

ON ASSIGNMENT INC
Form DEF 14A
April 20, 2017

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 (Amendment No. ____)

Filed by the Registrant x

Filed by a Party other than the Registrant o

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 under Rule 14a-12

ON ASSIGNMENT, INC.

(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)(1) 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:
- (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:

26745 Malibu Hills Road
Calabasas, California 91301

April 20, 2017

Dear Fellow Stockholder:

On behalf of your Board of Directors and management, you are cordially invited to attend the 2017 Annual Meeting of Stockholders (the “Annual Meeting”) of On Assignment, Inc. (the “Company” or “On Assignment”), at which you will be asked to vote upon:

- the election of
Peter T.
Dameris,
Jonathan S.
Holman and
Arshad Matin,
- 1. as directors for
three-year
terms to expire
at our 2020
Annual
Meeting of
Stockholders;
an advisory
vote to approve
the Company's
executive
- 2. compensation
for the year
ended
December 31,
2016;
an advisory
vote on the
frequency of
- 3. future advisory
votes on
executive
compensation;
- 4. the ratification
of the
appointment of
Deloitte &
Touche LLP as
our
independent
registered

public
accounting
firm for the
year ending
December 31,
2017; and
such other
business as
may properly
come before
the Annual
5. Meeting or any
adjournments
or
postponements
thereof.

The Annual Meeting will be held on Thursday, June 8, 2017, at 9:00 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time, at the Ritz Carlton Georgetown located at 3100 South Street, N.W., Washington D.C. 20007. The Notice of Annual Meeting of Stockholders and Proxy Statement accompanying this letter describe the business to be acted upon. Please promptly vote your shares by telephone, using the Internet, or by signing and returning your proxy in the enclosed envelope.

Before voting, you should carefully review all the information contained in the accompanying Proxy Statement.

Your vote is important no matter how many shares you own. In order to ensure that your shares will be represented at the Annual Meeting, please vote your shares using one of the voting instruments available to you. If you attend the Annual Meeting and desire to vote in person, you may do so even though you have previously submitted your proxy card.

We thank you for your continued interest in On Assignment and look forward to seeing you at the Annual Meeting.

Sincerely,

/s/ Peter T. Dameris
Peter T. Dameris
Chief Executive Officer

26745 Malibu Hills Road
Calabasas, California 91301

NOTICE OF ANNUAL MEETING OF STOCKHOLDERS
to be held on Thursday, June 8, 2017

The 2017 Annual Meeting of Stockholders of On Assignment, Inc. will be held on Thursday, June 8, 2017, at 9:00 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time, at the Ritz Carlton Georgetown located at 3100 South Street, N.W., Washington D.C. 20007, for the purpose of considering and voting upon:

the election of
Peter T.
Dameris,
Jonathan S.
Holman and
Arshad Matin,
as directors for
three-year
terms to expire
at our 2020
Annual
Meeting of
Stockholders;
an advisory
vote to approve
the Company's
executive
2compensation
for the year
ended
December 31,
2016;
an advisory
vote on the
frequency of
3future advisory
votes on
executive
compensation;
4the ratification
of the
appointment of
Deloitte &
Touche LLP as
our

independent
registered
public
accounting
firm for the
year ending
December 31,
2017; and
such other
business as
may properly
come before
the Annual
Meeting or any
adjournments
or
postponements
thereof.

The foregoing items of business are more fully described in the Proxy Statement accompanying this notice. The expenses of printing proxy materials, including expenses involved in forwarding materials to beneficial owners of stock, will be paid by On Assignment, Inc. Only stockholders of record at the close of business on April 10, 2017 are entitled to notice of, and to vote at, the Annual Meeting.

All stockholders are cordially invited to attend the Annual Meeting in person. Please call (818) 878-7900 to obtain directions. However, to ensure your representation at the Annual Meeting, you may access your proxy card by going to www.envisionreports.com/ASGN, entering the information requested on your computer screen and following the simple instructions, or by calling (in the United States, U.S. territories, and Canada) toll free 1-800-652-VOTE (8683) on a touchtone telephone and following the simple instructions provided by the recorded message. The instructions for voting can be found with your proxy card, on the Notice, and on the website listed in the Notice. If you received or requested a printed version of the proxy card, you may also vote by mail. Any stockholder of record attending the Annual Meeting may vote in person even if he or she has previously returned a proxy card. If you hold your shares in "street name," you must obtain a proxy in your name from your bank, broker or other holder of record in order to vote by ballot at the Annual Meeting.

By Order of the Board,

/s/ Jennifer Hanks Painter
Jennifer Hanks Painter
Secretary

April 20, 2017
Calabasas, California

2017 PROXY STATEMENT
TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION

General
Information
about
the
Annual
Meeting
and
Voting
Proposal
One
5 Election
of
Directors
Approval
of
Proposal
One
Continuing
Directors
Advisers
to
the
Board
of
Directors
Independent
Directors
and
Material
Proceedings
Role
of
the
Board
Board
Leadership
Structure
Board
Committees
and
Meetings
Risk
Oversight
Meetings
Attendance
of
Directors

at
2016
Annual
Meeting
of
Stockholders
Director
12
Compensation
Director
and
Executive
13
Stock
Ownership
Guidelines
Director
and
Executive
Officer
Hedging
Transactions
Policy
Communicating
with
13
the
Board
13
Ethics
Compensation
Committee
Interlocks
13
and
Insider
Participation
Security
Ownership
of
Certain
14
Beneficial
Owners
and
Management
Ownership
of
More
than
Five
Percent
of
the
Common
Stock
of

On
Assignment
Ownership
of
Management
and
15
Directors
of
On
Assignment
Executive
Compensation
18
Discussion
and
Analysis
Stock
20
Performance
Graph
21
Compensation
Consultant
21
Compensation
Philosophy
Compensation
24
Program
Elements
Compensation
26
Committee
Report
Summary
27
Compensation
Table
Grants
of
35
Plan-Based
Awards
Narrative
to
Summary
Compensation
Table
36
Grants
of
Plan-Based
Awards
Table
38
2016
Outstanding
Equity
Awards
at

Fiscal
Year
End
2016
Option
Exercises
40
and
Stock
Vested
Payments
Upon
Termination
40
Change
in
Control
Equity
Compensation
43
Plan
Information
Inducement
Award
Programs
Proposal
Two
– Advisory
46
Vote
on
Executive
Compensation
Vote
47
Required
Board
47
Recommendation
Proposal
Three
– Advisory
Vote
on
the
Frequency
48
of
the
Advisory
Vote
on
Executive
Compensation
Vote
48
Required
48

Board
Recommendation
Proposal
Four
– Ratification
of
Appointment
~~49~~
Independent
Registered
Public
Accounting
Firm
Principal
Accountant
~~49~~
Fees and
Services
Vote
~~49~~
Required
Board
~~49~~
Recommendation
Report
of
~~50~~
Audit
Committee
Certain
Relationships
~~51~~
Related
Transactions
Section 16(a) Beneficial
Ownership
~~51~~
Reporting
Compliance
Other
~~51~~
Matters
Where
You
Can
~~51~~
Find
Additional
Information
Incorporation
~~52~~
Reference
Proposals
~~52~~
Stockholders
~~52~~
Miscellaneous
A-1

Annex
A
– Adjusted
EBITDA
Calculation

On Assignment, Inc.
26745 Malibu Hills Road
Calabasas, California 91301

PROXY STATEMENT

For the Annual Meeting of Stockholders to be Held on

Thursday, June 8, 2017

On Assignment, Inc. (the “Company,” “On Assignment,” “we,” “our,” or “us”) is providing these proxy materials in connection with the solicitation by the Board of Directors of On Assignment, Inc. (the “Board”) of proxies to be voted at On Assignment’s 2017 Annual Meeting of Stockholders (the “Annual Meeting”) to be held on Thursday, June 8, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time, or at any adjournment or postponement thereof. This Proxy Statement, the proxy card and On Assignment’s Annual Report to Stockholders will be mailed to each stockholder entitled to vote at the Annual Meeting commencing on or about April 20, 2017.

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE ANNUAL MEETING AND VOTING

The following questions and answers address some questions you may have regarding the matters to be voted upon at the Annual Meeting. These questions and answers may not address all questions that may be important to you as an On Assignment stockholder. Please refer to the more detailed information contained elsewhere in this Proxy Statement and the documents referred to or incorporated by reference in this Proxy Statement.

Who is soliciting my vote?

The Board of On Assignment is soliciting your vote at the 2017 Annual Meeting of Stockholders for the following matters:

Proposal 1: the election of Peter T. Dameris, Jonathan S. Holman and Arshad Matin, as directors for three-year terms to expire at our 2020 Annual Meeting of Stockholders;

Proposal 2: an advisory vote to approve the Company’s executive compensation for the year ended December 31, 2016; and

Proposal 3: an advisory vote on the frequency of future advisory votes on executive compensation; and

Proposal 4: the ratification of the appointment of Deloitte & Touche LLP as our independent registered public accounting firm for the year ending December 31, 2017.

If any such other matters properly come before the Annual Meeting or any adjournments or postponements thereof, the persons named as proxies shall vote the shares represented thereby in their discretion.

What is included in the proxy materials?

Proxy materials include this Proxy Statement for the Annual Meeting and the Company’s Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2016 (the “Annual Report”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the “SEC”) on March 1, 2017. The Company will provide without charge to each person solicited hereunder, upon the

written request of any such person, a copy of the Annual Report, including the financial statements and the financial statement schedules thereto. This Proxy Statement and our Annual Report are available free of charge on our website (<http://www.onassignment.com>). Information on our website is not and should not be considered part of, nor is it incorporated by reference into, this Proxy Statement.

Who may vote at the Annual Meeting?

The Board has set April 10, 2017, as the record date for the Annual Meeting. If you were the owner of shares of On Assignment, Inc. common stock at the close of business on April 10, 2017, you may vote at the Annual Meeting. You are entitled to one vote for each share of common stock you held on the record date, including shares held directly in your name with our transfer agent as a “holder of record” and shares held for you in an account with a broker, bank or other nominee (shares held in “street name”).

Delivery of Proxy Materials: What is Notice and Access?

In accordance with the e-proxy rules of the SEC, On Assignment will mail a Notice of Internet Availability of Proxy Materials (the “Notice”) to our stockholders of record, and brokers, bank and other nominees (collectively, “nominees”) who hold shares on behalf of beneficial owners (also called “street name holders”) on or about April 20, 2017. The Notice describes the matters to be considered at the Annual Meeting and how the stockholders can access the proxy materials online. It also provides instructions on how those stockholders can vote their shares. If you received the Notice, you will not receive a print version of the proxy materials, unless you request one. If you would like to receive a print

version of the proxy materials, free of charge, please follow the instructions on the Notice. If you hold your shares in street name, you may request paper copies of the Proxy Statement and proxy card from your nominee by following the instructions on the notice your nominee provides you.

A list of stockholders entitled to vote at the Annual Meeting will be open to the examination of any stockholder, for any purpose germane to the Annual Meeting, during normal business hours for a period of 10 days before the Annual Meeting at our principal executive offices at 26745 Malibu Hills Road, Calabasas, California 91301, and at the time and place of the Annual Meeting.

How many shares must be present to hold the meeting?

A majority of On Assignment's outstanding shares of common stock as of the record date must be present in person or represented by proxy at the Annual Meeting in order to hold the meeting and conduct business. This is called a quorum. Abstentions and broker non-votes will be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum at the meeting. On March 31, 2017, there were 52,794,871 shares of On Assignment common stock outstanding (all of which are entitled to vote at the Annual Meeting).

How many votes are required to approve each item?

Election of directors (Proposal 1) - Directors shall be elected by the affirmative vote of the majority of the votes cast (meaning the number of shares voted "for" a nominee must exceed the number of shares voted "against" such nominee) at any meeting for the election of directors at which a quorum is present. If any nominee for director receives a greater number of votes "against" his or her election than votes "for" such election, our Bylaws require that such person must promptly tender his or her resignation to the Board following certification of the vote. Abstentions and broker non-votes are not considered votes cast for the foregoing purpose, and will have no effect on the vote.

Other proposals (Proposals 2, 3 and 4) - Stockholder approval of each of the other proposals, including the ratification of the appointment of an independent registered public accounting firm and the non-binding votes to approve executive compensation and the frequency of the vote on executive compensation, requires that the number of shares voted "for" the proposal exceed the number of shares voted "against" the proposal. These votes are advisory and are not binding on the Board or On Assignment. However, the Board will review the voting results and take them into consideration. Abstentions and broker non-votes are not considered votes cast for the foregoing purpose, and will have no effect on the vote.

How are votes counted?

With respect to the election of directors, you may vote "for," "withhold" or "abstain" with respect to each of the nominees for the Board. If you abstain authority to vote with respect to the director nominees, your shares will be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum, but will have no effect on the election of the nominees.

You may vote "for," "against" or "abstain" with respect to the advisory vote on executive compensation and the ratification of the appointment of our independent registered public accounting firm.

With respect to the advisory vote on the frequency of the advisory vote on executive compensation, you may vote to hold the advisory vote on executive compensation "every year," "every two years," "every three years" or "abstain."

If you sign and submit your proxy card without voting instructions, your shares will be voted FOR the director nominees put forth by the Board, FOR the approval of the advisory vote on executive compensation, and FOR the appointment of Deloitte & Touche LLP as our independent registered public accounting firm.

What if I abstain from voting?

If you attend the Annual Meeting or send in your signed proxy card, but abstain from voting on any proposal, your shares will still be counted for purposes of determining whether a quorum exists and your abstention will have no effect on the election of the nominees, and the same effect as a vote against the other proposals.

Will my shares be voted if I do not sign and return my proxy card or vote in person?

If you do not sign and return your proxy card or vote in person, your shares will not be voted at the Annual Meeting. If your shares are held in “street name” and you do not issue instructions to your broker, your broker may vote your shares at its discretion on routine matters, but may not vote your shares on non-routine matters. If a broker who holds shares for another person does not vote on a particular proposal because that broker does not have discretionary voting power for the proposal and has not received voting instructions from the owner of the shares, then a “broker non-vote” will occur. It is important that you vote your shares.

The election of directors and the advisory votes on executive compensation and the frequency of an advisory vote on executive compensation are non-routine matters, whereas the appointment of our independent registered public accounting firm is a routine matter. Therefore, if your shares are held in “street name” by your broker and you do not provide your broker with instructions on how to vote your “street name” shares, your broker will not be permitted to vote on the election of directors or the advisory votes on executive compensation or the frequency of the advisory vote on executive compensation. However, with regards to the ratification of the appointment of our independent registered public accounting firm, your broker will be permitted to vote your shares at its discretion. You should therefore be sure to provide your broker with instructions on how to vote your shares. Please check the voting form used by your broker to see if it offers telephone or Internet submission of proxies.

Broker non-votes are counted as present for purposes of determining the presence or absence of a quorum for the transaction of business, but they will not be counted for purposes of determining whether the proposals have been approved.

How does the Board recommend that I vote?

The Board recommends that you vote your shares:

Proposal 1: FOR Peter T. Dameris, Jonathan S. Holman and Arshad Matin, the director nominees named in this Proxy Statement;

Proposal 2: FOR the proposal regarding an advisory vote to approve the Company's executive compensation for the year ended December 31, 2016; and

Proposal 3: EVERY YEAR for the proposal regarding an advisory vote on the frequency of future advisory votes on executive compensation; and

Proposal 4: FOR the ratification of the appointment of Deloitte & Touche LLP as our independent registered public accounting firm.

What do I need to do now?

All stockholders are urged to vote by telephone or on the Internet by following the instructions on the Notice. If you have properly requested and received a paper copy of this Proxy Statement, you may vote your shares by (a) submitting a proxy by telephone or on the Internet by following the instructions on the proxy card or (b) completing, dating and signing the proxy card included with the Proxy Statement and promptly returning it in the pre-addressed, postage-paid envelope provided.

On Assignment stockholders may vote by mail or at the Annual Meeting. Most of our stockholders may vote their shares by telephone or the Internet. If you vote by telephone or the Internet, you do not need to return your proxy card. The instructions for voting can be found with your proxy card or on the Notice.

How do I vote my shares without attending the Annual Meeting?

If you are a registered stockholder, you may access your proxy card by either:

• Going to the following website: www.envisionreports.com/ASGN, entering the information requested on your computer screen, and then following the simple instructions;

•

Edgar Filing: ON ASSIGNMENT INC - Form DEF 14A

Calling (in the United States, U.S. territories and Canada), toll free 1-800-652-VOTE (8683) on a touch-tone telephone, and following the simple instructions provided by the recorded message; and

• Completing, dating and signing the proxy card included with the Proxy Statement and promptly returning it in the pre-addressed, postage-paid envelope provided.

If you hold your shares in "street name," you need to follow the instructions provided to you by your bank, broker or other holder of record. Your bank or broker may direct you to the following website, www.edocumentview.com/ASGN to view and download the proxy documents.

How do I vote my shares in person at the Annual Meeting?

Even if you plan to attend the Annual Meeting, we encourage you to vote by accessing your proxy card as noted above.

If you choose to vote in person at the Annual Meeting:

• if you are a stockholder of record, you may vote by the ballot to be provided at the Annual Meeting; or
• if you hold your shares in “street name,” you must obtain a proxy in your name from your bank, broker or other holder of record in order to vote by ballot at the Annual Meeting.

Please call (818) 878-7900 to obtain directions to attend the Annual Meeting.

What happens if my shares are held in more than one account?

If your shares are held in more than one account, you will receive a voting instrument for each account. To ensure that all of your shares in each account are voted, you must sign, date and return each proxy card you receive.

If you and other residents at your mailing address own shares of On Assignment stock in “street name,” your bank, broker or other holder of record may have notified you that your household will receive only one Notice of Annual Meeting of Stockholders for each company in which you hold stock through that bank, broker or other holder of record. This practice is known as “householding.” Unless you responded that you did not want to participate in householding, you were deemed to have consented to the process. Therefore, your bank, broker or other holder of record will send only one copy of our Annual Report and Proxy Statement to your address. Each stockholder in your household will continue to receive a separate voting instruction form.

If you would like to receive your own set of our Annual Report and Proxy Statement in the future, the Company will promptly deliver, upon oral or written request, a separate copy of the Annual Report and Proxy Statement. Requests should be directed to On Assignment, Inc., Attention: Investor Relations group, 26745 Malibu Hills Road, Calabasas, California 91301; tel: (818) 878-7900. If you share an address with another On Assignment stockholder and together both of you would like to receive only a single set of On Assignment annual disclosure documents, please contact our Investor Relations group by written or telephonic request at On Assignment, Inc., 26745 Malibu Hills Road, Calabasas, California 91301; tel: (818) 878-7900. As a part of this process, you will be asked to provide your name, the name of your bank, broker or other holder of record and your account number. The revocation of your consent to householding should be effective 30 days following receipt of your instructions.

If you did not receive an individual copy of this year’s Annual Report or Proxy Statement, we will send a copy to you upon a written or oral request. Written requests for such copies should be addressed to On Assignment, Inc., Attention: Investor Relations, 26745 Malibu Hills Road, Calabasas, California 91301. Please contact our Investor Relations group by telephone at (818) 878-3136 with any oral requests for such copies.

May I revoke my proxy and change my vote?

You may revoke your proxy at any time before it is voted by:

- submitting a properly signed proxy card with a later date;
- delivering to the Secretary of On Assignment a written revocation notice bearing a later date than the proxy card;
- voting in person at the Annual Meeting; or
- voting by telephone or the Internet after you have given your proxy.

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

The preliminary voting results will be announced at the Annual Meeting. The final voting results will be published on a Form 8-K which will be filed with the SEC within four business days after the Annual Meeting.

PROPOSAL ONE – ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

The Bylaws of On Assignment provide that our Board shall be comprised of not less than four but no more than nine directors and the exact number within that range may be fixed by the Board. The number is currently fixed at nine directors. The Board is divided into three classes, as equal in number as possible. At each Annual Meeting, one class of directors is elected for a three-year term.

At this year's Annual Meeting, three directors will be elected to serve until our 2020 Annual Meeting of Stockholders or until their successors are elected and qualified.

Peter T. Dameris, Jonathan S. Holman and Arshad Matin have terms that are expiring, and they have been nominated to stand for re-election. Unless otherwise instructed by stockholders, the persons named as proxies will vote the proxies received by them FOR the election of Messrs. Dameris, Holman and Matin. Each of Messrs. Dameris, Holman and Matin have consented to serve if elected, but if they are unable or unwilling to serve, the persons named as proxies may exercise their discretion to vote for substitute nominees.

Approval of Proposal One

The nominees receiving the affirmative vote of a majority of the votes cast will be elected as directors. The Board unanimously recommends that our stockholders vote FOR the election of our nominees.

Set forth below are the nominees' names, age and biographies which include the skills, qualities and experiences of each of the nominees.

Directors with Terms Ending in 2017

Peter T. Dameris
Age: 57

Mr. Dameris is our Chief Executive Officer, and is responsible for overseeing On Assignment's growth as a leading provider of staffing services in the technology, creative, health care technology and life sciences sectors. He joined On Assignment in 2003, and has held several roles as Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer and then President. He has also served as a director since December 2004. Prior to joining On Assignment, from February 2001 through October 2002, Mr. Dameris served as executive vice president and chief operating officer of Quanta Services, Inc., a publicly-held provider of specialized contracting services for the electric and gas utility, cable and telecommunications industries. Mr. Dameris created a regional operating organization for 85 acquired businesses and developed materials to support marketing and a national corporate image to support outsourcing initiatives. He further established cash generation, credit management and balance sheet improvement initiatives. From 1994 through 2000, Mr. Dameris served in a number of different positions at Metamor Worldwide, Inc., then an international, publicly-traded information technology consulting/staffing company. Mr. Dameris' positions at Metamor Worldwide included chairman of the board, president and chief executive officer, executive vice president, general counsel, senior vice president and secretary. Mr. Dameris negotiated the \$1.9 billion sale of Metamor to PSINet. Mr. Dameris started his career as a corporate attorney and clerked for the Honorable Federal District Judge George Cire of the Southern District of Texas. Mr. Dameris was named the Ernst & Young Entrepreneur of the Year in 2012, and Staffing Industry Analysts has included him on their Staffing 100 list since its inception in 2011. This year he was inducted into the Staffing Industry Analysts' Hall of Fame. Mr. Dameris serves on the executive board for the Cox School of Business for Southern Methodist University ("SMU") and the board of trustees for Marymount High School of Los Angeles. Mr. Dameris received his juris doctor degree from the University of Texas Law School and his bachelor of science degree in business administration from SMU. Mr. Dameris provides the Board with extensive staffing industry experience, having served in various capacities at publicly-traded staffing companies and having represented staffing

companies in the private practice of law. Mr. Dameris has comprehensive experience from his roles in senior executive management, leadership and legal positions as well as his work as an attorney in the private practice of law. Mr. Dameris has extensive experience in international and domestic staffing, financial reporting, compensation, legal matters and corporate affairs which are invaluable in his position as a director and Chief Executive Officer of the Company.

Jonathan S. Holman

Age: 71

Mr. Holman has served as a director of the Company since March 1994 and is the Chairman of our Compensation Committee. Mr. Holman is the founder and since 1981 has been the president of The Holman Group, Inc., an executive search firm. To date, Mr. Holman has recruited over 150 chief executive officers to public and private companies, ranging from start-ups to companies with over \$1 billion in revenue in a variety of industries. Mr. Holman was named as one of the top 200 executive recruiters in the world in The Global 200 Executive Recruiters and named as one of the top 250 executive recruiters in The New Career Makers. Mr. Holman regularly speaks at technology industry gatherings. Prior to founding The Holman Group, Mr. Holman served in various human resources-related positions. Mr. Holman received a master of business administration degree from Stanford University and a bachelor of arts degree from Princeton University, both with high academic honors. In his role at The Holman Group, Mr. Holman has developed extensive skills and experience in compensation matters. He also serves as a member of the National Association of Corporate Directors Compensation Committee Roundtable which addresses best practices in compensation-related matters. Mr. Holman provides the Board, including our Compensation Committee, with meaningful insight regarding hiring and salary practices of publicly-traded companies. In addition, Mr. Holman provides the Board with human resources experience.

Arshad Matin

Age: 53

Mr. Matin has served as a director of the Company since June 2014. He has been the president, chief executive officer and a board member of Paradigm Ltd. since his appointment in May 2013. Paradigm was acquired by Apax Partners in 2012 for \$1 billion and is a leading developer of software solutions to the global oil and gas industry. From January 2012 to April 2013, Mr. Matin was executive vice president of IHS Inc., a publicly-traded company that is a leading global source of information and analytics where he was responsible for lines of businesses accounting for over \$1.5 billion in revenues and managed over 4,500 colleagues. Mr. Matin joined IHS through the acquisition of Seismic Micro-Technology, Inc. (“SMT”), a global leader in the geology and geophysics software market. He joined SMT in July 2007 and was the president, chief executive officer and a board member. Under his leadership, the company achieved unprecedented growth in revenues and profits expanding into new geographies and market segments. Before joining SMT, Mr. Matin was general manager of the enterprise security business unit at Symantec Corporation, which he joined in January 2006 upon the company’s acquisition of BindView Corporation and remained until July 2007. BindView was a global provider of agentless IT security compliance software. Mr. Matin took over as president and chief operating officer of BindView in 2004, and was responsible for products, sales, marketing, corporate development and services functions. Prior to BindView, Mr. Matin was a partner at the Houston office of McKinsey & Company from 1995 to 2004, where he served clients in both the technology and energy industries. He started his career as a software developer for Oregon-based Mentor Graphics Corporation. Mr. Matin earned a master of business administration degree from the University of Pennsylvania – The Wharton School, a master of science degree in computer engineering from the University of Texas at Austin, and a bachelor of engineering degree in electrical engineering from Regional Engineering College in India. Mr. Matin brings extensive experience managing and advising public and private high-technology companies.

Continuing Directors

Set forth below is certain information regarding On Assignment’s continuing directors including their age as of the Annual Meeting, term of office as director, and business experience.

Directors with Terms Ending in 2019

Senator William E. Brock

Age: 86

Senator Brock has served as a director of the Company since April 1996 and is the Chairman of our Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee. From 1994 to present, Sen. Brock has been the founder and chief executive officer of The Brock Offices, a consulting firm specializing in international trade and human resource development. From 1988 to 1991, Sen. Brock served as chairman of the National Endowment for Democracy, an organization he helped found in 1980. Sen. Brock served in President Reagan’s cabinet as Secretary of Labor from 1985 to 1987 and as U.S. Trade Representative from 1981 to 1985. As U.S. Trade Representative, Sen. Brock organized the Quad Forum of trade and economic ministers from Europe, Japan and Canada and led the group to initiate the World Trade Organization. From 1977 to 1981, Sen. Brock served as National Chairman of the Republican Party. From 1970 to 1976, he was a member of the U.S. Senate, and from 1962 to 1970, he was a member of the U.S. House of Representatives. The National Academy of Human Resources has recognized Senator Brock for his outstanding contribution to human development in the United States. Sen. Brock is a member of the board of Strayer Education, Inc., a Nasdaq-traded education services holding company that owns Strayer University, which provides professional education to working adults, and serves on its compensation and nomination and governance committees. Sen. Brock is also a member of the board of ResCare, Inc., a privately-held provider of home care, residential support services to the elderly and persons with disabilities, as well as vocational training and job placement for people of all ages and skill levels, and he serves on its audit and mergers and acquisitions committees. Through his extensive governmental

experience, he provides in-depth knowledge in the areas of business, regulatory compliance and risk management. Sen. Brock provides our Board with a wealth of business operations experience including direct experience with human resource development and public company corporate governance.

Brian J. Callaghan

Age: 46

Mr. Callaghan has served as a director of the Company since May 2012. He co-founded Apex Systems, LLC (“Apex Systems”) in 1995 and served as co-chief executive officer during his time with Apex Systems. His duties at Apex Systems ranged from working directly with customers, leading staff, strategy, forecasting, and building systems to support growth. Mr. Callaghan and the other co-founders were recognized as Ernst & Young’s Entrepreneur of the Year in 2003. Prior to co-founding Apex Systems, Mr. Callaghan began his career as a telecommunications recruiter for a staffing firm based in Reston, Virginia. Mr. Callaghan is a graduate of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, where he earned a bachelor of science degree in psychology. Mr. Callaghan is also part-owner of the Richmond Flying Squirrels, the Double-A affiliate of the San Francisco Giants, and the Omaha Storm Chasers (Triple-A affiliate of the Kansas City Royals). Mr. Callaghan brings 20 years of staffing experience to the Board and provides extensive knowledge about all aspects of the information technology staffing business and business growth strategies.

Edwin A. Sheridan, IV

Age: 47

Mr. Sheridan has served as a director of the Company since May 2012. He co-founded Apex Systems in 1995 and served as co-chief executive officer during his time with Apex Systems. His roles at Apex Systems have included technical recruiter, account manager and regional operations manager. He also managed the sales and recruiting operations for the company. Mr. Sheridan and the other co-founders were recognized as Ernst & Young's Entrepreneur of the Year in 2003. Prior to co-founding Apex Systems, Mr. Sheridan began his career as a telecommunications recruiter for a staffing firm based in Reston, Virginia. Mr. Sheridan is a graduate of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, where he earned bachelor of arts degrees in English and political science, with a minor in business administration. Mr. Sheridan also serves on the boards of several non-profit organizations including the advisory board of the Virginia Commonwealth University Massey Cancer Research Center, the Greater Washington Sports Alliance, the Virginia Tech Athletic Fund, and Peace Players International, an international community improvement and leadership organization. Mr. Sheridan brings 20 years of staffing experience to the Board and provides extensive knowledge about all aspects of the information technology staffing business and business growth strategies.

Directors with Terms Ending in 2018

Mariel A. Joliet

Age: 51

Ms. Joliet joined On Assignment as an observer to the Board of Directors in January 2016 and was appointed as a director in December 2016. From 1998 to 2008, she was an executive with Hilton Hotels Corporation, a publicly-traded hotel company. She most recently served as senior vice president and treasurer and was instrumental in its sale to the Blackstone Group for \$27 billion, one of the 10 largest LBOs in history when it closed in 2007. In her capacity as treasurer, Ms. Joliet was responsible for capital markets and financial investment initiatives, including credit ratings, debt/equity issuances, interest rate risk, cash management and foreign exchange. Prior to her role at Hilton, she had 10 years of experience as a coverage officer and corporate banker at both Wachovia Bank and Corestates Bank, where she was responsible for client relationships and portfolio management. Ms. Joliet also serves as an advisory board member for the Vision Center at Children's Hospital Los Angeles, and serves as a member of Know The Glow, a vision non-profit organization. She received a bachelor of science at the University of Scranton and earned a master in business administration from Marywood University. Ms. Joliet has a strong background in financing, acquisitions, deal structuring, strategic planning and operational integration, and provides advice to the Board and management in these areas, among others.

Jeremy M. Jones

Age: 75

Mr. Jones has served as a director since May 1995 and was appointed Chairman of the Board in February 2003. Mr. Jones has been an investor and business development consultant since February 1998. From 1987 to 1995, Mr. Jones was the chief executive officer and chairman of the board of Homedco Group, Inc., a home healthcare services company, which became publicly traded in 1991. Homedco merged into Apria Healthcare Group, Inc. in 1995 and from 1995 through January 1998, Mr. Jones was chief executive officer and chairman of the board of Apria Healthcare, which also provided home healthcare services. He currently serves on the board of directors of CombiMatrix Corporation, a Nasdaq-traded molecular diagnostics company specializing in DNA-based testing services for developmental disorders and cancer diagnostics. Mr. Jones has also served on the board of directors of the Hoag Hospital Foundation, a philanthropic foundation, since 2013. He served on the board of directors of OxySure Systems, Inc., a publicly-traded company that is a world leader in short and emergency duration medical oxygen and respiratory solutions for mass market use, from 2013 to 2016, Lifecare Solutions, Inc., a provider of integrated home healthcare products and services, from 2003 to 2011, and Byram Healthcare Centers, a provider of retail medical

supplies and wholesale medical and hospital equipment, from 1999 until its sale in 2008. Mr. Jones possesses significant business management and corporate governance experience. Mr. Jones received a bachelor's degree in business administration from the University of Iowa. Mr. Jones contributes to our Board with his extensive executive experience in leading and advising public companies.

Marty R. Kittrell

Age: 60

Mr. Kittrell has served as a director of the Company and Chairman of the Audit Committee since September 2012. Mr. Kittrell served as the executive vice president and chief financial officer of Dresser, Inc., a multinational provider of technology, products and services for developing energy and natural resources, from December 2007 until the sale of the company to General Electric in February 2011. Mr. Kittrell also served as chief financial officer of Andrew Corporation, a manufacturer of hardware for communications networks, from 2003 until the sale of the company in December 2007. Mr. Kittrell previously served in executive management positions in technology, consumer products and other commercial and industrial industry sectors. Mr. Kittrell began his business career with Price Waterhouse where he was a certified public accountant. Mr. Kittrell served as a member of the board of directors and corporate governance and environmental, safety and sustainability committees, and the chairman of the audit and risk committee, for Columbia Pipeline Group, Inc., which developed and operated over 15,000 miles of natural gas pipelines extending from New York to the Gulf of Mexico, from July 2015, after its separation from NiSource, Inc. ("NiSource"), until the sale of the company in July 2016. From 2007 to 2015, Mr. Kittrell served on the board of directors of NiSource, one of the largest utility companies in the United States serving approximately four million customers, where he chaired the audit committee and served on the finance and corporate governance committees. Mr. Kittrell graduated magna cum laude with a bachelor of science degree in accounting from Lipscomb University where he currently serves on the board of trustees and is chairman of the finance and real estate committee and serves on the executive committee. Mr. Kittrell has extensive experience with the analysis and preparation of financial statements, risk management, corporate strategy, mergers and acquisitions, corporate finance, including public offerings of equity and debt, organization development, and board practices.

Advisers to the Board of Directors

The Company has two non-executive advisers to the Board of Directors that attend and participate in all Board meetings and discussions, though the Board has the right to ask them to depart from any particular discussion at its discretion. Jeffrey E. Veatch is the third co-founder and former co-chief executive officer of Apex Systems, and has been an adviser to the Board since the acquisition of Apex Systems in May 2012. He has extensive executive and staffing experience, which he utilizes in providing advice and guidance to the Board. Ms. Joliet served as a non-executive observer from January to December 2016, and is now a director of the Board. Michael J. McGowan, former Chief Operating Officer of the Company and President of our Oxford Global Resources, LLC ("Oxford") subsidiary, retired at the end of 2016, and was appointed as an adviser effective January 9, 2017.

Independent Directors and Material Proceedings

The Board consists of nine members, all of whom the Board has deemed to be independent under the current listing standards of the New York Stock Exchange ("NYSE") with the exception of Mr. Dameris, our Chief Executive Officer. For each independent director, the Board has made a subjective determination that no relationships exist which, in the opinion of the Board, would interfere with the exercise of independent judgment in carrying out his or her responsibilities as a director. In making these determinations, the Board has considered information provided by the directors and management with regard to the business and personal activities of each director as they may relate to On Assignment and members of management. There are no family relationships among our executive officers and directors.

There are no material legal proceedings to which the Company or any of its subsidiaries is a party or of which any of their property is subject. There are no material legal proceedings to which any director, officer or affiliate of the Company, any owner of record or beneficially of more than five percent of the Company's voting securities, or any associate of any such director, officer, affiliate of the Company or security holder is a party adverse to the Company or any of its subsidiaries or has a material interest adverse to the Company or any of its subsidiaries. Further, there are no legal proceedings in the last 10 years where a director or executive officer was a party and that are material to the person's ability or integrity, including bankruptcy, criminal convictions, orders enjoining certain activities, adverse findings by courts, the SEC or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and adverse orders relating to violations of securities or commodities laws.

Role of the Board

The Board oversees the Company's Chief Executive Officer and other executive officers in the competent and ethical operation of the Company. The Board ensures that the long-term interests of the stockholders are considered in the operation of the Company.

Board Leadership Structure

The Board has consistently maintained an independent Chairman of the Board. The Board has made a determination that the Board leadership structure is appropriate and that the structure allows the Board to fulfill its duties effectively and efficiently. The Company has determined that its leadership structure is appropriate because the Chairman of the Board is independent, as defined by the NYSE and the SEC. An independent Chairman, like independent Board members, allows for an objective evaluation of the performance of the Company and its officers. Nonetheless, the Board recognizes that the Chief Executive Officer has invaluable insight into the Company due to the nature of his position and recognizes the value of having him on the Board. Accordingly, the Board believes that the Company's stockholders and interests are best served by having the Chief Executive Officer serve as a director but not a Board committee member, and keeping the position of Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board as separate and independent positions.

Board Committees and Meetings

The Board held six meetings during 2016 and acted by unanimous written consent on three additional occasions. The Board has a Compensation Committee, an Audit Committee, and a Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee. The Board has determined that the chairmen and committee members of each of the Compensation Committee, the Audit Committee and the Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee are independent under applicable NYSE and SEC rules.

The members and chairmen who served on the Committees in 2016 (and are currently still serving in those positions) are identified in the table below:

* Ms. Joliet joined the Audit Committee as an observer on January 1, 2016, and became a member of the committee on December 15, 2016 concurrent with her becoming a member of the Board of Directors.

Compensation Committee

The Compensation Committee held six meetings during 2016 and acted by unanimous written consent on eight additional occasions. The Compensation Committee meets in executive session without management present on a regular basis. The Compensation Committee reviews our general compensation policies, sets the compensation levels for our executive officers, including the Chief Executive Officer, administers our equity plans, and approves all equity grants to employees, directors and consultants. The Compensation Committee approves the compensation, including incentive compensation, of executive officers of On Assignment and determines the terms of key agreements concerning employment, compensation and termination of employment. The Committee evaluates the Chief Executive Officer's performance in light of goals and objectives that have been set for him. The Board has determined that each member of the Compensation Committee is independent within the meaning of the NYSE rules requiring members of compensation committees to be independent. The Compensation Committee charter provides that the Compensation Committee may delegate its authority, subject to the terms in the charter, but the Compensation Committee does not do so for purposes of equity grants.

Audit Committee

The Audit Committee held 10 meetings during 2016. The Audit Committee reviews, acts on and reports to the Board with respect to various auditing and accounting matters. The Audit Committee performs functions required of audit committees of public companies under applicable laws, rules and regulations and the requirements of the NYSE. The primary functions of the Audit Committee are to assist the Board in its responsibility for oversight of:

- the quality and integrity of our financial statements and our financial reporting and disclosure practices;
- our systems of internal controls regarding finance, accounting and SEC compliance;
- the qualification, independence and oversight of performance of our independent registered public accounting firm including its appointment, compensation, evaluation and retention;
- our ethical compliance programs; and
- risk issues related to financial statements.

Additional functions of the Audit Committee include, but are not limited to, reviewing compliance with and reporting under Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, reviewing matters of disagreement, if any, between management and our independent registered public accounting firm, and regularly meeting with management, our independent registered public accounting firm and internal audit staff, to review the adequacy of our internal controls.

Rules adopted by the NYSE and the SEC impose strict independence requirements for all members of the Audit Committee. Audit Committee members are barred from accepting, directly or indirectly, any consulting, advisory or other compensatory fee from the Company or an affiliate of the Company, other than in the member's capacity as a member of the Board and any Board committee. In addition, an Audit Committee member may not be an affiliated person, as defined in the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "Exchange Act") of the Company except in his or her capacity as a member of the Board and any Board committee. The Board has determined that each member of the Audit Committee meets all applicable independence requirements and that each Audit Committee member has no material relationship with the Company that would jeopardize the director's ability to exercise independent judgment. In addition, the Board has determined that Mr. Kittrell, based on his experience, skills and education as described above, is the Audit Committee financial expert, as that term is defined under the SEC rules.

The Company has adopted a process, which the Audit Committee oversees, for disclosing related-party transactions and identifying significant deficiencies each quarter in connection with filing our quarterly reports on Form 10-Q and our annual reports on Form 10-K. See "Certain Relationships and Related Party Transactions" on page 51 of this Proxy Statement.

Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee

The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee met three times during 2016. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee evaluates director nominee candidates and makes recommendations to the Board with respect to the nomination of individuals for election to the Board and to serve as committee members, consistent with criteria approved by the Board. In addition, the Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee makes recommendations to the Board concerning the size, structure and composition of the Board and its committees. The Committee also monitors the qualification and performance of, and the Company's succession planning regarding, key executives. The Board has determined that each member of the Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee is independent within the meaning of the NYSE rules requiring members of nominating committees to be independent. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee recommended the nominations of Messrs. Dameris, Holman and Matin for election at this year's Annual Meeting.

The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee Charter, and the Corporate Governance Guidelines established by the Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee, set forth certain criteria for the committee to consider in evaluating potential director nominees. However, in considering potential director nominees, the Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee considers the entirety of each candidate's credentials. Qualifications considered by the Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee vary according to the particular areas of expertise being sought as a complement to the existing composition of the Board and include:

- personal and professional ethics and integrity;
- business judgment;
- familiarity with general issues affecting our business;
- qualifications as an audit committee financial expert;
- diversity in a variety of areas;
- qualifications as an independent director; and
- areas of expertise that the Board should collectively possess such as board experience, executive experience, human resources experience, accounting and financial oversight experience and corporate governance experience.

The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee relies primarily on recommendations for director candidates from its members, other directors, the Chief Executive Officer and third parties, including professional recruiting firms. In January 2016, Ms. Joliet was hired as an adviser to the Board, and she was appointed as a director in December 2016. The committee had sought recommendations from directors and management of potential candidates in 2015, and Mr. Dameris recommended Ms. Joliet. After a review of the other candidates and the skill sets of Ms.

Joliet, it was determined that no professional recruiting firms or consultants would be needed and, accordingly, no fees were paid for recruiting director nominees. Existing directors being considered for re-nomination are evaluated based on their performance as directors, experience, skills, education and independence to ensure that they continue to meet the qualifications above.

The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee Charter also provides for the importance of diversified Board membership, in terms of both the individuals involved and their various experiences and areas of expertise. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee considers diversity in identifying nominees, including differences in skill, viewpoints and experience, as well as gender, race and nationality, and these factors will be considered for purposes of nominating directors.

Stockholders wishing to suggest a candidate for director nomination for the 2018 Annual Meeting of Stockholders should mail their suggestions to On Assignment, Inc., 26745 Malibu Hills Road, Calabasas, California 91301, Attn: Secretary. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee will also consider timely written suggestions from our stockholders. Pursuant to our Bylaws, a stockholder's notice for director nominations shall be delivered to the Secretary at the Company's executive offices at 26745 Malibu Hills Road, Calabasas, California 91301, not earlier than the close of business on the 120th day, and not later than the close of business on the 90th day prior to the first anniversary of the Annual Meeting. The manner in which director nominee candidates suggested in accordance with this policy are evaluated shall not differ from the manner in which candidates recommended by other sources are evaluated. As of March 31, 2017, there were no director candidates put forward by stockholders for consideration at the Annual Meeting.

The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee evaluates the Board's leadership structure and believes that separation of the Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board positions is in the best interest of the Company, assures an adequate level of independence of the Board, and is best aligned with the interests of its stockholders.

The written charters governing the Audit Committee, the Compensation Committee and the Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee, and the Company's Corporate Governance Guidelines, Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, and Supplemental Code of Business Conduct and Ethics for Directors, Executive Officers and Financial Officers, are posted on the Investor Relations Corporate Governance page of our website at <http://www.onassignment.com>. You may also obtain a copy of any of these documents without charge by writing to: On Assignment, Inc., 26745 Malibu Hills Road, Calabasas, California 91301, Attn: Secretary.

Board IT Liaison

In June 2015, the Board elected Mr. Martin to the position of Board IT liaison. The Board believed that the significance of IT and cybersecurity risks and the importance of IT risk management measures had risen to the level where it was important for the Board members to be more informed of the issues that the Company faces in these areas. The Board IT liaison was a newly-created position that provides the Board a dedicated director to work with management, including the Chief Information Officer and divisional IT managers, to keep apprised of IT, cybersecurity and IT risk management measures, and to inform the Board of issues or projects of note from a Board member's perspective. The Board further receives a cybersecurity risk status review each quarter.

Risk Oversight

The Board has an active role, as a whole and at the committee level, in overseeing management of the Company's risks. Company representatives regularly report to the Board on risks that the Company faces. The Board regularly reviews and determines the Company's risk management philosophies, policies and processes. The Board is primarily responsible for overseeing the management of the Company's risks associated with the Board's governance and delegation decisions, including decisions about compensation. The Board oversees officers' identification and management of risk management issues and regularly meets with such officers regarding risk management issues of the Company, and the processes and procedures used for identifying and managing risk. The Board also regularly reviews the reporting processes from those officers that are responsible for the day-to-day management of the Company's risks to determine if these reporting processes or other flow of information to the Board could be improved.

The Audit Committee is primarily responsible for overseeing the management of the Company's accounting and financial reporting matters and risks related to the Company's accounting and financial practices. The Audit Committee Charter provides that the Audit Committee's responsibilities include inquiry of management and the Company's outside auditors regarding key financial statement risk areas, including the Company's processes for identifying and assessing such risk areas and the steps the Company has taken with regard to such risk areas. In connection with these responsibilities, the Audit Committee routinely reviews and evaluates the Company's processes for identifying and assessing key financial statement risk areas and for formulating and implementing steps to address such risk areas. The Audit Committee is also responsible for inquiry of management and the Company's outside auditors regarding significant business risks or exposures, including the Company's processes for identifying and assessing such risks and exposures, and the steps management has taken to minimize such risks and exposures.

The Compensation Committee is responsible for overseeing risks associated with compensation practices. Upon evaluation, the Compensation Committee has determined that the Company's compensation practices and policies are not reasonably likely to have a material adverse effect on the Company. In making this determination, the Compensation Committee considered that none of the compensation policies and practices at a business unit carry a significant portion of the Company's risk profile, has a significantly different compensation structure than other units,

is significantly more profitable than other units, or pays compensation expenses as a significant percentage of the unit's revenues.

Meetings

Each director attended 100 percent of the meetings of the Board and Committees of the Board on which he or she served during 2016. Our independent directors regularly meet as a group in executive sessions outside the presence of management presided over by the non-executive Chairman of our Board.

Attendance of Directors at 2016 Annual Meeting of Stockholders

Our Board of Directors has a policy with respect to director attendance at annual meetings of stockholders which requires that the directors attend the Annual Meeting unless they are unable to do so as a result of health reasons or exigent personal circumstances, and if that is the case, the director must notify the Chairman of the Board as promptly as possible. All of our directors attended our 2016 Annual Meeting of Stockholders.

Director Compensation

The following table shows compensation information for each of On Assignment's non-employee directors for the year ended December 31, 2016. The compensation of our Chief Executive Officer, who is also a director, is disclosed in the "Summary Compensation Table" set forth on page 34, and he receives no additional compensation for his service as a director.

2016 Director Compensation

Name	Fees Earned in Cash (\$) ⁽²⁾	Stock Awards (\$) ⁽³⁾	Total (\$)
William E.	83,000	124,966	207,966
Brock Brian J.	77,500	124,966	202,466
Callaghan Jonathan S.	83,000	124,966	207,966
Holman Mariel A.	4,500	-	4,500
Joliet ⁽¹⁾ Jeremy M.	139,000	124,966	263,996
Jones Marty R.	92,500	124,966	217,466
Kittrell Arshad 80,500 Matin	80,500	124,966	205,466
Edwin A. 71,500 Sheridan, IV	71,500	124,966	196,466

Amounts reflect prorated cash fees earned following Ms.

Joliet's appointment as a director on December 15, 2016.

(1) She had been an adviser to the Board from January 1, 2016 to the date of her appointment as a director.

This amount includes the quarterly retainer fees and fees

(2) for meeting attendance which each non-employee director earned for his or her service during 2016.

(3) Amounts shown in the table above reflect the aggregate grant date fair value of the awards, computed in accordance with FASB ASC Topic 718. Assumptions used in the calculation of these amounts with respect to stock are included in Note 13 to the consolidated financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2016 included in our Annual Report on Form 10 K filed on March 1, 2017. The amounts were calculated based on the grant date fair value per share of \$36.69, which was

the closing sale price of Common Stock on the date of grant, August 1, 2016. As of December 31, 2016, Senator Brock, Ms. Joliet and Messrs. Callaghan, Holman, Jones, Kittrell, Matin and Sheridan each held 1,703 unvested restricted stock units. No options were outstanding for any director at December 31, 2016.

The Compensation Committee recommends, and the Board reviews and approves, the form and amount of director compensation. In 2015, the Compensation Committee retained Semler Brossy Consulting Group, LLC (“Semler Brossy”) as its compensation consultant to help determine compensation for certain positions in the Company including members of the Board of Directors. Semler Brossy provided a review of market data, noting that the Company's Board was below market, and proposed increases in compensation to bring the directors' compensation in line with market. The Compensation Committee retained its practice to base a substantial portion of a director’s annual retainer on equity compensation. The Board approved the director compensation proposals, and made no further changes to director compensation in 2016. In 2016, each non-employee director received an annual restricted stock unit ("RSU") grant with a grant-date value of approximately \$125,000 on August 1, 2016. The number of RSUs received by each of the non-employee directors was 3,406, with one-half of the RSU grants vesting on the grant date and the remaining half vesting on the one-year anniversary of the grant date, subject to the director’s continued service through that date.

In 2016, each non-employee director received \$2,000 for each regularly scheduled quarterly in-person Board meeting attended, and \$750 for each other Board or committee meeting held separately and attended in person or by telephone not in conjunction with the quarterly in-person Board meetings. In addition, we reimbursed all directors for their reasonable expenses incurred in attending Board or committee meetings, and up to \$2,500 per director for director education and training.

The annual cash retainer fee for non-employee directors in 2016 was \$60,000, paid pro rata on a quarterly basis. In addition, committee chairs and the Board's IT liaison were entitled to the following fees:

Outside Director	Additional Annual Cash Retainer
Chairman of the Board	\$60,000
Audit Committee Chair	\$15,000
Compensation Committee Chair	\$10,000
Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee Chair	\$10,000
Board IT Liaison	\$10,000

Mr. Veatch and Ms. Joliet, advisers to the Board in 2016, received the same annual cash retainer, Board meeting fees and equity awards as members of the Board. In 2016, the cash fees totaled \$65,500 and \$71,500, respectively for Mr. Veatch and Ms. Joliet, for their advisory services, and stock awards for each totaled a grant date fair value of \$124,966.

Director and Executive Stock Ownership Guidelines

In September 2016, the Board adopted Stock Ownership Guidelines for directors, named executive officers and other designated officers that require that certain stock ownership levels be met within three years of implementation of the policy or within five years from appointment or promotion to one of the designated positions. The previous ownership policy in place for non-employee directors did not change, requiring that each Board member must own shares of the Company with a fair market value of four times their annual cash retainer fee, which was \$60,000 for 2016 for a total ownership requirement of shares with a fair market value of \$240,000. The required levels of ownership for executives are based upon a multiple of their annual base salary. Our Chief Executive Officer is required to own a number of shares with a value of five times his annual base salary. Executive Vice Presidents and Division Presidents are required to own a number of shares with a value of three times their annual base salary, and the requirement for Senior Vice Presidents is two times annual base salary. The guidelines also provide that directors and officers must retain any net shares that vest or are exercised until such time as the appropriate ownership levels are met. Shares counted as beneficially owned include shares that would be issuable upon the vesting of any outstanding RSUs, but not stock options. A hardship provision provides a process to request a waiver from the Compensation Committee in exigent circumstances. As of March 31, 2017, all of our named executive officers and directors have exceeded his or her stock ownership requirements with the exception of Ms. Joliet who joined the Board in December 2016.

Director and Executive Officer Hedging Transactions Policy

In March 2016, the Board adopted a Hedging Transactions Policy that prohibits hedging transactions for the Company's directors and executive officers (subject to a hardship exemption with appropriate approval requirements) designed to limit the financial risk of ownership of the Company's stock. These include any prepaid variable forward contracts, equity swaps, collars or similar financial instruments designed to hedge or offset any decrease in the market value of the Company's stock.

Communicating with the Board

We invite stockholders and other interested parties to communicate any concerns they may have about On Assignment with either the Chairman of the Board or the directors as a group by writing to the attention of either the Chairman of the Board or the Directors at On Assignment, Inc., 26745 Malibu Hills Road, Calabasas, California 91301. Any and all such communication will be forwarded by the Secretary of the Company to Mr. Jones, Chairman of the Board, or all of the directors, as applicable.

Ethics

On Assignment has adopted a Code of Business Conduct and Ethics that is applicable to all directors, officers and employees of On Assignment. More importantly, it reflects On Assignment's policy for dealing with all persons, including its customers, employees, investors, regulators and vendors, with honesty and integrity. A copy of On Assignment's Code of Business Conduct and Ethics can be found on the Investor Relations-Corporate Governance page of our website at <http://www.onassignment.com>. In addition, On Assignment adopted a Supplemental Code of Business Conduct and Ethics for Directors, Executive Officers and Financial Officers which applies to our Chief Executive Officer, Chief Financial Officer, and other senior financial officers. The codes comply with the requirements of Section 406 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. The supplemental code focuses on honest and ethical conduct, full, fair and accurate disclosure in our SEC filings and other public disclosures, compliance with applicable government laws, rules and regulations, and prompt internal reporting of violations of the code. This policy is located on the same page on our website as our Code of Business Conduct and Ethics. You may also obtain a copy of these documents without charge by writing to On Assignment, Inc., 26745 Malibu Hills Road, Calabasas, California 91301, Attn: Secretary.

Compensation Committee Interlocks and Insider Participation

During 2016, the Compensation Committee of the Board was composed of Sen. Brock and Messrs. Holman, Jones and Matin. There are no Compensation Committee interlocks and no member of the Compensation Committee was or has been an officer or employee of On Assignment or its subsidiaries and no member of the Compensation Committee had any relationships requiring disclosure of certain relationships and related-party transactions. None of the Company's executives served as a member of the Compensation Committee.

13

SECURITY OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN BENEFICIAL OWNERS AND MANAGEMENT

The following tables set forth the beneficial ownership by the persons listed below of shares of On Assignment's common stock as of March 31, 2017.

Certain information in the table concerning stockholders other than our directors and officers is based on information contained in filings made by such beneficial owner with the SEC. Pursuant to Rule 13d-3 of the Exchange Act among other determining factors, shares are deemed to be beneficially owned by a person if that person has the right to acquire shares (for example, upon exercise of an option) within 60 days of the date that information is provided. In addition, we note that Section 16(a) of the Exchange Act requires the Company's officers and directors, and persons who own more than 10 percent of a registered class of the Company's equity securities, to file reports of securities ownership and changes in such ownership with the SEC. In determining the percentage ownership of any person, the amount of shares outstanding is deemed to include any shares beneficially owned by such person (and only such person) but excludes any securities held by or for the account of the Company or its subsidiaries. As a result, the percentage of outstanding shares held by any person in the table below does not necessarily reflect the person's actual voting power. As of March 31, 2017 there were 52,794,871 shares of On Assignment common stock outstanding.

The following tables set forth the beneficial ownership of On Assignment's common stock as of March 31, 2017 for the following persons:

- all stockholders known by us to beneficially own more than five percent of our common stock;
- each of our directors;
- each of our named executive officers, as identified; and
- all of our directors and executive officers as a group.

Unless otherwise indicated, each person listed has sole voting power and sole investment power.

Ownership of More than Five Percent of the Common Stock of On Assignment

Name and Address of Beneficial Owner	Amount and Nature of Beneficial Ownership	Percent of Common Stock ⁽⁴⁾
BlackRock, Inc. 55 East 52nd Street New York, NY 10055	5,560,755 ⁽¹⁾	10.5%
The Vanguard Group, Inc. 100 Vanguard Blvd. Malvern, PA 19355	4,052,646 ⁽²⁾	7.7%
Capital World Investors 333 South Hope Street Los Angeles, CA 90071	3,580,500 ⁽³⁾	6.8%

(1)

Based on information contained in a Schedule 13G/A filed with the SEC on January 17, 2017 by Blackrock, Inc., on behalf of various subsidiaries, Blackrock, Inc. directly or indirectly has sole voting power of 5,454,772 shares of our common stock, and sole dispositive power of 5,560,755 shares. The various subsidiaries listed in the filing as beneficially owning the shares set forth above include: BlackRock (Netherlands) B.V., BlackRock Advisors, LLC, BlackRock Asset Management Canada Limited, BlackRock Asset Management Ireland Limited, BlackRock Asset Management Schweiz AG, BlackRock Financial Management, Inc., BlackRock Fund Advisors, BlackRock Institutional Trust Company, N.A., BlackRock Investment Management (Australia) Limited, BlackRock Investment Management (UK) Ltd and BlackRock Investment Management, LLC.

Based on information contained in a Schedule 13G/A filed with the SEC on February 10, 2017 by The Vanguard Group, Inc. ("Vanguard") on its own behalf and on behalf of two subsidiaries, Vanguard has sole voting power of 99,917 shares of the Company's common stock, shared voting power of another 5,831 shares, sole dispositive power over 3,949,352 shares, and shared dispositive power over 103,294 shares. Vanguard Fiduciary Trust Company, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Vanguard, is the beneficial owner of 97,463 shares as a result of its serving as investment manager of collective trust accounts. Vanguard Investments Australia, Ltd., a wholly-owned subsidiary of Vanguard, is the beneficial owner of 8,285 shares as a result of its serving as investment manager of Australian investment offerings.

Based on information contained in a Schedule 13G filed with the SEC on February 13, 2017 by Capital World Investors ("CWI"), a division of Capital Research and Management Company ("CRMC"). The filing states that CWI (3) has sole voting and dispositive power over all the shares listed above. It is deemed to be the beneficial owner of the shares set forth above due to CRMC acting as an investment adviser to various investment companies that hold the shares.

For each beneficial owner included in the table above, percentage ownership is calculated by dividing the number of shares beneficially owned by such holder by the 52,794,871 shares of the Company's common stock outstanding as of March 31, 2017. To the knowledge of the Company, none of the holders listed above had the right to acquire any additional shares of the Company on or within 60 days after March 31, 2017.

executive
officers
as
a
group
(14
persons)

* Represents less than one percent of the shares outstanding.

(1) All of the shares beneficially owned by Mr. Jones are held in his family trust. He and his wife are trustees of the trust, and each has the sole right to vote and invest the assets in the trust.

(2) 112,483 of the shares beneficially owned by Mr. Dameris are held in various family trusts or in a Grantor Retained Annuity Trust for which he is a trustee and the sole recipient of the annuity payments.

(3) 60,504 of the shares beneficially owned by Mr. McGowan are held in two family trusts.

All amounts shown include shares subject to stock options which are, or will become, exercisable within 60 days of March 31, 2017, and shares available upon vesting of RSUs that will vest within 60 days of March 31, 2017. The
(4) number of shares beneficially held by Mr. Pierce includes 75,000 vested stock options. The number of shares beneficially owned by Messrs. Hanson and Blazer include shares available upon vesting of 4,179 and 6,617 RSUs, respectively.

For each individual included in the table above, percentage ownership is calculated by dividing the number of shares beneficially owned by the sum of the 52,794,871 shares of the Company's common stock outstanding as of March 31, 2016, plus the number of shares of common stock that are issuable upon exercise of options that are
(5) exercisable or upon the vesting of RSUs within 60 days of March 31, 2016 held by such individual (but not giving effect to the shares of common stock that are issuable upon exercise of options that are exercisable or upon the vesting of RSUs held by others).

The following individuals are executive officers of On Assignment, with the exception of Mr. McGowan who retired from his position as an officer on December 30, 2016:

Name	Age	Title	Years Experience in Human Capital Industry	Years with On Assignment
Peter T. Dameris*	57	Chief Executive Officer	18 years in industry	13 years
Edward L. Pierce*	60	Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer	15 years CFO experience	5 years
Theodore S. Hanson*	49	President, On Assignment	19 years in industry	19 years with Apex Systems
Randolph C. Blazer*	66	President, Apex Systems	over 30 years in industry	10 years with Apex Systems
Michael J. McGowan*	64	Former Chief Operating Officer of On Assignment and President of Oxford	over 20 years in industry	20 years with Oxford
James L. Brill	66	SVP, Chief Administrative Officer and Treasurer	over 35 years as finance executive	10 years
Jennifer Hanks Painter	47	SVP, Chief Legal Officer and Secretary	10 years GC experience	4 years

* These individuals are our named executive officers as defined in Item 402 of Regulation S-K of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (the "Securities Act").

The biography of our Chief Executive Officer is included in the section above entitled "Election of Directors" on page 5.

Edward L. Pierce joined On Assignment in September 2012 as Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer. Prior to this appointment, Mr. Pierce served on the Board of Directors for the Company from December 2007 to August 2012. From March 2011 through August 2012, Mr. Pierce was an executive in residence at Flexpoint Ford, a private equity firm. From October 2006 to March 2011, Mr. Pierce served as executive vice president and chief financial officer, and later as president of First Acceptance Corporation, a publicly-traded retailer, servicer and underwriter of non-standard private passenger automobile insurance. From May 2001 through February 2006, Mr. Pierce served as the executive vice president, chief financial officer and as a director of BindView Corporation. From November 1994 through January 2001, Mr. Pierce held various financial management positions, including executive vice president and chief financial officer of Metamor Worldwide, Inc. Mr. Pierce received his bachelor of science degree in accounting from Harding University and began his career with Arthur Andersen & Co. in Houston, Texas.

Theodore S. Hanson was promoted to the role of President of On Assignment in December 2016. He joined On Assignment as Chief Financial Officer of Apex Systems as a result of the Company's acquisition of Apex Systems in May 2012. In January 2014, he was promoted to the role of President of Apex Life Sciences, LLC, formerly known as Lab Support ("Apex Life Sciences"), and in January 2016, he ceased his duties as the Chief Financial Officer of Apex Systems and became an Executive Vice President of On Assignment in addition to his role as President of Apex Life Sciences. Mr. Hanson joined Apex Systems in November 1998 as Corporate Controller and became Chief Financial Officer in January 2001. From 1991 to 1998, he worked at Keiter, Stephens, Hurst, Gary and Shreaves, an independent accounting firm, and from 1996 to 1998 he was the chief financial officer of Property Technologies Ltd. He currently serves as a director and vice chairman of the Massey Cancer advisory board and as a director for the Virginia Tech Foundation board. Mr. Hanson holds a bachelor of science degree from Virginia Tech University and a master of business administration degree from Virginia Commonwealth University.

Randolph C. Blazer joined On Assignment as President of Apex Systems as a result of the Company's acquisition of Apex Systems in May 2012. Prior to the acquisition, Mr. Blazer served as Apex Systems' Chief Operating Officer, a role he held from February 2007. Formerly, Mr. Blazer served as president of public sector for SAP America. From 2000 through 2004, Mr. Blazer was chairman and chief executive officer of BearingPoint Inc., one of the world's largest consulting and systems integration firms. From 1977 through 2000, Mr. Blazer held increasing senior positions with KPMG. Under his leadership, KPMG Consulting launched the second-largest IPO in NASDAQ's history, becoming the first of the Big Five consulting firms to separate from its audit and tax parent and become an independent, publicly-traded company. Mr. Blazer has been a member of the board of directors of AtSite Inc. since September 2012 and of 3Pillar Global, Inc. since January 2015. Mr. Blazer holds a bachelor's degree in economics from McDaniel College and a master of business administration degree from the University of Kentucky.

Michael J. McGowan joined On Assignment as President of Oxford as a result of our acquisition of Oxford in January 2007, and became our Chief Operating Officer in 2012. He had held the position of President of Oxford since 1998, after joining Oxford in May 1997 as its Chief Operating Officer. Mr. McGowan retired from his position as an officer of the Company effective December 30, 2016, and accepted a position as an adviser to the Company's Board of Directors. Prior to Oxford, Mr. McGowan was senior vice president and general manager for Kelly Services' Middle Markets Division, a provider of workforce solutions. Prior to that time he served as vice president and general manager for The MEDSTAT Group, a healthcare information firm, and held increasingly senior positions for Automatic Data Processing, a provider of human resources, payroll and tax and benefits administration solutions, during a 16-year tenure. Mr. McGowan holds a bachelor of science degree in electrical engineering from Michigan State University and a master of business administration degree from the Eli Broad Graduate School of Management, also at Michigan State University.

James L. Brill joined On Assignment as Senior Vice President, Finance and Chief Financial Officer in January 2007, and has been instrumental in the growth of On Assignment. In his current role as Chief Administrative Officer and Treasurer which he took on in 2012, Mr. Brill oversees human resources, risk management, banking and cash management along with assisting in investor relations. Prior to On Assignment, Mr. Brill was vice president, finance and chief financial officer of Diagnostic Products Corporation, a medical diagnostic products and solutions company which was later acquired for \$1.9 billion by Siemens in July 2006. Mr. Brill was also Chief Financial Officer of Jafra Cosmetics International; vice president of finance and administration, and chief financial officer of Vertel Corporation, a provider of telecommunication systems management software and services; and senior vice president, finance and chief financial officer of Merisel, Inc., a worldwide distributor of computer hardware and software. Mr. Brill has served on the board of directors of Onvia Inc., a provider of business to government commerce intelligence for companies desiring to grow their public sector business and for government agencies desiring to improve their procurement efficiencies since 2004, and is the chairman of their audit committee. Mr. Brill holds a bachelor of science degree from the U.S. Naval Academy and a masters of business administration degree from the UCLA Anderson School of Management.

Jennifer Hanks Painter joined On Assignment in June 2013 and is the Senior Vice President, Chief Legal Officer and Secretary focusing on legal and compliance issues affecting the Company, including mergers and acquisitions, litigation, corporate governance and Board support. Ms. Painter joined On Assignment after serving as general counsel, chief compliance officer and secretary of MRV Communications, Inc., a global provider of telecommunications equipment and services, from 2009 to 2013. From 2004 through 2008, Ms. Painter served as vice president and assistant general counsel for The Ryland Group, Inc., a leading national homebuilder traded on the NYSE. From 2001 through 2004, Ms. Painter served as vice president and general counsel of Cadiz, Inc., a water and agricultural company traded on NASDAQ. Prior to joining Cadiz, Ms. Painter was employed as an associate with Sullivan & Cromwell LLP, an international law firm, where she dealt with mergers and acquisitions, securities, and other corporate matters. She was an officer in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers prior to her legal career. Ms. Painter serves as a member of the governing board and its management and budget committee for Meet Each Need with Dignity (MEND), a non-profit poverty center providing food, clothing, healthcare, job training and education. She received a bachelor of science degree in civil engineering from the U.S. Military Academy, and a juris doctor degree from Loyola Law School of Los Angeles.

EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Our executive compensation program is designed to provide a total compensation package intended to attract and retain high-caliber executive officers and also to incentivize executive contributions that are consistent with our corporate objectives and stockholder interests. It is our policy to provide a competitive total compensation package and share our success with our named executive officers, as well as our other employees, when our objectives are met. The Compensation Committee has structured executive compensation to focus on pay-for-performance utilizing performance metrics that are tied to our business objectives, and our performance has far exceeded our industry's average, as set forth below.

Performance	<p>In 2016, we achieved over \$2.4 billion in revenues representing a pro forma increase of \$261.5 million, or 12.0 percent over the prior year, and delivered basic earnings of \$1.83 per diluted share. Net income was \$97.2 million in 2016, compared with \$97.7 million in 2015 (2015 net income included \$27.7 million gain on sale of discontinued operations, net of income taxes). Adjusted EBITDA for purposes of determining performance targets grew to \$287.4 million representing an increase of \$47.0 million, or 19.5 percent over the prior year, which is significantly higher than the four percent growth projected for the staffing industry overall for 2016.</p>
Growth	<p>On Assignment has been the only staffing company to be featured on the Fortune “100 Fastest Growing Companies” list for three years running from 2014 to 2016. We consistently grow faster than the industry average with a target of \$3 billion in revenues for 2018. Our year-over-year pro forma revenue growth rate was 12.0 percent in 2016, 11.1 percent in 2015 and 10.9 percent in 2014.⁽¹⁾ According to Staffing Industry Analysts’ 2016 reports, On Assignment is a leader in multiple areas of the staffing industry:</p>
Industry Rankings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second largest IT staffing firm in the United States for the fourth consecutive year; • Second largest marketing/creative staffing firm in the United States; • Fifth largest clinical/scientific staffing firm in the United States; • Sixth largest direct hire staffing firm in the United States; • 10th largest U.S. staffing and recruitment firm overall; and • 16th largest global staffing and recruitment firm.
Corporate Governance Objectives	<p>On Assignment's Compensation Committee, Board of Directors and management have taken several actions in the past year to promote corporate governance best practices for our benefit and the benefit of our stockholders. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board adopted stock ownership guidelines for our executive officers in addition to the policy previously in place for directors that prohibits our directors and executive officers from selling stock until they attain and maintain certain ownership levels of our stock; and • The Compensation Committee incorporated clawback language into the 2016 incentive compensation program which covers all named executive officers performance-based compensation. The provision would subject any bonuses or equity awards to a clawback policy adopted by the Company to the extent required to comply with applicable law or securities exchange listing standards.
Compensation	<p>On Assignment offers a competitive compensation plan in order to incentivize both short- and long-term performance, and encourage retention. Executives receive a base salary, an annual cash incentive bonus, long-term equity-based incentives and perquisites, and are eligible to participate in our employee benefits plans.</p>
Experience	<p>On Assignment takes pride in having a management team that is highly experienced, with a proven record of delivering on our growth strategies that puts them in high demand. Their longevity with our Company provides stability and improves our ability to follow through on extended plans.</p>

(1) Pro forma includes revenues from businesses acquired during the last four years as if those acquisitions occurred at the beginning of 2013.

The following graphs illustrate our improvement in revenues, Adjusted EBITDA and gross profit over the last five years and compares that information against the total compensation listed for our Chief Executive Officer in the Summary Compensation Table on page 34 of this Proxy Statement and in our prior proxy statements. These performance metrics are used by our Compensation Committee to calculate our named executive officers' performance-based compensation, as described below in the section entitled "Compensation Program Elements."

(1) As reported for the year in which the compensation was earned.

(2) 2013 and 2015 net income included gain on sale of discontinued operations, net of income taxes, of \$30.8 million and \$27.7 million, respectively.

Stock Performance Graph

The following graph compares the performance of On Assignment’s common stock price during the period from December 31, 2011 to December 31, 2016 with the composite prices of companies listed on the NYSE and of companies included in the SIC Code No. 736—Personnel Supply Services Companies Index. The companies listed in the SIC Code No. 736 include peer companies in the same industry or line of business as On Assignment.

The graph depicts the results of investing \$100 in our common stock, the NYSE market index, and an index of the companies listed in the SIC Code No. 736 on December 31, 2011, and assumes that dividends were reinvested during the period.

The comparisons shown in the graph below are based upon historical data, and we caution stockholders that the stock price performance shown in the graph below is not indicative of, nor intended to forecast, potential future performance.

ASSUMES \$100 INVESTED ON DECEMBER 31, 2011
 ASSUMES DIVIDEND REINVESTED
 YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2016

	Year Ended December 31,					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
On Assignment	\$100.00	\$181.40	\$312.34	\$296.87	\$402.06	\$394.99
NYSE Market Index	\$100.00	\$116.25	\$146.94	\$157.04	\$150.77	\$168.95
SIC Code No. 736 Index—Personnel Supply Services Company Index	\$100.00	\$123.22	\$198.14	\$183.68	\$196.17	\$197.36

Compensation Consultant

In 2015, the Compensation Committee retained Semler Brossy as its compensation consultant to help determine compensation for certain positions in the Company including all of the named executive officers as well as the Board of Directors. Semler Brossy also advised the Compensation Committee in designing the annual cash and long-term incentive compensation programs, and the consultant also provided advice regarding the renewal of the Chief Executive Officer's employment agreement. These compensation programs and designs remained substantially in place for 2016, though Semler Brossy was retained in 2016 as well for compensation advice as requested from time to time. The Compensation Committee has assessed the independence of Semler Brossy pursuant to SEC and NYSE rules and concluded that no conflict of interest exists that would prevent Semler Brossy from independently representing the Compensation Committee.

Compensation Philosophy

This section explains our compensation philosophy and compensation program as it relates to our named executive officers. The following table sets forth the key elements of our named executive officers' compensation, along with the primary objective associated with each element of compensation.

Compensation Element	Primary Objective
Base salary	To provide stable income as compensation for ongoing performance of job responsibilities.
Annual performance-based cash compensation (bonuses)	To incentivize short-term corporate objectives and individual contributions to the achievement of those objectives.
Long-term equity incentive compensation	To incentivize long-term performance objectives, align the interests of our named executive officers with stockholder interests, encourage the maximization of shareholder value, and retain key executives.
Severance and change in control benefits	To encourage the continued attention and dedication of our named executive officers and provide reasonable individual security to enable our named executive officers to focus on our best interests, particularly when considering strategic alternatives.
Retirement savings (401(k) plan)	To provide retirement savings in a tax-efficient manner.
Health and welfare benefits	To provide standard protection with regard to health, dental, life and disability risks as part of a market-competitive compensation package.

To serve the foregoing objectives, our overall compensation program is generally designed to be flexible and complementary rather than purely formulaic, and it is reviewed and revised on an annual basis. In alignment with the objectives set forth above, the Compensation Committee has generally determined the overall compensation of our named executive officers and its allocation among the elements described above, relying on the analyses and advice provided by its compensation consultant as well as input from our management team.

The Company seeks to attract, motivate and retain key talent needed to enable On Assignment to operate successfully in a competitive environment. The Company's fundamental policy is to offer On Assignment's named executive officers competitive and fair compensation opportunities based upon their relevant experience, their individual performance, and the overall financial performance of On Assignment in a way that is aligned with the long-term interests of the Company's stockholders. The Company believes that the compensation program for the executive officers is instrumental to the Company's performance.

The Compensation Committee oversees the executive compensation program and determines compensation for the Company's executive officers. The Compensation Committee recognizes that, from time to time, it is appropriate to enter into compensatory agreements with key executives, and has done so with each of its named executive officers.

Through these agreements, On Assignment seeks to further motivate such individuals, retain their services, and secure confidentiality and non-solicitation obligations from such executives, applicable both during and after their employment. These compensatory agreements include executive employment agreements and severance arrangements.

In exercising discretion to determine compensation, the Compensation Committee carefully considers the experience, responsibilities and performance of each executive officer, and the Company's overall financial performance. In determining appropriate compensation for our executives, the Compensation Committee considers numerous factors including, but not limited to: rewarding results which are beneficial for the stockholders, competitive compensation, balancing cash and equity payments, recognizing external effects on our business, retention of our executive officers, skills of the executive officers, the Company's business and growth strategy, and the overall reasonableness of compensation in the experience of our Compensation Committee members.

The Compensation Committee also compares our performance against that of our peer group as part of its oversight responsibilities. For purposes of setting compensation for 2016, the Compensation Committee, with the assistance of Semler Brossy, considered the compensation of executive officers of competitor companies with the compensation of certain executives of On Assignment, including the named executive officers. In its analysis, Semler Brossy utilized a peer group of 16 professional services companies to establish the compensation for comparable executive positions, including related industry peers, primarily in the staffing and consulting services area. The competitor compensation review occurred in the fall of 2015, and at that time, revenues for the prior 12 months of the entities in the peer group ranged from \$848 million to \$4.8 billion, which were generally within one-third to twice On Assignment's revenues at that time. The following companies were included in the peer group, which was our peer group for 2016 as well:

- AMN Healthcare Services, Inc.;
- Booz Allen Hamilton Inc.;
- CACI International Inc.;
- CDI Corporation;
- Ciber Inc.;
- FTI Consulting, Inc.;
- Huron Consulting Group Inc.;
- Insperity, Inc.;
- Kforce Inc.;
- Korn/Ferry International;
- Navigant Consulting, Inc.;
- Robert Half International Inc.;
- Team Health Holdings, Inc.;
- Towers Watson & Co. (prior to its acquisition by Willis Group Holdings PLC);
- TrueBlue, Inc.; and
- Unisys Corporation.

The Compensation Committee considers the Chief Executive Officer's reviews and assessments of the performance of the other executive officers in its compensation decisions. The Compensation Committee works closely with the Chief Executive Officer in setting compensation for the executive officers (other than the Chief Executive Officer), giving weight to the Chief Executive Officer's evaluation of the other executive officers because of his direct knowledge of their performance.

The Compensation Committee strives to achieve a balance between cash and equity compensation as well as long-term and short-term incentive compensation which aligns with our stockholders' interests, but the Compensation Committee does not employ any formal method for allocating between cash and equity awards or between long-term and short-term incentives. Instead, the Compensation Committee balances various goals, longer-term performance objectives and vesting conditions on an individualized basis.

A fundamental objective of the Compensation Committee is to make a substantial portion of each executive officer's compensation contingent upon On Assignment's performance, as well as upon his or her own individual level of performance such that each executive officer is compensated for results. The Compensation Committee furthers this objective through an annual performance-based incentive compensation program using multi-year, long-term incentive awards subject to achievement of specified goals tied to business criteria, including periodic equity grants

with performance-based vesting components. The Compensation Committee strives to align the remuneration potential for the executive officers with stockholder interests through the use of equity awards. The mechanics and performance criteria for annual incentive awards and long-term incentive awards are discussed in greater detail below.

With respect to our named executive officers, in 2016, the Compensation Committee linked a substantial portion of each executive's total compensation to the performance of the Company or division over which the executive has responsibility (as applicable), quantified by the following measurements: (i) EBITDA adjusted for the purposes of incentive compensation targets, but excluding gains, losses or expenses associated with unusual items which include restructurings, discontinued operations, force majeure, litigation, judgments and settlements, changes in tax laws or accounting principles, certain severance amounts, equity-based compensation expense, one-time gains or losses from disposal or sale of assets, and impairment of goodwill or other identifiable intangible assets ("Adjusted EBITDA"); (ii) Adjusted EBITDA per share; and (iii) gross profit. A calculation of Adjusted EBITDA is included in Annex A.

The Compensation Committee believes this structure is appropriate because senior executives' efforts and business judgment significantly impact the performance of the Company and the Company's stock price, and these metrics qualify that impact. Our executive officers receive annual cash incentive compensation opportunities with attainment targets set each year by the Compensation Committee, based on percentages of their annual salary depending upon the scope of the executive's responsibilities. Additionally, our executive officers receive annual RSU equity grants, the size of which increase as the executive's level of responsibility and impact on overall Company performance increases. The value of the annual equity grants is tied to the value of On Assignment's common stock, with vesting schedules that are based on the attainment of performance-based goals established by the Compensation Committee and continued service to the Company over a period of time. We believe that linking equity awards to performance-based vesting conditions and continued service to the Company provides desirable retention and performance incentives.

The Compensation Committee believes the use of both annual and long-term incentive awards encourages the executive officers to balance and manage short-term returns against long-term Company goals and investments in future opportunities. Annual incentive awards are generally cash awards intended to reward the executive for achieving growth in one or more designated business unit level or consolidated performance metrics. Multi-year, long-term incentive awards are typically equity awards, with vesting subject to the attainment of designated levels of Company or division financial performance, as well as the passage of time. Awards to individuals who are "covered employees" under Internal Revenue Code (the "Code") Section 162(m) (discussed below) or who the Compensation Committee believes may be covered in the future, may be structured in a manner intended to constitute "qualified performance-based compensation" under Code Section 162(m) in order to preserve the deductibility of the awards.

Our compensation decisions for the named executive officers in 2016, including each of the key elements of our executive compensation program, are discussed in detail below. This discussion is intended to be read in conjunction with the executive compensation tables and related disclosures.

Compensation Program Elements

Base Salary

One component of our compensation package is an annual salary commensurate with each executive officer's experience, scope of responsibility, skill in executing those responsibilities and overall value to the organization. The Compensation Committee considers the following factors in determining the base salary for each named executive officer:

- individual performance as measured by the success of the executive officer's business division or area of responsibility;
- competitiveness with salary levels of similarly-sized companies and our peer group evaluated through salary surveys and internal compensation parity standards;
- the range of the Company's other executive officer salaries and annual salary increases awarded to the Company's other executive officers;
- the performance of the Company and the overall economic climate;
- whether the base salary equitably compensates the executive for the competent

execution of his duties and responsibilities;

- the executive officer's experience; and

- the anticipated impact of the executive officer's business division or area of responsibility.

The amount and timing of any increase in base compensation depends upon, among other things, overall economic conditions, the performance of the Company and the executive officer's business unit (if applicable), the individual's performance, internal compensation parity and the time interval and any responsibilities assumed since the last salary increase. While the Compensation Committee allocates a competitive base salary for each executive, base salary is only a portion of the overall compensation program. Executive officers' performance, including over-achievement, is generally rewarded through incentive programs, rather than base salary.

In determining whether or not to apply a salary increase for the named executive officers in 2016, the Compensation Committee requested Semler Brossy to conduct a compensation study which reviewed, among other things, our executives' compensation against our peer group. The Compensation Committee took this pay study into consideration, along with the overall value of each named executive officer's compensation and equity, the timing of the named executive officer's last salary increase, the performance of the Company and the division over which the named executive officer has responsibility (if applicable), the percentage of executive compensation compared to the Company's overall expenses, the performance of the staffing industry, and the overall economic climate. After taking all of this information into consideration, the Compensation Committee approved the following merit increases to base salary for each named executive officer effective January 1, 2016: a five percent increase for Mr. Dameris; a four percent increase for Mr. Hanson; and a three percent increase for Mr. Pierce. Further, on December 30, 2016, Mr. Hanson was promoted to the role of President of the Company, and commensurate with the promotion, the Compensation Committee approved an additional 25 percent increase for him increasing his annual base salary to \$600,000 effective January 1, 2017.

Annual Cash Incentive Compensation

Executive officers, including our named executive officers, are eligible for annual incentive compensation payable in cash and tied to achievement of performance goals, which typically include components related to profitability and growth, either at the divisional or corporate levels, or a combination, depending upon the executive's area of responsibility. By focusing on profitability and growth measures, the Compensation Committee attempts to relate annual cash incentive compensation to performance measures that demonstrate appropriate growth and contribute to overall shareholder value. Within the first 90 days of each fiscal year, the Compensation Committee typically establishes annual performance targets and corresponding target incentive compensation. Annual incentive compensation is typically calculated as a percentage of the individual's base salary, with higher level executives eligible for higher target percentages. The Compensation Committee followed this procedure for 2016 annual incentive compensation, setting target and maximum cash incentive compensation opportunities of 100 percent and

200 percent in the aggregate, respectively, of annual base salary for Mr. Dameris, 70 and 140 percent in the aggregate of annual base salary for Messrs. Hanson, Blazer and McGowan, and 60 and 120 percent in the aggregate of annual base salary for Mr. Pierce, assigned according to the rank and the scope of responsibilities of the executive and provisions in their employment agreements.

24

A schedule of 2016 annual base salary and target and maximum cash incentive compensation amounts is as follows:

Name	Annual	Annual Cash Incentive	
	Base Salary	Target	Maximum
Peter T. Dameris	\$926,000	\$926,000	\$1,852,000
Edward L. Pierce	530,000	318,000	636,000
Theodore S. Hanson	480,000	336,000	672,000
Randolph C. Blazer	716,625	501,638	1,003,276
Michael J. McGowan	630,630	441,441	882,882

For our named executive officers, over half of their 2016 potential cash compensation package is attached to attainment of their respective cash incentive compensation program targets, assuming the achievement of applicable performance goals. The Compensation Committee believes this arrangement appropriately links the executives' remuneration to the performance of the Company and the benefits derived by the stockholders. The targets are based on full-year performance measures and are, therefore, determined at a time when attainment is substantially uncertain. This incentive bonus opportunity consists of two components established by the Compensation Committee: a "Tier 1 bonus" for target achievement of set objectives, and a "Tier 2 bonus" based on extraordinary performance surpassing those objectives, paid incrementally up to a pre-set maximum level. The Tier 1 bonus and Tier 2 bonus together make up the executive officer's maximum annual cash incentive bonus opportunity. Structuring the annual incentive compensation in this manner upholds On Assignment's philosophy of paying for performance. The Tier 1 bonus component is designed to be achievable based upon highly competent management performance on the executive's part, assuming certain economic conditions and other circumstances at the time the goal was established. The Tier 2 bonus component is designed to be difficult to achieve under those circumstances and to reward truly exceptional performance.

In 2016, the Compensation Committee established the cash incentive compensation percentages based on its review of the compensation study and recommendations made by Semler Brossy, provisions in each named executive officer's employment agreement, historical cash incentive compensation amounts, and the same general factors that the Compensation Committee considered for annual base salary. The performance goals were set by the Compensation Committee after consultation with the Chief Executive Officer (with respect to named executive officers other than himself) and changes to performance targets reflect growth from the prior year based on weighted averages of projected growth for the staffing industry sectors that On Assignment serves as projected by Staffing Industry Analysts in its September 2015 report, the latest available projections available prior to setting the targets. Tier 1 targets were generally set at weighted industry average growth projections for 2016 over the prior year results, which was 5.8 percent growth on a consolidated Company basis. Tier 2 targets for Company performance were based on consolidated Company performance being 46 percent above the weighted industry average growth rates, or 8.5 percent above prior year results. Division performance targets generally required performance substantially above the industry weighted average growth projections. In 2016, for purposes of setting named executive officer annual cash incentive bonus targets, the Compensation Committee determined that growth and success in the areas of Adjusted EBITDA and gross profit would best indicate growth and success for the Company. The Compensation Committee moved from revenues to gross profits as a financial metric to ensure that executives were being properly incentivized to avoid growth without corresponding profitability. The Compensation Committee believes that the Company's success in these areas represents the measures used by our stockholders to assess our Company's value. As described under "Compensation Philosophy" above, Adjusted EBITDA for purposes of incentive compensation targets is earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization but excluding gains losses or expenses associated with unusual items. In addition to the financial metrics for targets described above, the Compensation Committee wanted to set special discretionary targets for one-half of Mr. Hanson's Tier 2 bonus opportunity to reflect certain goals and objectives that were set for him in 2016 when he was promoted to the role of Executive Vice President of the

Company, and these targets are set forth below for Mr. Hanson. In order to determine successful achievement of these discretionary targets, the Compensation Committee reviewed each of the components with Mr. Dameris to evaluate Mr. Hanson's achievements in each of the areas listed.

The cash incentive compensation target and maximum goals, and actual amounts attained with respect to those goals for each named executive officer, are set forth below for 2016.

25

Chief Executive Officer

For 2016, Mr. Dameris' target and maximum cash incentive compensation opportunities were set at 100 percent and 200 percent in the aggregate of his annual base salary, respectively, as provided for in the Second Amended and Restated Executive Agreement we entered into with Mr. Dameris on November 17, 2015 (the "Dameris Employment Agreement"). Mr. Dameris earned the maximum possible cash incentive bonus of \$1,852,000. The performance targets for Mr. Dameris' 2016 cash incentive bonus and the amounts earned are noted below.

Tier 1

Mr. Dameris was eligible to earn his Tier 1 cash incentive bonus equal to 100 percent of his annual base salary upon the Company's attainment of the following targets during 2016:

% of Tier 1 Target	Performance Target	Actual Performance	Maximum Incentive Opportunity	Incentive Amount Earned
100%	Company achieves Adjusted EBITDA of \$279,094,858	\$287,353,027	\$926,000	\$926,000

Tier 2

Mr. Dameris was eligible to earn his Tier 2 cash incentive bonus of up to 100 percent of his annual base salary upon the Company's attainment of the following targets during 2016:

% of Tier 2 Target	Performance Target	Actual Performance	Maximum Incentive Opportunity	Incentive Amount Earned
40%	Company achieves Adjusted EBITDA of \$279,094,858 to \$286,217,317 (sliding linear scale)	\$287,353,027	\$370,400	\$370,400
60%	Company achieves gross profit of \$769,224,576 to \$788,855,071 (sliding linear scale) of gross profit	\$790,643,796	\$555,600	\$555,600
	Tier 1 plus Tier 2 Total		\$1,852,000	\$1,852,000

Chief Financial Officer

Mr. Pierce's maximum cash incentive compensation bonus opportunity was set at 120 percent of his annual base salary, and Mr. Pierce earned the maximum cash incentive bonus possible of \$636,000. The performance targets for Mr. Pierce's 2016 cash incentive bonus and the amounts earned are noted below.

Tier 1

Mr. Pierce was eligible to earn his Tier 1 cash incentive bonus equal to 60 percent of his annual base salary upon the Company's attainment of the following targets during 2016:

% of Tier 1 Target	Performance Target	Actual Performance	Maximum Incentive Opportunity	Incentive Amount Earned
100%	Company achieves Adjusted EBITDA of \$279,094,858	\$287,353,027	\$318,000	\$318,000

Tier 2

Mr. Pierce was eligible to earn his Tier 2 cash incentive bonus up to 60 percent of his annual base salary upon the Company's attainment of the following targets for 2016:

% of Tier 2 Target	Performance Target	Actual Performance	Maximum Incentive Opportunity	Incentive Amount Earned
40%		\$287,353,027	\$127,200	\$127,200

Edgar Filing: ON ASSIGNMENT INC - Form DEF 14A

Company achieves Adjusted EBITDA of \$279,094,858 to
\$286,217,317 (sliding linear scale)

60%	Company achieves gross profit of \$769,224,576 to \$788,855,071 (sliding linear scale) of gross profit	\$790,643,796	\$190,800	\$190,800
	Tier 1 plus Tier 2 Total		\$636,000	\$636,000

President

In January 2016, Mr. Hanson was promoted to the role of Executive Vice President of the Company and he relinquished his title as Chief Financial Officer of Apex Systems, though he retained certain duties and responsibilities for Apex Segment. With the promotion, the Compensation Committee included a stronger representation of consolidated results of On Assignment in the weighting of his financial metric targets, and he was also provided special discretionary targets for one-half of his Tier 2 bonus to reflect certain goals and objectives that the Board of Directors wanted him to focus upon in his new role. On December 30, 2016, Mr. Hanson was promoted to the role of President of the Company, and commensurate with this promotion, his 2017 maximum cash incentive bonus opportunity was increased to 150 percent of his base salary. For 2016, the maximum cash incentive compensation opportunity for Mr. Hanson was 140 percent of his annual base salary. Mr. Hanson earned the maximum cash incentive bonus possible of \$672,000. The performance targets for Mr. Hanson's 2016 cash incentive bonus and the amounts earned are noted below.

Tier 1

Mr. Hanson was eligible to earn a Tier 1 cash incentive bonus up to 70 percent of his annual base salary contingent upon attainment of the following targets during 2016 by On Assignment and our Apex Segment:

% of Tier 1 Target	Performance Target	Actual Performance	Maximum Incentive Opportunity	Incentive Amount Earned
20%	Company achieves Adjusted EBITDA of \$279,094,858 to \$286,217,317 (sliding linear scale)	\$287,353,027	\$67,200	\$67,200
30%	Apex Segment (excluding Creative Circle, LLC ("Creative Circle")) achieves gross profit growth of 8.0 percent over 2015	11.4% over 2015	\$100,800	\$100,800
15%	Creative Circle achieves gross profit growth of 12.5 percent over pro forma 2015	14.8% over pro forma 2015	\$50,400	\$50,400
35%	Apex Segment achieves Adjusted EBITDA growth of 8.0 percent over pro forma 2015	14.7% over pro forma 2015	\$117,600	\$117,600

Tier 2

Mr. Hanson was eligible to earn a Tier 2 cash incentive bonus up to 70 percent of his annual base salary contingent upon attainment of the following targets during 2016 by On Assignment and by him personally:

% of Tier 2 Target	Performance Target	Actual Performance	Maximum Incentive Opportunity	Incentive Amount Earned
50%	Company achieves Adjusted EBITDA of \$279,094,858 to \$286,217,317 (sliding linear scale)	\$287,353,027	\$168,000	\$168,000
50%	Achievement of objectives related to training across all divisions, succession planning, strategy, budget and financial planning oversight, and increased responsibilities with the Apex Segment	100%	\$168,000	\$168,000
	Tier 1 plus Tier 2 Total		\$672,000	\$672,000

President of Apex Systems

Mr. Blazer's maximum cash incentive compensation bonus opportunity was set at 140 percent of his annual base salary, and Mr. Blazer earned \$986,748 out of a maximum cash incentive bonus possible of \$1,003,275. The performance targets for Mr. Blazer's 2016 cash incentive bonus and the amounts earned are noted below.

Tier 1

Mr. Blazer was eligible to earn a Tier 1 cash incentive bonus up to 70 percent of his annual base salary contingent upon attainment of the following targets during 2016 by On Assignment and our Apex Segment:

Edgar Filing: ON ASSIGNMENT INC - Form DEF 14A

% of Tier 1 Target	Performance Target	Actual Performance	Maximum Incentive Opportunity	Incentive Amount Earned
20%	Company achieves Adjusted EBITDA of \$279,094,858	\$287,353,027	\$100,328	\$100,328
30%	Apex Segment (excluding Creative Circle, LLC ("Creative Circle")) achieves gross profit growth of 8.0 percent over 2015	11.4% over 2015	\$150,491	\$150,491
15%	Creative Circle achieves gross profit growth of 12.5 percent over pro forma 2015	14.8% over pro forma 2015	\$75,246	\$75,246
35%	Apex Segment achieves Adjusted EBITDA growth of 8.0 percent over pro forma 2015	14.7% over pro forma 2015	\$175,573	\$175,573

27

Edgar Filing: ON ASSIGNMENT INC - Form DEF 14A

Tier 2

Mr. Blazer was eligible to earn a Tier 2 cash incentive bonus up to 70 percent of his annual base salary contingent upon attainment of the following targets during 2016 by On Assignment and our Apex Segment:

% of Tier 2 Target	Performance Target	Actual Performance	Maximum Incentive Opportunity	Incentive Amount Earned
20%	Company achieves Adjusted EBITDA of \$279,094,858 to \$286,217,317 (sliding linear scale)	\$287,353,027	\$100,328	\$100,328
30%	Apex Segment (excluding Creative Circle) achieves gross profit growth of 8.0 to 11.0 percent over 2015 (sliding linear scale)	11.4% over 2015	\$150,491	\$150,491
15%	Creative Circle achieves gross profit growth of 12.5 to 15.5 percent growth over pro forma 2015 (sliding linear scale)	14.8% over pro forma 2015	\$75,246	\$58,718
35%	Apex Segment achieves Adjusted EBITDA growth of 8.0 to 11.0 percent over pro forma 2015 (sliding linear scale)	14.7% over pro forma 2015	\$175,573	\$175,573
	Tier 1 plus Tier 2 Total		\$1,003,275	\$986,748

Former President of Oxford and Chief Operating Officer

Mr. McGowan's maximum cash incentive compensation opportunity was set at 140 percent of his base salary. He earned a cash incentive bonus equal to \$176,576 out of a maximum possible \$882,882. The performance targets for Mr. McGowan's 2016 cash incentive bonus and the amounts earned are noted below.

Tier 1

For 2016, Mr. McGowan was eligible to earn a Tier 1 cash incentive bonus up to 70 percent of his annual base salary contingent upon attainment of the following 2016 targets by On Assignment and the subsidiaries and divisions for which he was directly responsible:

% of Tier 1 Target	Performance Target	Actual Performance	Maximum Incentive Opportunity	Incentive Amount Earned
20%	Company achieves Adjusted EBITDA of \$279,094,858 Oxford Segment (without Life Sciences Europe and	\$287,353,027	\$88,288	\$88,288
30%	CyberCoders, Inc. ("CyberCoders")) achieves gross profit growth of 5.8 percent over 2015	5.3% over 2015	\$132,432	-
15%	Life Sciences Europe achieves Adjusted EBITDA growth of 5.8 percent over pro forma 2015	17.7% under pro forma 2015	\$66,216	-
35%	Oxford Segment achieves Adjusted EBITDA growth of 5.8 percent over pro forma 2015	7.8% under pro forma 2015	\$154,504	-

Tier 2

Mr. McGowan was eligible to earn a Tier 2 cash incentive bonus up to 70 percent of his annual base salary contingent upon attainment of the following 2016 targets by On Assignment and the subsidiaries and divisions for which he was directly responsible:

% of Tier	Performance Target	Actual Performance	Maximum Incentive	Incentive Amount
-----------	--------------------	--------------------	-------------------	------------------

Edgar Filing: ON ASSIGNMENT INC - Form DEF 14A

2 Target			Opportunity	Earned
20%	Company achieves Adjusted EBITDA of \$279,094,858 to \$286,217,317 (sliding linear scale)	\$287,353,027	\$88,288	\$88,288
30%	Oxford Segment (without Life Sciences Europe and CyberCoders) achieves gross profit growth of 5.8 to 8.5 percent over 2015 (sliding linear scale)	5.3% over 2015	\$132,432	-
15%	CyberCoders achieves Adjusted EBITDA equal to 2015	10.7% under 2015	\$66,216	-
35%	Oxford Segment achieves Adjusted EBITDA growth of 5.8 to 8.5 percent over pro forma 2015 (sliding linear scale)	7.8% under pro forma 2015	\$154,504	-
	Tier 1 plus Tier 2 Total		\$882,882	\$176,576

28

Annual Equity Incentive Compensation

The Compensation Committee periodically approves grants of restricted stock units to On Assignment's executive officers, including its named executive officers. These grants are designed to balance the comparatively short-term goals of the annual cash incentive compensation bonuses with long-term stock price performance, to align the interests of each executive officer with those of the stockholders and to provide each individual with a significant incentive to manage their responsibilities from the perspective of an owner with an equity stake in the business. In addition, On Assignment believes that granting equity awards with long vesting periods creates a retention incentive and encourages the executive officers to focus on the Company's long-term business objectives and long-term stock price performance.

In 2016, the Company continued to rely on long-term equity awards in the form of RSUs to ensure a strong connection between the executive compensation program and the long-term interests of the Company's stockholders. RSUs enable the Company to confer value in excess of simple future appreciation, providing a valuable incentive in a sometimes volatile market. Accordingly, the Company believes that RSUs are an effective compensation element for attracting executives and promoting their long-term commitment to the Company. The Compensation Committee prefers RSUs to stock options because, unlike stock options, RSUs are not at risk of having an exercise price which is greater than the market price of the underlying shares during the vesting period and thereby failing in their fundamental purpose of providing an incentive to the executives to remain employed with the Company and focus efforts on achieving the performance targets necessary for vesting.

All 2016 RSU grants for the named executive officers had vesting terms that were conditioned upon achievement of performance criteria. The Compensation Committee believes that conditioning the vesting of RSU awards on the attainment of performance objectives is appropriate because this type of award creates an incentive for the executive to attain the designated performance criteria for vesting purposes, as well as to execute business plans that increase the overall fair market value of our common stock and align the executives' interests with the Company's stockholders. Upon achievement of the performance targets, many of these grants continue to be subject to additional time-vesting requirements which provides further retention incentives.

The size of the RSU grants is set at a level that the Compensation Committee deems appropriate in order to create a meaningful opportunity for stock ownership based upon the executive's seniority and ability to impact our stock price. In determining the size of the grants, the Compensation Committee also considers the executive officer's annual salary and annual cash incentive compensation opportunity. The Compensation Committee also takes into account the scope and business impact of the executive's position, the individual's potential to assume future duties and responsibility on behalf of On Assignment over the vesting schedule, the executive's individual performance in recent periods, and the executive's current holdings of On Assignment stock and options received through previous equity grants, as well as the equity plan's individual award limits, quality of service to the Company, experience of the officer, the then-current fair market value of the Company's common stock, and the overall equity awarded to each executive officer. The Compensation Committee feels that taking all of these factors into consideration enhances our ability to provide meaningful, appropriate and balanced incentives.

Long-term equity incentive compensation, structured in a way that aligns compensation of the executive officers with interests of our stockholders, comprised a significant portion of our named executive officers' total 2016 compensation. The Compensation Committee granted Mr. Dameris, our Chief Executive Officer, equity awards in 2016 in accordance with the terms of the Dameris Employment Agreement. Pursuant to the agreement, Mr. Dameris' 2016 equity awards have both one-year and multi-year vesting schedules and are further conditioned on performance-vesting requirements linked to the attainment of specified goals related to Adjusted EBITDA and Adjusted EBITDA per share. The Compensation Committee believes that a multi-year vesting schedule, which governs the majority of Mr. Dameris' RSU grants, encourages Mr. Dameris' continuation in service with the Company

through those vesting dates. In addition, the Compensation Committee believes that Mr. Dameris' RSU grants provide Mr. Dameris with incentive to focus on increasing the long-term value of the Company as measured by the Company's Adjusted EBITDA. The use of Adjusted EBITDA targets encourages Mr. Dameris to focus on producing financial results that align with the interests of our stockholders.

The Compensation Committee similarly strove to align the remuneration potential for the other named executive officers with stockholder interests through the use of annual RSU equity awards during 2016. Equity awards for Messrs. Pierce, Hanson, Blazer and McGowan included multi-year vesting components based on the achievement of Adjusted EBITDA performance targets set by the Company. The Compensation Committee believes the performance-target vesting requirements of the RSU grants encourage the executives to strive for superior Adjusted EBITDA results, which is an important measurement of the Company's success for our stockholders.

The 2016 annual long-term equity incentive compensation granted to each named executive officer is set forth below.

Chief Executive Officer

On January 4, 2016, Mr. Dameris was granted the following equity incentive compensation opportunities pursuant to the Dameris Employment Agreement:

Tranche A Award - Mr. Dameris was granted 18,700 RSUs having a grant date fair value of \$800,000. This award vested on January 2, 2017 and was subject to continued service to the Company and the Company attaining positive EBITDA in 2016 which was achieved. Mr. Dameris received 18,700 shares on February 9, 2017 when the Compensation Committee certified achievement of the performance target.

Tranche B Award - Mr. Dameris was granted 80,645 performance-based RSUs, and the performance targets were set on February 11, 2016. The RSUs were eligible to vest based on the Company's attainment of Adjusted EBITDA at various levels over the one-year period ending on December 31, 2016. The earned portion of the award vests and becomes (or became) payable in three equal components on January 2, 2017, January 2, 2018 and January 2, 2019, subject to continued service to the Company. The Compensation Committee set the applicable targets and their weighting as follows:

% of RSU Award	Performance Target	Maximum Number of Shares to be Earned
10%	Company achieves a minimum of \$223,275,887 of Adjusted EBITDA	8,064
40%	Company achieves Adjusted EBITDA of \$223,275,887 to \$251,185,372 (sliding linear scale)	32,258
16.7%	Company achieves Adjusted EBITDA of \$251,185,372 to \$279,094,858 (sliding linear scale)	13,441
33.3%	Company achieves Adjusted EBITDA of \$279,094,858 to \$286,217,317 (sliding linear scale)	26,882

The Company achieved \$287,353,027 in Adjusted EBITDA in 2016 and therefore Mr. Dameris earned the performance objective for all 80,645 shares related to this RSU grant when the Compensation Committee certified achievement of the performance target. 26,882 of the shares vested and paid out upon certification of performance on February 9, 2017, with the remaining shares to vest and be paid out equally on January 2, 2018 and January 2, 2019, subject to continued service to the Company.

Tranche C Award - Mr. Dameris was granted an RSU award with a fair market value of up to \$500,000, with the share number determined on the date of settlement. Pursuant to the grant terms, Mr. Dameris was eligible to receive a linear pro rata portion of the grant based on percentage attainment of the target after a minimum threshold was met. On February 11, 2016, the Compensation Committee set the performance targets for the Tranche C award, and the minimum threshold target was determined to be achievement by the Company of Adjusted EBITDA per share of \$4.70 during the 12-month performance period ending December 31, 2016. Mr. Dameris vested in 80 percent of the Tranche C award upon achievement of the minimum threshold target. The remaining 20 percent of the target was achievable upon the Company attaining Adjusted EBITDA per share of the Company's common stock of \$4.70 to \$5.74 during the same performance period. The Company achieved \$5.40 in Adjusted EBITDA per share in 2016, and therefore Mr. Dameris vested in \$467,550 of the Tranche C award. Mr. Dameris received 10,024 shares on February 9, 2017 when the Compensation Committee certified achievement of the performance target.

Additional Award - Mr. Dameris was granted 18,700 RSUs having a grant date fair value of \$800,000. This award is subject to continued service to the Company on the four vesting dates, which are January 2 of 2017 to 2020, as well as achievement by the Company of positive EBITDA in 2016, which occurred. Mr. Dameris received 4,675 shares on February 9, 2017 when the Compensation Committee certified achievement of the performance target, and the remainder of the grant vests pro rata on the remaining three vesting dates.

Other Named Executive Officers

On January 4, 2016, Messrs. Pierce, Hanson, Blazer and McGowan received grants of 16,362, 17,531, 25,712 and 25,712 RSUs, respectively, 60 percent of which vest in three equal, annual installments on January 4, 2017, January 4, 2018 and January 4, 2019, subject to achievement of positive Adjusted EBITDA for the Company in 2016 (the "Positive EBITDA Component") and continued service to the Company. Consistent with its overall compensation philosophy, the Compensation Committee believes that the added time-vesting requirement of the RSU grants creates a retention incentive for the executive officers and rewards them for exercising business judgment that maximizes the

trading price of the Company's common stock over a multi-year period. The remaining 40 percent of each RSU award is also performance-based, vesting in three equal, annual installments subject to attainment of performance targets established by the Compensation Committee for 2016, 2017 and 2018 (the "Three-Year Performance Component"), and subject to continued service to the Company. On February 11, 2016, the Compensation Committee established the following targets for performance-vesting grants for Messrs. Pierce, Hanson, Blazer and McGowan for 2016: 50 percent based on the Company achieving \$279,094,858 of Adjusted EBITDA in 2016, and up to an additional 50 percent vested on a linear basis incrementally for Company achievement of Adjusted EBITDA greater than \$279,094,858 up to a maximum of \$286,217,317 in 2016. According to the terms of the grant, if the performance goal was not attained in full, any portion of the 2016 performance-target grants which is not earned will roll forward for only one year to become part of the 2017 performance-target grants scheduled to vest in January 2018 contingent upon attainment of the applicable target for 2017. The roll forward provision also applies to the 2017 and 2018 portions of these grants. The targets applied to the first third of the Three-Year Performance Component of the January 4, 2016 grant also apply to the second third of the related Three-Year Performance Component of the executives' January 2, 2015 grant, and the third third of the related Three-Year Performance Component of the executives' January 2, 2014 grant. The Company achieved \$287,353,027 in Adjusted EBITDA in 2016 so these named executive officers earned their 2016 performance-target grants in full, and no portion was rolled forward to the following year.

Other Benefits

Company-Sponsored Health and Welfare Benefits

Our executives and their legal dependents are eligible to participate in Company-sponsored health and welfare plans. These benefits are designed to be competitive with overall market practices and to attract and retain employees with the skills and experience needed to promote On Assignment's goals. The Compensation Committee believes that providing this coverage opportunity and enabling payment of the employee portion of such coverage costs through payroll deductions encourages our executives and their legal dependents to avail themselves of appropriate medical, dental and other health care services, as necessary, to help ensure our executives' continued ability to contribute their efforts towards achieving On Assignment's growth, profitability and other goals.

401(k) Plan

On Assignment and its subsidiaries offer tax-qualified 401(k) plans to our U.S. employees. Some of our executives and other employees are not eligible to fully participate up to the maximum contribution levels permitted by the Code in their applicable 401(k) plan as a result of their status as "highly compensated" employees under the Code.

Severance and Change in Control Benefits

In 2016, each of our named executive officers was party to an employment agreement that provides for severance upon a qualifying termination of employment. Additionally, pursuant to the Second Amended and Restated Change in Control Agreement with Mr. Dameris that was effective on December 31, 2015 (the "Dameris CIC Agreement"), the Executive Change of Control Agreement entered into with Mr. Pierce on September 1, 2012 (the "Pierce CIC Agreement") as well as the On Assignment Change in Control Severance Plan, as amended and restated on December 10, 2015 (the "CIC Severance Plan") in which Messrs. Hanson and Blazer participate and in which Mr. McGowan participated through December 30, 2016, On Assignment provides for cash severance and other benefits in the event the executive is terminated under certain defined circumstances following a change in control of our Company. We feel that these severance triggers and levels (described in more detail below) are appropriate to ensure our executive officers' financial security, commensurate with their positions, in order to permit them to stay focused on their duties and responsibilities and promote the best interests of On Assignment in all circumstances.

Pursuant to the Dameris CIC Agreement and the Pierce CIC Agreement, in the event it is determined that any payment arising under the agreements would be subject to an excise tax for any excess parachute payment under Code Section 280G, a "best pay cap" reduction for any excess parachute payments under Code Section 280G is provided for unless the executive would receive a greater benefit without the reduction and after paying the related excise tax. The Compensation Committee believes that the change in control arrangements serve to minimize any distraction to the executive officers resulting from a potential change in the control of the Company and decrease the risk that these individuals would leave On Assignment when a transaction was imminent which would reduce the value of On Assignment to a prospective buyer, or to the stockholders in the event the transaction failed to close. Further, the Compensation Committee has structured the change in control severance payments as "double-trigger" (becoming payable only upon a qualifying termination following the change in control) and believes that this form of payment appropriately serves these goals yet avoids bestowing a windfall on the executive officers in the event that they are not involuntarily terminated following such an event.

The Pierce CIC Agreement allows for all unvested equity awards then held by Mr. Pierce to become fully vested and exercisable immediately prior to a change in control regardless of whether he is involuntarily terminated upon or following the transaction. The executive severance and change in control arrangements are further described under the heading "Employment Agreements" and "Payments upon Termination or Change in Control" below.

Perquisites

On Assignment also makes reasonable perquisites available to its executive officers, which includes a monthly automobile allowance, payment or reimbursement of actual expenses incurred by the executive officer in connection with an annual physical examination (subject to specific limits) and/or payment or reimbursement of actual expenses incurred for tax preparation and financial planning services (again, not to exceed specific limits). The Compensation Committee acknowledges the considerable time and focus demanded of our executive officers by their work duties as well as their role as “ambassadors” of On Assignment and authorizes these benefits in order to limit the impact and distraction of attending to these personal responsibilities. Additionally, the Compensation Committee believes the executives perceive these perquisites to be valuable and therefore helpful in attracting and retaining qualified leaders.

Tax Provisions and Accounting Consequences

The Compensation Committee considers the anticipated tax consequences to us and our executive officers when reviewing our compensation programs, as the deductibility of some types of compensation payments or the amount of tax imposed on the payments can depend upon the timing of an executive's vesting or exercise of previously granted rights or termination of employment. The Compensation Committee considers the requirements of Code Sections 409A and 162(m) when structuring the executive compensation packages. Code Section 162 (m) limits the tax deductibility to the Company of annual compensation in excess of \$1,000,000 that is paid to our Chief Executive Officer and our three other most highly compensated executive officers (other than the Chief Financial Officer). However, certain performance-based compensation is excluded from the \$1,000,000 limit if, among other requirements, the compensation is payable only upon the attainment of pre-established, objective performance goals that are based on stockholder-approved performance criteria and the committee that establishes and certifies such goals consists only of "outside directors." Section 409A of the Code requires that "nonqualified deferred compensation" be deferred and/or paid under plans or arrangements that satisfy the requirements of the statute with respect to the timing of deferral elections, timing of payments and certain other matters. Failure to satisfy these requirements can expose employees and other service providers to accelerated income tax liabilities, penalty taxes, and interest on their vested compensation under such plans. Changes in applicable tax laws and regulations, the increase in our stock price, and other factors beyond the Compensation Committee's control can affect the deductibility of compensation. While the Compensation Committee endeavors to minimize deductibility limitations for the Company, in appropriate circumstances the Compensation Committee may authorize, and has authorized, payments that may become subject to these limitations in order to properly incentivize an executive officer.

Code Section 280G disallows a tax deduction with respect to excess parachute payments to certain executives of companies which undergo a change in control. In addition, Code Section 4999 imposes a 20 percent tax penalty on the individual receiving the excess payment. Parachute payments are compensation that is linked to or triggered by a change in control and may include, but are not limited to, bonus payments, severance payments, certain fringe benefits, and payments and acceleration of vesting from long-term incentive plans including stock options and other equity-based compensation. Excess parachute payments are parachute payments that exceed a threshold determined under Code Section 280G based on the executive's prior compensation. In approving the compensation arrangements for our executive officers, our Compensation Committee considers all elements of the cost to our Company of providing such compensation, including the potential impact of Code Section 280G. Our Board and its Compensation Committee have noted the unfavorable consequences to the Company and its executives of triggering such excess payments, and have taken measures to minimize these negative consequences. In 2013, the Board eliminated the tax gross-up provision included in the CIC Severance Plan and eliminated all excess payments which trigger Code Section 280G penalties. In 2015, Mr. Dameris and the Compensation Committee agreed to remove the tax gross-up provision included in his prior change in control agreement; the Dameris CIC Agreement includes a best pay cap reduction provision for excess parachute payments under Code Section 280G unless the executive would otherwise receive a greater after-tax benefit without the reduction and after paying the related taxes (including the excise tax). Mr. Pierce has the same best pay cap reduction provision in his Pierce CIC Agreement.

The Compensation Committee also regularly considers the accounting implications of significant compensation decisions, especially in connection with decisions that relate to equity compensation awards. In particular, ASC Topic 718 (formerly known as FASB 123R), requires us to recognize an expense for the fair value of equity-based compensation awards. As accounting standards change, we may revise certain programs to appropriately align accounting expenses of our awards with our overall executive compensation philosophy and objectives.

While the tax or accounting impact of any compensation arrangement is one factor to be considered in determining appropriate compensation, such impact is evaluated in light of the Compensation Committee's overall compensation philosophy and objectives. The Compensation Committee will consider ways to maximize the deductibility of executive compensation, while retaining the discretion it deems necessary to compensate executive officers in a manner commensurate with performance and the competitive environment for executive talent. The Compensation Committee may award compensation which is not fully deductible to our executive officers if it determines that such

award is consistent with its philosophy and is in our and our stockholders' best interests.

Say-on-Pay

We provide our stockholders with the opportunity to cast an annual advisory vote on the compensation of our named executive officers (a "say-on-pay proposal"). At our 2016 annual meeting of stockholders held on June 9, 2016, 79.4 percent of the votes cast on the say-on-pay proposal at that meeting affirmatively voted in favor of the proposal (83.3 percent excluding broker non-votes). The Compensation Committee believes this affirms our stockholders' support of the compensation program, objectives and policies for our named executive officers. At this Annual Meeting our stockholders are being asked to indicate how frequently they believe we should seek an advisory vote on the compensation of our named executive officers (the "Frequency Proposal"). As our Board has recommended that our stockholders vote for a frequency of one year, we currently expect our next vote on a say-on-pay proposal (after the vote at this Annual Meeting) will be held at our annual meeting in 2018, although our Board may decide to modify this practice, particularly in light of the results of the Frequency Proposal. The Compensation Committee will continue to consider the outcome of the Company's say-on-pay proposals when making future compensation decisions for our named executive officers.

COMPENSATION COMMITTEE REPORT

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary set forth in any of the Company's previous filings under the Securities Act or the Exchange Act that might incorporate future filings, in whole or in part, including the Company's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2016 and its Registration Statements on Forms S-3 and S-8, the following Report shall not be incorporated by reference into any such filings.

The Compensation Committee of On Assignment, Inc. has reviewed and discussed with management the Compensation Discussion and Analysis required by Item 402(b) of Regulation S-K promulgated under the Exchange Act and, based on such review and discussions, the Compensation Committee recommended to the Board of Directors that the Executive Compensation Discussion and Analysis be included in this Proxy Statement and the Company's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2016.

Compensation Committee of the Board of Directors

Jonathan S. Holman (Chairman)

Senator William E. Brock

Jeremy M. Jones

Arshad Matin

SUMMARY COMPENSATION TABLE

The following table sets forth the compensation earned by our named executive officers for services rendered in all capacities to On Assignment for the years ended December 31, 2016, 2015 and 2014.

Name and Principal Position	Year	Salary	Stock Awards ⁽¹⁾	Non-Equity Incentive Plan Comp ⁽²⁾	All Other Compensation ⁽³⁾	Total
Peter T. Dameris Chief Executive Officer	2016	\$926,000	\$4,493,516	\$1,852,000	\$ 10,380	\$7,281,896
	2015	881,515	5,101,032	1,587,600	13,923	7,584,070
	2014	839,692	3,306,450	1,415,471	414	5,562,027
Edward L. Pierce Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer	2016	530,000	588,910	636,000	288	1,755,198
	2015	515,686	1,497,052	541,769	144	2,554,651
Theodore S. Hanson President	2014	497,105	399,073	483,029	571	1,379,778
	2016	480,000	602,499	672,000	24,273	1,778,772
Randolph C. Blazer President, Apex Systems	2015	470,462	1,375,623	452,783	25,227	2,324,095
	2014	439,231	555,159	436,246	26,480	1,457,116
Michael J. McGowan Former Chief Operating Officer and President, Oxford	2016	716,625	893,549	986,748	20,931	2,617,853
	2015	729,750	2,756,140	702,328	20,827	4,209,045
	2014	681,875	745,813	676,678	23,077	2,127,443
	2016	630,630	1,273,422	176,576	12,480	2,093,108
	2015	641,832	2,787,824	627,148	14,232	4,071,036