

May 28, 2024

Dear Colleagues,

As Large State components of the American Institute of Architects, we have reservations about governance changes proposed for approval by delegates at the Annual Business Meeting on June 5. While we applaud efforts of a peer chapter and numerous experienced leaders to address real and perceived shortcomings in our national governing bodies, the proposed expansion does not offer a viable solution. We ask delegates to consider voting as follows:

Governing Body Amendment. OPPOSE. Though well meaning, the current resolution presupposes a return to governance models AIA previously utilized without careful analysis of how the new structure would support the organization's mission, member services and strategic plan priorities.

While the premise of the resolution recognizes that governance of the organization needs to be reconstituted, the resolution does not address the cultural disconnects, competing agendas and overlapping roles among elected and appointed bodies that presently exist.

- 1. The current resolution assumes a traditional representational structure without identifying constituencies within AIA that should be represented beyond stating they are from small, medium or large states which resembles the old regions model.
- 2. The current resolution neither includes a vision for the Strategic Council nor a mechanism for member engagement and feedback, elevating a select group of already committed volunteers from the Council and charging them with more duties on the Board.
- 3. The current resolution relies on adding quantity without addressing the underlying shortcomings of the model. Going from 15 to 24 voting members and increasing the number of board members chosen outside the will of delegates from 8 to 17 (leaving members the ability to elect only 7 out of 24 board members) lacks forethought.

More does not equal better. There is a greater risk that it may raise false hopes of addressing longstanding challenges by merely adding seats to the table. It may further reinforce a top-down decision-making tendency. It may lessen the effectiveness and available support for those already in positions elected by

delegates, components and council. It may add even more distance between the work of the board and the circumstances of our members. And it may further delay efforts to fundamentally re-envision a governance model that is fit for our future and not one constructed from playbooks of the past.

The Repositioning Report of 2013 and the Member Voice Task Force of 2023 each echoed similar themes with governance and representation at the heart of their recommendations. Too many of those have not come to fruition and recent actions of the board have led many to question how we got here. We take the offering of this resolution by the authors in good faith and in the spirit of addressing those concerns. While we join them in calling for a serious review of our governance structure, we differ in the proposed change and look forward to a robust and collaborative dialog in the near future focused on crafting a better solution.

Sincerely,

Winston Thorne, AIA, NOMA, NCARB, CSBA AIA California 2024 President

MR. MARKER,

Julianne Scherer, AIA AIA Colorado 2024 President

NMIN

Rhonda Hammond, AIA AIA Florida 2024 President

0

Jeff Jeno, AIA AIA Illinois 2024 President

allow G. Watts

Ellen A. Watts, FAIA AIA Massachusetts 2024 President

Todd Drouillard, ÁIA AIA Michigan 2024 President

Rinan W. Penschow, ATA

Brian W. Penschow, AIA AIA New Jersey 2024 President

Willy Žambrano, FAIA AIA New York State 2024 President

Megan Bowles, AIA AIA North Carolina 2024 President

Michael Metzger, AIA, LEED AP AIA Pennsylvania 2024 President

Kelly D. Callahan, AIA AIA Virginia 2024 President

Dave Buescher, AIA AIA Washington 2024 President

Derwin Broughton, AIA, NOMA, NCARB, WELL AP Texas Society of Architects 2024 President