



## **BOARD OF DIRECTORS SPECIAL MEETING**

26 March 2024 Meeting Minutes

APPROVED

**Board Members Present Via Videoconference:** Brian Bishop '83, Chair; Cathy Almand '90, Vice Chair; Ginny Caine Tonneson '80, Secretary; Glenn Strebe '87, Treasurer; Hank Hoffman '63; Hans Mueh '66; Garry Dudley '68; Bob Lowe '71; Lee Krauth '72; William Carpenter '73; Christian Evans '08; Emma Przybyslawski '10; Nathan Dial '10; Joseph Bledsoe III '11; Jennifer Walters '11.

**Board Members Absent:** Randy Helms '79, President, Class Advisory Senate.

**Advisor to the Board Present Via Videoconference:** Mike Gould '76, Executive Vice Chair.

**AOG Staff Present Via Videoconference:** Mark Hille '97, AOG/AFAF President/CEO; Katie Willemarck, AOG/AFAF CFO; Naviere Walkewicz '99, SVP, Alumni Relations and Business Development; Kelly Banet, SVP Development; Wyatt Hornsby, AOG/AFAF VP of Marketing and Communications; Jillian Wood, Chief of Staff and Special Assistant to the Boards; Emma Ross, Board Support and Office Manager.

### **I. Call to Order/Chairman's Welcome**

Chair Bishop called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m. MDT on Tuesday, 26 March 2024.

### **II. Agenda Approval**

The only item on the agenda was the 2025 election. We did not have enough time at our February 2024 meeting for the Nominating Committee to address this.

MOTION: Director Tonneson moved and Director Lowe seconded to approve the agenda. The motion was unanimously approved. The approved agenda is in Attachment 1.

### **III. Nominating Committee**

Prior to discussing the election, Director Bledsoe provided an update on the new Leadership Achievement Award. Twelve nominees were considered and three were selected. The winners will be notified by CEO Hille later this week, and they will be featured in the September issue of *Checkpoints*, along with the Young Alumni Excellence Award winners and the Distinguished Graduate Award winners.

MOTION: The Nominating Committee recommended that the Board approved the three Leadership Achievement Award winners. The motion was unanimously approved.

Committee Chair Przybyslawski then began an information briefing on the 2025 election (Attachment 2). The committee was tasked to do a hotwash of the last election, explore how the Board could ensure better member engagement through voting, and to present potential courses of action to improve and increase voting. She talked about election challenges to include the unrealistic expectation for voters to comb through over 30 candidates to make an informed selection decision. The committee does not recommend capping the number of candidates; rather they brought forward the idea of making it easier by having the Board endorse a certain number of candidates based on their skills and attributes. She noted that five elected seats and two appointed seats will be coming open when the current Board term ends. She also reminded the group about our desire to have Directors from each decade, but pointed out that we are already doing that naturally, so it likely will not be one of the primary attributes. The Nominating Committee will present the skills and attributes needed by the Board and potential weighting at the April meeting. In the fall, candidates would be scored on the weighted attributes and the top eight candidates would be presented to the Board. The intent would be for the Board to reduce the number of highlighted candidates to five. All candidates would be on the ballot, with those who best fill the skills and attributes highlighted in some manner. It was noted that the Governance Policies states that from the list of all qualified candidates, the Nominating Committee should present “for Board approval and recommendation to the membership, a slate of candidates that best offers the skills, talents, and capabilities needed.”

A lengthy discussion ensued. Some Directors were adamant that the Board should not endorse specific candidates, citing numerous reasons including the fact that we have never endorsed candidates in the past, it might discourage candidates from running or alienate them, it might appear that we are “shaping” the Board, and that it would put current Directors who are running again – but not endorsed – in an awkward position. It was noted that we already have a variety of Directors without having had to highlight any candidates. It was also pointed out that groups which currently oppose the AOG policies could erroneously interpret a Board endorsement of candidates as somehow related to them. Committee Chair Przybyslawski stressed that this process would not be shaping the Board; rather, it is simply trying to show what attributes are missing and which candidates might fill the gap.

Other Directors thought it was a reasonable idea as most graduates do not follow the Board or AOG activities very closely and this would assist them in culling through all the names on the ballot. However, there were questions on the type of skills and attributes the committee was considering and what the correct number of highlighted candidates should be. It was pointed out that if we decided to highlight candidates, it would be important as to how that was communicated to the graduate community. An idea surfaced that perhaps we should have a higher bar on the application, such as an item related to how the applicant has rendered service back to the Academy.

Chair Bishop summarized the discussion by noting that there is a general consensus that the Nominating Committee should continue to identify the recommended skills and attributes and to come up with a scoring system. There is no agreement on the number of candidates the Board should endorse, or whether we should endorse any candidates at all. For the April meeting, he asked the Nominating Committee to continue working on the attributes and how many names should potentially be highlighted.

#### **IV. Adjournment**

Chair Bishop adjourned the meeting at 13:41 a.m. MDT.

Respectfully submitted,  
Virginia Caine Tonneson, Secretary

Atch:

1. 26 March 2024 Board Meeting Agenda
2. Nominating Committee Slides