relies on proxy statements, compensation surveys and Mercer for data on current market pay practices and trends. Mercer is primarily engaged to provide the Compensation Committee with publicly available compensation data and current compensation trends. Based upon information provided by Mercer in fiscal year 2011, the Company adjusted the various components of its director compensation program to more closely approximate the median of the Comparator Group.

The components of our director compensation program for the 2012 and 2011 Board terms were generally as follows:

Compensation Item	2012	2011
Annual retainer	\$ 37,000	\$ 15,000
Board of director meeting fee	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500
Committee meeting fee except for Subsidiary Committee	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000
Subsidiary Committee meeting fee	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500
Conference call in lieu of meeting fee except for Subsidiary Committee	\$ 1,000	\$
Chairman of the Board retainer	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
Annual fee for Audit Committee Chair	\$ 12,000	\$ 10,000
Annual fee for Compensation Committee Chair	\$ 7,000	\$ 6,000
Annual fee for Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee Chair	\$ 7,000	\$ 5,000
Annual fee for Subsidiary Committee Chair	\$ 5,000	\$ 3,500
Lead Independent Director retainer	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000
Annual stock option award	\$ 81,500	\$ 66,577
Annual restricted stock award	\$ 81,500	\$ 66,577

### *Non-Employee Director Equity Program*

Annual equity awards are typically granted to each eligible non-employee director. In August 2011, each non-employee director received a grant of 9,300 stock options to purchase shares of Common Stock at an



exercise price of \$17.53 per share, the fair market value of our stock on the date of grant, with a total fair value of \$81,500 (using a Black-Scholes valuation). Options received by non-employee directors have the same terms as those granted to our employees. In addition, each non-employee director received a restricted stock award grant of 4,650 shares of Common Stock at a price of \$17.53 per share with a total fair value of \$81,500. The restricted stock awards are subject to our standard three-year cliff vesting schedule.

The table below summarizes the compensation paid by the Company to our non-employee directors for fiscal year 2012. Francis J. Kramer, our President and Chief Executive Officer, is a member of the Board of Directors. Mr. Kramer's compensation is reported in the Summary Compensation Table and the other tables set forth herein. He did not receive any additional compensation in connection with his service on our Board of Directors during fiscal year 2012.

**Director Compensation Table**

**For Fiscal Year 2012**

<b>Non-Employee Director</b>	<b>Fees Earned or Paid in</b>			<b>Total</b>
	<b>Cash</b>	<b>Stock Awards</b>	<b>Option Awards</b>	
	<b>(\$)</b>	<b>(\$) (1)</b>	<b>(\$) (2)</b>	<b>(\$)</b>
JOSEPH J. CORASANTI	\$ 52,000	\$ 81,500	\$ 81,500	\$ 215,000
WENDY F. DiCICCO	68,500	81,500	81,500	231,500
CARL J. JOHNSON	124,500	81,500	81,500	287,500
THOMAS E. MISTLER	73,500	81,500	81,500	236,500
MARC Y.E. PELAEZ	87,000	81,500	81,500	250,000
PETER W. SOGNEFEST	93,500	81,500	81,500	256,500
HOWARD H. XIA	54,000	81,500	81,500	217,000

(1) Represents the aggregate grant date fair value of option awards issued by the Company to the non-employee directors under the 2009 Omnibus Plan, computed in accordance with Financial Accounting Standards Board ( FASB ) ASC Topic 718. The grant date fair value of stock option awards is based on the Black-Scholes option pricing model. The actual value, if any, that a director may realize upon exercise of stock options will depend on the excess of the stock option price over the strike value on the date of exercise. As such, there is no assurance that the value realized by a director will be at or near the value estimated by the Black-Scholes model. Refer to Note 1 to the Company's Consolidated Financial Statements on Form 10-K for fiscal year 2012 for relevant assumptions used to determine the valuation of option awards, except that any estimate of forfeitures for service-based conditions have been disregarded.

(2) Represents the aggregate grant date fair value of restricted stock issued by the Company during the year presented, computed in accordance with FASB. The grant date fair value of restricted stock was computed based upon the closing price of the Company's Common Stock on the date of grant.

The following table provides information regarding stock options and restricted stock held by each of our non-employee directors as of June 30, 2012:

**Director Equity Awards**

**At Fiscal Year End 2012**

<b>Non-Employee Director</b>	<b>Restricted Stock</b>	<b>Total Option Awards</b>	<b>Exercisable Option</b>
------------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------

Edgar Filing: II-VI INC - Form DEF 14A

	(#)	Held (#)	Awards (#)
JOSEPH J. CORASANTI	8,600	95,680	56,588
WENDY F. DiCICCO	8,600	90,720	51,628
CARL J. JOHNSON	8,600	200,650	185,030
THOMAS E. MISTLER	8,600	155,920	116,828
MARC Y.E. PELAEZ	8,600	137,120	98,028
PETER W. SOGNEFEST	8,600	56,120	17,028
HOWARD H. XIA	4,650	9,300	

## EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION

### COMPENSATION DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

#### Executive Summary

In the paragraphs that follow, the Company (or we) will provide an overview and analysis of the Company's (or our) executive compensation program, the material compensation decisions we have made under this program and related policies, and the material factors that we have considered in making those decisions. Following this Compensation Discussion and Analysis you will find a series of tables containing specific information about the compensation earned or paid in fiscal year 2012 (and in some cases fiscal years 2011 and 2010) to our Chief Executive Officer, Chief Financial Officer and our two remaining executive officers (other than the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer), whose total compensation exceeded \$100,000 (collectively, our named executive officers or NEOs). Our NEOs for fiscal year 2012 were as follows:

our President and Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Francis J. Kramer,

our Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, Mr. Craig A. Creaturo,

our Executive Vice President, Dr. Vincent D. Mattera, Jr., and

our Vice President - Military & Materials Businesses, Mr. James Martinelli

#### 2012 Executive Compensation Highlights

The Compensation Committee has a pay-for-performance philosophy, which is why a substantial portion of our executives' annual and long-term compensation is at risk.

The objectives of our executive compensation program are to attract and retain top talent, drive the achievement of short-term and long-term objectives, link pay with performance, align management's interests with our shareholders' interests and to be competitive in the markets in which we compete.

Our Comparator Group has been thoughtfully constructed by the Compensation Committee to include companies with sustained levels of high financial performance in similar technology space with whom we compete for investor capital, talent and market share. As part of the Committee's rigorous process of selecting only high financial performing companies, care is undertaken to intentionally exclude companies that have incurred operating losses for any period over the prior five years. This high standard ensures the Company establishes challenging financial performance goals for its NEOs.

The compensation program for our NEOs consists of the following three components: (i) base salary; (ii) annual cash incentive awards and (iii) long-term equity-based compensation.

## Edgar Filing: II-VI INC - Form DEF 14A

The Compensation Committee generally targets individual base salaries at the market median of our Comparator Group. We target total compensation from annual cash incentive awards and long-term equity-based awards at levels designed to provide for total direct compensation at the upper third quartile or lower fourth quartile of the Comparator Group when the Company's operating performance is also in the upper third quartile or lower fourth quartile of the Comparator Group.

The Compensation Committee retained an independent compensation consultant to advise the Committee on executive compensation matters and to ensure that compensation decisions are reasonable and fair, particularly in light of the compensation decisions made by companies included in the Comparator Group.

The Company's annual cash incentive awards are aligned directly with critical measures of annual performance centered on challenging growth targets, consistent with our pay-for-performance philosophy and target compensation levels.

The Company's long-term equity-based awards are intended to drive the achievement of critical long-term business objectives including challenging growth targets, align management's interests with those of our shareholders and foster retention of key executives, consistent with our pay-for-performance philosophy.

The Company does not provide perquisites or personal benefits to the NEOs.

To further align the interests of the NEOs with those of our shareholders, the Company adopted a clawback policy in August 2012, as further described below.

In May 2012, the Compensation Committee discontinued the practice of granting the Chief Executive Officer fully vested stock options. The stock options granted to Mr. Kramer in August 2012 vest over a five year period, with 20% vesting to occur on each of the first, second, third, fourth and fifth anniversaries of the grant date. Future grants to Mr. Kramer, if any, are expected to provide for the same vesting features.

In fiscal year 2012, the Company pay-for-performance analysis indicated that the Company achieved a composite performance ranking of 5<sup>th</sup> highest among the Comparator Group for financial performance while the Company's CEO compensation ranked 9<sup>th</sup> highest among the same Comparator Group. These results indicate that the Company operated at a high performance level for the pay awarded.

As shareholders, you will be invited to express your view of the compensation paid to the Company's NEOs, as discussed and analyzed below (Proposal 3). In considering how to vote on Proposal 3 below, you should be guided by the following discussions in evaluating whether the Compensation Committee and the Board have adequately aligned the interests of the Company's NEOs with those of our shareholders.

#### Recap of the Company's Performance in 2012

During fiscal year 2012, the Company was affected by several external factors outside the direct control of the Company that unfavorably impacted our performance in fiscal year 2012. Among them were the flooding in Thailand, which severely impacted the manufacturing operations of our recently acquired Aegis Lightwave, Inc. (Aegis) subsidiary, and declines in global raw material index pricing driven by volatility in the global photovoltaic market and economic uncertainty, which resulted in write-downs of tellurium and selenium inventory at the Company's Pacific Rare Specialty Metals & Chemicals, Inc. business unit. Despite these external challenges in 2012, the Company was able to deliver the following positive financial results for the year:

Generated \$535 million in revenues, an increase of 6% compared to fiscal year 2011, and grew our order backlog to the highest level in the Company's history;

Generated record cash from operations of approximately \$88 million for fiscal year 2012 and initiated a \$25 million share repurchase program;

Completed the acquisition of Aegis and, as a result of the flooding in Thailand, accelerated our manufacturing transition strategy for Aegis from its external contract manufacturer in Thailand to our Photop Technologies, Inc. facility in Fuzhou, China.

Achieved our 40<sup>th</sup> consecutive year of positive net income.

## Edgar Filing: II-VI INC - Form DEF 14A

The items above are only a partial summary of the Company's financial performance in 2012. For more complete information about our financial performance in 2012, please see the Company's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the fiscal year 2012 filed with the SEC on August 28, 2012 and included within our 2012 Annual Report to Shareholders.

### Prior Year Say on Pay Results

At the Company's 2011 Annual Meeting, in an advisory non-binding vote, 78% of the votes cast were cast in favor of the compensation paid to our named executive officers in Fiscal Year 2011 (the 2011 Say-on-Pay



Vote ). Although this result meant that over three-fourths of those who voted agreed with the compensation paid to our named executive officers, the Compensation Committee took note of the minority of shareholders that did not vote in favor of the compensation paid to our named executive officers for that year. After careful consideration, the Compensation Committee made certain modifications to the Company's existing executive compensation structure during fiscal year 2012, including the following:

In May 2012, the Compensation Committee discontinued the practice of granting the Company's Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Kramer, fully vested stock options. Since the Company does not provide for tax gross-ups in the event of a change in control and requires that its executives' compensation is reduced as necessary to avoid the excise tax under Section 280G of the Code, that practice had been utilized in order to lessen the impact on Mr. Kramer in the event of a change in control. The stock options that were granted to Mr. Kramer in August 2012 provided for vesting over a five year period, with 20% vesting to occur on each of the first, second, third, fourth and fifth anniversaries of the grant date. Future stock option grants to Mr. Kramer, if any, are expected to provide for the same vesting features.

In August 2012, with the goal of further aligning the interests of the NEOs with those of our shareholders, the Company adopted a clawback policy, as hereinafter described.

In an effort to better demonstrate our pay-for-performance philosophy, and in response to the 2011 Say-on-Pay-Vote, we have also expanded the disclosure provided in this Proxy Statement, as compared to previous years, regarding the performance goals we set and how their achievement, or lack thereof, affects the compensation paid to our named executive officers,

At the 2011 Annual Meeting, our shareholders also had the opportunity to cast a non-binding advisory vote (a say-on-frequency vote) on how often the Company should include a say-on-pay proposal in its proxy statement for future annual meetings. Shareholders had the choice of voting to have the say-on-pay vote every year, every two years or every three years. The frequency receiving the highest number of votes was every year, which was the recommendation of the Board of Directors. As a result of this vote, our Board of Directors decided to hold the say-on-pay advisory vote every year until the next advisory vote is held to determine the frequency of the say-on-pay vote, which will occur no later than our 2017 annual meeting of shareholders.

### **Compensation Philosophy and Objectives**

World class organizations have clear purposes and challenging objectives that require talented and committed people to achieve those objectives. Every day the Company strives to be a world class organization and to provide a compensation program which re-enforces and emphasizes its focus on the achievement of its business objectives. With these goals in mind, the Company has defined its global compensation objectives and philosophy which guide the Company's compensation practices. The Company's executive compensation program is designed to align our executives' compensation with the Company's strategic objectives, while providing competitive compensation that enables us to attract, retain, motivate and reward high quality executive talent. The Company's executive compensation philosophy is based on a fundamental philosophy of pay-for-performance with a substantial portion of pay being at-risk, meaning it is not guaranteed, but rather is largely earned through cash bonuses or equity-based compensation both of which are contingent on the Company's performance. The Compensation Committee believes in a system that rewards employees for performance. Company performance is measured by revenue growth, return on sales, earnings growth and cash flow from operations, which are all key drivers of total shareholder return. The primary objectives of our executive compensation program are to:

Maximize company performance to enhance total shareholder return.

Provide externally competitive and internally equitable compensation that rewards identifiable and measurable accomplishments and that deliver significant rewards for exceptional performance without creating incentive for the assumption of unnecessary or excessive risk.

Edgar Filing: II-VI INC - Form DEF 14A

Link the interests of the NEOs to the interests of shareholders and other potential investors.

Provide incentive for innovation, quality management, responsiveness to customer needs, talent management, environmental, health and safety performance, and an action-oriented approach to opportunities in the marketplace.

The Company's compensation programs are managed so as to help communicate the Company's desired results and to promote decisions and action by management that produce those results. The Company's compensation programs and philosophies are characterized by the following qualities:

**Variability (performance-based)** a significant portion of total compensation should be based on Company performance. Salaries are to be generally maintained at competitive levels, with opportunities for significant upward adjustments in total compensation to be provided by performance-based cash incentive compensation and long-term equity incentive awards;

**Clarity** all relevant performance objectives for cash incentive compensation and long-term equity incentive programs will be clearly established and articulated;

**Communicability** NEOs will be made aware of and fully comprehend their earnings potential for a given year and what specific actions and results are necessary to achieve that potential;

**Strategic Focus** compensation programs should include recognition of the roles that various elements of compensation play in attracting, retaining, and motivating employees, the performance aspects that each element is best suited to reward, and the needs of the Company and its NEOs that may warrant emphasis on specific elements of pay; and

**Risk Management** compensation programs should provide appropriate rewards for prudent risk taking, but must not create incentive for the assumption of unnecessary and/or excessive risks that would threaten the reputation or sustainability of the Company.

The Company believes that its executive compensation philosophy is best achieved by targeting base salaries at the market median of our Comparator Group and targeting total compensation from annual cash incentive awards and long-term equity-based awards at levels designed to provide for total direct compensation at the upper third quartile or lower fourth quartile of the Comparator Group when the Company's operating performance is also in the upper third quartile or lower fourth quartile as compared to our Comparator Group's high performance.

### **Principal Components of Executive Compensation**

The principal components of our executive compensation program are:

Base salary;

Annual cash incentive awards; and

Long-term equity-based compensation.

### **Mix of Compensation Components**

Our executive compensation is based on our pay-for-performance philosophy, which emphasizes executive performance measures that correlate closely with the achievement of both shorter-term performance objectives and longer-term shareholder value. To this end, a substantial portion of our NEOs' annual and long-term compensation is at-risk. This provides more upside potential and downside risk to the executives, which we believe is justified due to their ability to influence the performance of the Company as a whole.

**Compensation Committee Matters and Scope of Authority**

The Compensation Committee meets all applicable standards for independence. The Committee acts on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Company and, by extension, the shareholders to establish the

compensation of executive officers of the Company and provides oversight of the Company's global compensation philosophy. The Compensation Committee is advised by an independent compensation consultant, Mercer, which is retained directly by and reports to the Compensation Committee. The compensation consultant performs no other work for the Company or for the members of the Board of Directors (other than its advisory services related to director compensation). The compensation consultant has no prior relationship with our Chief Executive Officer or with any other executive officer.

The Compensation Committee acts as the oversight committee with respect to the 2009 Omnibus Plan, the II-VI Incorporated Deferred Compensation Plan and the bonus plans discussed below covering NEOs and other employees. In overseeing those plans, the Compensation Committee may delegate, when appropriate, authority for day-to-day administration and interpretation, including selection of participants, determination of award levels within plan parameters, and approval of award documents, to officers and employees of the Company. In general, certain duties such as participant selection and award determination have been delegated to the Chief Executive Officer and Vice President of Human Resources and matters regarding award documents have been delegated to the Chief Financial Officer. However, the Compensation Committee may not delegate any authority under those plans for matters affecting the compensation and benefits of the NEOs.

### **The Committee's Processes**

The Compensation Committee has established a number of processes to assist it in ensuring that the Company's executive compensation program is achieving its desired objectives. Among those are:

*Meetings.* The Compensation Committee meets as needed each year. Compensation Committee agendas are established in advance of the meetings in consultation with the Committee Chair.

*Assessment of Company Performance.* The Compensation Committee uses performance measures in establishing total compensation ranges. The Compensation Committee considers various measures of Company and industry performance, including return on sales, earnings growth and revenue growth. The Board of Directors believes profitable growth is the primary objective of the Company and the NEOs should be evaluated based on and rewarded for the financial growth of the Company.

*Assessment of Individual Performance.* Individual performance has a strong impact on the compensation of all employees, including the NEOs. During the course of the year, the Compensation Committee meets with the Chief Executive Officer and the Vice President of Human Resources to review recommendations on changes, if any, in the base salary of each NEO other than the Chief Executive Officer. During fiscal year 2012, the Compensation Committee continued to engage Mercer as its independent compensation consultant. Based on the Compensation Committee's judgment and salary practices, input from the Comparator Group data provided by Mercer, and each employee's performance and contribution to the Company, the Compensation Committee adjusts total annual compensation for each of the NEOs.

*Target Pay Philosophy.* The Compensation Committee considers relevant market pay practices when setting executive compensation to ensure alignment with performance expectation and the Company's ability to recruit, motivate and retain high caliber talent.

### **Development of Peer Group for Compensation Purposes**

In assessing market competitiveness, the total annual compensation of the Company's NEOs is reviewed against executive compensation of a designated set of highly profitable publicly-traded companies which are listed below (the Comparator Group). Our Comparator Group has been thoughtfully constructed by the Compensation Committee to include companies with sustained levels of high financial performance in similar technology space with whom we compete for investor capital, talent and market share. The Comparator Group was identified and selected by the Compensation Committee with the assistance of Mercer. The Comparator



Group for fiscal year 2012 consisted of 17 manufacturing companies with Global Industry Classification Standard ( GICS ) codes as follows:

GICS code 453010 Eight companies classified as Information Technology Semiconductors and Semiconductor Equipment  
Semiconductors and Semiconductor Equipment;

GICS code 452030 Six companies classified as Information Technology Technology Hardware and Equipment Electronic Equipment,  
Instruments and Components;

GICS code 201010 Two companies classified as Industrial Capital Goods Aerospace and Defense;

GICS code 201040 One company classified as Industrial Capital Goods Electrical Equipment.

Because the Company provides a wide range of products servicing multiple end markets, the Compensation Committee believes that it is important to consider peers with different GICS codes than the Company.

The Comparator Group has revenues ranging from \$0.2 billion to \$1.6 billion, with median revenues of \$0.8 billion. In evaluating the composition of the Comparator Group, the Compensation Committee focuses on the three key performance metrics that are used to evaluate the Company's performance, which are (a) revenue growth, (b) earnings growth and (c) return on sales, over one, three and five year performance periods. The Comparator Group's average revenue and earnings growth for the one, three and five year periods exceeded 10% while return on sales for the same periods also exceeded 10%. The Company's Comparator Group also has executive officer positions that are comparable in terms of breadth, complexity and scope of responsibilities. In fiscal year 2012, the Comparator Group remained unchanged from the prior year and was comprised of the following companies:

American Science & Engineering Inc.	FLIR Systems, Inc.	Rofin-SinarTechnologies, Inc.
Cabot Microelectronics Corp.	Franklin Electric Co., Inc.	Rogers Corporation
Ceradyne, Inc.	IPG Photonics Corporation	Silicon Laboratories, Inc.
Cree, Inc.	MKS Instruments, Inc.	Trimble Navigation Limited
Cymer Inc.	Microsemi Corporation	Veeco Instruments Inc.
FEI Co.	OmniVision Technologies, Inc.	

In measuring the Company's financial performance against the Comparator Group, the Compensation Committee places more emphasis on recent financial performance, by applying a weighting factor of 50% to the one year performance metrics, 33% to the three year performance metrics and 17% to the five year performance metrics. In fiscal year 2012, the Company achieved a composite performance ranking of 5<sup>th</sup> highest among the Comparator Group for financial performance while the Company's CEO compensation ranked 9 among the same Comparator Group. These results indicate that the Company operated at a high performance level for the pay awarded.

In determining executive compensation, the Compensation Committee reviewed the compensation practices of the Comparator Group in order to ensure the appropriateness of the Company's compensation program design and compensation levels. Mercer employed a benchmarking process as an assessment tool that compares elements of the Company's compensation program with those of companies from the Comparator Group.

The purpose of the benchmarking process is to:

Understand the competitiveness of the Company's current pay levels relative to the Comparator Group;

Understand the alignment between executive compensation levels and company performance across a broad range of companies; and

Assist the Company in setting appropriate pay levels and incentive opportunities for our NEOs.



## Use of Judgment

The Compensation Committee believes that the application of their collective experiences and related business judgment, in addition to the blended market data provided by Mercer, significantly contributes to the overall compensation setting process. While blended market data provides an important tool for analysis and decision-making, the Compensation Committee realizes that over-reliance on this data can give a false sense of precision. Consequently, the Compensation Committee also gives serious consideration to an individual's personal contribution to the Company as well as his or her individual skill sets, qualifications, experience and demonstrated performance. The Company also values and seeks to reward performance that develops talent within the Company, embraces the sense of urgency that distinguishes the Company, and demonstrates the qualities of imagination and drive to resolve longer-term challenges or important new issues. These and similar qualities and competencies are not easily correlated to typical compensation benchmarking data, but deserve, and are given, consideration in reaching compensation decisions. The blended market data provided by Mercer provides the Compensation Committee and senior management with the foundation for application of the above principles and the ensuing decisions.

## Components of Executive Compensation for fiscal year 2012

For fiscal year 2012, our executive compensation program consisted of the following components: (1) base salary; (2) annual cash incentive awards and (3) long-term equity-based compensation. The Compensation Committee believes this program balances the mix of cash and equity compensation and ensures that a significant portion of each NEO's compensation package is at-risk. Historically, executive compensation for a particular fiscal year is reviewed by the Compensation Committee on a preliminary basis at its last meeting in the prior fiscal year and finalized at its first meeting in the fiscal year for which the compensation will apply. The following is a discussion of the Compensation Committee's considerations in establishing each of the compensation components for the NEOs.

## Base Salary

The Compensation Committee sets base salary levels for executive officers each year based on a number of factors, including individual performance, competition in the marketplace for individuals in similar positions, the responsibilities of the particular position, the experience of the individual and the particular position's relationship to other positions within the Company. Base salary is the one fixed component of our NEOs' total direct compensation (which includes base salary and short- and long-term incentive compensation), in contrast to annual and long-term compensation, which is at-risk based on the Company's performance. The Compensation Committee meets with the Chief Executive Officer and Vice President of Human Resources to review the base salaries of the other NEOs and to consider any changes thereto. The Compensation Committee receives input from Mercer regarding any such proposed changes. The executive officers' base salaries are targeted at the market median for similar positions at companies included in the Comparator Group. The Compensation Committee has periodically adjusted the NEOs' base salaries over the last several years to align their base salary levels to the market median for similar positions at companies in the Comparator Group. For more information regarding our NEOs' base salaries, see the Summary Compensation Table.

Named Executive Officer	Fiscal Year 2012 Base Salary	Fiscal Year 2011 Base Salary	Percentage Increase
FRANCIS J. KRAMER	\$ 575,000	\$ 560,000	2.7%
CRAIG A. CREATURO	328,000	318,000	3.1%
VINCENT D. MATTERA, JR.	355,000	345,000	2.9%
JAMES MARTINELLI	275,000	264,000	4.2%

---

**Annual Cash Incentive Program**

The Compensation Committee establishes the annual cash incentive awards program for each NEO each fiscal year based on input from several sources, including Mercer and, for each NEO (other than the Chief Executive Officer), the Chief Executive Officer and the Vice President of Human Resources. The annual cash incentive awards are designed to target total compensation (including the NEO's base salary, annual cash incentive awards and long-term equity-based compensation) at the upper third quartile or lower fourth quartile of the Comparator Group's annual total cash payout for NEOs in similar positions and with similar responsibilities when the Company's operating performance is also in the upper third quartile or lower fourth quartile of the Comparator Group's performance. The Compensation Committee targeted this range to emphasize its pay-for-performance philosophy, which aligns compensation awards with the achievement of our performance objectives relative to our Comparator Group. Actual payouts under our annual cash incentive program are determined by the Compensation Committee based upon the actual performance by the NEO and the Company against certain targeted goals, which for fiscal year 2012 were based on revenues, earnings per share, operating profits, and other relevant performance metrics. Actual bonus program payouts also take into consideration the NEO's leadership skills and job responsibilities. These awards are not guaranteed.

The Compensation Committee has established three separate types of annual cash incentive awards that may be provided to our NEOs, which are described below.

***Bonus Incentive Plan***

All employees of the Company who have been employed by the Company for at least one year are eligible to participate in the Bonus Incentive Plan. Under the Bonus Incentive Plan, each NEO receives a cash bonus which is allocated from a percentage of the Company's operating profit, as pre-determined by the Compensation Committee. The Company believes that the operating profits are an appropriate metric to calculate the Bonus Incentive Plan payout and helps align the interests of our NEOs with those of the Company as a whole. In general terms, the Bonus Incentive Plan is based on the budgeted operating profit for the Company. A fixed percentage of operating profit is allocated over the projected base wages of our NEOs and any other qualified participants such that each participant is targeted to receive a percentage of the total available pool of funds that is equal to the percentage such person's base wages represent in relation to the base wages of all participants. Actual payouts under the Bonus Incentive Plan, if any, will generally deviate from the budgeted payout due to changes in actual operating profit performance as compared to the budgeted operating performance goals, and changes in actual base wages as compared to the budgeted base wages. The Company believes the established target level is a meaningful at-risk compensation level and is consistent with the overall at-risk compensation philosophy that focuses on the financial growth and profitability of the Company. Partial bonus amounts are paid quarterly based on interim financial performance, and the remainder is paid after fiscal year end. The Compensation Committee establishes the budgeted operating profits goal for the Bonus Incentive Plan at an attainable but challenging level. Payouts under the Bonus Incentive Plan are set forth in the Summary Compensation Table in the Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation column.

***Management-by-Objective Plan ( MBO )***

Under the MBO Plan, selected employees receive a fixed percentage of the appropriate business unit or location's operating profits, as determined by the Compensation Committee. The Company believes that the operating profits of each business unit or location are the appropriate metric to calculate the MBO payout as operating profits are a financial measurement of the business unit's or location's growth. In general terms, the MBO Plan targets a payout if the business unit or location achieves its targeted operating profit goals and the employee accomplishes his or her pre-established team goals. The Company believes the targeted payout is an appropriate at-risk compensation level for these eligible employees and helps promote cross-functional performance and teamwork goals on financial, operational, customer, technical development and safety objectives that are important to the Company and that require collaborative efforts from more than one employee



and from one or more departments or functional areas. Mr. Creaturo participates in the MBO Plan that has been established for the Company's corporate location. These awards under the MBO Plan are based on the graded performance of recipients measured against pre-established Company operational goals. Mr. Kramer and Dr. Mattera did not participate in the MBO Plan in fiscal years 2010, 2011 or 2012 because they had significant influence on the establishment and grading of the goals under this program. Mr. Martinelli did not participate in the MBO Plan in fiscal year 2012. The Chief Executive Officer, the Business Segment Leader and the Vice President of Human Resources establish the operational target goals for the MBO Plan to an attainable but challenging level. The Compensation Committee, in conjunction with the Chief Executive Officer, may adjust the payout under this plan based upon the evaluation of the individual's participation and the overall accomplishments of the MBO Plan. Payouts of awards under the MBO Plan appear in the Summary Compensation Table under the Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation column.

*Goal / Results Incentive Plan ( GRIP )*

The GRIP provides a mechanism for providing compensation to the NEOs based not only on the Company's performance, but on their individual performance as well. The targeted amounts to be paid to the NEOs under this plan provide the most significant non-equity incentive compensation opportunity. Awards under the GRIP are at-risk based on the performance of the Company, business unit and/or location, as determined by the Compensation Committee. Each NEO receives a GRIP award with an assigned target award opportunity, expressed as a dollar amount. Each GRIP award is individually tailored to the particular responsibilities of the NEO. Certain goals of the GRIP are linked to the Company's annual growth objectives for revenues and earnings per share, while other goals focus on specific financial and operational targets that have been determined by the Compensation Committee and/or Chief Executive Officer and Vice President of Human Resources to be important for that particular employee and are generally selected to direct such NEO's efforts. Each performance goal is graded individually and the GRIP award payout is based on the total achievement with respect to each of the underlying performance goals. The Chief Executive Officer approves individual GRIP awards, other than his own, which is approved by the Compensation Committee. GRIP awards are provided to all NEOs and selected members of the Company's senior management. Payouts under the GRIP are set forth in the Summary Compensation Table under the Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation column.

For fiscal year 2012, the performance goals for Mr. Kramer, Mr. Creaturo and Dr. Mattera were based upon consolidated revenues and earnings per share for the fiscal year and upon certain pre-established individual goals, which were determined to be important in relation to the positions they hold in the Company. Mr. Martinelli's performance goals were based upon the revenues and earnings per share of both the Company's consolidated results and those of our Military & Materials business segment, which he manages, and on certain individual goals, which were determined to be important in relation to the position he holds in the Company. The Compensation Committee believes an appropriate measurement of each NEO's performance is such person's ability to drive both revenue and earnings per share growth in accordance with Company's compensation philosophy.

For fiscal year 2012, three levels of performance were established for each GRIP award: (i) a threshold level of performance, below which no GRIP award is paid; (ii) a target level of performance, for which a target level of the GRIP award is paid; and (iii) a maximum level of performance, for which an amount above the target level of the GRIP award is paid. The threshold, target and maximum levels for the 2012 GRIP awards were established based on targeted results. In general, the targeted levels of performance are correlated with the Company's annual growth objectives for revenues and earnings per share. With respect to the other performance metrics utilized in determining whether GRIP awards are earned, the Compensation Committee sets the minimum, target and maximum levels for each metric such that the relative difficulty of achieving the metric at target is consistent from year to year and is set to be an attainable but challenging goal to meet. For more information regarding our annual cash incentive awards (including the payout of the 2012 annual incentive awards), see the Summary Compensation Table and the Grants of Plan-Based Awards Table.

### Long-Term Equity-Based Compensation

The Compensation Committee believes that long-term equity-based compensation is an integral component of our compensation program because it has the effect of retaining and motivating high-quality employees. In addition, the Compensation Committee believes that long-term equity compensation aligns the interests of eligible employees with the interests of shareholders, and rewards the achievement of the Company's long-term strategic goals. Payment of long-term equity-based compensation to our NEOs in fiscal year 2012 was targeted at levels that ranged between the upper third quartile and lower fourth quartile of Comparator Group executives in comparable positions, utilizing the same compensation data used for setting total annual cash compensation when the Company's operating performance is also in the upper third quartile and lower fourth quartile range against our Comparator Group's performance. At the beginning of each fiscal year, the Compensation Committee reviews and approves the equity-based compensation for that year to be granted to the NEOs and other eligible employees who participate in the Company's long-term equity programs. In recent years, three types of long-term equity awards, stock options, performance shares and restricted stock, have been granted to our NEOs. The long-term equity awards granted to our NEOs are designed in combination with our cash compensation to target an aggregate payout in the upper third quartile or lower fourth quartile of the total direct compensation paid by our Comparator Group when the Company's performance is also in the upper third or lower fourth quartile. The allocation among stock options, performance shares and restricted stock is at the discretion of the Compensation Committee and may vary from NEO to NEO and from year to year. The Compensation Committee believes that the use of stock options is an effective way to align the NEOs' interests with our shareholders' interests, because the NEOs only receive value through stock options if the Company's stock appreciates. At the same time, the Compensation Committee does not want single-minded focus to drive short-term stock price appreciation to the detriment of the long-term success of the Company. To address this concern, the Company uses performance shares and restricted stock to ensure that the NEOs remain focused on the long-term strategic goals of the Company. Generally, each NEO receives annual stock option, performance share and restricted stock awards during the first quarter of the fiscal year.

The Company's stock options, performance shares and restricted stock vest immediately prior to a change in control. Stock options, performance shares and restricted stock also vest in the event of death, disability or retirement, although performance awards only vest to the extent earned on a pro-rata basis for the months employed relative to the performance period of the award. In all other circumstances, the awards terminate upon termination of employment. These acceleration provisions are provided to reduce distractions that might otherwise arise in a change-in-control situation and to otherwise provide vesting terms that the Company believes are comparable in the market for these kinds of awards.

The Compensation Committee uses the grant date fair value of the equity compensation as calculated under Accounting Standards Codification (ASC 718), Compensation-Stock Compensation, to determine the value of the stock option, performance share and restricted stock awards. More specifically, for stock options, the Company uses a Black-Scholes valuation.

Mercer provided information on long-term equity compensation opportunities provided to other comparable executive officer positions in our Comparator Group and general information regarding the mix of long-term equity incentive awards generally provided. In 2012 our Compensation Committee allocated long term equity compensation as follows:

*Long-Term Equity Compensation Stock Options*

Stock options provide the opportunity to purchase and maintain an equity interest in the Company and to share in the appreciation of the value of the Company's Common Stock over time. All stock options granted in fiscal year 2012 were granted from the Company's 2009 Omnibus Plan. Some key features of our stock option program include:

Options generally vest over a five year period, with 20% vesting occurring on each of the first, second, third, fourth and fifth anniversaries of the grant date;

The term of each grant does not exceed ten years; and

The exercise price is equal to the closing market price on the date of grant.

*Long-Term Equity Compensation Performance Shares*

Performance shares provide the opportunity to receive shares of Common Stock if certain Company performance goals are achieved. At June 30, 2012, each of the Company's NEOs had two outstanding performance share awards granted under the 2009 Omnibus Plan including an award granted in 2010 with a twenty-four month performance period which ended June 30, 2012 (the 2010 Performance Awards) and an award granted in 2011 with a twenty-four month performance period which ends on June 30, 2013 (the 2011 Performance Awards). Our performance share awards entitle recipients to receive shares of our Common Stock in the event that one or more independent performance goals are achieved by the Company. The 2010 and 2011 Performance Awards each include two independent performance components, which are weighted equally: (i) consolidated revenue and (ii) consolidated cash flow from operations. Payout of the revenue portion of an award is independent from and not contingent upon the payout of the cash flow portion of an award and vice versa. The payout of these awards is determined by the Compensation Committee and is based upon the greater of (i) the actual results for the full twenty-four-month performance period or (ii) the sum of the deemed payouts for each of the four (4) consecutive six-month periods comprising each of the performance periods, based on predetermined six-month goals. The Compensation Committee establishes the target performance goals underlying these awards to be attainable but challenging. The Compensation Committee believes that growth in revenues and cash flow from operations correlate to increased stock value over time. Performance shares under the 2010 Awards and 2011 Award may be earned as follows:

Achieving 79.99% or less of either or both performance goals earns 0% of the target award for that particular performance goal;

Achieving between 80.0% and 99.99% of either or both performance goals earns from 50.0% to 99.99% of the target award for that particular performance goal;

Achieving 100.0% of either or both performance goals earns 100.0% of the target award for that particular performance goal;

Achieving between 100.1% and 119.99% of either or both performance goals earns from 100.01% up to 149.99% of the target award for that particular performance goal; and

Achieving 120.0% or greater of either or both performance goals earns 150.0% of the target award for that particular performance goal.

Performance shares that are deemed earned by the Compensation Committee are issued after the completion of the applicable performance period and upon the determination and approval of the Compensation Committee that one or more performance goals have been achieved at a particular level.

The target revenue and target cash flow established by the Compensation Committee for the twenty-four month period of the 2010 Awards were \$920.6 million and \$158.7 million, respectively. Actual revenues and cash flow for the twenty-four month period ended June 30, 2012 were \$1,037.5 million and \$161.5 million, respectively, which generated payouts of 131.7% and 104.5% of target, respectively.

The Company's target and actual performance shares earned under the 2010 Performance Awards based on consolidated revenue (the Revenue Awards) and based on consolidated cash flow from operations (the Cash Flow Awards) were as follows:

Named Executive Officer	Overall % of Revenue		Overall % of Cash Flow	
	Revenue Awards Target	Revenue Awards Earned	Cash Flow Awards Target	Cash Flow Awards Earned
FRANCIS J. KRAMER	11,510 shares	131.7%	11,510 shares	12,029 shares
CRAIG A. CREATUREO	3,845 shares	131.7%	3,845 shares	4,018 shares
VINCENT D. MATTERA, JR.	3,395 shares	131.7%	3,395 shares	3,548 shares
JAMES MARTINELLI	2,905 shares	131.7%	2,905 shares	3,036 shares

For more information regarding the long-term incentive component of our compensation program, see the Summary Compensation Table and Grants of Plan-Based Awards Table.

#### *Long-Term Equity Compensation - Restricted Stock*

Because it is important to the Company to provide compensation that is externally competitive and to retain our executive officers, the Company utilizes time-based restricted stock which generally cliff-vest three years from the date of the grant. Grants of restricted stock help provide balance to the executive compensation program when used with stock options and performance shares and also help minimize excessive risk taking.

#### **Deferred Compensation**

The II-VI Incorporated Deferred Compensation Plan (the "Deferred Compensation Plan") is designed to allow executive officers and key employees of the Company to defer receipt of compensation into a trust fund for retirement or other qualified purposes. The Deferred Compensation Plan was established to provide retirement savings benefits for NEOs and other executives beyond what is available through the II-VI Incorporated Employees Profit Sharing Plan, which is subject to IRS limitations on annual contributions and compensation. Under the Deferred Compensation Plan, eligible participants can elect to defer up to 100% of discretionary incentive compensation, performance shares and restricted stock into an account that will be credited with earnings at the same rate as one or more investments chosen by the participant, which are similar to the investment funds under the II-VI Incorporated Employees Profit Sharing Plan. The Company does not make any



matching contributions to the Deferred Compensation Plan. All assets in the Deferred Compensation Plan are subject to claims of the Company's creditors until such amounts are paid to participants.

For more information regarding the amounts deferred under the Deferred Compensation Plan, see the Non-Qualified Deferred Compensation Table.

### **Employees Profit Sharing Plan**

The NEOs each participate in the II-VI Incorporated Employees Profit Sharing Plan (the Profit Sharing Plan), which is available to all eligible employees who have met tenure and service requirements. All NEOs participate in the Profit Sharing Plan that covers the Company's corporate employees. The Profit Sharing Plan also has the features of a 401(k) plan. Under the Profit Sharing Plan, the Company makes a matching contribution to the Profit Sharing Plan based upon the employee's 401(k) deferred savings. In addition, the Company may make an additional discretionary contribution to the Profit Sharing Plan out of the Company's operating profits as determined by the Compensation Committee.

For information regarding our contributions to the NEOs' accounts under the Profit Sharing Plan, see the Summary Compensation Table.

### **Perquisites and Other Benefits**

The Company does not provide perquisites or personal benefits to its NEOs.

### **Employment Agreements**

Each of the NEOs has an employment agreement with the Company, terminable by either party on thirty days' prior written notice, which contains, among other things, provisions for payment of compensation and benefits, and provisions regarding confidentiality, non-competition and assignment of inventions. These provisions are intended to protect the Company from a misuse of confidential information, knowledge and experience by the employee, and to specify the terms of separation, should the employee cease to be employed by the Company. The agreements generally provide for severance payments prior to a change in control of up to nine months base salary for all NEOs, except for Mr. Kramer, whose agreement calls for two times Average Annual Salary (as defined in his employment agreement) and also contain provisions providing for severance upon a change in control. These change in control provisions, however, do not provide for a tax gross-up if severance compensation paid in connection with a change in control transaction is a parachute payment under Section 280G of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the Code). In fact, they provide for a cut-back of such compensation so that such payments are not parachute payments under the Code. The terms of these agreements are more fully described in the section titled Potential Payments upon Change in Control and Employment Termination. The change in control provisions of these agreements are provided to reduce personal distractions that might otherwise arise in a change-in-control situation and are in the Company's opinion consistent with market practice.

The employment agreement with Mr. Kramer was entered into in 2007 in connection with his agreement to serve as Chief Executive Officer of the Company. Mr. Kramer's agreement was amended and restated in 2008, primarily to make his arrangements comply with Section 409A of the Code. In connection with the execution of Mr. Kramer's employment agreement in 2007, the Compensation Committee of the Board of Directors accelerated the vesting provisions on all outstanding stock options held by Mr. Kramer as of June 30, 2007. From 2007 to 2011, stock options granted to Mr. Kramer were already fully vested. In May 2012, the Compensation Committee of the Board of Directors discontinued the practice

## Edgar Filing: II-VI INC - Form DEF 14A

of granting Mr. Kramer fully vested stock options. The stock options that were granted to Mr. Kramer in August 2012 provide for vesting over a five year period, with 20% vesting to occur on each of the first, second, third, fourth and fifth anniversaries of the grant date. Future stock option grants to Mr. Kramer, if any, are expected to provide for the same vesting features.

Messrs. Creaturo and Martinelli entered into employment agreements with the Company in 2008. These agreements include provisions which are designed to protect the Company from a misuse of confidential information, knowledge and experience by the employee, and to specify the terms of separation should the employee cease to be employed by the Company.

Dr. Mattera originally entered into an employment agreement in 2004 in connection with his initial employment with the Company. In 2008, the Company entered into an amended and restated employment agreement with Dr. Mattera. This agreement includes provisions designed to protect the Company from a misuse of confidential information, knowledge or experience by the employee and specifies the terms of separation should Dr. Mattera cease to be employed by the Company.

As noted above, each of these employment agreements are more fully described in the section entitled Potential Payments upon Change in Control and Employment Termination.

### **Tax Considerations**

The Committee considers the impact of the applicable tax laws with respect to executive compensation. In certain circumstances, applicable tax laws impose potential penalties on compensation or result in a loss of deduction to the Company for such compensation. Participation in and compensation paid under our plans, contracts and compensation arrangements may result in the deferral of compensation that is subject to the requirements of Section 409A of the Code. While we intend for our plans, contracts and compensation arrangements to be structured and administered in a manner that complies with the requirements of Section 409A, to the extent that our plans, contracts and compensation arrangements fail to meet certain requirements under Section 409A, compensation earned thereunder may be subject to immediate taxation and tax penalties.

With certain exceptions, Section 162(m) of the Code limits the deductibility of compensation in excess of \$1 million paid to certain covered employees. Compensation paid to covered employees is not subject to the deduction limitation if it is considered qualified performance-based compensation. The Committee reserves the right to provide both market and performance-based compensation to covered employees. Certain awards, such as stock options and performance share awards, are intended to qualify for deduction under Section 162(m). Other types of awards, such as restricted shares, however, may not qualify for the performance-based exception, and therefore may not be deductible under Section 162(m). While the Committee considers the tax impact of any compensation arrangement, it reserves the right to approve non-deductible compensation that is consistent with the overall pay philosophy of the Company. However, the Compensation Committee does not believe that such loss of deductibility would have a material impact on the financial condition of the Company.

### **Clawback Policy**

To further align the interests of the NEOs with those of our shareholders, the Company's Board of Directors formalized a Clawback Policy in August 2012, which will be triggered in the event of any restatement (a Restatement) of the Company's financial statements due to material non-compliance with any financial reporting requirements promulgated under the federal securities laws. In the event of a Restatement, any current or former executive officer or other employee of the Company (i) who received incentive compensation (cash- or equity-based) based on erroneous financial information provided in the financial statements that were subsequently restated and (ii) whose gross negligence, fraud or misconduct caused or contributed to the noncompliance that resulted in the need for the Restatement, as determined by the Board of Directors in its sole discretion, will be required to reimburse the Company for any incentive compensation received in excess of what they would have received under the Restatement. In addition, if the Board of Directors determines that gross negligence, fraud or misconduct by a current or former executive officer or other employee of the Company caused or contributed to the need for the Restatement, then the Company will also seek to recover from such



person, and such person will be required pay to the Company, the net profits realized by such person from any sales of shares of the Company's Common Stock received as incentive compensation based on the erroneous financial information provided in the financial statements that were subsequently restated.

### Compensation Decisions for Fiscal Year 2013

At its August 18, 2012 meeting, the Compensation Committee approved the NEOs' compensation packages for fiscal year 2013, which included adjustments to the NEOs' base salaries and the granting of stock options, performance shares and restricted stock.

On August 18, 2012, the following base salary adjustments were made: Mr. Kramer's base salary increased from \$575,000 to \$628,000; Mr. Creaturo's base salary increased from \$328,000 to \$343,000; Dr. Mattera's base salary increased from \$355,000 to \$380,000 and Mr. Martinelli's base salary increased from \$275,000 to \$300,000. These salary adjustments were made to align base salaries at the market median of the Company's Comparator Group.

The performance share awards granted on August 18, 2012 will be earned based on the achievement of specific performance goals established for the twenty-four month period ending June 30, 2014 (the 2012 Performance Period). Similar to the 2010 Performance Awards and 2011 Performance Awards, these awards include two independent performance components, which are weighted equally: (i) consolidated revenue and (ii) consolidated cash flow from operations.

The Revenue Awards and Cash Flow Awards which make up the 2012 Performance Awards are earned as follows:

Achieving 79.99% or less of either or both performance goals earns 0% of the target award for that particular performance goal;

Achieving between 80.0% and 99.99% of either or both performance goals earns between 50.0% to 99.99% of the target award for that particular goal;

Achieving 100.0% of either or both performance goals earns 100.0% of the target award for that particular performance goal;

Achieving between 100.1% and 139.99% of either or both performance goals earns from 100.01% up to 199.99% of the target award for that particular performance goal; and

Achieving 140.0% or greater of either or both performance goals earns 200% of the target award for that particular goal.

Payouts will be determined based upon the greater of (i) the actual results for the 2012 Performance Period or (ii) the sum of the deemed payouts for each of the four consecutive six-month periods comprising the 2012 Performance Period, based on predetermined six-month performance goals. Payout of Revenue Awards is not contingent upon payout of Cash Flow Awards and vice versa.

The Revenue Awards and Cash Flow Awards targets for the NEOs for the 2012 Performance Period are as follows:

Edgar Filing: II-VI INC - Form DEF 14A

<b>Named Executive Officer</b>	<b>Revenue Awards</b>	<b>Cash Flow Awards</b>	<b>Fair Value at Target Payout</b>	<b>Fair Value at Maximum Payout</b>
FRANCIS J. KRAMER	15,690 shares	15,690 shares	\$ 594,000	\$ 1,188,000
CRAIG A. CREATURO	6,205 shares	6,205 shares	\$ 235,000	\$ 470,000
VINCENT D. MATTERA, JR.	8,915 shares	8,915 shares	\$ 338,000	\$ 676,000
JAMES MARTINELLI	4,485 shares	4,485 shares	\$ 170,000	\$ 340,000

In addition, on August 18, 2012, the Compensation Committee granted stock options and restricted stock to the NEOs under the 2009 Omnibus Plan. The stock options contain the same features as described in the section titled Long-Term Equity-Based Compensation Stock Options, above and were granted with a strike price \$18.93, the closing price of the Company's stock on August 18, 2012, which is the fair market value on the date of grant. Stock options were granted with a ten year life and provide for vesting over a five year period, with 20% vesting to occur on each of the first, second, third, fourth and fifth anniversaries. Restricted stock was granted subject to our standard three-year cliff vesting schedule. Stock options and restricted stock were granted to the NEOs as follows:

<b>Named Executive Officer</b>	<b>Stock Options Granted</b>	<b>Grant Date Fair Value</b>
FRANCIS J. KRAMER	83,680 shares	\$ 792,000
CRAIG A. CREATURO	33,070 shares	\$ 313,000
VINCENT D. MATTERA, JR.	47,550 shares	\$ 450,000
JAMES MARTINELLI	23,900 shares	\$ 226,000

<b>Named Executive Officer</b>	<b>Restricted Stock Granted</b>	<b>Grant Date Fair Value</b>
FRANCIS J. KRAMER	31,380 shares	\$ 594,000
CRAIG A. CREATURO	12,410 shares	\$ 235,000
VINCENT D. MATTERA, JR.	17,830 shares	\$ 338,000
JAMES MARTINELLI	8,970 shares	\$ 170,000

**COMPENSATION COMMITTEE REPORT**

The Compensation Committee has:

- (1) reviewed and discussed the Compensation Discussion and Analysis included in this Proxy Statement with management; and
- (2) based on the review and discussions referred to in paragraph (1) above, the Compensation Committee recommended to the Board of Directors that the Compensation Discussion and Analysis be included in this Proxy Statement.

Compensation Committee

Peter W. Sognefest, *Chairman*

Joseph J. Corasanti

Wendy F. DiCicco

Marc Y.E. Pelaez

The foregoing report of the Compensation Committee shall not be deemed to be soliciting material or to be filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission, nor shall such information be incorporated by reference into any future filing under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, except to the extent that the Company specifically incorporates it by reference in such filing.



## COMPENSATION AND RISK

The Company's compensation programs and policies are designed to motivate and reward our employees and executive officers for their performance during the fiscal year and over the long-term and for taking appropriate business risks. The Compensation Committee periodically reviews our compensation policies and practices to ensure that they do not encourage our executives or other employees to take inappropriate risks. Based on these reviews and a review of the Company's internal controls, the Compensation Committee and management have concluded that such policies and practices are sound and do not encourage executives or other employees to take excessive risks which would be reasonably likely to have a material adverse effect on the Company.

Our compensation programs for our executives and other employees include the following features, which we believe reduce incentives for excessive risk taking and mitigate incentives to maximize short-term results at the expense of long-term value:

*Balanced Pay Mix:* Our compensation program balances the mix of cash and equity-based compensation and short-term and long-term awards.

*Mix of Performance Metrics:* We do not rely on a single performance metric to determine payouts for performance-based awards. Instead, performance targets are tied to a variety of financial metrics, including, without limitation, return on revenues, earnings growth, revenue growth and cash flow from operations.

*Calculation and Verification of Performance:* Controls are in place to ensure accuracy of calculations as to actual performance against the pre-established performance targets for each award.

*Stock Ownership Guidelines:* As it relates to our executives, this policy requires our CEO to own Company common stock having a value of at least three times his annual base salary and all other executive officers to own Company common stock having a value at least equal to their annual base salary.

## COMPENSATION OF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

## Summary Compensation Table

## Fiscal Years 2012, 2011 and 2010

The following table summarizes compensation paid to our named executive officers for fiscal years 2012, 2011 and 2010. All footnote references and explanatory statements relate to fiscal year 2012 unless otherwise noted.

Name and Principal Position	Year	Salary (\$)	Stock Awards (\$ (1))	Option Awards (\$ (2))	Non-Equity Incentive Plan	All Other	Total (\$)
					Compensation (\$ (3))	Compensation (\$ (4))	
FRANCIS J. KRAMER President and Chief Executive Officer	2012	\$ 575,000	\$ 1,420,800	\$ 947,200	\$ 228,125	\$ 32,026	\$ 3,203,151
		560,000	776,004	517,280	1,317,541	30,828	3,201,653
	2011	433,000	503,626	403,403	806,837	33,060	2,179,926
	2010						
CRAIG A. CREATUREO Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer	2012	\$ 328,000	\$ 640,200	\$ 426,800	\$ 65,082	\$ 27,432	\$ 1,487,514
		297,125	259,230	172,932	461,497	32,288	1,223,072
	2011	234,500	209,059	108,836	296,890	30,872	880,157
	2010						
VINCENT D. MATTERA, JR. Executive Vice President	2012	\$ 355,000	\$ 914,830	\$ 609,886	\$ 90,826	\$ 28,147	\$ 1,998,689
		297,500	228,890	152,538	483,915	32,657	1,195,500
	2011	229,250	193,680	294,137	343,402	28,584	1,089,053
	2010						
JAMES MARTINELLI Vice President Military & Materials Businesses	2012	\$ 275,000	\$ 310,800	\$ 207,200	\$ 80,116	\$ 27,851	\$ 900,967
		247,000	247,646	184,635	325,387	34,412	1,039,080
	2011	196,000	193,680	93,457	245,922	25,974	755,033
	2010						

(1) Represents the aggregate grant date fair value of performance shares and restricted stock issued by the Company during the years presented, computed in accordance with FASB ASC Topic 718. For restricted stock, the grant date fair value was computed based upon the closing price of the Company's Common Stock on the date of grant multiplied by the number of shares awarded. The grant date fair value of the restricted stock awards reported in this column for fiscal year 2012 were as follows: Mr. Kramer, \$710,400; Mr. Creaturo, \$320,100; Dr. Mattera, \$457,415 and Mr. Martinelli \$155,400. For performance shares, the grant date fair value was computed based upon the estimate of aggregate compensation expense to be recognized over the service period, which was calculated based upon the number of shares projected to be earned multiplied by the stock price at the date the performance shares were awarded. The grant date fair value of the performance share awards included in this column was calculated based on the probable outcome of the performance conditions, as determined at the grant date (which was target). The grant date fair value of performance shares for fiscal year 2012 included in this column (measured at target) were as follows: Mr. Kramer, \$710,400; Mr. Creaturo, \$320,100; Dr. Mattera, \$457,415 and Mr. Martinelli, \$155,400. If these awards were to be paid out at the maximum amount, the value of these awards would be as follows: Mr. Kramer, \$1,065,600; Mr. Creaturo, \$480,150; Dr. Mattera, \$686,123 and Mr. Martinelli, \$233,100.

(2)

## Edgar Filing: II-VI INC - Form DEF 14A

Represents the aggregate grant date fair value of stock option awards issued by the Company during the years presented, computed in accordance with FASB ASC Topic 718. Refer to Note 1 to the Company's Consolidated Financial Statements on Form 10-K for the fiscal year 2012 for the relevant weighted-average assumptions underlying the valuation of the option awards, except that any estimate of forfeitures for service-based conditions have been disregarded. The grant date fair value of stock option awards is based on the Black-Scholes option pricing model. The actual value a named executive officer may realize upon exercise of stock options, if any, will depend on the excess of the stock option price over the grant date fair market value on the date of exercise. As such, there is no assurance that the value realized by a named executive officer will be at or near the value estimated by the Black-Scholes model.

- (3) Amounts reflect the cash awards earned by our NEOs under the Company's Bonus Incentive Plan, the MBO Plan and the GRIP, which are discussed in further detail in the Compensation Discussion and Analysis section of this Proxy Statement. Mr. Kramer and Dr. Mattera did not participate in the MBO Plan in fiscal years 2010, 2011 and 2012. Mr. Martinelli did not participate in the MBO Plan in fiscal year 2012. The cash awards earned by Mr. Kramer, Mr. Creaturo, Dr. Mattera and Mr. Martinelli under the Bonus Incentive Plan for fiscal year 2012 were \$66,125, \$37,721, \$40,826 and \$31,625, respectively. The cash award earned by Mr. Creaturo under the Management-by-Objective Plan for fiscal year 2012 was \$27,361. The cash awards earned by Mr. Kramer, Mr. Creaturo, Dr. Mattera and Mr. Martinelli under the GRIP for fiscal year 2012 were \$162,000, \$0, \$50,000 and \$48,491 respectively.
- (4) Amounts reflect premiums paid for life and disability insurance and the Company's 401(k) and profit sharing contributions under the Company's Profit Sharing Plan, which is qualified under Section 401 of the Code. Profit sharing contributions made by the Company on behalf of Mr. Kramer, Mr. Creaturo, Dr. Mattera and Mr. Martinelli for fiscal year 2012 were \$18,829, \$18,829, \$18,750 and \$18,829, respectively. 401(k) matching contributions made by the Company on behalf of Mr. Kramer, Mr. Creaturo, Dr. Mattera and Mr. Martinelli, for fiscal year 2012 were \$8,391, \$8,363, \$8,365 and \$8,470, respectively.

## Grants of Plan-Based Awards

## Fiscal Year 2012

The following table sets forth each annual incentive cash award and long-term equity-based award granted by the Company to the named executive officers in fiscal year 2012.

Name	Grant Date	Estimated Future Payouts Under Non-Equity Incentive Plan Awards (1)			Estimated Future Payouts Under Equity Incentive Plan Awards (2)			All Other Stock Awards: Number of Shares of Stock (#) (3)	All Other Option Awards: Number of Securities Underlying Options (#) (4)	Exercise or Base Price of Option Awards (\$/Share) (5)	Grant Date Fair Value of Stock and Option Awards (6)
		Threshold (\$)	Target (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Threshold (#)	Target (#)	Maximum (#)				
FRANCIS J. KRAMER		\$	\$ 1,347,000 <sup>(i)</sup>	\$ 3,239,000 <sup>(i)</sup>						\$	\$
		\$	\$ 96,025 <sup>(ii)</sup>	\$ 144,038 <sup>(ii)</sup>						\$	\$
	8/20/2011	\$			20,264	40,528	60,792			\$	\$ 710,400
	8/20/2011	\$						40,528		\$	\$ 710,400
	8/20/2011	\$							108,070	\$ 17.53	\$ 947,200
CRAIG A. CREATUREO		\$	\$ 170,000 <sup>(i)</sup>	\$ 292,500 <sup>(i)</sup>						\$	\$
		\$	\$ 54,776 <sup>(ii)</sup>	\$ 82,164 <sup>(ii)</sup>						\$	\$
		\$	\$ 29,520 <sup>(iii)</sup>	\$ 44,280 <sup>(iii)</sup>						\$	\$
	8/20/2011	\$			9,132	18,264	27,396			\$	\$ 320,100
	8/20/2011	\$					18,264		\$	\$ 320,100	
	8/20/2011	\$						48,700	\$ 17.53	\$ 426,800	
VINCENT D. MATTERA, JR.		\$	\$ 254,000 <sup>(i)</sup>	\$ 313,500 <sup>(i)</sup>						\$	\$
		\$	\$ 59,285 <sup>(ii)</sup>	\$ 88,928 <sup>(ii)</sup>						\$	\$
	8/20/2011	\$			13,050	26,100	39,150			\$	\$ 457,415
	8/20/2011	\$						26,100		\$	\$ 457,415
	8/20/2011	\$						69,600	\$ 17.53	\$ 609,886	
JAMES MARTINELLI		\$	\$ 193,000 <sup>(i)</sup>	\$ 298,250 <sup>(i)</sup>						\$	\$
		\$	\$ 45,925 <sup>(ii)</sup>	\$ 68,888 <sup>(ii)</sup>						\$	\$
	8/20/2011	\$			4,444	8,888	13,332			\$	\$ 155,400
	8/20/2011	\$						8,888		\$	\$ 155,400
	8/20/2011	\$						23,700	\$ 17.53	\$ 207,200	

- (1) These columns show the range of potential payouts for awards made to our named executive officers in fiscal year 2012 under (i) the GRIP, (ii) the Bonus Incentive Plan and (iii) the MBO Plan assuming the target or maximum goals are satisfied with respect to the applicable performance measures underlying such awards. There was no threshold level of performance established for these awards. The business measurements and performance goals underlying these awards are described in the Compensation Discussion and Analysis section of this Proxy Statement. Mr. Kramer, Dr. Mattera and Mr. Martinelli did not receive any awards under the MBO Plan for fiscal 2012. The aggregate amounts actually paid to our named executive officers under these plans for fiscal year 2012 are set forth in the Summary Compensation Table in the column titled Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation and additional details regarding the specific payouts under each of the various plans are provided in the footnotes thereto.
- (2) These columns show the range of payouts of performance share awards granted to our named executive officers in fiscal year 2012 under the 2009 Omnibus Plan if threshold, target or maximum goals are achieved. Please see the section of this Proxy Statement titled Long-Term Incentive Compensation Performance Share Awards in the Compensation Discussion and Analysis section of this Proxy Statement for additional information regarding our performance share awards.
- (3) This column shows the number of restricted stock awards granted to our named executive officers in fiscal year 2012 under the 2009 Omnibus Plan. These awards are subject to our standard three-year cliff-vesting schedule.

## Edgar Filing: II-VI INC - Form DEF 14A

- (4) This column shows the number of stock options granted to our named executive officers in fiscal year 2012 under the 2009 Omnibus Plan. Other than those granted to Mr. Kramer, the options vest over a five year period, with 20% vesting to occur on each of the first, second, third, fourth and fifth anniversaries of the grant date. The options granted to Mr. Kramer were fully vested at grant pursuant to the terms of his employment agreement. In May 2012, the Compensation Committee discontinued its practice of granting fully vested stock options to Mr. Kramer.
- (5) This column shows the exercise price for the stock options granted to our named executive officers in fiscal year 2012, which is equal to the closing market price of our Common Stock on the grant date.

- (6) This column shows the full grant date fair value of the stock and option awards reported in this table, which were computed in accordance with FASB ASC Topic 718. Generally, the full grant date fair value of an award is the amount the Company would expense in its financial statements over the award's vesting period as determined at the grant date. The performance share grant date fair value is based on a value of \$17.53 per share, which was the closing price of Common Stock on the grant date multiplied by the number of shares underlying the award at the target level. The restricted stock award grant date fair value is based on a value of \$17.53 per share, which was the closing price of Common Stock on the grant date multiplied by the number of shares underlying the award. Refer to Note 1 to the Company's Consolidated Financial Statements on Form 10-K for fiscal year 2012 for the relevant weighted-average assumptions underlying the valuation of the option awards, except that any estimate of forfeitures for service-based conditions have been disregarded.

## Outstanding Equity Awards

As of Fiscal Year End June 30, 2012

This table summarizes the long-term equity-based awards held by our named executive officers which were outstanding as of June 30, 2012.

Name	Number of Securities Underlying Unexercised Options (#) Exercisable (1)	Number of Securities Underlying Unexercised Options (#) Unexercisable (1)	Option Exercise Price (\$)	Option Expiration Date	Number of Shares or Units of Stock That Have Not Vested (#) (2)	Market Value of Shares or Units of Stock That Have Not Vested (\$) (3)	Equity Incentive Plan Awards: Number of Unearned Shares, Units or Other Rights That Have Not Vested (#) (4)	Equity Incentive Plan Awards: Market or Payout Value of Unearned Shares, Units or Other Rights That Have Not Vested (\$) (3)
	FRANCIS J. KRAMER					71,848	\$ 1,197,706	20,264
	40,000		\$ 3.23	8/09/2012				
	28,000		\$ 8.44	8/13/2014				
	50,000		\$ 9.55	2/24/2015				
	18,000		\$ 10.37	8/12/2016				
	8,300		\$ 10.54	8/31/2016				
	35,200		\$ 13.89	8/11/2017				
	41,850		\$ 23.50	8/16/2018				
	68,200		\$ 12.08	8/15/2019				
	61,380		\$ 16.86	8/21/2020				
	108,700		\$ 17.53	8/20/2021				
CRAIG A. CREATURE					34,254	\$ 571,014	9,132	\$ 152,230
	12,000		\$ 8.80	9/19/2015				
	12,000		\$ 10.37	8/12/2016				