SpencerStuart
 Board Index

## About Spencer Stuart Board Services

At Spencer Stuart, we know how much leadership matters. We are trusted by organizations around the world to help them make the senior-level leadership decisions that have a lasting impact on their enterprises. Through our executive search, board and leadership advisory services, we help build and enhance high-performing teams for select clients ranging from major multinationals to emerging companies to nonprofit institutions.

Privately held since 1956, we focus on delivering knowledge, insight and results through the collaborative efforts of a team of experts - now spanning more than 70 offices, across 30 countries and more than 50 practice specialties. Boards and leaders consistently turn to Spencer Stuart to help address their evolving leadership needs in areas such as senior-level executive search, board recruitment, board effectiveness, succession planning, in-depth senior management assessment, employee engagement and many other facets of organizational effectiveness.

For more than 35 years, our Board Practice has helped boards around the world identify and recruit independent directors and provided advice to board chairs, CEOs and nominating committees on important governance issues. We serve a range of organizations across geographies and scale, from leading multinationals to smaller organizations.

Our global team of board experts works together to ensure that our clients have unrivaled access to the best existing and potential director talent, and regularly assists boards in increasing the diversity of their composition.

$$
1,200
$$

We've conducted more than 1,200 director searches worldwide in the past year alone.
of our assignments in North America were for companies with revenues over \$1 billion.

Over 3,400 of our global corporate board director placements have been women.

1,100
More than 1,100 of our global corporate board director placements have been from underrepresented racial and ethnic groups.

In addition to our work with clients, Spencer Stuart has long played an active role in corporate governance by exploring the key concerns of boards and innovative solutions to the challenges they face. Publishing the U.S. Spencer Stuart Board Index, now in its 37th edition, is just one of our many ongoing efforts. Each year, we support a range of organizations focused on enhancing diversity and inclusion in the boardroom and participate in several acclaimed director programs, including:

```
> African American Directors Forum
# Ascend Leadership
> Diligent Modern Leadership initiative
# Latino Corporate Directors Association
> Next-Gen Board Leaders (NGBL)
» The New Directors Program, a unique two-year development program for first-time, non-executive directors
# WomenCorporateDirectors (WCD) Foundation
```

Social media @ Spencer Stuart
Stay up to date on the trends and topics that are relevant to your business and career.
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## Executive Summary

## The 2022 U.S. Spencer Stuart Board Index

Now in its 37th year, the U.S. Spencer Stuart Board Index is the definitive guide to the shifting composition and governance practices of S\&P 500 company boards.

This report sets out the key trends revealed by our in-depth analysis of this year's proxy statements, from profiling the "class of 2022" (directors appointed this year) to pinpointing shifting governance arrangements and setting out the latest changes in directors' compensation. And for the first time, this year's U.S. Spencer Stuart Board Index incorporates viewpoints from several S\&P 500 boardroom leaders, contextualizing the data with a new level of insight.

## 2022: Has the pace of change slowed?

The 2021 U.S. Spencer Stuart Board Index painted a picture of widespread, almost tumultuous, change in S\&P 500 boards. It was an exceptionally dynamic year for new appointments, with 456 new directors appointed across 59\% of the S\&P 500's boards. We hailed the new class of S\&P 500 directors as the most diverse ever. And the number of board meetings jumped by almost $20 \%$ as boards wrestled with the complexities of an economic landscape reshaped by the COVID-19 pandemic.

By comparison, our 2022 analysis could be seen as indicating a relative slowing in the pace of change. This year, 395 new director appointments were spread across $55 \%$ of boards. The share of new directors who are first-time directors in outside public companies dipped one percentage point to $34 \%$ of appointments. The number of board meetings dropped back to a more normal level.

Yet by many measures, it is clear that the pace of change remains significant — not least in the changing profile of S\&P 500 directors. Historically underrepresented groups — defined as individuals who self-identify in one or more of the following categories: women, underrepresented racial/ethnic group or the LGBTQ+ community - account for $72 \%$ of the new class of directors (the same proportion as last year) and a rising share of S\&P 500 board directors as a whole. Meanwhile, next-generation (next-gen) directors, aged 50 and younger, account for $18 \%$ of the incoming class of 2022, up from $16 \%$ in 2021.

As the 2022 U.S. Spencer Stuart Board Index reveals in detail, the pace of change may have slowed slightly compared with 2021 - but evolution and change remain fixtures in the boardrooms of the S\&P 500.


We would like to thank the following individuals for their contribution to this report:
» Frank Blake, director at Macy's and former chair and CEO of The Home Depot
» Mike Calbert, chair of the boards at Dollar General Corporation and PVH Corporationn
" Fred Diaz, director of Archer Aviation, SiteOne Landscape Supply, Smith \& Wesson Brands and Valero Energy Corporation
» Wayne Hewett, chair of the board at Cambrex Corporation, and director of The Home Depot, UPS and Wells Fargo
» Donna Zarcone, director of CDW Corporation, Cigna, Quinnox and The Duchossois Group

## About the U.S. Spencer Stuart Board Index

The analysis presented in the 2022 report draws on the latest proxy statements from 489 companies filed between May 1, 2021, and April 30, 2022.

Comparisons are drawn with last year's data throughout the report - plus, we draw on our deep understanding of the issues and extensive data sets from previous years to highlight key trends, with select comparisons over a five- and 10 -year timeframe.

## Snapshot reports

Alongside the 2022 U.S. Spencer Stuart Board Index, we have produced three Snapshot reports:

》 New Director Snapshot
» Compensation Snapshot
» Diversity Snapshot
These separate standalone reports provide a speedy overview of the key trends in each area and, in some places, include additional analysis that readers with a particular interest may find valuable. All three are available at www.spencerstuart.com/usbi.

# 2022 U.S. Spencer Stuart Board Index Highlights 

## The push for greater board diversity continues

## 72\%

of new directors are from historically underrepresented groups
$46 \%$
of new independent directors are women
» Directors from historically underrepresented groups - including women, underrepresented racial or ethnic groups and members of the LGBTQ+ communities - account for $72 \%$ of all new directors, the same proportion as last year. Nearly half - $46 \%$ - of the 395 new independent directors appointed this year are from underrepresented racial and ethnic groups. Forty-six percent are women, including 20\% female Black or African American, Asian, Hispanic or Latina, American Indian or Alaska Native or multiracial directors.

- Just over one-quarter (26\%) of all new independent directors are Black or African American, down from $33 \%$ in 2021 - though still significantly higher from $11 \%$ in 2020.
- The representation of Asian directors among new directors rose from $7 \%$ to $10 \%$.
- Hispanic or Latino/a directors make up $8 \%$ of new directors, a onepoint increase from last year, making it a record high for the second consecutive year since we began collecting this data in 2008.
- The representation of women among new independent directors rose to $46 \%$ from $43 \%$ in 2021.


## Almost one-third of all S\&P 500 directors are women - another new milestone

》) Female representation among S\&P 500 board directors as a whole rose to $32 \%$ this year, up from $30 \%$ last year and $17 \%$ a decade ago - marking an $86 \%$ increase over the decade.
» All S\&P 500 boards now have at least one woman director, and 98\% of boards include two or more women directors, compared with 61\% in 2012. Eighty-one percent have three or more women, up from $72 \%$ last year.
" Fourteen percent of independent board chairs and $14 \%$ of lead or presiding directors are women, up from $8 \%$ and $13 \%$, respectively, in 2021.

## More than one-third of new directors are serving on their first outside public company board

» Just over one-third (34\%) of the S\&P 500 directors appointed in the 2022 proxy year are serving on their first public company board, down one point from 2021.
» Three-quarters of first-time directors (75\%) are actively employed, compared with $31 \%$ of new directors with previous board experience. Only $2 \%$ are actively employed private company CEOs serving on their first public company board.

## Directors aged 50 and younger make up $18 \%$ of new directors and $6 \%$ of all directors

» Fifty-six percent of these new next-gen directors are from historically underrepresented groups.
» Ten percent of new next-gen directors are women.

of S\&P 500 board directors are women

## 100\%

of S\&P 500 boards have at least one woman director

of new next-gen directors are from historically underrepresented groups

## Division or subsidiary and line or functional leaders are the most common new director backgrounds

" One-third ( $33 \%$ ) of new S\&P 500 directors are active and retired corporate executives, including line or functional leaders and division or subsidiary leaders.
» Twenty-three percent are active and retired CEOs.
» Fifty-six percent of new directors are actively employed.
» New independent directors from historically underrepresented groups are more likely to be division or subsidiary and line or functional leaders than those who are not and much less likely to be CEOs.

## Boards continue to be more likely to use mandatory retirement rather than term limits as a refreshment tool

» Just 35 S\&P 500 boards (7\%) report having explicit term limits for non-executive directors. Term limits range from 10 to 20 years, with $69 \%$ of those that have them setting limits at 15 years or more.
» Seventy percent report having a mandatory retirement age, the same as last year. Fifty-three percent of boards with age limits set the age of mandatory retirement at 75 or older.
» The average tenure of independent directors on S\&P 500 boards is 7.8 years, almost a year less on average than in 2012 ( 8.6 years).
» The average age of independent directors is 63.1, compared with 62.6 in 2012.

## Almost all S\&P 500 boards now disclose their racial or ethnic composition

» Ninety-three percent of S\&P 500 boards disclose their racial or ethnic composition, a substantial increase compared with 2021 (60\%). Forty-one percent of those boards identify directors from underrepresented racial or ethnic groups by name.
» Fifty percent of boards report having a policy to include individuals from historically underrepresented groups in the candidate pool when recruiting new directors - a "Rooney Rule"-like policy — up from 39\% last year.
" The overall representation of some demographic groups in S\&P 500 boards continues to trail their representation in the U.S. population, despite the increased proportion of directors appointed from historically underrepresented groups in 2021 and 2022.


## Additional proxy disclosures on diversity are fast becoming more common

» Seventy-four boards (15\%) included LGBTQ+ disclosure in their proxy statement, more than twice as many as in 2021 ( 32 boards, 6\%).
» Twenty-nine boards (6\%) identified the LGBTQ+ status of individual directors.

## The number of boards with a separate chair and CEO has fallen slightly

» Fifty-seven percent of S\&P 500 boards split the chair and CEO roles, compared with $59 \%$ last year but still more than in 2012 (43\%).
> Thirty-six percent of boards named an independent chair - a director who meets applicable NYSE or Nasdaq rules for independence - slightly down compared with last year (37\%) but still substantially higher than a decade ago (23\%).

## Getting back to normal on the number of board meetings

» Boards met 8.3 times on average, down from 9.4 meetings the year before, although still higher than pre-COVID ( 7.9 meetings). This year's average number of meetings is the same as a decade ago.

## More board performance evaluations include individual director evaluations

» Ninety-eight percent of boards - all but 10 - report conducting some sort of annual performance evaluation.
» Forty-seven percent of boards disclose that they have some form of individual director evaluation, the same number as last year but up from $31 \%$ a decade ago.

boards included LGBTQ+ disclosure in their proxy statement

of S\&P 500 boards have a truly independent chair

## 8.3

average number of board meetings, a $12 \%$ decrease from the previous year

of boards conducted annual performance evaluations

## Modest increase in director compensation

» The average total director compensation, excluding the chair's fee, increased by $3 \%$ to $\$ 316,091$; this is a $9 \%$ increase from 2017.
» Stock grants and cash represent the largest share of director compensation, at $56 \%$ and $37 \%$, respectively.
" The average annual retainer increased by $3 \%$ to $\$ 136,133$.
» Seventy-six percent of boards provide stock grants to directors in addition to a cash retainer.
» Ninety-one percent of the 176 boards with independent board chairs provide additional compensation to the board chair, averaging $\$ 164,205$. Eighty-two percent of boards with a lead or presiding director provide additional compensation to directors serving in those roles, averaging \$44,314.


凸

increase in average total director compensation from 2017

## Our perspective:

How forward-looking
boards are thinking about boardroom talent

## With S\&P 500 board directors enjoying an average tenure of 7.8 years, the appointments that boards make today will influence companies for years to come.

Here are eight defining characteristics we see among forward-looking boards as they choose the directors who will guide them into the future.

They consider boards and directors to be strategic assets
A strong, diverse and balanced board composition is critical to performance. In recognition of this, leading boards are increasingly taking a strategic view of new director appointments, with many using board evaluations ( $98 \%$ ), peer evaluations ( $47 \%$ ) and skills matrices ( $56 \%$ ) to identify gaps and clarify the qualities required to fill them.

They cast their nets wide and deep for director talent
Rather than setting narrow specifications for new directors, forward-looking boards are considering candidates from a broader range of professional backgrounds. Fewer appointments are active CEOs: $13 \%$ this year, down from $22 \%$ a decade ago. As boards respond to emerging oversight challenges such as digital transformation and the greater prominence of environmental, social and governance (ESG) considerations in business strategy, they benefit from fresh perspectives and expertise in the boardroom.

## They adopt a culture of continuous commitment to board diversity

Leading boards are doubling down on their commitment to improving diversity in the boardroom. Boards that are most successful on the diversity journey will view every director search as an opportunity to enhance boardroom diversity and ensure boardroom policies and procedures reflect an inclusive culture of trust, belonging and respect for all perspectives. This year, the vast majority of new directors again come from historically underrepresented groups (72\%). Half of S\&P 500 boards now report the implementation of a policy like the Rooney Rule for candidate pools, helping ensure consideration of diverse candidates. Slowly but surely, the composition of the S\&P 500's independent directors is changing; a rising proportion comprises women or individuals who are from underrepresented racial or ethnic groups or part of the LGBTQ+ community.

> Diversity in leadership can elevate important perspectives and increase the sense of belonging in the boardroom for all directors"

## They are increasing the diversity of board leadership

Diversity in leadership can elevate important perspectives and increase the sense of belonging in the boardroom for all directors. Forward-looking board succession planning anticipates the departure of board and committee leaders early. It ensures that the board has someone with the right skills, time and commitment to serve when the time comes, taking diversity into account.

## They build the company leadership pipeline for the future

More boards are increasing their oversight of the leadership talent pipeline and diversity, equity and inclusion (DE\&I) in the business. They often encourage the CEO to support the career development of executives from historically underrepresented groups by ensuring they gain exposure to the company's board and sponsoring up-and-coming leaders for external board opportunities. In addition, the board should monitor the career progression of all high potential leaders, including those from historically underrepresented groups, and encourage the CEO to ensure they are given jobs that build their skills and provide visibility.

## They reject a scarcity mindset and build robust candidate pipelines

Leading boards enhance candidate pipelines by looking beyond the director's personal networks - leveraging company and external affinity groups - to proactively meet and cultivate relationships with executives from diverse backgrounds. Developing these networks requires a purposeful and ongoing commitment and a willingness to widen the aperture beyond sitting and retired CEOs and CFOs. In addition, some boards are striving for at least half of the candidate pool for a board seat to be people from underrepresented communities.

## They consider the diversity of age and the implications for tenure

As boards refresh their memberships, the proportion of next-gen directors (those aged 50 or under) has risen. Many boards are thinking carefully about attaining the right balance between youth and experience for today's fast-changing strategic context. For many, the accelerating shift into the digital era demands the appointment of younger directors in their early 40 s or 50 s . That, in turn, has raised questions about tenure, with more boards (67\%) now having an average tenure of 6-10 years. While some boards are reviewing their formal policies, others are looking to manage expectations informally through conversations about tenure, for example, by establishing that appointments are generally for $5-10$ years and will be reviewed in light of changing requirements and individual performance - rather than being a position that is guaranteed until a mandatory retirement date.

## They think globally

An increasing number of leading boards are seeking board candidates with international experience. This year, $50 \%$ of new directors appointed to S\&P 500 boards have international experience, up from $34 \%$ last year. They may be from the U.S. and have spent time overseas or originally from other parts of the world. Either route can bring readymade international networks and deep knowledge of significant markets.

## S\&P 500 Boards: <br> Trends Over One, Five and 10 Years

## TRENDS OVER ONE, FIVE AND 10 YEARS

|  | $2022(a)$ | $2021(b)$ | $2017(c)$ | 2012 (d) | 5-year <br> change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Board composition |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average board size | 10.8 | 10.8 | 10.8 | 10.7 | $0 \%$ |
| change |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 2022 (a) | 2021 (b) | 2017 (c) | 2012 (d) | 5-year change | 10-year change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retirement age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Boards with mandatory retirement age | 70\% | 70\% | 73\% | 73\% | -4\% | -4\% |
| Boards with mandatory retirement age of 75+ | 53\% | 51\% | 42\% | 22\% | 26\% | 141\% |
| Board with mandatory retirement age of 72+ | 96\% | 97\% | 96\% | 85\% | 0\% | 13\% |
| Committee meetings (average number) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Audit committees | 8.2 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 8.7 | -5\% | -6\% |
| Compensation committees | 6 | 6.2 | 6 | 6.4 | 0\% | -6\% |
| Nominating committees | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.6 | 0\% | 2\% |
| Audit committee chair |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Active CEO/chair/president/COO | 5\% | 4\% | 6\% | 10\% | -17\% | -50\% |
| Financial exec/CFO/treas/public acct. exec | 38\% | 37\% | 32\% | 23\% | 19\% | 65\% |
| Non-employee director compensation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total average compensation (e) *** | \$316,091 | \$305,808 | \$286,119 | N/A | 10\% | N/A |
| Average annual retainer (f) | \$136,133 | \$131,664 | \$120,409 | \$96,649 | 13\% | 41\% |
| Median annual retainer (f) | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | \$75,000 | 0\% | 33\% |
| Boards paying retainer of at least \$ 100,000 | 65\% | 61\% | 52\% | 29\% | 25\% | 124\% |
| Boards paying board meeting fee | 5\% | 6\% | 14\% | 33\% | -64\% | -85\% |
| Average board meeting fee | \$2,767 | \$2,663 | \$2,197 | \$2,224 | 26\% | 24\% |
| Boards offering stock option program | 11\% | 11\% | 13\% | 25\% | -15\% | -56\% |
| Boards paying equity in addition to retainer | 76\% | 76\% | 77\% | 76\% | -1\% | 0\% |
| Committee compensation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Boards paying committee chair retainer | 97\% | 98\% | 96\% | 92\% | 1\% | 5\% |
| Average committee chair retainer | \$23,558 | \$23,073 | \$20,443 | \$17,872 | 15\% | 32\% |
| Boards paying committee member retainer | 49\% | 51\% | 45\% | 38\% | 9\% | 29\% |
| Average committee member retainer | \$11,964 | \$11,863 | \$11,560 | \$10,295 | 3\% | 16\% |
| Boards paying committee meeting fees | 6\% | 8\% | 19\% | 33\% | -68\% | -82\% |
| Average committee meeting fees | \$1,775 | \$1,874 | \$1,653 | \$1,703 | 7\% | 4\% |

## Notes

(a) Data based on proxy year May 1, 2021, through to April 30, 2022.
(b) Data based on proxy year May 28, 2020, through to May 13, 2021.
(c) Data based on proxy year May 15, 2016, through to May 15, 2017.
(d) Data based on proxy year May 15, 2011, through to May 15, 2012.
(e) Based on non-employee director compensation tables included in 489 (2022), 493 (2021), 491 (2017) and 485 (2021) proxies. The number includes all board and committee retainers and meeting fees, supplemental non-executive chairman and lead or presiding director fees, the value of equity compensation and all other compensation paid in the fiscal year 2021 to non-employee directors who served for the full year.
(f) Not including stock beyond retainer.

* Prior to 2018, first-time directors represented only directors with no prior outside board service.
** Excluding independent chair fee.


## Editor's note

The U.S. Spencer Stuart Board Index is based on our analysis of the latest proxy statements from the S\&P 500. This edition of the Index draws on the DEF14A proxy statements from 489 companies filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission between May 1, 2021, and April 30, 2022. Revenue data and industry or sector categories were taken from Capital IQ.
The content presented herein is for informational purposes only. Spencer Stuart has presented this information in good faith and in accordance with applicable laws. You agree not to use this information in violation of any applicable law.
Data in tables may not total $100 \%$ due to rounding.

## Board Composition

## 2022 Snapshot

## 395

new independent directors

## $36^{\%}$

of S\&P 500 boards have an independent chair

## 70\%

of boards report a mandatory retirement policy; $53 \%$ set the retirement age at 75 or older

of new independent
directors are from historically underrepresented groups
$46^{\%}$
are Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino/a, Asian, American Indian or Alaska Native or multiracial directors

46\%
are women,
up from $43 \%$
last year last year

## Boards add 395 independent directors

») Of the 489 S\&P 500 boards included in the 2022 Index, $55 \%$ appointed at least one new independent director in the 2022 proxy year, and $19 \%$ appointed two or more board members. That compares to $59 \%$ and $21 \%$, respectively, last year.
» In total, boards added 395 new independent directors, down from 456 last year (the highest number of appointments since 2004). New directors appointed in 2022 represent $7 \%$ of all S\&P 500 directors.
> New directors range in age from 34 to 72, and the average age of new directors is 57.3, down slightly from 57.5 in 2021.

## The incoming class maintains the pace of progress on diversity, with $72 \%$ from historically underrepresented groups

» Just under half (46\%) of new directors are Black or African American, Asian, Hispanic or Latino/a, American Indian or Alaska Native or multiracial - down one point from 2021. The share of new directors who are women has increased to $46 \%$ from $43 \%$ last year.
» Together, directors from these historically underrepresented groups account for $72 \%$ of all new directors - the same as in 2021 and substantially more than in 2020 (59\%).
» For the second year in a row, nearly all the gains in the racial or ethnic diversity of the new class of directors are due to the increase in Black or African American directors.

- One quarter (26\%) of all new independent directors are Black or African American, a decrease from last year (33\%).
- The representation of Asian directors among new directors increased to $10 \%$ from $7 \%$ last year.
- Hispanic or Latino/a directors make up 8\% of new directors, a slight increase from $7 \%$ last year but significantly lower than representation among the U.S. population according to the U.S. Census Bureau.
» Two-hundred and forty-three companies (50\%) report a commitment to diverse slates when considering new directors, often known as a Rooney Rule policy - up from 39\% in 2021 and $24 \%$ in 2020.
» Among the 83 boards that added one or more directors, 100 directors were from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups, which includes 62 women.
» Eighty-three boards expanded in size to add racial or ethnic diversity. These boards added a total of 114 directors ( 77 men and 37 women) who are Black or African American, Asian, Hispanic or Latino/a, American Indian or Alaska Native or multiracial.

NEW S\&P 500 DIRECTORS: ONE-, FIVE- AND 10-YEAR BREAKDOWN BY GENDER AND RACE/ETHNICITY

|  | 2022 | 2021 | 2017 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New directors | 395 | 456 | 397 | 291 |
| \% women | 46\% | 43\% | 36\% | 26\% |
| \% underrepresented racial/ethnic group <br> (Black or African American, Asian, Hispanic or Latino/a, American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander or two or more races) | 46\% | 47\% | 21\% | 12\% |
| \% Black or African American | 26\% | 33\% | 11\% | 5\% |
| \% Asian | 10\% | 7\% | 7\% | 2\% |
| \% Hispanic or Latino/a | 8\% | 7\% | 3\% | 5\% |
| \% American Indian or Alaska Native | <1\% | <1\% | N/A | N/A |
| \% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 0\% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| \% Two or more races (multiracial) | 1\% | <1\% | N/A | N/A |
| \% Female | 20\% | 18\% | 6\% | 4\% |
| \% Male | 26\% | 29\% | 14\% | 8\% |
| \% of new directors from historically underrepresented groups (women and/or Black or African American, Asian, Hispanic or Latino/a, American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander or multiracial men and/or LGTBQ+ when disclosed) | 72\% | 72\% | 64\% | 35\% |

## DIRECTOR INTERVIEWS

## The value of diversity

One of the most striking trends in recent editions of the U.S. Spencer Stuart Board Index has been the rapid growth in the diversity of appointments to S\&P 500 boards.
"There's no question in my mind that having diverse voices around the table - be it experiences, be it age, ethnicity, gender, or anything that brings a different perspective - results in better decision making," says Mike Calbert, chair of the boards at Dollar General Corporation and PVH Corporation.

Performance is the ultimate driver of board diversity, says Calbert: "We do it because it makes for a better board." Its impact lies in bringing different perspectives to bear on the business's challenges. "It's very easy to get into a groupthink kind of mentality if everybody has the same set of experiences and backgrounds."

Donna Zarcone, who serves on four corporate boards, including CDW and Cigna, agrees that board diversity hugely benefits companies. CEOs need to be highly focused on the operational challenges of running the business. Hence, the board plays a vital role in providing an "outside-in" perspective, says Zarcone, "shining light on blind spots and potential risks." That impact is why companies face pressure from institutional investors and proxy advisors to improve diversity, she adds.

## One-third of new directors are serving in their first outside public company board role

» Just over one-third (34\%) of the S\&P 500 directors appointed in the 2022 proxy year are serving on their first public company board, down one point from 2021 but still higher than in 2020 (28\%).

- Three-quarters of first-time directors ( $75 \%$ ) are actively employed. Only $2 \%$ are actively employed private company CEOs serving on their first public company board.
- The average age of first-time directors is 54.4, about three years younger than the average age of all new directors overall (57.3).
- Eighty-two percent of first-time directors are from historically underrepresented groups, down from 2021 ( $86 \%$ ) but still substantially higher than in 2020 ( $65 \%$ ) or five years ago ( $55 \%$ in 2017).


## NEW S\&P 500 DIRECTORS: FIRST-TIME DIRECTOR SNAPSHOT

|  | 2022 | 2021 | 2017 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% of all new directors | 34\% | 35\% | 30\% | 30\% |
| First-time directors from historically underrepresented groups | 82\% | 86\% | 55\% | N/A |
| First-time directors who are women | 44\% | 45\% | 42\% | 27\% |
| First-time directors from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups | 61\% | 65\% | 21\% | 13\% |
| Black or African American | 34\% | 45\% | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 16\% | 13\% | N/A | N/A |
| Hispanic or Latino/a | 10\% | 7\% | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1\% | 0\% | N/A | N/A |
| Two or more races (multiracial) | 1\% | 1\% | N/A | N/A |
| Women from racial/ethnic underrepresented groups | 23\% | 24\% | 8\% | N/A |

## S\&P 500 NEW DIRECTOR BACKGROUNDS

|  | First-time |  |  | Non-first-time |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Active \# | Retired \# | Total \% | Active \# | Retired \# | Total \% |
| CEOs | 2 | 0 | 2\% | 51 | 46 | 37\% |
| Chairs/presidents/COOs | 4 | 0 | 3\% | 7 | 2 | 3\% |
| Functional and other line leaders | 32 | 10 | 32\% | 11 | 25 | 14\% |
| Financial executives/CFOs | 19 | 2 | 16\% | 7 | 16 | 9\% |
| Division/subsidiary leaders | 21 | 5 | 20\% | 3 | 21 | 9\% - |
| Investment managers/investors | 3 | 1 | 3\% | 15 | 3 | 7\% = |
| Academics/nonprofit | 3 | 0 | 2\% | 13 | 1 | 5\% |
| Lawyers/general counsel | 7 | 4 | 8\% - | 6 | 4 | 4\% |
| Consultants | 0 | 2 | 2\% | 4 | 3 | 3\% |
| Bankers/investment bankers | 3 | 4 | 5\% = | 2 | 9 | 4\% |
| Public accounting executives | 1 | 0 | 1\% | 0 | 2 | 1\% |
| Others | 5 | 5 | 8\% = | 5 | 6 | 4\% |
| Total | 100 | 33 | 100\% | 124 | 138 | 100\% |

## Directors aged 50 and younger make up $18 \%$ of new directors and $6 \%$ of all directors

» Next-gen directors, aged 50 and younger, account for $18 \%$ of the incoming class of 2022 , up from $16 \%$ in 2021.
» Fifty-six percent of new next-gen directors are from underrepresented racial or ethnic groups - down from 69\% in 2021 but still considerably higher than in 2020 (40\%).
» Fifty-five percent of all next-gen directors are serving on their first public company board, and 56\% of these new next-gen directors are women.
» The most common industry backgrounds for new next-gen directors are technology ( $31 \%$ ), consumer ( $21 \%$ ) and financial services ( $10 \%$ ).
» Next-gen directors make up 6\% of S\&P 500 independent directors, the same as last year.

## DIRECTOR INTERVIEWS

## Next-gen directors: Facing new challenges

The increase in next-gen director appointments reflects a desire among many boards to bring in expertise relevant to the new challenges facing their businesses, says Frank Blake, a director on the board of Macy's. "There is a desire among many boards to have people who bring a fresh vantage point on the business," particularly from "digital natives," says Blake. "That has definitely led to younger board members."

As they focus on new, highly technical areas such as cybersecurity, boards are now debating the relative importance of board experience versus specialist skills and experience when making director appointments, says Mike Calbert, who chairs the boards at Dollar General Corporation and PVH Corporation. "In some of these areas, you're going to see a lot offirst-time board members because their domain expertise is critical," he argues.

An alternative being adopted by many companies, says Calbert, is to have specialists report directly to the board on key focus areas.

Wayne Hewett, who serves on the boards of The Home Depot, UPS and Wells Fargo \& Company, likewise points out the value of external expertise, particularly where boards are tackling developing areas such as ESG. "We're selectively finding people to come give presentations and deep dives to the board," says Hewett. "I've seen a lot more of that."

## Half of new directors have international experience

» Fifty percent of new directors have experience working internationally (defined as having spent time working in a non-U.S. location), up from $34 \%$ last year.

## NEW DIRECTORS APPOINTED TO S\&P 500 BOARDS WITH INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE


» Sixteen percent of new independent directors were born outside the U.S., the same proportion as in 2021.
» Thirteen percent of new directors born outside the U.S. are active CEOs and another $19 \%$ are retired CEOs. A further $19 \%$ are division/ subsidiary leaders.

## DIRECTOR INTERVIEWS

## The value of a global perspective

International business experience can be a huge advantage for directors. "It's always a plus," says Frank Blake, director at Macy's and former chair and CEO of The Home Depot, especially for companies with overseas operations or global supply chains.

Fred Diaz, who serves on four corporate boards, including Archer Aviation and Valero Energy Corporation, says the value of international experience reflects the reality of global business. "The globe is getting so small now," he says. Working overseas forces executives "to get out of their shell" and can help them develop broader perspectives. Diaz says his own international assignments have regularly been valuable in his subsequent board roles: "I'm quite surprised at how often I fall back on that international experience to help me with problem-solving input."

## Functional and division corporate executives are the most common new director backgrounds

" Active and retired CEOs account for $23 \%$ of new directors, slightly up from last year (22\%) but down from 30\% in 2017 and 37\% in 2012.
» One-third ( $33 \%$ ) of new S\&P 500 directors are other active and retired corporate executives, excluding CEOs but including functional and division or subsidiary executives - the same number as last year, up from $24 \%$ five years ago and $22 \%$ a decade ago.
» Fifty-six percent of new directors today are actively employed, a decline from $62 \%$ a decade ago.
» The technology, consumer and financial services sectors are the largest sources of new directors, accounting for $17 \%, 13 \%$ and $12 \%$ of new independent directors, respectively.
» The top industry destinations for new independent directors in 2022 are the technology and financial sectors, which appointed $17 \%$ and $15 \%$ of new directors, respectively. The technology sector makes up $15 \%$ of all S\&P 500 boards and the financial sector $13 \%$.
» Twenty-one percent of new directors have some experience in the government or the military, compared to $19 \%$ in 2021.

S\&P 500 DIRECTORS: NEW INDEPENDENT DIRECTORS' FUNCTIONAL BACKGROUNDS

|  |  | 2022 | 2021 | 2017 | 2012 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Active CEOs/chairs/presidents/COOs | $\mathbf{1 4 \%}$ | $14 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $25 \%$ |  |
| Retired CEOs/chairs/presidents/COOs | $\mathbf{1 2 \%}$ | $12 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $16 \%$ |  |
| Division/subsidiary leaders | $13 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $12 \%$ |  |
| Line and functional leaders | $20 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $10 \%$ |  |
| Financial backgrounds | $23 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $22 \%$ |  |


» New independent directors from historically underrepresented groups are more likely to be functional leaders but less likely to be active or retired CEOs.

## DIRECTOR INTERVIEWS

## Domain expertise and judgment

Our leader interviews suggest that a key driver of changes in new directors' backgrounds - as with the rising numbers of next-gen director appointments - is the boards' desire to bring in domain expertise relevant to the emerging challenges they face, such as digital and cybersecurity.

However, Frank Blake, director at Macy's and former chair and CEO of The Home Depot, argues that domain expertise is less important than sound business judgment. "The overriding skill that you're trying to recruit for a board is mature judgment," he argues, "because, as I tell CEOs, when you most need your board is when it's raining frogs." In a crisis, says Blake, "you want people around the table who have mature, thoughtful judgment — having a particular slice of knowledge is far less important."

Boards are making a mistake if they appoint directors as "the senator for cybersecurity or the senator for digital," Blake continues. "Everyone shares in the responsibility for oversight of the company. That's the first obligation."

S\&P 500: NEW INDEPENDENT DIRECTOR FUNCTIONAL BACKGROUNDS

|  | All new directors | Black or African American | Asian | Hispanic or Latino/a | Men | Women |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional and other line leaders | 20\% | 27\% | 28\% | 27\% | 15\% | 25\% |
| Financial executives/CFOs/treasurers | 12\% | 10\% | 10\% | 18\% | 11\% | 11\% |
| Active CEOs | 13\% | 6\% | 15\% | 6\% | 17\% | 9\% |
| Division/subsidiary leaders | 12\% | 13\% | 18\% | 9\% | 14\% | 11\% |
| Retired CEOs | 12\% | 1\% | 0\% | 12\% | 17\% | 5\% |
| Investment managers/investors | 6\% | 8\% | 5\% | 3\% | 7\% | 4\% |
| Academics/nonprofit executives | 4\% | 8\% | 3\% | 3\% | 2\% | 7\% |
| General counsel/lawyers | 5\% | 7\% | 5\% | 3\% | 2\% | 9\% |
| Bankers/investment bankers | 4\% | 6\% | 5\% | 3\% | 3\% | 7\% |
| Public accounting executives | 1\% | 1\% | 3\% | 3\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Active chairs/presidents/COOs | 3\% | 3\% | 5\% | 0\% | 3\% | 3\% |
| Consultants | 2\% | 1\% | 3\% | 0\% | 1\% | 3\% |
| Retired chairs/presidents/COOs | 1\% | 0\% | 3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Others | 5\% | 10\% | 0\% | 12\% | 7\% | 3\% |

## Boards have 10.8 directors on average

" S\&P 500 boards have, on average, 10.8 directors - the same number as in 2021 and 2017 and just fractionally up compared to a decade ago ( 10.7 in 2012 ). They range in size from six to 21 members, with $72 \%$ in the 9 -to-12-member range.
» Eighty-six percent of all S\&P 500 board directors are independent, largely consistent with the past several years. Boards average 9.3 independent directors and 1.5 non-independent directors.
» The CEO is the only non-independent director on $65 \%$ of S\&P 500 boards, up one point from 2021 and compared with $59 \%$ in 2012 - a $10 \%$ shift over the decade.

## Nearly $90 \%$ of boards have annual director elections and majority voting for directors

» Over the past decade, most S\&P 500 boards have moved to a declassified board structure, where directors stand for election by shareholders annually. Today, $89 \%$ of boards have one-year terms down one point from 2021 and compared with $83 \%$ in 2012. The remaining $11 \%$ of boards have three-year terms.

## S\&P 500 DIRECTORS: TERM LENGTHS

|  |  | 2022 | 2021 |  | 2012 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 year | $89 \%$ | $90 \%$ |  | $83 \%$ | $=$ |
| 3 years | $11 \%$ | $10 \%$ |  | $17 \%$ | $=$ |

» Eighty-eight percent of boards have policies requiring directors to offer their resignation if they fail to receive a majority vote from shareholders. Boards retain the discretion to accept or decline a director's resignation.

## Average board tenure has declined by a year over the past decade

» The average tenure of independent directors on S\&P 500 boards is 7.8 years, up slightly from 2021 (7.7) but almost a year less on average than in 2012 ( 8.6 years). Median tenure is 6.0 years, compared to 8.4 years a decade ago.
» Just under half of the independent directors (46\%) have served for five or fewer years, the same as last year. Twenty-eight percent have served for $6-10$ years, $14 \%$ for $11-15$ years and $13 \%$ for 16 years or more. The longest-serving director has been on the board for 48 years.
>) About two-thirds of S\&P 500 boards (67\%) have an average tenure between six and 10 years. The longest average board tenure is 18 years.

## S\&P 500 DIRECTORS: AVERAGE TENURE OF INDEPENDENT DIRECTORS



## DIRECTOR INTERVIEWS

## Managing board tenure

Boards are paying increasing attention to how they manage tenure, thanks in part to the increasing appointment of next-gen directors, says Wayne Hewett, director of The Home Depot, UPS and Wells Fargo \& Company. "Some of the experience that boards are seeking results in younger people coming in," he explains. "But if you bring somebody in who is 50, and they're on the board till they're 72, you're going to end up with less turnover on your board." It is a question of balance, argues Hewett: Turnover can bring in fresh perspectives, but boards also benefit from experienced directors, as long as they remain relevant.

Frank Blake, who sits on the board at Macy's, agrees on the need for boards to manage tenure. "We all develop biases to the decisions we've made, so some board turnover is important and healthy," he says. "Either formal or informal notions of tenure are a good idea," he says, pointing out that with younger directors being appointed, tenure limits make more sense than retirement age limits. "If you put somebody on the board who's 42 , and your retirement age is 72 , you don't really want the person on the board for 30 years."

Approaches to managing tenure vary widely. Hewett describes one board that has one-year renewable terms, while Donna Zarcone, who sits on the boards of CDW Corporation and Cigna, describes one board that put in place a 12 -year term limit. "It's rare," she says, "but we have absolutely stuck to that limit. We see great board members that are rolling off - and we see great new board members coming on."

## Most boards require director resignations when an employment situation changes

» Eighty-eight percent of S\&P 500 boards require directors who experience a change in employment status or job responsibilities to offer their resignation, up from $85 \%$ in 2021. The board chair or the nominating committee chair typically can accept or decline the resignation at their discretion.
» Specific policies for company CEOs are less common. Only 35\% of S\&P 500 boards specifically require the CEO to submit their resignation from the board when the CEO's employment with the company ends. In all cases, boards retain the discretion to accept or decline the resignation.

## Many boards limit additional board activity by directors and CEOs

》 Eighty percent of S\&P 500 boards report having some limit on directors accepting other corporate directorships, up from $77 \%$ last year and $74 \%$ a decade ago. Limits take different forms; some apply to all directors, while others apply only to audit committee members or directors who are public company CEOs.

- Seventy percent of boards report having a numerical limit for outside corporate directorships that applies to all directors, up from $67 \%$ in 2021. Most of these boards limit members to three or four additional directorships.
- Forty-four percent restrict the number of other audit committees on which their audit committee members may serve (nearly all limit this to no more than two other audit committees), up two percentage points from last year.

》 Ninety-eight boards do not report specific limits on additional board service; 98\% of these boards require directors to notify the board chair before accepting an invitation to join another company board or encourage directors to "reasonably limit" their other board service commitments.
» One-quarter of S\&P 500 boards report a specific limit on the number of outside boards on which their CEOs may serve. Nearly all of those limit CEOs to one or two outside boards. Two boards allow their CEOs to serve on three outside corporate boards.
» Fifty-nine percent of S\&P 500 CEOs do not serve on a public corporate board in addition to their own board, compared with $60 \%$ last year and $54 \%$ a decade ago. Of the 200 CEOs with an outside board commitment, only nine serve on more than one outside corporate board.


## S\&P 500 DIRECTORS: BOARDS WITH LIMITS ON ADDITIONAL CORPORATE DIRECTORSHIPS

|  | All or retired directors | Full-time employed | Audit committee |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $0 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| 2 | $3 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| 3 | $38 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| 4 | $26 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| 5 | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| 6 | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Total boards | $70 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $44 \%$ |

## Independent directors serve on two boards on average

» On average, independent directors on S\&P 500 boards have 2.1 public corporate board affiliations, the same number as last year, five years ago and a decade ago.
" Thirty-five percent have just one board affiliation, $33 \%$ have two, $21 \%$ have three, $10 \%$ have four and $1 \%$ have five. No S\&P 500 directors serve on six boards or more.

## Few boards have established director term limits

» Just 35 S\&P 500 boards (7\%) report having term limits for non-executive directors, four more than last year. Term limits range from 10 to 20 years, with 24 boards ( $69 \%$ of those with them) setting limits at 15 years or more.
» Sixty-four percent of boards explicitly state in their corporate governance guidelines that they do not have term limits. Twenty-eight percent do not mention term limits. Four companies (1\%) disclose that director terms are not unlimited but do not specify a number.
» Hybrid tenure policies are emerging. For example, Microsoft's tenure policy targets an average tenure of 10 years or less for the board's independent directors.

## Half of boards with mandatory retirement set the age at 75 or older

》 Seventy percent of S\&P 500 boards disclose that they have a mandatory retirement age for directors, the same as last year. This has declined modestly during the past 10 years - from $73 \%$ in 2012.
» Fifty-three percent of boards with mandatory retirement ages set them at 75 or older.
» Eighteen percent of boards report not having a mandatory retirement age, while $12 \%$ do not discuss mandatory retirement in their corporate governance guidelines.

of S\&P 500 boards disclose that they have a mandatory retirement age for directors

of boards with mandatory retirement ages set them at 75 or older

of boards report not having a mandatory retirement age

S\&P 500: MANDATORY RETIREMENT AGES AMONG BOARDS WITH RETIREMENT POLICIES

|  | 2022 | 2017 | 2012 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boards with a retirement policy | $70 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $73 \%$ |
| 70 and younger | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| 71 | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| 72 | $36 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $54 \%$ |
| 73 | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| 74 | $5 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| 75 and older | $53 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $22 \%$ |

## DIRECTOR INTERVIEWS

## Managing retirement

Fred Diaz, director of four companies including Archer Aviation, says mandatory retirements still have a role to play. "Having mandatory age restrictions is really important because it removes the awkwardness of needing to have a difficult conversation with somebody about stepping down when they have served the company quite well for many years," he says. "While it is critical to have a strong balance of experienced and new board members, a healthy board refreshment protocol is essential to keeping up with ever-changing market and industry dynamics, to best serve our stakeholders."

Most importantly, boards with defined retirement ages can clearly anticipate their future replacement needs well in advance, says Diaz, and plan accordingly. One of his boards is expecting a significant turnover of directors in the next two to three years, he explains. "We're properly studying, in detail, where our gaps are and where we believe our needs are for the corporation going forward so we can look for those talent specifications as we do our deep dive director searches."

Mike Calbert, who chairs the boards at Dollar General Corporation and PVH Corporation, suggests that boards need to be flexible and use individual evaluations to manage both retirement ages and tenure. "IfI had Warren Buffett on my board, and he was in his gos and had been on the board 15 years, would I think it's the right thing for shareholders to roll him off my board? No, not at all. Who would roll Warren Buffett off their board?" Retirement should be "individual-specific," says Calbert. Assessing individual directors' performance and independence remains key.

## Average and median director ages have increased by a year in the past decade

» The average age of independent directors of S\&P 500 boards is 63.1, compared with 62.6 in 2012. The median age is 64 , versus 63 a decade ago.
» Independent directors range from 34 to 98 years old. Most directors ( $51 \%$ ) are in their 6os.
» Similarly, most boards (85\%) have an average board age in the 6os. Twelve percent have an average age of 59 or younger, and $12 \%$ have an average age of 70 or older.

of boards have an average board age in the 60s

S\&P 500: AVERAGE AGE OF INDEPENDENT DIRECTORS

|  | 2022 | 2017 | 2012 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average age of all independent directors | 63.1 | 63.1 | 62.6 |
| Youngest average board age | 50 | 46 | 43 |
| Oldest average board age | 74 | 75 | 72 |

S\&P 500: PERCENTAGE OF BOARDS WITHIN AVERAGE AGE RANGE

|  | 2022 |  | 2017 |  | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 59 and younger | 12\% | 16\% |  | 16\% |  |
| 60-63 | 40\% | 45\% |  | 46\% |  |
| 64 and older | 47\% | 39\% |  | 38\% |  |

## The number of women directors continues to rise

» Female representation continues to tick up. Women comprise $32 \%$ of S\&P 500 board directors in total, up from $30 \%$ last year and $28 \%$ the year before, compared with $22 \%$ in 2017 and $17 \%$ in 2012 .
» All S\&P 500 boards have at least one woman director and only $2 \%$ of boards have only one woman. Ninety-eight percent of boards include two or more women directors, compared with $61 \%$ in 2012. Thirty-seven percent of boards today have three female directors and another $44 \%$ compared with $36 \%$ last year - have four or more. In 2012, only $20 \%$ of boards had three or more female directors.
» Forty-six percent of the new directors appointed this year are women, up from $43 \%$ in 2021.

## S\&P 500 DIRECTORS: WOMEN DIRECTORS


» Women now chair $32 \%$ of board audit committees (up from $30 \%$ last year), $33 \%$ of compensation committees (up from $28 \%$ ) and $34 \%$ of nominating or governance committees (up from $29 \%$ ). Fourteen percent of independent board chairs are women, up from $8 \%$ in 2021, and $14 \%$ of lead or presiding directors are women, up one percentage point from last year.
» As of our cut-off date of April 30, 34 S\&P 500 boards (7\%) have a woman serving as CEO - five more than last year. This marks a new high point.

WOMEN IN S\&P 500 LEADERSHIP ROLES

|  | 2022 |  |  |  |  | 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CEO | 34 | 6.80\% |  | 29 | 5.80\% | = |
| Independent board chair | 24 | 14\% | $\square$ | 15 | 8\% | - |
| Lead/presiding director | 48 | 14\% |  | 46 | 13\% | $\square$ |
| Audit committee chair | 157 | 32\% |  | 149 | 30\% |  |
| Compensation committee chair | 159 | 33\% |  | 140 | 28\% |  |
| Nominating/governance committee chair | 164 | 34\% |  | 142 | 29\% | - |

# Nearly all boards disclose their racial or ethnic diversity, and appointments from historically underrepresented groups are increasing 

» Ninety-three percent of S\&P 500 boards disclosed their racial or ethnic composition, a substantial shift from 2021 (60\%). Forty-one percent of those boards identify directors from historically underrepresented groups by name, for those who volunteered to self-identify - up from 28\% last year.
» Ninety-nine percent of S\&P 500 boards have at least one director from a historically underrepresented group, defined as a woman, Black or African American, Asian, Hispanic or Latino/a, two or more races or ethnicities, American Indian or Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, compared with $92 \%$ in 2021.
» Despite the record number of new directors from historically underrepresented groups recruited during the 2022 proxy year, persistent low boardroom turnover means the overall representation of some demographic groups on S\&P 500 boards trails their representation in the U.S. population.

》 Twenty-two percent of all S\&P 500 directors are from an underrepresented racial or ethnic group, up one percentage point from last year. Forty-six percent of new directors are from such groups, down one point from 2021.

of S\&P 500 boards disclosed their racial or ethnic composition
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## S\&P 500 BOARD REPRESENTATION VERSUS U.S. POPULATION

|  |  | New S\&P 500 directors |  | All S\&P 500 directors |  | U.S. Census Bureau |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% women | 46\% |  | 32\% |  | 50.8\% |  |
| \% from underrepresented racial or ethnic groups | 46\% |  | 22\% | - | 42\% | $\bigcirc$ |
| \% Black or African American | 26\% |  | 11\% | - | 13.4\% | - |
| \% Hispanic and/or Latino/a | 8\% | - | 5\% | - | 18.5\% | $\square$ |
| \% Asian | 10\% |  | 6\% | - | 5.9\% | - |
| \% American Indian or Alaska Native | 0\% |  | <1\% | - | 1.3\% |  |
| \% Two or more races (multiracial) | 1\% |  | <1\% |  | 2.8\% | $\cdots$ |

» Fifty-six (11.5\%) S\&P 500 boards are led by Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino/a, Asian, American Indian or Alaska Native or multiracial CEOs. Companies led by underrepresented CEOs are more likely to have underrepresented directors on their boards.
» Only $9 \%$ of independent board chairs and $10 \%$ of lead independent board directors are from an underrepresented racial or ethnic group.

S\&P 500: UNDERREPRESENTED RACIAL OR ETHNIC GROUPS IN LEADERSHIP ROLES

| Independent board chair | $9 \%$ | $\%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lead/presiding director underrepresented racial or ethnic groups |  |  |
| Audit committee chair | $10 \%$ |  |
| Nominating/governance committee chair | $18 \%$ |  |
| Compensation committee chair | $15 \%$ |  |

## The majority of boards include at least one director born overseas

» More than two-thirds (68\%) of boards include at least one director born outside the U.S.
" The overall representation of non-U.S. directors increased slightly to $15 \%$ of all directors, from $14 \%$ in 2021.
» Women make up more than one-quarter (26\%) of directors born outside the U.S.

## Additional proxy disclosures on diversity are quickly becoming more common

» Seventy-four boards ( $15 \%$ ) included LGBTQ+ disclosure in their proxy statement, more than twice as many as in 2021 ( 32 boards, $6 \%$ ). This year, 29 boards ( $6 \%$ ) identified the LGBTQ+ status of individual directors. On these boards, a total of 45 LGBTQ+ directors were disclosed: 27 unnamed and 18 named, more than three times the number who were named in 2021 (5).
» Twenty-two boards disclosed having a military veteran on their board, up from three in 2021.
» One board disclosed having a director with disabilities.

## Slightly fewer boards separate the chair and CEO roles

» For over a decade, the U.S. Spencer Stuart Board Index has reported that a growing number of S\&P 500 boards have separated the chair and CEO roles. However, the number of boards where this is the case is slightly down this year, at $57 \%$, compared to $59 \%$ last year. A decade ago, $43 \%$ of boards split the chair and CEO roles.
» Boards have also generally been increasingly likely to name an independent chair - a director who meets applicable NYSE or Nasdaq rules for independence. Thirty-six percent of boards have an independent chair today, down slightly compared with last year (37\%). In 2012, 23\% of boards had an independent chair.
" As of last year, $15 \%$ of board chairs hold the title "executive chair" (non-CEO who is considered a company executive). Additionally, $4 \%$ are the former company CEO and $3 \%$ are non-independent directors, such as major investors, retired company executives other than the CEO and directors who are classified as company executives. $30 \%$ are considered non independent under listing standards.

》 Among the 104 boards where the chair is separate but not independent, nearly all (100, or 96\%) have identified a lead or presiding independent director.
» Four boards do not report having any form of independent board leadership, neither as a chair nor a lead or presiding director.

## S\&P 500 DIRECTORS: CHAIR'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE COMPANY



## DIRECTOR INTERVIEWS

## Separating chair and CEO responsibilities

Mike Calbert is an advocate of separating chair and CEO responsibilities, having served on a public company board in the UK, where such separation is the norm. "I developed an appreciation for why that's a better model than the CEO being chairman," he says.

Two factors are key, in Calbert's view. "Effectively leading the board is a big job, and the CEO already has a big job," he points out. "They don't need to be dealing with board issues; they need to have input."

The second factor is that it may be hard for a lead director to fulfill their role with true independence. "There is a tendency for politics with the CEO to come into play," observes Calbert, who currently sits on the boards of Dollar General Corporation and PVH Corporation. Lead directors may hold back for fear of upsetting a powerful CEO-chairman, while those CEOs can become defensive when challenged. An independent chairperson can build a more constructive relationship, consolidating and filtering feedback while providing constructive criticism and challenge where needed. "It makes a CEO's life a lot easier," says Calbert.
"The CEOs I work with where we have that model would totally agree," Calbert adds. "Other CEOs that like to be king of everything - chairman, president, CEO - obviously, they like their model. I just don't think it's as effective."

## The average tenure for independent chairs is four years

» Independent chairs on S\&P 500 boards are three years older on average than their fellow directors: 65.8 versus 63.1.
" Nearly all independent chairs (94\%) served on the board before becoming a chair, serving 7.6 years on average before their new appointment.
» Independent chair tenures range from less than one year to 21 years. The average tenure is 4.2 years, the same as a decade ago.
» Twenty-four women serve as independent chairs, compared with 15 in 2021.

of independent chairs served on the board before becoming a chair

## Fewer lead or presiding directors as more boards name an independent chair

» Sixty-eight percent of boards report having an independent lead or presiding director, declining from $70 \%$ last year and $92 \%$ a decade ago.
" Among boards with these roles, lead directors are far more common than presiding directors. Eighty-eight percent of the 334 boards with one of these roles have lead directors and $12 \%$ have presiding directors, including those identified as "chair of executive sessions." A decade ago, 58\% were lead directors and $42 \%$ were presiding directors.

S\&P 500: LEAD OR PRESIDING DIRECTORS

» Eighty-seven percent of boards with a lead or presiding director disclosed their tenure. On average, lead or presiding directors have served in the role for 4.4 years, more than a year longer than the average a decade ago - 3.2 years.

## Retired CEOs and investors are the most common independent chairs and lead directors

》 A majority of the 176 independent chairs (53\%) are retired CEOs, chairs, vice chairs, presidents or COOs. Investors and investment managers are the next most common profile, representing $15 \%$ of independent chairs.
» Twelve active top executives, including six public company CEOs, are independent chairs, representing $7 \%$ of the total. A decade ago, 110 boards had independent chairs, 10 of whom (9\%) were active CEOs, chairs, presidents or COOs.
» Similar to independent chairs, the most common backgrounds of lead and presiding directors are retired CEOs, chairs, vice chairs, presidents or COOs (44\%) and investors and investment managers (12\%). Active executives in these top roles are somewhat more likely to serve as a lead or presiding director than an independent chair, but half as likely than a decade ago to serve in the role - $8 \%$ versus $16 \%$ in 2012.


of independent chairs are retired CEOs, chairs, vice chairs, presidents or COOs

S\&P 500: INDEPENDENT CHAIR AND LEAD OR PRESIDING DIRECTOR BACKGROUNDS

|  | Ret pres | Investor/ investment manager | Bankers/financial executives/CFOs/ public accounting | Active chair/ president/CEO | Academics/ nonprofit executives | Others* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Independent chair | 53\% | 15\% - | 12\% = | 7\% | 3\% | 10\% |
| Lead or presiding director | 44\% | 12\% = | 15\% = | 8\% = | 4\% | 16\% |

[^0]
## Board Organization and Process



## Getting back to normal on the number of board meetings

» The number of board meetings headed back towards normal after a year in which the COVID19 pandemic and social unrest buffeted businesses. S\&P 500 boards met 8.3 times on average, compared to 9.4 in 2021, including regularly scheduled and special meetings. While still higher than in 2020 ( 7.9 meetings), the average number of meetings this year was the same as in 2012.
" Boards had as few as four meetings and as many as 29. Just over one-quarter (26\%) met 10 or more times, compared with more than one-third (36\%) in 2021.
» The share of boards meeting five or fewer times has increased in the past several years, reaching $27 \%$ in 2020 before falling to $14 \%$ in 2021. In this proxy year, $20 \%$ of boards met five times or less.

S\&P 500: DISTRIBUTION OF BOARD MEETINGS*

|  |  | 2022 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 or fewer meetings | $20 \%$ |  |  |  |
| $6-9$ meetings | $52 \%$ |  | $14 \%$ | $=$ |
| $10-12$ meetings | $16 \%$ |  | $49 \%$ |  |
| 13 or more meetings | $10 \%$ |  | $19 \%$ | $=$ |

*Includes in-person and telephonic regular and special meetings.

## DIRECTOR INTERVIEWS

## Board meetings, committees and one-on-one time

After the unprecedented challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic, many boards appear to be returning to a more normal pattern of meetings.

How boards meet has also been changing, not least due to pandemic lockdowns. Wayne Hewett, who chairs the board at Cambrex Corporation, says boards are evolving their use of videoconferencing. "Boards are trying to say, 'How do I incorporate that technology as part of my rotation of board meetings?' That's clearly a change."

Hewett observes that board members are also spending time with the company in different ways. "One-on-one time between a board director and the management team gives you a lot of different insights," he says. "It helps with succession planning, and it also helps board members to get a better sense of the issues that individual managers are talking about. I've definitely seen that increasing."

## Boards have four standing committees on average

» S\&P 500 boards have an average of 4.2 standing committees. The average and the median number of committees - 4- have remained mostly unchanged for the past decade. The highest number of committees is eight, up one compared to last year.
» Seventy-one percent have more than the three NYSE-mandated committees (audit, compensation and nominating or governance). In addition to these, the finance and executive committees are the most common.
» A growing number of boards have a standalone science and technology committee: $15 \%$ compared with $13 \%$ last year and $7 \%$ a decade ago.
» Three boards have a dedicated DE\&I committee - down one compared with last year.

## S\&P 500: STANDING COMMITTEES



S\&P 500: PREVALENCE AND INDEPENDENCE OF STANDING COMMITTEES

|  |  | 2022 |  | 2021 |  | 2017 |  | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Audit | 100\% |  | 100\% |  | 100\% |  | 100\% |  |
| Compensation/HR | 100\% |  | 100\% |  | 100\% |  | 100\% |  |
| Nominating/Governance | 99.80\% |  | 99.80\% | - | 99.60\% |  | 99.20\% |  |
| Finance | 28\% | - | 27\% | - | 31\% | - | 34\% | - |
| Executive | 25\% | - | 27\% | - | 32\% | - | 35\% | - |
| Science \& Technology | 15\% | - | 13\% | - | 10\% | - | 7\% | - |
| Risk | 12\% | $-$ | 12\% |  | 11\% | - | 8\% | - |
| Environment, Health \& Safety | 12\% | , | 11\% | - | 9\% | - | 7\% | = |
| Public Policy/Social \& CorporateResponsibility | 7\% |  | 7\% |  | 9\% |  | 12\% | - |
| Legal/Compliance | 7\% | , | 6\% |  | 6\% |  | 5\% | - |
| Investment/Pension | 3\% |  | 3\% | $\stackrel{ }{ }$ | 3\% | $\cdots$ | 3\% | $\square$ |
| Acquisitions/Corporate Development | 2\% |  | 2\% | $\checkmark$ | 1\% | $\square$ | 1\% | - |
| Strategy \& Planning | 1\% | $\square$ | 2\% | $\checkmark$ | 2\% | $\stackrel{\square}{ }$ | 4\% |  |

## Board committees met slightly less

## often on average

》 Audit committees met 8.2 times on average, compared with 8.4 last year and 8.7 a decade ago. The number of audit committee meetings ranged from one to 23 , with a median of eight meetings.
» Compensation committees averaged 6.0 meetings, compared with 6.2 last year and 6.4 a decade ago.
» Nominating or governance committees held an average of 4.7 meetings, the same number as last year and a decade ago.

## Retired CEOs and finance leaders are most likely to chair board committees

> Sixty-two percent of audit committee chairs have a financial background, including CFOs and other corporate financial leaders, public accounting executives, investors, bankers or investment bankers; another $25 \%$ are active or retired CEOs, chairs, presidents, COOs and vice chairs.

》 Twenty-seven percent of all directors are identified as audit committee financial experts.
» Chairs of compensation and nominating or governance committees are most likely to be retired CEOs, chairs, vice chairs, presidents and COOs; $34 \%$ of compensation committee chairs and $34 \%$ of nominating committee chairs have these backgrounds.
» Active CEOs, chairs, presidents and COOs serve as chairs of just 5\% of audit committees, $10 \%$ of compensation committees and $7 \%$ of nominating or governance committees. A decade ago, these leaders were generally twice as likely to hold such roles; working CEOs, chairs, presidents and COOs chaired $10 \%$ of audit committees, $20 \%$ of compensation committees and $14 \%$ of nominating or governance committees in 2012.
of audit committee chairs have a financial background

of all directors are identified as audit committee financial experts

## Nearly half of boards report conducting individual director evaluations

» Ninety-eight percent of boards - all but 10 - report conducting some sort of annual performance evaluation.
» Forty-seven percent of boards disclose that they have some form of individual director evaluation.
» Twenty-five percent of boards report working with an independent third party to facilitate the evaluation process, versus $20 \%$ last year.
> Fifty-six percent of boards include a director skills matrix in their proxies, up from $45 \%$ in 2021.

ANNUAL BOARD, COMMITTEE AND DIRECTOR EVALUATIONS

|  | 2022 |  | 2021 |  | 2022 |  | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Full board and committees | 47\% | 47\% |  | 54\% | = | 51\% | - |
| Full board, committees and directors | 47\% | 45\% |  | 33\% | - | 31\% | - |
| Full board only | 5\% | 6\% |  | 9\% | - | 13\% | - |
| Full board and director | 1\% | 2\% |  | 4\% | - | 5\% | - |

## DIRECTOR INTERVIEWS

## The importance of director evaluations

According to According to Donna Zarcone, who sits on the boards of firms including Quinnox and The Duchossois Group, director evaluations are crucial in determining the effectiveness of a board. "Increasing the effectiveness of board evaluations at the board level, at the committee level and at the individual member level is going to be critical," she says. "And there's additional pressure to disclose the individual competencies of each board member to demonstrate that they have the relevant skills fit for the future purpose of the organization."

In addition, Mike Calbert describes a positive shift from self-assessment to evaluations carried out by management or third parties. "The boards I'm on are moving more in the direction of having management input on director evaluations - that wasn't the case five-plus years ago. It was just the board evaluating themselves. I think it's really helpful for board members to read what management or their peers think they're doing well and think they need to improve on."

## Director Compensation

## 2022 Snapshot



Stock grants and cash represent the largest share of director compensation:

## $56 \% 37 \%$

respectively

## $76 \%$ <br> 

of S\&P 500 boards provide stock grants to directors in addition to a cash retainer

The average annual retainer for S\&P 500 directors increased by 3\% to
\$136,133


The average total compensation for S\&P 500 directors increased by about 3\%, from

## \$305,808

 ${ }^{\circ} \$ 316,097^{*}$*This is the total excluding independent chair's compensation. Total including independent chair's compensation is $\$ 322,015$.

## Average total director compensation increases by 3\% to \$316,091

» Excluding premium compensation for the independent board chair, the average total compensation per director increased by $3 \%$, from $\$ 305,808$ to $\$ 316,091$.
» The average total compensation for directors, including the chair's fee, also rose by $3 \%$ to $\$ 322,015$ from \$312,279 last year.
» Stock grants represent the largest share of director compensation, at $56 \%$ - the same proportion as last year. And these are again followed by cash at $37 \%$ of compensation - up one point from last year.
» The composition of equity awards has shifted significantly over the past two decades, with fewer companies granting options and more providing stock awards. This year, $11 \%$ of boards disclosed that they award stock options to directors - down from 25\% in 2012.
» Sixty-nine percent of boards have deferred compensation plans, down one point from 2021. This number has not changed much over the past 20 years; in 2002, it stood at 68\%, and in 2012 it was 72\%.

BREAKDOWN OF DIRECTOR COMPENSATION: 2022 VS 2021


* Includes deferred compensation amounts.
** All other compensation consists of the following: insurance premiums, charitable award programs and the incremental cost to company of products provided.


## Average retainer rises 3\% to \$136,133

» The average annual retainer for S\&P 500 independent board directors is $\$ 136,133,3 \%$ higher than last year's average of \$131,664.
» The average retainer has increased by $2-3 \%$ each year over the past five years and by $13 \%$ overall since 2017.
» Retainers vary widely across the S\&P 500. The lowest board retainer is $\$ 20,000$, and the highest is $\$ 375,000$, which is paid partially in equity.

》 Thirty-four percent of boards pay retainers of less than \$100,000, including 13 companies with retainers under $\$ 50,000$ - one more than last year. At the other end of the spectrum, 41 companies (8\%) pay retainers of $\$ 300,000$ or more, up from 29 companies (6\%) in 2021. In total, $65 \%$ of boards pay a retainer of at least $\$ 100,000$.


The average annual retainer for S\&P 500 independent board directors

\$375,000

The highest retainer, which is paid partially in equity

of boards pay retainers of less than \$100,000

of boards pay a retainer of at least $\$ 100,000$

ANNUAL RETAINERS*:


* Chart shows the \% of S\&P 500 firms that pay their board directors retainers within each range.
» The shift by S\&P 500 boards away from paying meeting fees continues. Only 24 boards, or $5 \%$, pay board meeting fees - down from 30 companies (6\%) last year. A decade ago, $33 \%$ paid meeting fees. Where they are paid, the average value of meeting fees is $\$ 2,767$, although they range between $\$ 900$ and $\$ 15,000$.


## CHANGES IN NON-EMPLOYEE DIRECTOR COMPENSATION, 2012-2022

|  | \% of boards paying this type |  | Average paid (\$) |  | \% change in value |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type of compensation | 2022 | 2012 | 2022 | 2012 |  | 1-year \% change |  | 10-year \% change |
| Board retainer* | 100\% | 100\% | \$136,133 | \$96,649 | 3\% | - | 41\% |  |
| Board meeting fees | 5\% | $33 \%$ | \$2,767 | \$2,224 | 4\% | = | 24\% |  |
| Committee chair retainer | 97\% | 92\% | \$23,558 | \$17,872 | 2\% | * | 32\% |  |
| Committee member retainer | 49\% | 38\% | \$11,964 | \$10,295 | 1\% | - | 16\% | - |
| Committee meeting fee | 6\% | $33 \%$ | \$1,775 | \$1,703 | -5\% | - | 4\% | - |
| Stock option awards | 11\% | 25\% | \$141,830 | \$72,105 | 13\% | - | 97\% |  |
| Supplemental stock awards | 76\% | 76\% | \$181,372 | \$122,479 | 2\% |  | 48\% |  |

* Dollar amounts for retainer do not include boards that do not pay a retainer or boards that do not provide a dollar equivalent for the retainer equity amount.


## On most boards, director compensation includes stock grants

» Three-quarters of boards (76\%) provide stock grants to directors in addition to a cash retainer, the same as last year and 2012. The average targeted dollar value of annual stock grants is \$181,372, up $2 \%$ from \$177,529 last year.
» Stock options, however, are less common today. Only $11 \%$ of boards grant stock options to directors, the same proportion as last year, compared with $25 \%$ a decade ago. The average disclosed value of annual stock option grants is \$141,830, up from \$125,934 last year - a nearly 13\% increase.
» A large majority of boards (93\%) disclose share ownership guidelines for directors, up from 92\% last year and $88 \%$ in 2012. Typically, these guidelines require directors to own a certain number of shares or a multiple of the retainer value within a specified number of years. The aim is to align directors' interests with those of shareholders.


$$
76 \%
$$

of boards provide stock grants to directors in addition to a cash retainer

of boards grant stock options to directors

of boards disclose share ownership guidelines for directors

## EQUITY COMPENSATION



## The premium for board leadership service varies by role

» Of the 176 S\&P 500 boards with independent board chairs, $91 \%$ provide the chair with additional compensation (worth an average of \$164,205, $\$ 71$ less than last year). The value of additional compensation for board chairs ranges from \$25,000 to \$585,000.
» Among boards with a lead or presiding director, $82 \%$ pay them additional compensation, averaging \$44,314. Lead directors are more likely than presiding directors to receive additional compensation $86 \%$ versus $51 \%$ - although the gap has narrowed since last year ( $87 \%$ versus $38 \%$ ).
» The average lead director premium is $\$ 44,309$, up $5 \%$ from last year. In 2021, the average premium paid to lead directors was $18 \%$ more than that paid to presiding directors, but that has reversed this year. The compensation for presiding directors is now aligned with lead director premiums at $\$ 44,375$, up from $\$ 35,595$ last year.

## Committee chair retainers vary

» Nearly all (97\%) of S\&P 500 boards provide a retainer to committee chairs, compared with $92 \%$ a decade ago.
» Among these boards, compared with the nominating or governance committee chair retainer, $88 \%$ pay a higher retainer to the audit committee chair and $55 \%$ pay more to the compensation committee chair.
» Just under half of the boards (49\%) provide a retainer for committee member service, slightly down from last year (51\%) but still higher than a decade ago (38\%). Twenty years ago, just 13\% of boards paid committee membership retainers.
» Like board meeting fees, attendance fees for committee meetings are less common today. Six percent of S\&P 500 boards pay committee meeting fees, down from $8 \%$ last year and $33 \%$ a decade ago. The average committee meeting fee is $\$ 1,775$.

of boards with independent board chairs provide the chair with additional compensation

of boards with a lead or presiding director pay them additional compensation

of S\&P 500 boards provide a retainer to committee chairs

## COMMITTEE RETAINERS

|  | Average committee retainers (\$) |  |  | \% of boards paying this type |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 | 2017 | 2012 | 2022 | 2017 | 2012 |
| All committee members |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Audit committee members | \$14,059 | \$13,446 | \$11,503 | 49\% | 45\% | N/A |
| Compensation committee members | \$11,398 | \$11,801 | \$10,915 | 37\% | 31\% | N/A |
| Nominating committee members | \$9,619 | \$9,434 | \$10,202 | 35\% | 30\% | N/A |
| All committee chairs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Audit committee chairs | \$28,744 | \$25,163 | \$22,504 | 97\% | 96\% | N/A |
| Compensation committee chairs | \$22,675 | \$19,983 | \$18,079 | 97\% | 95\% | N/A |
| Nominating committee chairs | \$19,179 | \$16,184 | \$13,035 | 96\% | 93\% | N/A |

## Average director compensation varies widely by sector

» The average total director compensation (excluding the independent chair's fee) varies significantly across industries, ranging from a low of $\$ 277,164$ in real estate to a high of $\$ 349,349$ in healthcare. The average compensation for directors of healthcare companies is $11 \%$ more than the S\&P 500 average. The average compensation for directors in the real estate sector trails the S\&P 500 average by $14 \%$.
" Stock awards account for $65 \%$ of director compensation among information technology companies - the biggest share of any sector. Utility companies rely least on stock awards. There, stock awards represent $47 \%$ of director compensation, and cash represents a larger share, at $51 \%$ of compensation. The sector where cash represents the smallest share of compensation is healthcare (31\%).
» S\&P 500 companies have generally reduced their use of stock options in director compensation, but stock options represent $10 \%$ or more of compensation in two sectors: consumer discretionary ( $13 \%$ ) and healthcare ( $10 \%$ ).

Real Estate

$$
\$ 277,164 \div \$ 349,349
$$

The average total director compensation (excluding the independent chair's fee) varies significantly across industries, ranging from a low of $\$ 277,164$ in real estate to a high of $\$ 349,349$ in healthcare.
65\%
of director compensation among information technology companies is given in stock

## AVERAGE COMPENSATION PER NON-EMPLOYEE DIRECTOR BY INDUSTRY*

|  | \% of total compensation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industry | Total average compensation (\$) | Cash fees** | Stock awards | Option value | All other compensation*** |
| Communication services | \$346,647 | 33\% | 60\% | 6\% | 1\% |
| Consumer discretionary | \$312,138 | 34\% | 52\% | 13\% | 1\% |
| Consumer staples | \$288,603 | 37\% | 57\% | 4\% | 2\% |
| Energy | \$318,442 | 40\% | 57\% | 0\% | 3\% |
| Financials | \$305,728 | 40\% | 57\% | 1\% | 2\% |
| Healthcare | \$349,349 | 31\% | 56\% | 10\% | 3\% |
| Industrials | \$303,401 | 41\% | 51\% | 6\% | 2\% |
| Information technology | \$338,372 | 32\% | 65\% | 2\% | 1\% |
| Materials | \$295,815 | 42\% | 56\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Real estate | \$277,164 | 38\% | 56\% | 4\% | 1\% |
| Utilities | \$324,581 | 51\% | 47\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Average | \$316,091 | 37\% | 56\% | 5\% | 2\% |
| * Based on total compensation per non-employee director tables included in 489 proxies this year. |  |  |  |  |  |
| *** Includes deferred compensation amounts. |  |  |  |  |  |
| All other compensation consists of the following: insurance premiums, charitable award programs and the incremental cost to the company of products provided. |  |  |  |  |  |

» The average total compensation for directors also varies according to company size. It ranges from a low of $\$ 275,532$ for directors of companies with revenues less than $\$ 2.5$ billion, down almost $3 \%$ from last year, to a high of $\$ 330,129$ for companies with revenues greater than $\$ 10$ billion, up nearly $2 \%$.
» For companies with sales between $\$ 2.5$ billion and $\$ 10$ billion, the average total compensation is $\$ 301,417$, an increase of nearly $5 \%$ since last year and $10 \%$ since 2017.

## AVERAGE DIRECTOR COMPENSATION BY SALES

|  | 2022 | 1-year change | 5-year change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than $\$ 2.5$ billion | $\$ 275,532$ | $-3 \%$ | $-1 \%$ |
| $\$ 2.5$ billion to $\$ 10$ billion | $\$ 301,417$ | $5 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Greater than $\$ 10$ billion | $\$ 330,129$ | $2 \%$ | $12 \%$ |

## Boards Around the World

Spencer Stuart publishes Board Indexes covering more than 25 countries around the world. The majority of these Board Indexes are published annually, with a few appearing on alternate years.


We have compiled

Compare nationally aggregated data from leading companies from North and South America, Europe and Asia Pacific across a wide range of measures.

Our more detailed International Comparison data set, previously published in printed editions of our Board Indexes, is now available online only.

## Visit spencerstuart.com/BATW for more details.

## Comparative Board Data

## Methodology

Based on the S\&P 500 as of April 30, 2022. Fiscal year 2021 company sales data obtained from Capital IQ; industry/sector categories from Capital IQ. All remaining data were pulled from the most recent DEFı4A proxy statements released between May 1, 2021, and April $30,2022$. Tenure includes time at company and the company's predecessors. Corporate boards classified as public company boards and all data on the number of corporate boards obtained from BoardEx as of April 30, 2022. Total average compensation per non-employee director is based on non-employee director compensation tables included in 489 proxies. The number includes all board and committee retainers and meeting fees, supplemental non-executive chairman and lead or presiding director fees, the value of equity compensation, and all other compensation paid in fiscal year 2021. Total current other corporate board affiliations for new directors were found by counting any public boards a director was on upon appointment to the new S\&P 500 board, including executive directorships. This information was found through proxy data and BoardEx data as of the company's most recent proxy. First-time directors have not previously served on any public company board, whether their own board or an outside board.


## COMMUNICATION SERVICES

| Advertising |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The Interpublic Group of Companies | 9,107.9 | 9 | 8 | Y | 65 | 10 | 74 | 9 | 100,000 | b | 334,186 | 36\% | 60\% | 0\% | 4\% |
| Omnicom Group | 14,289.4 | 10 | 9 | N | 66 | 9 | 75 | 8 | 90,000 | b, c | 333,375 | 48\% | 52\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Alternative Carriers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lumen Technologies | 19,687.0 | 11 | 10 | Y | 66 | 9 | 75 | 8 | 100,000 | b | 375,073 | 45\% | 55\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Broadcasting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fox Corporation | 12,909.0 | 8 | 6 | Y | 59 | 8 | - | 4 | 295,000 | d | 331,992 | 41\% | 59\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Paramount Global | 28,586.0 | 12 | 9 | Y | 68 | 5 | - | 11 | 100,000 | $b, c$ | 349,359 | 39\% | 57\% | 0\% | 4\% |
| Cable and Satellite |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Charter Communications | 51,682.0 | 13 | 12 | N | 59 | 10 | - | 12 | 120,000 | b, c | 353,132 | 29\% | 71\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Comcast Corporation | 116,385.0 | 9 | 8 | N | 67 | 10 | 72 | 5 | 110,000 | b,c | 327,239 | 40\% | 60\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| DISH Network Corporation | 17,881.1 | 8 | 4 | Y | 58 | 8 | - | 6 | 60,000 | d | 145,550 | 55\% | 0\% | 41\% | 4\% |

Integrated Telecommunication Services

| AT\&T | 168,864.0 | 13 | 12 | Y | 64 | 7 | 72 | 10 | 140,000 | b, c | 407,991 | 44\% | 54\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Verizon Communications | 133,613.0 | 11 | 10 | N | 63 | 7 | 72 | 11 | 125,000 | b | 332,500 | 47\% | 53\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Interactive Home Entertainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activision Blizzard | 8,803.0 | 10 | 8 | Y | 65 | 9 | - | 19 | 90,000 | b | 379,952 | 34\% | 66\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Electronic Arts | 5,629.0 | 8 | 7 | N | 58 | 11 | 72 | 10 | 60,000 | b, c | 351,956 | 25\% | 74\% | 1\% | 0\% |
| Take-Two Interactive Software | 3,372.8 | 8 | 7 | N | 62 | 9 | - | 14 | 280,000 | c, d | 341,474 | 34\% | 66\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Interactive Media and Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alphabet | 257,637.0 | 10 | 7 | Y | 66 | 13 | - | 4 | 75,000 | b | 464,979 | 17\% | 83\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Match Group | 2,983.3 | 10 | 7 | Y | 57 | 5 | - | 13 | 50,000 | b | 317,199 | 21\% | 79\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Meta Platforms | 117,929.0 | 9 | 7 | N | 54 | 4 | 72 | 12 | 50,000 | b | 515,332 | 27\% | 73\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Twitter | 5,077.5 | 9 | 7 | Y | 50 | 5 | - | 15 | 50,000 | b, c | 289,439 | 15\% | 85\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Movies and Entertainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Live Nation Entertainment | 6,268.4 | 11 | 9 | Y | 58 | 8 | - | 4 | 90,000 | b, c | 271,208 | 40\% | 60\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Netflix | 29,697.8 | 12 | 10 | N | 60 | 11 | - | 4 | - | e,f,g | 350,599 | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% |
| The Walt Disney Company | 67,418.0 | 11 | 10 | Y | 59 | 5 | - | 6 | 115,000 | b, c | 366,756 | 38\% | 52\% | 0\% | 10\% |
| Publishing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| News Corporation | 9,358.0 | 9 | 6 | Y | 57 | 8 | - | 9 | 275,000 | d, h | 286,645 | 39\% | 61\% | 0\% | 0\% |


| Wireless Telecommunication Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T-Mobile US | 80,118.0 | 13 | 5 | Y | 62 | 6 | - | 4 | 135,000 | b | 593,663 | 42\% | 58\% | 0\% | 0\% |




## CONSUMER DISCRETIONARY

| Apparel Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ross Stores | $12,531.6$ | 10 | 8 | Y | 63 | 14 | - | 5 | 245,000 | $d$ |  | 295,524 | $37 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |
| The TJX Companies | $32,137.0$ | 11 | 9 | Y | 68 | 11 | 75 | 6 | 90,000 | b |  | 292,566 | $42 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |


| PVH Corporation | 7,132.6 | 12 | 10 | Y | 59 | 10 | 72 | 10 | 95,000 | b | 227,046 | 29\% | 71\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ralph Lauren Corporation | 4,400.8 | 12 | 9 | Y | 65 | 9 | - | 8 | 80,000 | b | 238,065 | 40\% | 59\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Tapestry | 5,746.3 | 10 | 9 | Y | 57 | 5 | - | 12 | 90,000 | b,e | 256,036 | 52\% | 24\% | 24\% | 0\% |
| Under Armour | 5,683.5 | 10 | 8 | Y | 62 | 8 | 75 | 6 | 75,000 | b, c | 258,764 | 42\% | 58\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| V.F. Corporation | 9,238.8 | 12 | 11 | N | 60 | 10 | 72 | 10 | 100,000 | b,c,e | 239,743 | 30\% | 35\% | 35\% | 0\% |


| Auto Parts and Equipment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aptiv PLC | 15,618.0 | 10 | 9 | N | 64 | 4 | 75 | 9 | 300,000 | c, d | 278,337 | 17\% | 83\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| BorgWarner | 14,838.0 | 8 | 7 | Y | 61 | 7 | 72 | 5 | 125,000 | b | 307,452 | 51\% | 49\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Automobile Manufacturers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ford Motor Company | 136,341.0 | 14 | 9 | Y | 63 | 9 | 72 | 12 | 315,000 | c, d, h | 371,498 | 31\% | 58\% | 0\% | 11\% |
| General Motors Company | 127,004.0 | 12 | 11 | N | 63 | 6 | 72 | 11 | 305,000 | c, d, h | 359,908 | 48\% | 45\% | 0\% | 7\% |
| Tesla | 53,823.0 | 8 | 6 | Y | 57 | 6 | - | 6 | 20,000 | e | 2,321,917 | 2\% | 0\% | 98\% | 0\% |


| Automotive Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advance Auto Parts | 10,998.0 | 10 | 9 | Y | 62 | 4 | 72 | 4 | 95,000 | c | 300,625 | 48\% | 52\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| AutoZone | 14,629.6 | 9 | 8 | N | 62 | 10 | 75 | 5 | 225,000 | d,g,i | 239,167 | 4\% | 96\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| CarMax | 20,092.1 | 12 | 10 | Y | 57 | 7 | 76 | 18 | 260,000 | e | 271,024 | 34\% | 65\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| O'Reilly Automotive | 13,327.6 | 10 | 7 | Y | 64 | 10 | 78 | 4 | 104,000 | b | 263,451 | 51\% | 49\% | 0\% | 0\% |


| Casinos and Gaming |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Caesars Entertainment | 9,571.0 | 10 | 8 | Y | 64 | 5 | - | 6 | 100,000 | b | 379,541 | 39\% | 61\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Las Vegas Sands Corporation | 4,234.0 | 10 | 6 | N | 69 | 6 | - | 12 | 150,000 | b,e | 357,050 | 51\% | 49\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| MGM Resorts International | 9,454.1 | 11 | 10 | Y | 61 | 8 | 74 | 10 | 90,000 | b | 343,092 | 45\% | 51\% | 0\% | 4\% |
| Penn National Gaming | 5,905.0 | 9 | 8 | Y | 66 | 12 | - | 16 | 50,000 | b | 334,375 | 21\% | 79\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Wynn Resorts Limited | 3,763.7 | 9 | 8 | Y | 64 | 5 | 75 | 5 | 100,000 | b | 384,888 | 35\% | 65\% | 0\% | 0\% |


| Computer and Electronics Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Best Buy Co. | 47,262.0 | 11 | 10 | Y | 57 | 6 | 72 | 8 | 100,000 | b, c | 300,755 | 30\% | 70\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Consumer Electronics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Garmin | 4,982.8 | 6 | 4 | Y | 67 | 9 | - | 4 | 85,000 | b | 235,056 | 38\% | 62\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Distributors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Genuine Parts Company | 18,870.5 | 13 | 11 | N | 65 | 9 | 72 | 7 | 90,000 | b | 276,572 | 33\% | 67\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| LKQ Corporation | 13,088.5 | 11 | 9 | $Y$ | 59 | 4 | - | 8 | 100,000 | b, c | 244,933 | 53\% | 47\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Pool Corporation | 5,295.6 | 9 | 7 | Y | 67 | 12 | 75 | 8 | 75,000 | b, c,j | 223,098 | 46\% | 54\% | 0\% | 0\% |




## CONSUMER STAPLES

| Agricultural Products |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Archer-Daniels-Midland Company | 85,249.0 | 11 | 10 | N | 62 | 9 | 75 | 8 | 315,000 | c, d | 374,490 | 30\% | 56\% | 0\% | 14\% |
| Brewers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Molson Coors Brewing Company | 10,279.7 | 14 | 9 | Y | 61 | 7 | 70 | 6 | 100,000 | b, c | 281,303 | 43\% | 52\% | 0\% | 5\% |
| Distillers and Vintners |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brown-Forman Corporation | 3,461.0 | 11 | 6 | Y | 60 | 9 | 72 | 6 | 205,000 | c, d, h | 244,965 | 40\% | 60\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Constellation Brands | 8,614.9 | 13 | 10 | Y | 59 | 9 | 70 | 6 | 100,000 | b,e | 266,372 | 41\% | 38\% | 21\% | 0\% |
| Drug Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walgreens Boots Alliance | 132,509.0 | 10 | 8 | Y | 64 | 13 | 75 | 10 | 100,000 | b,c | 328,125 | 39\% | 61\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Food Distributors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sysco Corporation | 51,297.8 | 10 | 9 | Y | 63 | 8 | - | 8 | 100,000 | b, c | 296,264 | 38\% | 62\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Food Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Kroger Co. | 132,498.0 | 10 | 9 | N | 61 | 8 | 72 | 5 | 90,000 | b | 281,415 | 38\% | 61\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Household Products |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Church \& Dwight Co. | 5,190.1 | 11 | 10 | N | 61 | 10 | 72 | 5 | 120,000 | d,e,g,i | 267,722 | 14\% | 34\% | 52\% | 0\% |
| The Clorox Company | 7,347.0 | 11 | 10 | Y | 62 | 6 | 72 | 8 | 103,000 | b,c | 275,688 | 43\% | 57\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Colgate-Palmolive Company | 17,421.0 | 10 | 9 | N | 62 | 7 | 72 | 8 | 75,000 | b,c,e,i | 303,946 | 29\% | 56\% | 14\% | 1\% |
| Kimberly-Clark Corporation | 19,440.0 | 13 | 12 | N | 60 | 6 | 72 | 6 | 105,000 | b | 287,455 | 34\% | 65\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| The Procter \& Gamble Company | 76,118.0 | 12 | 10 | N | 60 | 6 | 72 | 7 | 120,000 | b, c | 333,500 | 40\% | 60\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Hypermarkets and Super Centers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Costco Wholesale Corporation | 195,929.0 | 10 | 8 | Y | 69 | 14 | - | 5 | 30,000 | b | 307,338 | 14\% | 86\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Walmart | 559,151.0 | 11 | 7 | Y | 55 | 6 | 75 | 5 | 100,000 | b, c | 310,650 | 39\% | 61\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Packaged Foods and Meats |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Campbell Soup Company | 8,476.0 | 13 | 12 | Y | 61 | 10 | 72 | 6 | 263,500 | c, d | 301,114 | 46\% | 54\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Conagra Brands | 11,184.7 | 12 | 11 | Y | 63 | 7 | 72 | 6 | 100,000 | b | 289,996 | 33\% | 64\% | 0\% | 3\% |
| General Mills | 18,127.0 | 11 | 10 | N | 62 | 7 | 72 | 6 | 75,000 | b, c | 267,274 | 33\% | 67\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| The Hershey Company | 8,971.3 | 12 | 11 | N | 63 | 6 | 72 | 9 | 105,000 | b, c | 278,251 | 41\% | 58\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Hormel Foods Corporation | 11,386.2 | 12 | 11 | N | 62 | 9 | 72 | 7 | 80,000 | b, c | 265,546 | 37\% | 60\% | 0\% | 3\% |
| The J.M. Smucker Company | 8,002.7 | 11 | 8 | Y | 60 | 7 | 75 | 5 | 100,000 | b,c | 264,891 | 41\% | 57\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Kellogg Company | 14,181.0 | 12 | 11 | N | 63 | 7 | 72 | 8 | 260,000 | c, d | 272,000 | 43\% | 57\% | 0\% | 0\% |



## ENERGY

## Integrated Oil and Gas

| Chevron Corporation | $155,606.0$ | 12 | 11 | N | 65 | 7 | 74 | 7 | 150,000 | $\mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{c}, \mathrm{j}$ |  | 370,625 | $38 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ExxonMobil Corporation | $278,981.0$ | 11 | 10 | N | 62 | 3 | 72 | 13 | 110,000 | b |  | 224,851 | $54 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Occidental Petroleum Corporation | $25,956.0$ | 9 | 8 | Y | 71 | 6 | 75 | 7 | 110,000 | b |  | 338,790 | $30 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

Oil and Gas Equipment and Services

| Baker Hughes | 20,502.0 | 9 | 7 | N | 60 | 3 | 75 | 9 | 120,000 | b, c | 330,859 | 41\% | 53\% | 0\% | 6\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Halliburton Company | 15,295.0 | 11 | 10 | N | 64 | 7 | 72 | 7 | 115,000 | b, c | 379,745 | 34\% | 49\% | 0\% | 17\% |
| Schlumberger Limited | 22,929.0 | 11 | 9 | Y | 60 | 2 | 70 | 4 | 115,000 | b | 373,105 | 42\% | 58\% | 0\% | 0\% |

Oil and Gas Exploration and Production

| APA Corporation | 8,025.0 | 11 | 10 | Y | 63 | 6 | 75 | 10 | 100,000 | b, c | 333,709 | 36\% | 64\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ConocoPhillips | 46,660.0 | 13 | 11 | N | 61 | 6 | 72 | 8 | 115,000 | $b, c$ | 357,513 | 37\% | 62\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Coterra Energy | 3,670.0 | 10 | 8 | Y | 64 | 3 | - | 15 | 75,000 | b | 313,770 | 27\% | 73\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Devon Energy Corporation | 13,117.0 | 11 | 8 | Y | 66 | 6 | 73 | 17 | 100,000 | b | 340,551 | 32\% | 68\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Diamondback Energy | 6,443.0 | 8 | 7 | N | 63 | 7 | - | 9 | 80,000 | b | 334,468 | 36\% | 63\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| EOG Resources | 19,777.0 | 10 | 8 | Y | 69 | 10 | 80 | 7 | 100,000 | b | 347,717 | 29\% | 52\% | 0\% | 19\% |
| Hess Corporation | 7,301.0 | 12 | 11 | Y | 65 | 8 | - | 10 | 110,000 | b | 337,583 | 46\% | 52\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Marathon Oil Corporation | 5,616.0 | 7 | 6 | N | 62 | 4 | 72 | 12 | 95,000 | b | 255,357 | 40\% | 59\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Pioneer Natural Resources Company | 17,870.0 | 12 | 11 | Y | 64 | 8 | - | 12 | 310,000 | d | 325,558 | 26\% | 73\% | 0\% | 1\% |



## FINANCIALS

Asset Management and Custody Banks

| Ameriprise Financial | 13,443.0 | 8 | 7 | N | 66 | 8 | 75 | 6 | 300,000 | c,d,h | 280,440 | 47\% | 53\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The Bank of New York Mellon Corporation | 16,162.0 | 11 | 10 | Y | 59 | 4 | 75 | 19 | 110,000 | b,c | 325,455 | 43\% | 57\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| BlackRock | 19,374.0 | 17 | 15 | N | 60 | 7 | 75 | 7 | 85,000 | b, c | 370,197 | 35\% | 65\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Franklin Resources | 8,425.5 | 11 | 8 | Y | 58 | 4 | 75 | 5 | 100,000 | b, c | 296,375 | 34\% | 66\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Invesco | 6,894.5 | 11 | 10 | Y | 65 | 7 | 75 | 10 | 120,000 | b | 382,089 | 40\% | 60\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Northern Trust Corporation | 6,546.0 | 12 | 11 | N | 64 | 11 | 72 | 7 | 255,000 | c, d | 263,388 | 53\% | 47\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| State Street Corporation | 12,060.0 | 13 | 12 | N | 65 | 8 | 75 | 8 | 90,000 | b, c | 354,282 | 36\% | 55\% | 0\% | 9\% |
| T. Rowe Price Group | 7,671.9 | 13 | 10 | Y | 67 | 6 | 75 | 11 | 100,000 | b, c | 394,447 | 17\% | 81\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Consumer Finance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Express Company | 43,799.0 | 14 | 13 | N | 64 | 7 | 72 | 6 | 100,000 | b, c | 404,307 | 34\% | 51\% | 0\% | 15\% |
| Capital One Financial Corporation | 32,379.0 | 13 | 12 | N | 60 | 7 | 72 | 16 | 90,000 | b | 374,809 | 43\% | 53\% | 0\% | 4\% |
| Discover Financial Services | 11,869.0 | 12 | 11 | Y | 62 | 10 | 75 | 13 | 105,000 | b | 299,605 | 50\% | 50\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Synchrony Financial | 9,466.0 | 12 | 10 | Y | 62 | 5 | 75 | 10 | 265,000 | d | 287,425 | 48\% | 52\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Diversified Banks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bank of America Corporation | 93,707.0 | 14 | 13 | N | 68 | 9 | 75 | 21 | 100,000 | b, c | 369,333 | 31\% | 69\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Citigroup | 74,990.0 | 12 | 10 | Y | 63 | 7 | 72 | 29 | 75,000 | b, c | 407,709 | 63\% | 37\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| JPMorgan Chase \& Co. | 130,898.0 | 10 | 9 | N | 63 | 9 | 72 | 10 | 100,000 | b, c | 398,862 | 31\% | 63\% | 0\% | 6\% |
| U.S. Bancorp | 23,762.0 | 12 | 11 | N | 59 | 6 | 72 | 11 | 100,000 | b, c | 296,091 | 46\% | 54\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Wells Fargo \& Company | 82,948.0 | 14 | 13 | Y | 64 | 3 | 72 | 15 | 100,000 | b, c | 380,728 | 53\% | 47\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Financial Exchanges and Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cboe Global Markets | 3,494.8 | 14 | 13 | N | 64 | 9 | 73 | 14 | 90,000 | b | 289,255 | 47\% | 50\% | 0\% | 3\% |
| FactSet Research Systems | 1,597.4 | 9 | 8 | Y | 60 | 8 | - | 6 | 35,000 | e | 130,253 | 4\% | 0\% | 96\% | 0\% |
| Intercontinental Exchange | 7,146.0 | 10 | 9 | N | 60 | 5 | 75 | 6 | 100,000 | b, c | 318,308 | 39\% | 61\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| MarketAxess Holdings | 699.0 | 13 | 11 | N | 60 | 7 | - | 6 | 85,000 | b | 239,170 | 45\% | 55\% | 0\% | 0\% |




## HEALTHCARE

Biotechnology

| AbbVie | 56,197.0 | 11 | 10 | N | 66 | 7 | 75 | 9 | 115,000 | $\mathrm{b}, \mathrm{c}, \mathrm{j}$ | 348,054 | 37\% | 56\% | 0\% | 7\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Amgen | 25,979.0 | 12 | 11 | N | 66 | 7 | 75 | 7 | 105,000 | b | 368,859 | 34\% | 61\% | 0\% | 5\% |
| Biogen Idec | 10,981.7 | 11 | 10 | Y | 65 | 8 | 75 | 8 | 125,000 | b | 452,229 | 33\% | 64\% | 0\% | 3\% |
| Gilead Sciences | 27,305.0 | 9 | 8 | N | 65 | 4 | - | 6 | 75,000 | b,c,e | 364,585 | 18\% | 41\% | 41\% | 0\% |
| Incyte Corporation | 2,986.3 | 8 | 7 | N | 63 | 7 | - | 6 | 60,000 | b,c,e | 479,113 | 4\% | 46\% | 50\% | 0\% |
| Moderna | 18,471.0 | 9 | 8 | Y | 67 | 6 | - | 8 | 60,000 | e | 596,518 | 15\% | 64\% | 21\% | 0\% |
| Regeneron Pharmaceuticals | 16,071.7 | 12 | 9 | Y | 70 | 17 | - | 9 | 90,000 | b,e | 712,316 | 16\% | 17\% | 67\% | 0\% |
| Vertex Pharmaceuticals | 7,574.4 | 11 | 9 | Y | 60 | 8 | 72 | 9 | 100,000 | b,e,j | 543,713 | 25\% | 32\% | 41\% | 2\% |
| Healthcare Distributors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AmerisourceBergen Corporation | 213,988.8 | 10 | 8 | N | 68 | 12 | 75 | 11 | 100,000 | b, c | 316,101 | 40\% | 56\% | 0\% | 4\% |
| Cardinal Health | 162,467.0 | 11 | 10 | Y | 65 | 7 | 75 | 12 | 115,000 | b | 344,043 | 40\% | 60\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Henry Schein | 12,401.0 | 15 | 11 | N | 68 | 6 | 80 | 6 | 90,000 | b | 299,030 | 41\% | 59\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| McKesson Corporation | 238,228.0 | 9 | 8 | Y | 63 | 6 | 75 | 7 | 110,000 | b | 314,700 | 39\% | 61\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Healthcare Equipment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abbott Laboratories | 43,075.0 | 12 | 11 | N | 64 | 10 | 75 | 8 | 126,000 | b | 331,368 | 40\% | 56\% | 0\% | 4\% |
| Abiomed | 847.5 | 9 | 8 | N | 63 | 8 | - | 6 | 50,000 | b | 249,847 | 20\% | 80\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Baxter International | 12,784.0 | 11 | 10 | N | 66 | 7 | 75 | 13 | 100,000 | b,j | 323,389 | 41\% | 47\% | 8\% | 4\% |
| Becton, Dickinson and Company | 20,248.0 | 12 | 11 | N | 65 | 9 | 75 | 7 | 107,000 | b | 338,763 | 36\% | 63\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Boston Scientific Corporation | 11,888.0 | 10 | 9 | N | 64 | 8 | - | 8 | 115,000 | b, c | 335,625 | 39\% | 61\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| DexCom | 2,448.5 | 11 | 10 | N | 63 | 9 | - | 4 | 300,000 | d | 317,322 | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Edwards Lifesciences Corporation | 5,232.5 | 8 | 7 | N | 64 | 5 | 75 | 13 | 75,000 | b,c,e,j | 327,397 | 27\% | 73\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Hologic | 5,632.3 | 8 | 7 | N | 61 | 8 | 72 | 9 | 90,000 | b,e | 323,412 | 36\% | 32\% | 32\% | 0\% |



Life Sciences Tools and Services

| Agilent Technologies | 6,319.0 | 11 | 10 | Y | 64 | 8 | 75 | 8 | 100,000 | b, c | 349,570 | 35\% | 65\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bio-Rad Laboratories | 2,922.5 | 6 | 4 | N | 66 | 5 | - | 11 | 125,000 | - | 141,600 | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Bio-Techne Corporation | 931.0 | 9 | 8 | Y | 63 | 11 | 75 | 5 | 75,000 | b, e | 302,449 | 34\% | 33\% | 33\% | 0\% |
| Charles River Laboratories International | 3,540.2 | 10 | 8 | N | 66 | 10 | 75 | 9 | 65,000 | b,e | 319,639 | 24\% | 38\% | 38\% | 0\% |
| Danaher Corporation | 29,453.0 | 13 | 10 | Y | 63 | 13 | - | 8 | 125,000 | b,c,e | 324,449 | 14\% | 58\% | 28\% | 0\% |
| Illumina | 4,526.0 | 9 | 8 | Y | 62 | 8 | - | 14 | 75,000 | b, c | 444,940 | 21\% | 79\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| IQVIA Holdings | 13,874.0 | 11 | 10 | N | 61 | 5 | 74 | 7 | 100,000 | b, c | 326,497 | 39\% | 61\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Mettler-Toledo International | 3,717.9 | 8 | 7 | Y | 60 | 13 | 72 | 4 | 80,000 | b,e | 320,827 | 40\% | 22\% | 38\% | 0\% |
| PerkinElmer | 5,067.2 | 8 | 7 | Y | 63 | 8 | 72 | 6 | 90,000 | b | 304,497 | 36\% | 64\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Thermo Fisher Scientific | 39,211.0 | 12 | 9 | N | 61 | 9 | 72 | 6 | 125,000 | b, c | 344,147 | 40\% | 58\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Waters Corporation | 2,785.9 | 8 | 7 | Y | 63 | 12 | 72 | 6 | 55,000 | b,c,e | 332,340 | 34\% | 33\% | 33\% | 0\% |
| West Pharmaceutical Services | 2,831.6 | 10 | 9 | N | 60 | 8 | 75 | 5 | 90,000 | b | 334,838 | 34\% | 59\% | 0\% | 7\% |



INDUSTRIALS

| Aerospace and Defense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The Boeing Company | 62,286.0 | 11 | 10 | Y | 62 | 5 | 74 | 9 | 135,000 | b, c | 413,584 | 45\% | 48\% | 0\% | 7\% |
| General Dynamics Corporation | 38,469.0 | 12 | 11 | N | 65 | 7 | 75 | 8 | 95,000 | b,c,e | 331,029 | 52\% | 24\% | 24\% | 0\% |
| Howmet Aerospace | 4,972.0 | 10 | 9 | N | 62 | 3 | 75 | 9 | 120,000 | b | 280,009 | 46\% | 54\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Huntington Ingalls Industries | 9,524.0 | 13 | 11 | Y | 64 | 6 | 76 | 9 | 100,000 | b | 278,288 | 44\% | 56\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| L3Harris Technologies | 17,814.0 | 13 | 11 | Y | 69 | 13 | 75 | 8 | 310,000 | b,c | 314,307 | 46\% | 52\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Lockheed Martin Corporation | 67,044.0 | 13 | 12 | N | 67 | 7 | 75 | 10 | 325,000 | c, d | 343,206 | 52\% | 47\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Northrop Grumman Corporation | 35,667.0 | 13 | 12 | N | 68 | 9 | 75 | 10 | 305,000 | c,d,h | 335,559 | 45\% | 51\% | 0\% | 4\% |
| Raytheon Technologies Corporation | 64,388.0 | 13 | 11 | Y | 63 | 5 | 72 | 8 | 310,000 | d | 378,860 | 27\% | 70\% | 0\% | 3\% |
| Textron | 12,382.0 | 10 | 9 | N | 68 | 9 | 75 | 6 | 270,000 | c, d, h | 293,000 | 49\% | 49\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Agricultural and Farm Machinery |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deere \& Company | 43,956.0 | 11 | 10 | N | 63 | 8 | 75 | 6 | 135,000 | b, c | 309,924 | 47\% | 52\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Air Freight and Logistics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C.H. Robinson Worldwide | 23,102.1 | 11 | 10 | Y | 61 | 5 | - | 5 | 110,000 | b,c | 263,611 | 54\% | 46\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Expeditors International of Washington | 16,523.5 | 9 | 7 | Y | 61 | 6 | 72 | 6 | 325,000 | d | 324,268 | 38\% | 62\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| FedEx Corporation | 83,959.0 | 11 | 9 | N | 61 | 13 | 75 | 8 | 132,000 | c, e | 309,638 | 28\% | 17\% | 55\% | 0\% |
| United Parcel Service | 97,287.0 | 13 | 12 | Y | 60 | 8 | 75 | 5 | 110,000 | b | 301,773 | 43\% | 57\% | 0\% | 0\% |





## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

## Application Software

| Adobe | $15,785.0$ | 12 | 11 | N | 58 | 9 | - | 8 | 60,000 | $\mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{c}$ |  | 402,739 | $21 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ansys | $1,906.7$ | 9 | 8 | Y | 60 | 4 | 75 | 8 | 40,000 | b |  | 350,439 | $19 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Autodesk | $3,790.4$ | 10 | 9 | Y | 57 | 7 | - | 4 | 75,000 | $\mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{c}$ |  | 352,489 | $25 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Cadence Design Systems | $2,988.2$ | 11 | 9 | Y | 64 | 10 | - | 6 | 80,000 | b |  | 332,212 | $41 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Ceridian HCM Holding | $1,024.2$ | 10 | 8 | N | 60 | 6 | - | 6 | 50,000 | $\mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{c}, \mathrm{j}$ |  | 308,344 | $4 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Intuit | $9,633.0$ | 12 | 9 | Y | 58 | 8 | 75 | 4 | 75,000 | $\mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{c}$ | 385,522 | $18 \%$ | $82 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |
| Paycom Software | $1,055.5$ | 7 | 6 | N | 68 | 7 | - | 6 | 75,000 | b |  | 325,588 | $31 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| PTC | $1,807.2$ | 8 | 7 | Y | 64 | 7 | - | 7 | 310,000 | d |  | 352,854 | $27 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Roper Technologies | $5,777.8$ | 9 | 8 | Y | 66 | 10 | 80 | 7 | 60,000 | b |  | 448,571 | $14 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| salesforce.com | $21,252.0$ | 13 | 9 | N | 68 | 12 | - | 5 | 375,000 | $\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~g}$ |  | 394,903 | $5 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Synopsys | $4,204.2$ | 8 | 7 | N | 67 | 12 | 72 | 5 | 125,000 | $\mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{j}$ |  | 319,163 | $45 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Tyler Technologies | $1,592.3$ | 8 | 5 | Y | 64 | 5 | - | 7 | 40,000 | b |  | 327,226 | $24 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

Communications Equipment

| Arista Networks | $2,948.0$ | 9 | 7 | Y | 61 | 6 | - | 5 | 75,000 | b | 278,533 | $47 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cisco Systems | $49,878.0$ | 11 | 10 | N | 60 | 8 | 72 | 6 | 80,000 | b | 366,476 | $36 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |  |
| F5 | $2,603.4$ | 11 | 10 | Y | 57 | 6 | - | 17 | 60,000 | b | 354,155 | $29 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |
| Juniper Networks | $4,735.4$ | 10 | 9 | Y | 64 | 10 | 75 | 5 | 60,000 | b |  | 366,395 | $25 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Motorola Solutions | $8,171.0$ | 8 | 7 | N | 61 | 6 | 75 | 5 | 100,000 | b,c | 310,364 | $27 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |

Data Processing and Outsourced Services

| Automatic Data Processing | 15,005.4 | 11 | 10 | Y | 62 | 6 | 72 | 5 | 330,000 | c, d, h | 343,800 | 38\% | 60\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Broadridge Financial Solutions | 4,993.7 | 11 | 9 | Y | 64 | 7 | 72 | 7 | 250,000 | d, e | 294,243 | 40\% | 29\% | 28\% | 3\% |
| Fidelity National Information Services | 13,877.0 | 12 | 11 | N | 67 | 5 | 75 | 8 | 100,000 | b | 378,648 | 41\% | 58\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Fiserv | 16,226.0 | 9 | 8 | N | 57 | 5 | 75 | 9 | 78,000 | b, c | 325,032 | 37\% | 63\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| FleetCor Technologies | 2,833.7 | 10 | 9 | N | 65 | 10 | - | 6 | 250,000 | d,g | 277,883 | 10\% | 90\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Global Payments | 8,523.8 | 11 | 9 | Y | 64 | 10 | 75 | 8 | 320,000 | d | 381,033 | 41\% | 59\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Jack Henry \& Associates | 1,758.2 | 9 | 8 | N | 59 | 9 | 70 | 7 | 40,000 | b | 290,754 | 44\% | 56\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Mastercard | 18,884.0 | 13 | 12 | Y | 61 | 6 | 72 | 6 | 100,000 | b | 372,294 | 35\% | 64\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Paychex | 4,056.8 | 10 | 8 | $Y$ | 65 | 12 | - | 5 | 95,000 | b,e,k | 312,168 | 50\% | 25\% | 25\% | 0\% |
| PayPal Holdings | 25,371.0 | 12 | 11 | Y | 61 | 6 | - | 11 | 80,000 | b, c | 394,896 | 28\% | 72\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Visa | 24,105.0 | 10 | 9 | N | 64 | 8 | 75 | 10 | 110,000 | b | 386,739 | 41\% | 56\% | 0\% | 3\% |
| Electronic Components |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amphenol Corporation | 10,876.3 | 9 | 8 | Y | 69 | 11 | 72 | 10 | 100,000 | b, c | 276,891 | 42\% | 58\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Corning | 14,082.0 | 15 | 14 | N | 68 | 11 | 78 | 7 | 110,000 | b, c | 348,875 | 43\% | 56\% | 0\% | 1\% |

## Electronic Equipment and Instruments

| Keysight Technologies | $4,941.0$ | 9 | 8 | N | 65 | 6 | 75 | 6 | 100,000 | $\mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{c}$ |  | 338,718 | $34 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Teledyne Technologies | $4,614.3$ | 11 | 10 | N | 70 | 11 | 75 | 7 | 110,000 | b |  | 247,778 | $48 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |




## MATERIALS

| Commodity Chemicals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dow | 54,968.0 | 12 | 11 | N | 63 | 4 | 72 | 6 | 125,000 | b | 323,964 | 43\% | 57\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| LyondellBasell Industries N.V. | 46,173.0 | 12 | 11 | Y | 66 | 6 | 75 | 9 | 285,000 | c,d | 344,454 | 36\% | 62\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Construction Materials |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Martin Marietta Materials | 5,084.7 | 11 | 10 | N | 66 | 8 | 75 | 5 | 120,000 | b, c | 301,875 | 44\% | 48\% | 0\% | 8\% |
| Vulcan Materials | 5,552.2 | 11 | 10 | N | 62 | 7 | 74 | 7 | 115,000 | b, c | 291,138 | 44\% | 52\% | 0\% | 4\% |
| Copper |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Freeport-McMoRan | 22,845.0 | 11 | 10 | N | 64 | 4 | - | 7 | 125,000 | b, c | 310,245 | 43\% | 57\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Fertilizers and Agricultural Chemicals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CF Industries Holdings | 6,538.0 | 11 | 10 | Y | 60 | 6 | 74 | 9 | 105,000 | b | 286,267 | 42\% | 56\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Corteva | 15,655.0 | 13 | 12 | $Y$ | 63 | 3 | 75 | 16 | 285,000 | d | 302,209 | 40\% | 60\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| FMC Corporation | 5,045.2 | 12 | 10 | Y | 64 | 11 | 75 | 5 | 100,000 | b, c | 260,475 | 43\% | 54\% | 0\% | 3\% |
| The Mosaic Company | 12,357.4 | 11 | 10 | Y | 60 | 9 | 74 | 6 | 90,000 | b | 288,546 | 36\% | 63\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Gold |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Newmont Corporation | 12,222.0 | 12 | 11 | Y | 61 | 4 | 75 | 17 | 115,000 | b | 320,587 | 44\% | 56\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Industrial Gases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Air Products and Chemicals | 10,323.0 | 7 | 6 | N | 66 | 6 | 75 | 12 | 120,000 | b, c | 290,246 | 46\% | 52\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Linde plc | 30,793.0 | 10 | 8 | Y | 64 | 3 | 72 | 5 | 180,000 | b | 328,297 | 61\% | 39\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Metal and Glass Containers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ball Corporation | 13,811.0 | 12 | 10 | Y | 62 | 7 | - | 5 | 90,000 | b | 414,573 | 29\% | 69\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Paper Packaging |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amcor | 12,861.0 | 11 | 10 | Y | 65 | 6 | 75 | 6 | 260,100 | d | 306,936 | 49\% | 50\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Avery Dennison Corporation | 8,408.3 | 8 | 7 | N | 65 | 12 | 72 | 5 | 100,000 | b, c | 285,934 | 39\% | 59\% | 0\% | 2\% |



## REAL ESTATE

Healthcare REITs

| Healthpeak Properties | 1,896.2 | 8 | 7 | Y | 64 | 8 | - | 15 | 85,000 | b, c | 294,037 | 46\% | 54\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Welltower | 4,742.1 | 11 | 10 | Y | 63 | 6 | 75 | 6 | 95,000 | b | 322,073 | 46\% | 54\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Hotel and Resort REITs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Host Hotels \& Resorts | 2,921.0 | 8 | 6 | Y | 64 | 7 | - | 9 | 240,000 | c, d | 296,694 | 40\% | 47\% | 0\% | 13\% |
| Industrial REITs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Duke Realty Corporation | 1,118.6 | 11 | 10 | N | 64 | 6 | - | 7 | 100,000 | b, c | 240,885 | 44\% | 56\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Prologis | 5,163.7 | 11 | 10 | N | 65 | 13 | 75 | 4 | 120,000 | b | 331,385 | 40\% | 57\% | 0\% | 3\% |
| Office REITs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alexandria Real Estate Equities | 2,126.4 | 8 | 7 | Y | 62 | 9 | 75 | 6 | 110,000 | b | 326,623 | 49\% | 47\% | 0\% | 4\% |
| Boston Properties | 2,865.9 | 11 | 9 | N | 65 | 8 | 75 | 8 | 85,000 | b, c | 256,101 | 45\% | 55\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Vornado Realty Trust | 1,705.2 | 10 | 9 | N | 69 | 13 | - | 7 | 75,000 | b | 240,903 | 43\% | 57\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Real Estate Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CBRE Group | 27,746.0 | 10 | 9 | Y | 60 | 5 | - | 9 | 110,000 | b, c | 306,583 | 35\% | 65\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Residential REITs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AvalonBay Communities | 2,310.1 | 12 | 10 | Y | 62 | 7 | 75 | 5 | 100,000 | b, c | 273,083 | 23\% | 77\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Camden Property Trust | 1,165.1 | 10 | 8 | N | 64 | 11 | 75 | 6 | 80,000 | b, c | 225,975 | 9\% | 91\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Equity Residential | 2,464.0 | 11 | 8 | Y | 59 | 9 | - | 7 | 240,000 | d,e,j | 262,652 | 39\% | 59\% | 2\% | 0\% |
| Essex Property Trust | 1,552.3 | 9 | 7 | Y | 71 | 9 | $\cdot$ | 4 | 80,000 | e,k | 268,429 | 37\% | 31\% | 32\% | 0\% |



## UTILITIES

| Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The AES Corporation | 11,141.0 | 11 | 10 | Y | 65 | 6 | - | 16 | 85,000 | b, c, d, h | 303,438 | 41\% | 59\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Alliant Energy Corporation | 3,669.0 | 10 | 9 | N | 61 | 10 | 70 | 7 | 260,000 | c | 262,952 | 98\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Ameren Corporation | 6,119.0 | 14 | 12 | Y | 63 | 8 | 72 | 10 | 125,000 | b, c | 271,149 | 47\% | 53\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| American Electric Power Company | 16,792.0 | 12 | 11 | N | 64 | 7 | 72 | 7 | 125,000 | b, c | 300,800 | 46\% | 54\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| American Water Works Company | 3,930.0 | 9 | 8 | Y | 64 | 9 | 75 | 14 | 110,000 | b | 275,028 | 45\% | 54\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Atmos Energy Corporation | 3,407.5 | 10 | 8 | Y | 65 | 9 | 75 | 15 | 100,000 | b, c | 263,289 | 42\% | 57\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| CenterPoint Energy | 8,352.0 | 9 | 8 | Y | 58 | 3 | - | 8 | 115,000 | b | 327,739 | 46\% | 47\% | 0\% | 7\% |
| CMS Energy Corporation | 7,329.0 | 11 | 10 | Y | 64 | 8 | 75 | 10 | 115,000 | b,c | 289,000 | 48\% | 52\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Consolidated Edison | 13,676.0 | 12 | 9 | N | 65 | 8 | 75 | 9 | 115,000 | b,c | 307,140 | 47\% | 52\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Dominion Energy | 13,964.0 | 12 | 11 | N | 64 | 8 | 75 | 9 | 275,000 | c,d | 289,976 | 41\% | 58\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| DTE Energy Company | 14,964.0 | 11 | 10 | N | 68 | 11 | 75 | 9 | 120,000 | b, c | 281,643 | 47\% | 52\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Duke Energy Corporation | 24,677.0 | 14 | 13 | N | 64 | 4 | 71 | 10 | 285,000 | c,d | 312,495 | 48\% | 51\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| Edison International | 14,905.0 | 12 | 11 | Y | 63 | 6 | 72 | 14 | 127,500 | b | 320,312 | 43\% | 50\% | 0\% | 7\% |
| Entergy Corporation | 11,742.9 | 11 | 10 | N | 65 | 9 | 74 | 12 | 112,500 | b | 318,252 | 42\% | 50\% | 0\% | 8\% |
| Evergy | 5,586.7 | 12 | 10 | Y | 66 | 8 | 72 | 7 | 115,000 | b, c | 268,120 | 47\% | 49\% | 0\% | 4\% |



## Footnotes to Table:

a: Includes regular, special and telephonic board meetings.
b: Equity (stock or stock units) is paid in addition to stated retainer.
c: Directors can elect to receive cash compensation fully or partially in stock.
d: Equity (stock or stock units) is paid as part of retainer.
e: Stock option program for directors exists.
f: Dollar value equivalent for retainer not provided in proxy.
g: Retainer paid 100\% in stock.
$h$ : Equity portion of retainer paid in deferred stock.
i: Directors can elect to receive equity retainer fully or partially in cash.
j: Directors can elect to receive cash and/or stock compensation in stock options.
k : Directors can elect to receive stock in lieu of stock option grant.

## Research and Insights

Spencer Stuart regularly explores the key concerns of boards and senior management, as well as innovative solutions to the challenges they face.
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2022 S\&P 500 Board Diversity Snapshot
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Board Governance and SPACs: New Competition for Capital and Talent


Stakeholder Voices in the Boardroom: Ensuring Stakeholder Interests Are Factored into Decision-Making

## Board Governance Trends: A Global View

Spencer Stuart Board Governance Trends is an exclusive source of insight into the way board practices are changing around the world and how they compare across countries. It is a one-stop online resource for the latest data in board composition, governance practices and director compensation among leading public companies in more than 20 countries.

## Visit spencerstuart.com/bgt for more details.
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## SpencerStuart

## About Spencer Stuart

At Spencer Stuart, we know that leadership has never mattered more. We are trusted by organizations around the world to help them make the senior-level leadership decisions that have a lasting impact on their enterprises, on their stakeholders and on the world around them. Through our executive search, board and leadership advisory services, we help build and enhance high-performing teams for select clients ranging from major multinationals to emerging companies to nonprofit institutions.

Privately held since 1956, we focus on delivering knowledge, insight and results through the collaborative efforts of a team of experts - now spanning more than 70 offices, across 30 countries and more than 50 practice specialties. Boards and leaders consistently turn to Spencer Stuart to help address their evolving leadership needs in areas such as senior-level executive search, board recruitment, board effectiveness, succession planning, in-depth senior management assessment, employee engagement and many other facets of culture and organizational effectiveness, particularly in the context of the changing stakeholder expectations of business today. For more information on Spencer Stuart, please visit www.spencerstuart.com.

Stay up to date on the trends and topics that
are relevant to your business and career.


[^0]:    *Includes consultants, lawyers, division or subsidiary leaders, line and functional leaders and all other corporate executives.

