

## NATIONWIDE FUND ADVISORS

### GENERAL

The Board of Trustees of Nationwide Mutual Funds and Nationwide Variable Insurance Trust (the “Funds”) has approved the continued delegation of the authority to vote proxies relating to the securities held in the portfolios of the Funds to each Fund’s investment adviser or subadviser, some of which advisers and subadvisers use an independent service provider, as described below.

Nationwide Fund Advisors (“NFA” or the “Adviser”), is an investment adviser that is registered with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (the “SEC”) pursuant to the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended (the “Advisers Act”). NFA currently provides investment advisory services to registered investment companies (hereinafter referred to collectively as “Clients”).

Voting proxies that are received in connection with underlying portfolio securities held by Clients is an important element of the portfolio management services that NFA performs for Clients. NFA’s goal in performing this service is to make proxy voting decisions: (i) to vote or not to vote proxies in a manner that serves the best economic interests of Clients; and (ii) that avoid the influence of conflicts of interest. To implement this goal, NFA has adopted proxy voting guidelines (the “Proxy Voting Guidelines”) to assist it in making proxy voting decisions and in developing procedures for effecting those decisions. The Proxy Voting Guidelines are designed to ensure that, where NFA has the authority to vote proxies, all legal, fiduciary, and contractual obligations will be met.

The Proxy Voting Guidelines address a wide variety of individual topics, including, among other matters, shareholder voting rights, anti-takeover defenses, board structures and the election of directors, executive and director compensation, reorganizations, mergers, and various shareholder proposals.

The proxy voting records of the Funds are available to shareholders on the Trust’s website, [www.nationwidefunds.com](http://www.nationwidefunds.com), and the SEC’s website.

### HOW PROXIES ARE VOTED

NFA has delegated to Institutional Shareholder Services (“ISS”), an independent service provider, the administration of proxy voting for Client portfolio securities directly managed by NFA, subject to oversight by NFA’s “Proxy Voting Committee.” ISS, a Delaware corporation, provides proxy-voting services to many asset managers on a global basis. The NFA Proxy Voting Committee has reviewed, and will continue to review annually, the relationship with ISS and the quality and effectiveness of the various services provided by ISS.

Specifically, ISS assists NFA in the proxy voting and corporate governance oversight process by developing and updating the “ISS Proxy Voting Guidelines,” which are incorporated into the Proxy Voting Guidelines, and by providing research and analysis, recommendations regarding votes, operational implementation, and recordkeeping and reporting services. NFA’s decision to retain ISS is based principally on the view that the services that ISS provides, subject to oversight by NFA, generally will result in proxy voting decisions which serve the best economic interests of Clients. NFA has reviewed, analyzed, and determined that the ISS Proxy Voting Guidelines are consistent with the views of NFA on the various types of proxy proposals. When the ISS Proxy Voting Guidelines do not cover a specific proxy issue and ISS does not provide a recommendation: (i) ISS will notify NFA; and (ii) NFA will use its best judgment in voting proxies on behalf of the Clients. A summary of the ISS Proxy Voting Guidelines is set forth below.

### CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

NFA does not engage in investment banking, administration or management of corporate retirement plans, or any other activity that is likely to create a potential conflict of interest. In addition, because Client proxies are voted by ISS pursuant to the pre-determined ISS Proxy Voting Guidelines, NFA generally does not make an actual determination of how to vote a particular proxy, and, therefore, proxies voted on behalf of Clients do not reflect any conflict of interest. Nevertheless, the Proxy Voting Guidelines address the possibility of such a conflict of interest arising.

The Proxy Voting Guidelines provide that, if a proxy proposal were to create a conflict of interest between the interests of a Client and those of NFA (or between a Client and those of any of NFA's affiliates, including Nationwide Fund Distributors LLC and Nationwide), then the proxy should be voted strictly in conformity with the recommendation of ISS. To monitor compliance with this policy, any proposed or actual deviation from a recommendation of ISS must be reported by the NFA Proxy Voting Committee to the chief counsel for NFA. The chief counsel for NFA then will provide guidance concerning the proposed deviation and whether a deviation presents any potential conflict of interest. If NFA then casts a proxy vote that deviates from an ISS recommendation, the affected Client (or other appropriate Client authority) will be given a report of this deviation.

### **CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER WHICH PROXIES WILL NOT BE VOTED**

NFA, through ISS, shall attempt to process every vote for all domestic and foreign proxies that they receive; however, there may be cases in which NFA will not process a proxy because it is impractical or too expensive to do so. For example, NFA will not process a proxy in connection with a foreign security if the cost of voting a foreign proxy outweighs the benefit of voting the foreign proxy, when NFA has not been given enough time to process the vote, or when a sell order for the foreign security is outstanding and proxy voting would impede the sale of the foreign security. Also, NFA generally will not seek to recall the securities on loan for the purpose of voting the securities unless it is in the best interests of the applicable Fund to do so.

### **DELEGATION OF PROXY VOTING TO SUBADVISERS TO FUNDS**

For any Fund, or portion of a Fund that is directly managed by a subadviser, the Trustees of the Fund and NFA have delegated proxy voting authority to that sub-adviser. Each subadviser has provided its proxy voting policies to NFA for review and these proxy voting policies are described below. Each subadviser is required to represent quarterly to NFA that (1) all proxies of the Fund(s) advised by the sub-adviser were voted in accordance with the subadviser's proxy voting policies as provided to NFA and (2) there have been no material changes to the subadviser's proxy voting policies.

### **ISS' 2018 U.S. Proxy Voting Concise Guidelines**

#### **BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

##### **Voting on Director Nominees in Uncontested Elections**

General Recommendation: Generally vote for director nominees, except under the following circumstances:

##### **Independence**

Vote against<sup>1</sup> or withhold from non-independent directors (Executive Directors and Non-Independent Non-Executive Directors per ISS' Categorization of Directors) when:

- Independent directors comprise 50 percent or less of the board;
- The non-independent director serves on the audit, compensation, or nominating committee;
- The company lacks an audit, compensation, or nominating committee so that the full board functions as that committee; or
- The company lacks a formal nominating committee, even if the board attests that the independent directors fulfill the functions of such a committee.

##### **Composition**

Attendance at Board and Committee Meetings: Generally vote against or withhold from directors (except new nominees, who should be considered case-by-case<sup>2</sup>) who attend less than 75 percent of the aggregate of their board and committee meetings for the period for which they served, unless an acceptable reason for absences is disclosed in the proxy or another SEC filing. Acceptable reasons for director absences are generally limited to the following:

- Medical issues/illness;
- Family emergencies; and
- Missing only one meeting (when the total of all meetings is three or fewer).

If the proxy disclosure is unclear and insufficient to determine whether a director attended at least 75 percent of the aggregate of his/her board and committee meetings during his/her period of service, vote against or withhold from the director(s) in question.

**Overboarded Directors:** Generally vote against or withhold from individual directors who:

- Sit on more than five public company boards; or
- Are CEOs of public companies who sit on the boards of more than two public companies besides their own— withhold only at their outside boards<sup>3</sup>.

**Diversity:** Highlight boards with no gender diversity. However, no adverse vote recommendations will be made due to any lack of gender diversity.

### **Responsiveness**

Vote case-by-case on individual directors, committee members, or the entire board of directors as appropriate if:

- The board failed to act on a shareholder proposal that received the support of a majority of the shares cast in the previous year. Factors that will be considered are:
  - Disclosed outreach efforts by the board to shareholders in the wake of the vote;
  - Rationale provided in the proxy statement for the level of implementation;
  - The subject matter of the proposal;
  - The level of support for and opposition to the resolution in past meetings;
  - Actions taken by the board in response to the majority vote and its engagement with shareholders;
  - The continuation of the underlying issue as a voting item on the ballot (as either shareholder or management proposals); and
  - Other factors as appropriate.
- The board failed to act on takeover offers where the majority of shares are tendered;
- At the previous board election, any director received more than 50 percent withhold/against votes of the shares cast and the company has failed to address the issue(s) that caused the high withhold/against vote.

Vote case-by-case on Compensation Committee members (or, in exceptional cases, the full board) and the Say on Pay proposal if:

- The company's previous say-on-pay received the support of less than 70 percent of votes cast. Factors that will be considered are:
  - The company's response, including:
    - Disclosure of engagement efforts with major institutional investors, including the frequency and timing of engagements and the company participants (including whether independent directors participated);
    - Disclosure of the specific concerns voiced by dissenting shareholders that led to the say-on-pay opposition;
    - Disclosure of specific and meaningful actions taken to address shareholders' concerns;
  - Other recent compensation actions taken by the company;
  - Whether the issues raised are recurring or isolated;
  - The company's ownership structure; and
  - Whether the support level was less than 50 percent, which would warrant the highest degree of responsiveness.
- The board implements an advisory vote on executive compensation on a less frequent basis than the frequency that received the plurality of votes cast.

### **Accountability**

Vote against or withhold from the entire board of directors (except new nominees<sup>4</sup>, who should be considered case-by- case) for the following:

### **Problematic Takeover Defenses/Governance Structure**

**Poison Pills:** Vote against or withhold from all nominees (except new nominees, who should be considered case-by- case) if:

- The company has a poison pill that was not approved by shareholders<sup>5</sup>. However, vote case-by-case on nominees if the board adopts an initial pill with a term of one year or less, depending on the disclosed rationale for the adoption, and other factors as relevant (such as a commitment to put any renewal to a shareholder vote).
- The board makes a material adverse modification to an existing pill, including, but not limited to, extension, renewal, or lowering the trigger, without shareholder approval.

**Classified Board Structure:** The board is classified, and a continuing director responsible for a problematic governance issue at the board/committee level that would warrant a withhold/against vote recommendation is not up for election. All appropriate nominees (except new) may be held accountable.

**Removal of Shareholder Discretion on Classified Boards:** The company has opted into, or failed to opt out of, state laws requiring a classified board structure.

**Director Performance Evaluation:** The board lacks mechanisms to promote accountability and oversight, coupled with sustained poor performance relative to peers. Sustained poor performance is measured by one- and three-year total shareholder returns in the bottom half of a company's four-digit GICS industry group (Russell 3000 companies only). Take into consideration the company's five-year total shareholder return and operational metrics. Problematic provisions include but are not limited to:

- A classified board structure;
- A supermajority vote requirement;
- Either a plurality vote standard in uncontested director elections, or a majority vote standard in contested elections;
- The inability of shareholders to call special meetings;
- The inability of shareholders to act by written consent;
- A multi-class capital structure; and/or
- A non-shareholder-approved poison pill.

**Unilateral Bylaw/Charter Amendments and Problematic Capital Structures:** Generally vote against or withhold from directors individually, committee members, or the entire board (except new nominees, who should be considered case-by-case) if the board amends the company's bylaws or charter without shareholder approval in a manner that materially diminishes shareholders' rights or that could adversely impact shareholders, considering the following factors:

- The board's rationale for adopting the bylaw/charter amendment without shareholder ratification;
- Disclosure by the company of any significant engagement with shareholders regarding the amendment;
- The level of impairment of shareholders' rights caused by the board's unilateral amendment to the bylaws/charter;
- The board's track record with regard to unilateral board action on bylaw/charter amendments or other entrenchment provisions;
- The company's ownership structure;
- The company's existing governance provisions;
- The timing of the board's amendment to the bylaws/charter in connection with a significant business development; and
- Other factors, as deemed appropriate, that may be relevant to determine the impact of the amendment on shareholders.

Unless the adverse amendment is reversed or submitted to a binding shareholder vote, in subsequent years vote case-by-case on director nominees. Generally vote against (except new nominees, who should be considered case-by-case) if the directors:

- Classified the board;
- Adopted supermajority vote requirements to amend the bylaws or charter; or
- Eliminated shareholders' ability to amend bylaws.

**Problematic Governance Structure - Newly public companies:** For newly public companies, generally vote against or withhold from directors individually, committee members, or the entire board (except new nominees, who should be considered case-by-case) if, prior to or in connection with the company's public offering, the company or its board adopted bylaw or charter provisions materially adverse to shareholder rights, or implemented a multi-class capital structure in which the classes have unequal voting rights considering the following factors:

- The level of impairment of shareholders' rights;
- The disclosed rationale;

- The ability to change the governance structure (e.g., limitations on shareholders' right to amend the bylaws or charter, or supermajority vote requirements to amend the bylaws or charter);
- The ability of shareholders to hold directors accountable through annual director elections, or whether the company has a classified board structure;
- Any reasonable sunset provision; and
- Other relevant factors.

Unless the adverse provision and/or problematic capital structure is reversed or removed, vote case-by-case on director nominees in subsequent years.

### **Restrictions on Shareholders' Rights**

**Restricting Binding Shareholder Proposals:** Generally vote against or withhold from the members of the governance committee if:

- The company's governing documents impose undue restrictions on shareholders' ability to amend the bylaws. Such restrictions include, but are not limited to: outright prohibition on the submission of binding shareholder proposals, or share ownership requirements or time holding requirements in excess of SEC Rule 14a-8. Vote against on an ongoing basis.

### **Problematic Audit-Related Practices**

Generally vote against or withhold from the members of the Audit Committee if:

- The non-audit fees paid to the auditor are excessive;
- The company receives an adverse opinion on the company's financial statements from its auditor; or
- There is persuasive evidence that the Audit Committee entered into an inappropriate indemnification agreement with its auditor that limits the ability of the company, or its shareholders, to pursue legitimate legal recourse against the audit firm.

Vote case-by-case on members of the Audit Committee and potentially the full board if:

- Poor accounting practices are identified that rise to a level of serious concern, such as: fraud; misapplication of GAAP; and material weaknesses identified in Section 404 disclosures. Examine the severity, breadth, chronological sequence, and duration, as well as the company's efforts at remediation or corrective actions, in determining whether withhold/against votes are warranted.

### **Problematic Compensation Practices**

In the absence of an Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation (Say on Pay) ballot item or in egregious situations, vote against or withhold from the members of the Compensation Committee and potentially the full board if:

- There is a significant misalignment between CEO pay and company performance (pay for performance);
- The company maintains significant problematic pay practices; or
- The board exhibits a significant level of poor communication and responsiveness to shareholders.

Generally vote against or withhold from the Compensation Committee chair, other committee members, or potentially the full board if:

- The company fails to include a Say on Pay ballot item when required under SEC provisions, or under the company's declared frequency of say on pay; or
- The company fails to include a Frequency of Say on Pay ballot item when required under SEC provisions.

Generally vote against members of the board committee responsible for approving/setting non-employee director compensation if there is a pattern (i.e. two or more years) of awarding excessive non-employee director compensation without disclosing a compelling rationale or other mitigating factors.

## **Problematic Pledging of Company Stock:**

Vote against the members of the committee that oversees risks related to pledging, or the full board, where a significant level of pledged company stock by executives or directors raises concerns. The following factors will be considered:

- The presence of an anti-pledging policy, disclosed in the proxy statement, that prohibits future pledging activity;
- The magnitude of aggregate pledged shares in terms of total common shares outstanding, market value, and trading volume;
- Disclosure of progress or lack thereof in reducing the magnitude of aggregate pledged shares over time;
- Disclosure in the proxy statement that shares subject to stock ownership and holding requirements do not include pledged company stock; and
- Any other relevant factors.

## **Governance Failures**

Under extraordinary circumstances, vote against or withhold from directors individually, committee members, or the entire board, due to:

- Material failures of governance, stewardship, risk oversight<sup>6</sup>, or fiduciary responsibilities at the company;
- Failure to replace management as appropriate; or
- Egregious actions related to a director's service on other boards that raise substantial doubt about his or her ability to effectively oversee management and serve the best interests of shareholders at any company.

## **Voting on Director Nominees in Contested Elections**

### **Vote-No Campaigns**

**General Recommendation:** In cases where companies are targeted in connection with public "vote-no" campaigns, evaluate director nominees under the existing governance policies for voting on director nominees in uncontested elections. Take into consideration the arguments submitted by shareholders and other publicly available information.

### **Proxy Contests/Proxy Access — Voting for Director Nominees in Contested Elections**

**General Recommendation:** Vote case-by-case on the election of directors in contested elections, considering the following factors:

- Long-term financial performance of the company relative to its industry;
- Management's track record;
- Background to the contested election;
- Nominee qualifications and any compensatory arrangements;
- Strategic plan of dissident slate and quality of the critique against management;
- Likelihood that the proposed goals and objectives can be achieved (both slates); and
- Stock ownership positions.

In the case of candidates nominated pursuant to proxy access, vote case-by-case considering any applicable factors listed above or additional factors which may be relevant, including those that are specific to the company, to the nominee(s) and/or to the nature of the election (such as whether or not there are more candidates than board seats).

### **Independent Chair (Separate Chair/CEO)**

**General Recommendation:** Generally vote for shareholder proposals requiring that the chairman's position be filled by an independent director, taking into consideration the following:

- The scope of the proposal;
- The company's current board leadership structure;
- The company's governance structure and practices;
- Company performance; and
- Any other relevant factors that may be applicable.



Regarding the scope of the proposal, consider whether the proposal is precatory or binding and whether the proposal is seeking an immediate change in the chairman role or the policy can be implemented at the next CEO transition.

Under the review of the company's board leadership structure, ISS may support the proposal under the following scenarios absent a compelling rationale: the presence of an executive or non-independent chair in addition to the CEO; a recent recombination of the role of CEO and chair; and/or departure from a structure with an independent chair. ISS will also consider any recent transitions in board leadership and the effect such transitions may have on independent board leadership as well as the designation of a lead director role.

When considering the governance structure, ISS will consider the overall independence of the board, the independence of key committees, the establishment of governance guidelines, board tenure and its relationship to CEO tenure, and any other factors that may be relevant. Any concerns about a company's governance structure will weigh in favor of support for the proposal.

The review of the company's governance practices may include, but is not limited to, poor compensation practices, material failures of governance and risk oversight, related-party transactions or other issues putting director independence at risk, corporate or management scandals, and actions by management or the board with potential or realized negative impact on shareholders. Any such practices may suggest a need for more independent oversight at the company thus warranting support of the proposal.

ISS' performance assessment will generally consider one-, three-, and five-year TSR compared to the company's peers and the market as a whole. While poor performance will weigh in favor of the adoption of an independent chair policy, strong performance over the long term will be considered a mitigating factor when determining whether the proposed leadership change warrants support.

## **Proxy Access**

**General Recommendation:** Generally vote for management and shareholder proposals for proxy access with the following provisions:

- **Ownership threshold:** maximum requirement not more than three percent (3%) of the voting power;
- **Ownership duration:** maximum requirement not longer than three (3) years of continuous ownership for each member of the nominating group;
- **Aggregation:** minimal or no limits on the number of shareholders permitted to form a nominating group;
- **Cap:** cap on nominees of generally twenty-five percent (25%) of the board.

Review for reasonableness any other restrictions on the right of proxy access. Generally vote against proposals that are more restrictive than these guidelines.

## **CAPITAL/RESTRUCTURING**

### **Common Stock Authorization**

**General Recommendation:** Vote for proposals to increase the number of authorized common shares where the primary purpose of the increase is to issue shares in connection with a transaction on the same ballot that warrants support.

Vote against proposals at companies with more than one class of common stock to increase the number of authorized shares of the class of common stock that has superior voting rights.

Vote against proposals to increase the number of authorized common shares if a vote for a reverse stock split on the same ballot is warranted despite the fact that the authorized shares would not be reduced proportionally.

Vote case-by-case on all other proposals to increase the number of shares of common stock authorized for issuance. Take into account company-specific factors that include, at a minimum, the following:

- **Past Board Performance:**
  - The company's use of authorized shares during the last three years;

- The Current Request:
  - Disclosure in the proxy statement of the specific purposes of the proposed increase;
  - Disclosure in the proxy statement of specific and severe risks to shareholders of not approving the request; and
  - The dilutive impact of the request as determined relative to an allowable increase calculated by ISS (typically 100 percent of existing authorized shares) that reflects the company's need for shares and total shareholder returns.

ISS will apply the relevant allowable increase below to requests to increase common stock that are for general corporate purposes (or to the general corporate purposes portion of a request that also includes a specific need):

- Most companies: 100 percent of existing authorized shares.
- Companies with less than 50 percent of existing authorized shares either outstanding or reserved for issuance: 50 percent of existing authorized shares.
- Companies with one- and three-year total shareholder returns (TSRs) in the bottom 10 percent of the U.S. market as of the end of the calendar quarter that is closest to their most recent fiscal year end: 50 percent of existing authorized shares.
- Companies at which both conditions (B and C) above are both present: 25 percent of existing authorized shares.

If there is an acquisition, private placement, or similar transaction on the ballot (not including equity incentive plans) that ISS is recommending FOR, the allowable increase will be the greater of (i) twice the amount needed to support the transactions on the ballot, and (ii) the allowable increase as calculated above.

## Mergers and Acquisitions

**General Recommendation:** Vote case-by-case on mergers and acquisitions. Review and evaluate the merits and drawbacks of the proposed transaction, balancing various and sometimes countervailing factors including:

- Valuation - Is the value to be received by the target shareholders (or paid by the acquirer) reasonable? While the fairness opinion may provide an initial starting point for assessing valuation reasonableness, emphasis is placed on the offer premium, market reaction, and strategic rationale.
- Market reaction - How has the market responded to the proposed deal? A negative market reaction should cause closer scrutiny of a deal.
- Strategic rationale - Does the deal make sense strategically? From where is the value derived? Cost and revenue synergies should not be overly aggressive or optimistic, but reasonably achievable. Management should also have a favorable track record of successful integration of historical acquisitions.
- Negotiations and process - Were the terms of the transaction negotiated at arm's-length? Was the process fair and equitable? A fair process helps to ensure the best price for shareholders. Significant negotiation "wins" can also signify the deal makers' competency. The comprehensiveness of the sales process (e.g., full auction, partial auction, no auction) can also affect shareholder value.
- Conflicts of interest - Are insiders benefiting from the transaction disproportionately and inappropriately as compared to non-insider shareholders? As the result of potential conflicts, the directors and officers of the company may be more likely to vote to approve a merger than if they did not hold these interests. Consider whether these interests may have influenced these directors and officers to support or recommend the merger. The CIC figure presented in the "ISS Transaction Summary" section of this report is an aggregate figure that can in certain cases be a misleading indicator of the true value transfer from shareholders to insiders. Where such figure appears to be excessive, analyze the underlying assumptions to determine whether a potential conflict exists.
- Governance - Will the combined company have a better or worse governance profile than the current governance profiles of the respective parties to the transaction? If the governance profile is to change for the worse, the burden is on the company to prove that other issues (such as valuation) outweigh any deterioration in governance.

## COMPENSATION

### Executive Pay Evaluation

- Underlying all evaluations are five global principles that most investors expect corporations to adhere to in designing and administering executive and director compensation programs:



- Maintain appropriate pay-for-performance alignment, with emphasis on long-term shareholder value: This principle encompasses overall executive pay practices, which must be designed to attract, retain, and appropriately motivate the key employees who drive shareholder value creation over the long term. It will take into consideration, among other factors, the link between pay and performance; the mix between fixed and variable pay; performance goals; and equity-based plan costs;
- Avoid arrangements that risk “pay for failure”: This principle addresses the appropriateness of long or indefinite contracts, excessive severance packages, and guaranteed compensation;
- Maintain an independent and effective compensation committee: This principle promotes oversight of executive pay programs by directors with appropriate skills, knowledge, experience, and a sound process for compensation decision-making (e.g., including access to independent expertise and advice when needed);
- Provide shareholders with clear, comprehensive compensation disclosures: This principle underscores the importance of informative and timely disclosures that enable shareholders to evaluate executive pay practices fully and fairly;
- Avoid inappropriate pay to non-executive directors: This principle recognizes the interests of shareholders in ensuring that compensation to outside directors is reasonable and does not compromise their independence and ability to make appropriate judgments in overseeing managers’ pay and performance. At the market level, it may incorporate a variety of generally accepted best practices.

### **Advisory Votes on Executive Compensation—Management Proposals (Management Say-on-Pay)**

General Recommendation: Vote case-by-case on ballot items related to executive pay and practices, as well as certain aspects of outside director compensation.

Vote against Advisory Votes on Executive Compensation (Say-on-Pay or “SOP”) if:

- There is a significant misalignment between CEO pay and company performance (pay for performance);
- The company maintains significant problematic pay practices;
- The board exhibits a significant level of poor communication and responsiveness to shareholders.

Vote against or withhold from the members of the Compensation Committee and potentially the full board if:

- There is no SOP on the ballot, and an against vote on an SOP would otherwise be warranted due to pay-for-performance misalignment, problematic pay practices, or the lack of adequate responsiveness on compensation issues raised previously, or a combination thereof;
- The board fails to respond adequately to a previous SOP proposal that received less than 70 percent support of votes cast;
- The company has recently practiced or approved problematic pay practices, including option repricing or option backdating; or
- The situation is egregious.

### **Primary Evaluation Factors for Executive Pay**

#### **Pay-for-Performance Evaluation**

ISS annually conducts a pay-for-performance analysis to identify strong or satisfactory alignment between pay and performance over a sustained period. With respect to companies in the Russell 3000 or Russell 3000E Indices<sup>7</sup>, this analysis considers the following:

##### 1. Peer Group<sup>8</sup> Alignment:

- The degree of alignment between the company’s annualized TSR rank and the CEO’s annualized total pay rank within a peer group, each measured over a three-year period.
- The rankings of CEO total pay and company financial performance within a peer group, each measured over a three-year period.
- The multiple of the CEO’s total pay relative to the peer group median in the most recent fiscal year.

2. Absolute Alignment<sup>9</sup> – the absolute alignment between the trend in CEO pay and company TSR over the prior five fiscal years – i.e., the difference between the trend in annual pay changes and the trend in annualized TSR during the period.

If the above analysis demonstrates significant unsatisfactory long-term pay-for-performance alignment or, in the case of companies outside the Russell indices, misaligned pay and performance are otherwise suggested, our analysis may include any of the following qualitative factors, as relevant to evaluating how various pay elements may work to encourage or to undermine long-term value creation and alignment with shareholder interests:

- The ratio of performance- to time-based equity awards;
- The overall ratio of performance-based compensation;
- The completeness of disclosure and rigor of performance goals;
- The company’s peer group benchmarking practices;
- Actual results of financial/operational metrics, such as growth in revenue, profit, cash flow, etc., both absolute and relative to peers;
- Special circumstances related to, for example, a new CEO in the prior FY or anomalous equity grant practices (e.g., bi-annual awards);
- Realizable pay<sup>10</sup> compared to grant pay; and
- Any other factors deemed relevant.

### **Problematic Pay Practices**

The focus is on executive compensation practices that contravene the global pay principles, including:

- Problematic practices related to non-performance-based compensation elements;
- Incentives that may motivate excessive risk-taking; and
- Options backdating.

### **Problematic Pay Practices related to Non-Performance-Based Compensation Elements**

Pay elements that are not directly based on performance are generally evaluated case-by-case considering the context of a company’s overall pay program and demonstrated pay-for-performance philosophy. Please refer to ISS’ Compensation FAQ document for detail on specific pay practices that have been identified as potentially problematic and may lead to negative recommendations if they are deemed to be inappropriate or unjustified relative to executive pay best practices. The list below highlights the problematic practices that carry significant weight in this overall consideration and may result in adverse vote recommendations:

- Repricing or replacing of underwater stock options/SARS without prior shareholder approval (including cash buyouts and voluntary surrender of underwater options);
- Extraordinary perquisites or tax gross-ups, including any gross-up related to a secular trust or restricted stock vesting, or lifetime perquisites;
- New or extended agreements that provide for:
  - Excessive CIC payments (generally exceeding 3 times base salary and average/target/most recent bonus);
  - CIC severance payments without involuntary job loss or substantial diminution of duties (“single” or “modified single” triggers);
  - CIC payments with excise tax gross-ups (including “modified” gross-ups);
  - Multi-year guaranteed awards that are not at risk due to rigorous performance conditions;
  - Liberal CIC definition combined with any single-trigger CIC benefits;
- Insufficient executive compensation disclosure by externally-managed issuers (EMIs) such that a reasonable assessment of pay programs and practices applicable to the EMI’s executives is not possible;
- Any other provision or practice deemed to be egregious and present a significant risk to investors.

### **Incentives that may Motivate Excessive Risk-Taking**

- Multi-year guaranteed awards;
- A single or common performance metric used for short- and long-term incentives;
- Lucrative severance packages;
- High pay opportunities relative to industry peers;
- Disproportionate supplemental pensions; or
- Mega equity grants that provide overly large upside opportunity.

Factors that potentially mitigate the impact of risky incentives include rigorous claw-back provisions, robust stock ownership/holding guidelines, and limitations on accelerated vesting triggers.

### **Options Backdating**

The following factors should be examined case-by-case to allow for distinctions to be made between “sloppy” plan administration versus deliberate action or fraud:

- Reason and motive for the options backdating issue, such as inadvertent vs. deliberate grant date changes;
- Duration of options backdating;
- Size of restatement due to options backdating;
- Corrective actions taken by the board or compensation committee, such as canceling or re-pricing backdated options, the recouping of option gains on backdated grants; and
- Adoption of a grant policy that prohibits backdating, and creates a fixed grant schedule or window period for equity grants in the future.

### **Compensation Committee Communications and Responsiveness**

Consider the following factors case-by-case when evaluating ballot items related to executive pay on the board’s responsiveness to investor input and engagement on compensation issues:

- Failure to respond to majority-supported shareholder proposals on executive pay topics; or
- Failure to adequately respond to the company’s previous say-on-pay proposal that received the support of less than 70 percent of votes cast, taking into account:
  - The company’s response, including:
    - Disclosure of engagement efforts with major institutional investors, including the frequency and timing of engagements and the company participants (including whether independent directors participated);
    - Disclosure of the specific concerns voiced by dissenting shareholders that led to the say-on-pay opposition;
    - Disclosure of specific and meaningful actions taken to address shareholders’ concerns;
- Other recent compensation actions taken by the company;
- Whether the issues raised are recurring or isolated;
- The company’s ownership structure; and
- Whether the support level was less than 50 percent, which would warrant the highest degree of responsiveness.

### **Equity-Based and Other Incentive Plans**

**General Recommendation:** Vote case-by-case on certain equity-based compensation plans<sup>11</sup> depending on a combination of certain plan features and equity grant practices, where positive factors may counterbalance negative factors, and vice versa, as evaluated using an “equity plan scorecard” (EPSC) approach with three pillars:

- **Plan Cost:** The total estimated cost of the company’s equity plans relative to industry/market cap peers, measured by the company’s estimated Shareholder Value Transfer (SVT) in relation to peers and considering both:
- SVT based on new shares requested plus shares remaining for future grants, plus outstanding unvested/unexercised grants; and
- SVT based only on new shares requested plus shares remaining for future grants.

#### **Plan Features:**

- Discretionary or automatic single-triggered award vesting upon a change in control (CIC);
- Discretionary vesting authority;
- Liberal share recycling on various award types;
- Lack of minimum vesting period for grants made under the plan;
- Dividends payable prior to award vesting.

#### **Grant Practices:**

- The company’s three-year burn rate relative to its industry/market cap peers;
- Vesting requirements in most recent CEO equity grants (3-year look-back);

- The estimated duration of the plan (based on the sum of shares remaining available and the new shares requested, divided by the average annual shares granted in the prior three years);
- The proportion of the CEO's most recent equity grants/awards subject to performance conditions;
- Whether the company maintains a claw-back policy;
- Whether the company has established post-exercise/vesting share-holding requirements.

Generally vote against the plan proposal if the combination of above factors indicates that the plan is not, overall, in shareholders' interests, or if any of the following egregious factors apply:

- Awards may vest in connection with a liberal change-of-control definition;
- The plan would permit repricing or cash buyout of underwater options without shareholder approval (either by expressly permitting it – for NYSE and Nasdaq listed companies – or by not prohibiting it when the company has a history of repricing – for non-listed companies);
- The plan is a vehicle for problematic pay practices or a significant pay-for-performance disconnect under certain circumstances; or
- Any other plan features are determined to have a significant negative impact on shareholder interests.

## **SOCIAL/ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

### **Global Approach**

Issues covered under the policy include a wide range of topics, including consumer and product safety, environment and energy, labor standards and human rights, workplace and board diversity, and corporate political issues. While a variety of factors goes into each analysis, the overall principle guiding all vote recommendations focuses on how the proposal may enhance or protect shareholder value in either the short or long term.

**General Recommendation:** Generally vote case-by-case, taking into consideration whether implementation of the proposal is likely to enhance or protect shareholder value, and in addition the following will also be considered:

- If the issues presented in the proposal are more appropriately or effectively dealt with through legislation or government regulation;
- If the company has already responded in an appropriate and sufficient manner to the issue(s) raised in the proposal;
- Whether the proposal's request is unduly burdensome (scope or timeframe) or overly prescriptive;
- The company's approach compared with any industry standard practices for addressing the issue(s) raised by the proposal;
- If the proposal requests increased disclosure or greater transparency, whether or not reasonable and sufficient information is currently available to shareholders from the company or from other publicly available sources; and
- If the proposal requests increased disclosure or greater transparency, whether or not implementation would reveal proprietary or confidential information that could place the company at a competitive disadvantage.

### **Climate Change/Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions**

**General Recommendation:** Generally vote for resolutions requesting that a company disclose information on the financial, physical, or regulatory risks it faces related to climate change on its operations and investments or on how the company identifies, measures, and manages such risks, considering:

- Whether the company already provides current, publicly-available information on the impact that climate change may have on the company as well as associated company policies and procedures to address related risks and/or opportunities;
- The company's level of disclosure compared to industry peers; and
- Whether there are significant controversies, fines, penalties, or litigation associated with the company's climate change-related performance.

Generally vote for proposals requesting a report on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from company operations and/or products and operations, unless:

- The company already discloses current, publicly-available information on the impacts that GHG emissions may have on the company as well as associated company policies and procedures to address related risks and/or opportunities;

- The company's level of disclosure is comparable to that of industry peers; and
- There are no significant, controversies, fines, penalties, or litigation associated with the company's GHG emissions.

Vote case-by-case on proposals that call for the adoption of GHG reduction goals from products and operations, taking into account:

- Whether the company provides disclosure of year-over-year GHG emissions performance data;
- Whether company disclosure lags behind industry peers;
- The company's actual GHG emissions performance;
- The company's current GHG emission policies, oversight mechanisms, and related initiatives; and
- Whether the company has been the subject of recent, significant violations, fines, litigation, or controversy related to GHG emissions.

## Board Diversity

**General Recommendation:** Generally vote for requests for reports on a company's efforts to diversify the board, unless:

- The gender and racial minority representation of the company's board is reasonably inclusive in relation to companies of similar size and business; and
- The board already reports on its nominating procedures and gender and racial minority initiatives on the board and within the company.

Vote case-by-case on proposals asking a company to increase the gender and racial minority representation on its board, taking into account:

- The degree of existing gender and racial minority diversity on the company's board and among its executive officers;
- The level of gender and racial minority representation that exists at the company's industry peers;
- The company's established process for addressing gender and racial minority board representation;
- Whether the proposal includes an overly prescriptive request to amend nominating committee charter language;
- The independence of the company's nominating committee;
- Whether the company uses an outside search firm to identify potential director nominees; and
- Whether the company has had recent controversies, fines, or litigation regarding equal employment practices.

## Gender Pay Gap

**General Recommendation:** Generally vote case-by-case on requests for reports on a company's pay data by gender, or a report on a company's policies and goals to reduce any gender pay gap, taking into account:

- The company's current policies and disclosure related to both its diversity and inclusion policies and practices and its compensation philosophy and fair and equitable compensation practices;
- Whether the company has been the subject of recent controversy, litigation, or regulatory actions related to gender pay gap issues; and
- Whether the company's reporting regarding gender pay gap policies or initiatives is lagging its peers.

## Data Security, Privacy, and Internet Issues

**General Recommendation:** Vote case-by-case on proposals requesting the disclosure or implementation of data security, privacy, or information access and management policies and procedures, considering:

- The level of disclosure of company policies and procedures relating to data security, privacy, freedom of speech, information access and management, and Internet censorship;
- Engagement in dialogue with governments or relevant groups with respect to data security, privacy, or the free flow of information on the Internet;
- The scope of business involvement and of investment in countries whose governments censor or monitor the Internet and other telecommunications;
- Applicable market-specific laws or regulations that may be imposed on the company; and
- Controversies, fines, or litigation related to data security, privacy, freedom of speech, or Internet censorship.

## Lobbying

**General Recommendation:** Vote case-by-case on proposals requesting information on a company's lobbying (including direct, indirect, and grassroots lobbying) activities, policies, or procedures, considering:

- The company's current disclosure of relevant lobbying policies, and management and board oversight;
- The company's disclosure regarding trade associations or other groups that it supports, or is a member of, that engage in lobbying activities; and
- Recent significant controversies, fines, or litigation regarding the company's lobbying-related activities.

## Political Contributions

**General Recommendation:** Generally vote for proposals requesting greater disclosure of a company's political contributions and trade association spending policies and activities, considering:

- The company's policies, and management and board oversight related to its direct political contributions and payments to trade associations or other groups that may be used for political purposes;
- The company's disclosure regarding its support of, and participation in, trade associations or other groups that may make political contributions; and
- Recent significant controversies, fines, or litigation related to the company's political contributions or political activities.

Vote against proposals barring a company from making political contributions. Businesses are affected by legislation at the federal, state, and local level; barring political contributions can put the company at a competitive disadvantage.

Vote against proposals to publish in newspapers and other media a company's political contributions. Such publications could present significant cost to the company without providing commensurate value to shareholders.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> In general, companies with a plurality vote standard use "Withhold" as the contrary vote option in director elections; companies with a majority vote standard use "Against". However, it will vary by company and the proxy must be checked to determine the valid contrary vote option for the particular company.

<sup>2</sup> New nominees who served for only part of the fiscal year are generally exempted from the attendance policy.

<sup>3</sup> Although all of a CEO's subsidiary boards will be counted as separate boards, ISS will not recommend a withhold vote for the CEO of a parent company board or any of the controlled (>50 percent ownership) subsidiaries of that parent, but may do so at subsidiaries that are less than 50 percent controlled and boards outside the parent/subsidiary relationships.

<sup>4</sup> A "new nominee" is any current nominee who has not already been elected by shareholders and who joined the board after the problematic action in question transpired. If ISS cannot determine whether the nominee joined the board before or after the problematic action transpired, the nominee will be considered a "new nominee" if he or she joined the board within the 12 months prior to the upcoming shareholder meeting.

<sup>5</sup> Public shareholders only, approval prior to a company's becoming public is insufficient.

<sup>6</sup> Examples of failure of risk oversight include, but are not limited to: bribery; large or serial fines or sanctions from regulatory bodies; significant adverse legal judgments or settlement; or hedging of company stock.

<sup>7</sup> The Russell 3000E Index includes approximately 4,000 of the largest U.S. equity securities.

<sup>8</sup> The revised peer group is generally comprised of 14-24 companies that are selected using market cap, revenue (or assets for certain financial firms), GICS industry group, and company's selected peers' GICS industry group, with size constraints, via a process designed to select peers that are comparable to the subject company in terms of revenue/assets and industry, and also within a market-cap bucket that is reflective of the company's. For Oil, Gas & Consumable Fuels companies, market cap is the only size determinant.

<sup>9</sup> Only Russell 3000 Index companies are subject to the Absolute Alignment analysis.

<sup>10</sup> ISS research reports include realizable pay for S&P 1500 companies.

<sup>11</sup> Proposals evaluated under the EPSC policy generally include those to approve or amend (1) stock option plans for employees and/or employees and directors, (2) restricted stock plans for employees and/or employees and directors, and (3) omnibus stock incentive plans for employees and/or employees and directors; amended plans will be further evaluated case-by-case.



## AMERICAN CENTURY INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT, INC.

### Proxy Voting Policies

American Century Investment Management, Inc. (the “Advisor”) is the investment manager for a variety of advisory clients, including the American Century family of mutual funds. In such capacity, the Advisor has been delegated the authority to vote proxies with respect to investments held in the accounts it manages. The following is a statement of the proxy voting policies that have been adopted by the Advisor. In the exercise of proxy voting authority which has been delegated to it by particular clients, the Advisor will apply the following policies in accordance with, and subject to, any specific policies that have been adopted by the client and communicated to and accepted by the Advisor in writing.

#### A General Principles

In providing the service of voting client proxies, the Advisor is guided by general fiduciary principles, must act prudently, solely in the interest of its clients, and must not subordinate client interests to unrelated objectives. Except as otherwise indicated in these Policies, the Advisor will vote all proxies with respect to investments held in the client accounts it manages. The Advisor will attempt to consider all factors of its vote that could affect the value of the investment. Although in most instances the Advisor will vote proxies consistently across all client accounts, the votes will be based on the best interests of each client. As a result, accounts managed by the Advisor may at times vote differently on the same proposals. Examples of when an account’s vote might differ from other accounts managed by the Advisor include, but are not limited to, proxy contests and proposed mergers. In short, the Advisor will vote proxies in the manner that it believes will do the most to maximize shareholder value.

#### B Specific Proxy Matters

##### 1.1 Routine Matters

##### 1.2 Election of Directors

- (1) Generally. The Advisor will generally support the election of directors that result in a board made up of a majority of independent directors. In general, the Advisor will vote in favor of management’s director nominees if they are running unopposed. The Advisor believes that management is in the best possible position to evaluate the qualifications of directors and the needs and dynamics of a particular board. The Advisor of course maintains the ability to vote against any candidate whom it feels is not qualified or if there are specific concerns about the individual, such as allegations of criminal wrongdoing or breach of fiduciary responsibilities. Additional information the Advisor may consider concerning director nominees include, but is not limited to, whether (1) there is an adequate explanation for repeated absences at board meetings, (2) the nominee receives non-board fee compensation, or (3) there is a family relationship between the nominee and the company’s chief executive officer or controlling shareholder. When management’s nominees are opposed in a proxy contest, the Advisor will evaluate which nominees’ publicly-announced management policies and goals are most likely to maximize shareholder value, as well as the past performance of the incumbents.
- (2) Committee Service. The Advisor will withhold votes for non-independent directors who serve on the audit, compensation, and/or nominating committees of the board.
- (3) Classification of Boards. The Advisor will support proposals that seek to declassify boards. Conversely, the Advisor will oppose efforts to adopt classified board structures.
- (4) Majority Independent Board. The Advisor will support proposals calling for a majority of independent directors on board. The Advisor believes that a majority of independent directors can help to facilitate objective decision making and enhances accountability to shareholders.
- (5) Majority Vote Standard for Director Elections. The Advisor will vote in favor of proposals calling for directors to be elected by an affirmative majority of the votes cast in a board election, provided that the proposal allows for a plurality voting standard in the case of contested elections. The Advisor may consider voting against such shareholder proposals where a company’s board has adopted an alternative measure, such as a director resignation policy, that provides a meaningful alternative to the majority voting standard and appropriately addresses situations where an incumbent director fails to receive the support of the majority of the votes cast in an uncontested election.
- (6) Withholding Campaigns. The Advisor will support proposals calling for shareholders to withhold votes for directors where such actions will advance the principles set forth in paragraphs (1) through (5) above.

### 1.3 Ratification of Selection of Auditors

The Advisor will generally rely on the judgment of the issuer's audit committee in selecting the independent auditors who will provide the best service to the company. The Advisor believes that independence of the auditors is paramount and will vote against auditors whose independence appears to be impaired. The Advisor will vote against proposed auditors in those circumstances where (1) an auditor has a financial interest in or association with the company, and is therefore not independent; (2) non-audit fees comprise more than 50% of the total fees paid by the company to the audit firm; or (3) there is reason to believe that the independent auditor has previously rendered an opinion to the issuer that is either inaccurate or not indicative of the company's financial position.

### 1.4 Compensation Matters

#### 1.5 Executive Compensation

- (1) **Advisory Vote on Compensation.** The Advisor believes there are more effective ways to convey concerns about compensation than through an advisory vote on compensation (such as voting against specific excessive incentive plans or withholding votes from compensation committee members). The Advisor will consider and vote on a case-by-case basis on say-on-pay proposals and will generally support management proposals unless specific concerns exist, including if the Advisor concludes that executive compensation is (i) misaligned with shareholder interests, (ii) unreasonable in amount, or (iii) not in the aggregate meaningfully tied to the company's performance.
- (2) **Frequency of Advisory Votes on Compensation.** The Advisor generally supports the triennial option for the frequency of say-on-pay proposals, but will consider management recommendations for an alternative approach.

#### 1.6 Equity Based Compensation Plans

The Advisor believes that equity-based incentive plans are economically significant issues upon which shareholders are entitled to vote. The Advisor recognizes that equity-based compensation plans can be useful in attracting and maintaining desirable employees. The cost associated with such plans must be measured if plans are to be used appropriately to maximize shareholder value. The Advisor will conduct a case-by-case analysis of each stock option, stock bonus or similar plan or amendment, and generally approve management's recommendations with respect to adoption of or amendments to a company's equity-based compensation plans, provided that the total number of shares reserved under all of a company's plans is reasonable and not excessively dilutive.

The Advisor will review equity-based compensation plans or amendments thereto on a case-by-case basis. Factors that will be considered in the determination include the company's overall capitalization, the performance of the company relative to its peers, and the maturity of the company and its industry; for example, technology companies often use options broadly throughout its employee base which may justify somewhat greater dilution.

Amendments which are proposed in order to bring a company's plan within applicable legal requirements will be reviewed by the Advisor's legal counsel; amendments to executive bonus plans to comply with IRS Section 162(m) disclosure requirements, for example, are generally approved.

The Advisor will generally vote against the adoption of plans or plan amendments that:

- Provide for immediate vesting of all stock options in the event of a change of control of the company without reasonable safeguards against abuse (see "Anti-Takeover Proposals" below);
- Reset outstanding stock options at a lower strike price unless accompanied by a corresponding and proportionate reduction in the number of shares designated. The Advisor will generally oppose adoption of stock option plans that explicitly or historically permit repricing of stock options, regardless of the number of shares reserved for issuance, since their effect is impossible to evaluate;
- Establish restriction periods shorter than three years for restricted stock grants;
- Do not reasonably associate awards to performance of the company; or
- Are excessively dilutive to the company.

## 1.7 Anti-Takeover Proposals

In general, the Advisor will vote against any proposal, whether made by management or shareholders, which the Advisor believes would materially discourage a potential acquisition or takeover. In most cases an acquisition or takeover of a particular company will increase share value. The adoption of anti-takeover measures may prevent or frustrate a bid from being made, may prevent consummation of the acquisition, and may have a negative effect on share price when no acquisition proposal is pending. The items below discuss specific anti-takeover proposals.

### a. Cumulative Voting

The Advisor will vote in favor of any proposal to adopt cumulative voting and will vote against any proposal to eliminate cumulative voting that is already in place, except in cases where a company has a staggered board. Cumulative voting gives minority shareholders a stronger voice in the company and a greater chance for representation on the board. The Advisor believes that the elimination of cumulative voting constitutes an anti-takeover measure.

### b. Staggered Board

If a company has a “staggered board,” its directors are elected for terms of more than one year and only a segment of the board stands for election in any year. Therefore, a potential acquiror cannot replace the entire board in one year even if it controls a majority of the votes. Although staggered boards may provide some degree of continuity and stability of leadership and direction to the board of directors, the Advisor believes that staggered boards are primarily an anti-takeover device and will vote against establishing them and for eliminating them. However, the Advisor does not necessarily vote against the re-election of directors serving on staggered boards.

### c. “Blank Check” Preferred Stock

Blank check preferred stock gives the board of directors the ability to issue preferred stock, without further shareholder approval, with such rights, preferences, privileges and restrictions as may be set by the board. In response to a hostile takeover attempt, the board could issue such stock to a friendly party or “white knight” or could establish conversion or other rights in the preferred stock which would dilute the common stock and make an acquisition impossible or less attractive. The argument in favor of blank check preferred stock is that it gives the board flexibility in pursuing financing, acquisitions or other proper corporate purposes without incurring the time or expense of a shareholder vote. Generally, the Advisor will vote against blank check preferred stock. However, the Advisor may vote in favor of blank check preferred if the proxy statement discloses that such stock is limited to use for a specific, proper corporate objective as a financing instrument.

### d. Elimination of Preemptive Rights

When a company grants preemptive rights, existing shareholders are given an opportunity to maintain their proportional ownership when new shares are issued. A proposal to eliminate preemptive rights is a request from management to revoke that right.

While preemptive rights will protect the shareholder from having its equity diluted, it may also decrease a company’s ability to raise capital through stock offerings or use stock for acquisitions or other proper corporate purposes. Preemptive rights may therefore result in a lower market value for the company’s stock. In the long term, shareholders could be adversely affected by preemptive rights. The Advisor generally votes against proposals to grant preemptive rights, and for proposals to eliminate preemptive rights.

### e. Non-targeted Share Repurchase

A non-targeted share repurchase is generally used by company management to prevent the value of stock held by existing shareholders from deteriorating. A non-targeted share repurchase may reflect management’s belief in the favorable business prospects of the company. The Advisor finds no disadvantageous effects of a non-targeted share repurchase and will generally vote for the approval of a non-targeted share repurchase subject to analysis of the company’s financial condition.

f. Increase in Authorized Common Stock

The issuance of new common stock can also be viewed as an anti-takeover measure, although its effect on shareholder value would appear to be less significant than the adoption of blank check preferred. The Advisor will evaluate the amount of the proposed increase and the purpose or purposes for which the increase is sought. If the increase is not excessive and is sought for proper corporate purposes, the increase will be approved. Proper corporate purposes might include, for example, the creation of additional stock to accommodate a stock split or stock dividend, additional stock required for a proposed acquisition, or additional stock required to be reserved upon exercise of employee stock option plans or employee stock purchase plans. Generally, the Advisor will vote in favor of an increase in authorized common stock of up to 100%; increases in excess of 100% are evaluated on a case-by-case basis, and will be voted affirmatively if management has provided sound justification for the increase.

g. “Supermajority” Voting Provisions or Super Voting Share Classes

A “supermajority” voting provision is a provision placed in a company’s charter documents which would require a “supermajority” (ranging from 66 to 90%) of shareholders and shareholder votes to approve any type of acquisition of the company. A super voting share class grants one class of shareholders a greater per-share vote than those of shareholders of other voting classes. The Advisor believes that these are standard anti-takeover measures and will generally vote against them. The supermajority provision makes an acquisition more time-consuming and expensive for the acquiror. A super voting share class favors one group of shareholders disproportionately to economic interest. Both are often proposed in conjunction with other anti-takeover measures.

h. “Fair Price” Amendments

This is another type of charter amendment that would require an offeror to pay a “fair” and uniform price to all shareholders in an acquisition. In general, fair price amendments are designed to protect shareholders from coercive, two-tier tender offers in which some shareholders may be merged out on disadvantageous terms. Fair price amendments also have an anti-takeover impact, although their adoption is generally believed to have less of a negative effect on stock price than other anti-takeover measures. The Advisor will carefully examine all fair price proposals. In general, the Advisor will vote against fair price proposals unless the Advisor concludes that it is likely that the share price will not be negatively affected and the proposal will not have the effect of discouraging acquisition proposals.

i. Limiting the Right to Call Special Shareholder Meetings.

The corporation statutes of many states allow minority shareholders at a certain threshold level of ownership (frequently 10%) to call a special meeting of shareholders. This right can be eliminated (or the threshold increased) by amendment to the company’s charter documents. The Advisor believes that the right to call a special shareholder meeting is significant for minority shareholders; the elimination of such right will be viewed as an anti-takeover measure and the Advisor will generally vote against proposals attempting to eliminate this right and for proposals attempting to restore it.

j. Poison Pills or Shareholder Rights Plans

Many companies have now adopted some version of a poison pill plan (also known as a shareholder rights plan). Poison pill plans generally provide for the issuance of additional equity securities or rights to purchase equity securities upon the occurrence of certain hostile events, such as the acquisition of a large block of stock.

The basic argument against poison pills is that they depress share value, discourage offers for the company and serve to “entrench” management. The basic argument in favor of poison pills is that they give management more time and leverage to deal with a takeover bid and, as a result, shareholders may receive a better price. The Advisor believes that the potential benefits of a poison pill plan are outweighed by the potential detriments. The Advisor will generally vote against all forms of poison pills.

The Advisor will, however, consider on a case-by-case basis poison pills that are very limited in time and preclusive effect. The Advisor will generally vote in favor of such a poison pill if it is linked to a business strategy that will – in our view – likely result in greater value for shareholders, if the term is less than three years, and if shareholder approval is required to reinstate the expired plan or adopt a new plan at the end of this term.

k. Golden Parachutes

Golden parachute arrangements provide substantial compensation to executives who are terminated as a result of a takeover or change in control of their company. The existence of such plans in reasonable amounts probably has only a slight anti-takeover effect. In voting, the Advisor will evaluate the specifics of the plan presented.

l. Reincorporation

Reincorporation in a new state is often proposed as one part of a package of anti-takeover measures. Several states (such as Pennsylvania, Ohio and Indiana) now provide some type of legislation that greatly discourages takeovers. Management believes that Delaware in particular is beneficial as a corporate domicile because of the well-developed body of statutes and case law dealing with corporate acquisitions.

The Advisor will examine reincorporation proposals on a case-by-case basis. Generally, if the Advisor believes that the reincorporation will result in greater protection from takeovers, the reincorporation proposal will be opposed. The Advisor will also oppose reincorporation proposals involving jurisdictions that specify that directors can recognize non-shareholder interests over those of shareholders. When reincorporation is proposed for a legitimate business purpose and without the negative effects identified above, the Advisor will generally vote affirmatively.

m. Confidential Voting

Companies that have not previously adopted a “confidential voting” policy allow management to view the results of shareholder votes. This gives management the opportunity to contact those shareholders voting against management in an effort to change their votes.

Proponents of secret ballots argue that confidential voting enables shareholders to vote on all issues on the basis of merit without pressure from management to influence their decision. Opponents argue that confidential voting is more expensive and unnecessary; also, holding shares in a nominee name maintains shareholders’ confidentiality. The Advisor believes that the only way to insure anonymity of votes is through confidential voting, and that the benefits of confidential voting outweigh the incremental additional cost of administering a confidential voting system. Therefore, the Advisor will generally vote in favor of any proposal to adopt confidential voting.

n. Opting In or Out of State Takeover Laws

State takeover laws typically are designed to make it more difficult to acquire a corporation organized in that state. The Advisor believes that the decision of whether or not to accept or reject offers of merger or acquisition should be made by the shareholders, without unreasonably restrictive state laws that may impose ownership thresholds or waiting periods on potential acquirors. Therefore, the Advisor will generally vote in favor of opting out of restrictive state takeover laws.

1.8 Transaction Related Proposals

The Advisor will review transaction related proposals, such as mergers, acquisitions, and corporate reorganizations, on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration the impact of the transaction on each client account. In some instances, such as the approval of a proposed merger, a transaction may have a differential impact on client accounts depending on the securities held in each account. For example, whether a merger is in the best interest of a client account may be influenced by whether an account holds, and in what proportion, the stock of both the acquirer and the acquiror. In these circumstances, the Advisor may determine that it is in the best interests of the accounts to vote the accounts’ shares differently on proposals related to the same transaction.

1.9 Other Matters

a. Shareholder Proposals Involving Social, Moral or Ethical Matters

The Advisor will generally vote in accordance with management’s recommendation on issues that primarily involve social, moral or ethical matters, such as the MacBride Principles pertaining to operations in Northern Ireland. While the resolution of such issues may have an effect on shareholder value, the precise economic effect of such proposals, and individual shareholder’s preferences regarding such issues, is often unclear. Where this is the case, the Advisor believes it is generally impossible to know how to vote in a manner that would accurately reflect the views of the Advisor’s clients, and therefore will review management’s assessment of the economic effect of such proposals and rely upon it if the Advisor believes its assessment is not unreasonable.

Shareholders may also introduce social, moral or ethical proposals which are the subject of existing law or regulation. Examples of such proposals would include a proposal to require disclosure of a company's contributions to political action committees or a proposal to require a company to adopt a non-smoking workplace policy. The Advisor believes that such proposals are better addressed outside the corporate arena, and will generally vote with management's recommendation; in addition, the Advisor will generally vote against any proposal which would require a company to adopt practices or procedures which go beyond the requirements of existing, directly applicable law.

b. Anti-Greenmail Proposals

"Anti-greenmail" proposals generally limit the right of a corporation, without a shareholder vote, to pay a premium or buy out a 5% or greater shareholder. Management often argues that they should not be restricted from negotiating a deal to buy out a significant shareholder at a premium if they believe it is in the best interest of the company. Institutional shareholders generally believe that all shareholders should be able to vote on such a significant use of corporate assets. The Advisor believes that any repurchase by the company at a premium price of a large block of stock should be subject to a shareholder vote. Accordingly, it will generally vote in favor of anti-greenmail proposals.

c. Indemnification

The Advisor will generally vote in favor of a corporation's proposal to indemnify its officers and directors in accordance with applicable state law. Indemnification arrangements are often necessary in order to attract and retain qualified directors. The adoption of such proposals appears to have little effect on share value.

d. Non-Stock Incentive Plans

Management may propose a variety of cash-based incentive or bonus plans to stimulate employee performance. In general, the cash or other corporate assets required for most incentive plans is not material, and the Advisor will vote in favor of such proposals, particularly when the proposal is recommended in order to comply with IRC Section 162(m) regarding salary disclosure requirements. Case-by-case determinations will be made of the appropriateness of the amount of shareholder value transferred by proposed plans.

e. Director Tenure

These proposals ask that age and term restrictions be placed on the board of directors. The Advisor believes that these types of blanket restrictions are not necessarily in the best interests of shareholders and therefore will vote against such proposals, unless they have been recommended by management.

f. Directors' Stock Options Plans

The Advisor believes that stock options are an appropriate form of compensation for directors, and the Advisor will generally vote for director stock option plans which are reasonable and do not result in excessive shareholder dilution. Analysis of such proposals will be made on a case-by-case basis, and will take into account total board compensation and the company's total exposure to stock option plan dilution.

g. Director Share Ownership

The Advisor will generally vote against shareholder proposals which would require directors to hold a minimum number of the company's shares to serve on the Board of Directors, in the belief that such ownership should be at the discretion of Board members.

h. Non-U.S. Proxies

The Advisor will generally evaluate non-U.S. proxies in the context of the voting policies expressed herein but will also, where feasible, take into consideration differing laws, regulations, and practices in the relevant foreign market in determining if and how to vote. There may also be circumstances when practicalities and costs involved with non-U.S. investing make it disadvantageous to vote shares. For instance, the Advisor generally does not vote proxies in circumstances where share blocking restrictions apply, when meeting attendance is required in person, or when current share ownership disclosure is required.



## **C Use of Proxy Advisory Services**

The Advisor takes into account information from many different sources, including independent proxy advisory services. However, the decision on how to vote proxies will be made by the Advisor in accordance with these policies and will not be delegated to a proxy advisory service.

## **D Monitoring Potential Conflicts of Interest**

Corporate management has a strong interest in the outcome of proposals submitted to shareholders. As a consequence, management often seeks to influence large shareholders to vote with their recommendations on particularly controversial matters. In the vast majority of cases, these communications with large shareholders amount to little more than advocacy for management's positions and give the Advisor's staff the opportunity to ask additional questions about the matter being presented. Companies with which the Advisor has direct business relationships could theoretically use these relationships to attempt to unduly influence the manner in which the Advisor votes on matters for its clients. To ensure that such a conflict of interest does not affect proxy votes cast for the Advisor's clients, our proxy voting personnel regularly catalog companies with whom the Advisor has significant business relationships; all discretionary (including case-by-case) voting for these companies will be voted by the client or an appropriate fiduciary responsible for the client (e.g., a committee of the independent directors of a fund or the trustee of a retirement plan).

In addition, to avoid any potential conflict of interest that may arise when one American Century mutual fund owns shares of another American Century mutual fund, the Advisor will "echo vote" such shares, if possible. Echo voting means the Advisor will vote the shares in the same proportion as the vote of all of the other holders of the fund's shares. So, for example, if shareholders of a fund cast 80% of their votes in favor of a proposal and 20% against the proposal, any American Century fund that owns shares of such fund will cast 80% of its shares in favor of the proposal and 20% against. When this is not possible (as in the case of the "NT" funds, where the One Choice Target Date funds are the sole shareholder), the shares of the underlying fund (e.g. the "NT" fund) will be voted in the same proportion as the vote of the shareholders of the corresponding American Century policy portfolio for proposals common to both funds. For example, NT Growth Fund shares will be echo voted in accordance with the votes of the Growth Fund shareholders. In the case where the policy portfolio does not have a common proposal, shares will be voted in consultation with a committee of the independent directors.

The voting policies expressed above are of course subject to modification in certain circumstances and will be reexamined from time to time. With respect to matters that do not fit in the categories stated above, the Advisor will exercise its best judgment as a fiduciary to vote in the manner which will most enhance shareholder value.

Case-by-case determinations will be made by the Advisor's staff, which is overseen by the General Counsel of the Advisor, in consultation with equity managers. Electronic records will be kept of all votes made.

## THOMPSON, SIEGEL & WALMSLEY LLC

Thompson, Siegel & Walmsley LLC (“TSW”) acknowledges it has a fiduciary obligation to its clients that requires it to monitor corporate events and vote client proxies. TSW has adopted and implemented written policies and procedures reasonably designed to ensure that proxies for domestic and foreign stock holdings are voted in the best interest of our clients on a best efforts basis. TSW recognizes that it (i) has a fiduciary responsibility under the Employee Retirement Income Securities Act (ERISA) to vote proxies prudently and solely in the best interest of plan participants and beneficiaries (ii) will vote stock proxies in the best interest of the client (non-ERISA) when directed (together, our “clients”). TSW has developed its policy to be consistent with, wherever possible, enhancing long-term shareholder value and leading corporate governance practices. TSW has retained the services of Institutional Shareholder Services (ISS). ISS is a Registered Investment Adviser under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940. As a leading provider of proxy voting and corporate governance services with 20+ years of experience, ISS serves more than 1,700 institutions. ISS’s core business is to analyze proxies and issue informed research and objective vote recommendations for more than 38,000 companies across 115 markets worldwide. ISS provides TSW proxy proposal research and voting recommendations and votes accounts on TSW’s behalf under the guidance of ISS’s standard voting guidelines which include:

- Operational Issues
- Board of Directors
- Proxy Contests
- Anti-takeover Defenses and Voting Related Issues
- Mergers and Corporate Restructurings
- State of Incorporation
- Capital Structure
- Executive & Director Compensation
- Equity Compensation Plans
  - Specific Treatment of Certain Award Types in Equity Plan Evaluations
  - Other Compensation Proposals & Policies
  - Shareholder Proposals on Compensation
- Corporate Responsibility
- Consumer Issues and Public Safety
- Environment and Energy
- General Corporate Issues
- Labor Standards and Human Rights
- Military Business
- Workplace Diversity
- Mutual Fund Proxies

TSW’s proxy coordinator is responsible for monitoring ISS’s voting procedures on an ongoing basis. TSW’s general policy regarding the voting of proxies is as follows:

### **Proxy Voting Guidelines:**

Routine and/or non-controversial, general corporate governance issues are normally voted with management; this would include the Approval of Independent Auditors.

Occasionally, ISS may vote against management’s proposal on a particular issue; such issues would generally be those deemed likely to reduce shareholder control over management, entrench management at the expense of shareholders, or in some way diminish shareholders’ present or future value. From time to time TSW will receive and act upon the client’s specific instructions regarding proxy proposals. TSW reserves the right to vote against any proposals motivated by political, ethical or social concerns. TSW and ISS will examine each issue solely from an economic perspective.

A complete summary of ISS’s voting guidelines, domestic & foreign, are available at: <https://www.issgovernance.com/policy-gateway>

### **Conflicts of Interest:**

Occasions may arise during the voting process in which the best interests of the clients conflicts with TSW’s interests. Conflicts of interest generally include (i) business relationships where TSW has a substantial business relationship with, or is actively soliciting business from, a company soliciting proxies (ii) personal or family relationships whereby an employee of TSW has a family member or other personal relationship that is affiliated with a company soliciting proxies, such as a spouse who serves as a director of a public company. A conflict could also exist if a substantial business relationship exists with a proponent or opponent of a particular initiative. If TSW determines that a material conflict of interest exists, TSW will instruct ISS to vote using ISS’s standard policy guidelines which are derived independently from TSW.

**Proxy Voting Process:**

- Upon timely receipt of proxy materials, ISS will automatically release vote instructions on client's behalf as soon as custom research is completed. TSW retains authority to override the votes (before cut-off date) if they disagree with the vote recommendation.
- The Proxy Coordinator will monitor the voting process at ISS via Proxy Exchange website (ISS's online voting and research platform). Records of which accounts are voted, how accounts are voted, and how many shares are voted are kept electronically with ISS.
- For proxies not received at ISS, TSW and ISS will make a best efforts attempt to receive ballots from the clients' custodian.
- TSW will be responsible for account maintenance – opening and closing of accounts, transmission of holdings and account environment monitoring.
- Order Implementation Manager (proxy oversight representative) will keep abreast of any critical or exceptional events or events qualifying as a conflict of interest via ISS Proxy Exchange website and email. TSW has the ability to override vote instructions, and the Order Implementation Manager will consult with TSW's Investment Policy Committee or product managers in these types of situations.
- All proxies are voted solely in the best interest of clients.
- Proactive communication takes place via regular meetings with ISS's Client Relations Team.

**Practical Limitations Relating to Proxy Voting:**

While TSW uses its best efforts to vote proxies, in certain circumstances it may be impractical or impossible for TSW to do so. Identifiable circumstances include:

- Limited Value. TSW may abstain from voting in those circumstances where it has concluded to do so would have no identifiable economic benefit to the client-shareholder.
- Unjustifiable Cost. TSW may abstain from voting when the costs of or disadvantages resulting from voting, in TSW's judgment, outweigh the economic benefits of voting.
- Securities Lending. Certain of TSW's clients engage in securities lending programs under which shares of an issuer could be on loan while that issuer is conducting a proxy solicitation. As part of the securities lending program, if the securities are on loan at the record date, the client lending the security cannot vote that proxy. Because TSW generally is not aware of when a security may be on loan, it does not have an opportunity to recall the security prior to the record date. Therefore, in most cases, those shares will not be voted and TSW may not be able fully to reconcile the securities held at record date with the securities actually voted.
- Failure to Receive Proxy Statements. TSW may not be able to vote proxies in connection with certain holdings, most frequently for foreign securities, if it does not receive the account's proxy statement in time to vote the proxy.

**Proxy Voting Records & Reports:**

- The proxy information is maintained by ISS on TSW's behalf and includes the following: (i) name of the issuer, (ii) the exchange ticker symbol, (iii) the CUSIP number, (iv) the shareholder meeting date, (v) a brief description of the matter brought to vote; (vi) whether the proposal was submitted by management or a shareholder, (vii) how the proxy was voted (for, against, abstained), (viii) whether the proxy was voted for or against management, and (ix) documentation materials to make the decision. TSW's Proxy Coordinator coordinates retrieval and report production as required or requested.
- Clients will be notified annually of their ability to request a copy of our proxy policies and procedures. A copy of how TSW voted on securities held is available free of charge upon request from our clients or by calling us toll free at (800) 697-1056.

## **WEDGE CAPITAL MANAGEMENT L.L.P.**

WEDGE Capital Management L.L.P. (“WEDGE”) established this policy to comply with Rule 206(4)-6 under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 and, as a fiduciary to ERISA clients, proxy voting responsibilities promulgated by the Department of Labor. This policy applies to accounts in which WEDGE has voting authority. WEDGE’s authority to vote client proxies is established by an advisory contract or a comparable document.

### **Voting Guidelines**

#### **Traditional Products (SCP, MCP, LCP, SCP International)**

The analyst who recommends the security for the WEDGE portfolio has voting responsibility for that security. If the security is held in multiple traditional products, the analyst who holds the most shares in his or her portfolio is responsible for voting. Securities held in both a quantitative product and a traditional product are voted by the traditional portfolio analyst.

WEDGE casts votes in the best economic interest of shareholders. Therefore, the vote for each security held in a traditional product is cast on a case-by-case basis. Each analyst may conduct his or her own research and/or use the information provided by Glass Lewis & Co., LLC (“Glass Lewis”). (Glass Lewis provides proxy analyses containing research and objective vote recommendations on each proposal.) If an analyst chooses to vote against management’s recommended vote, a reason must be provided on the voting materials and recorded in the vote management software.

Votes should be cast either “For” or “Against.” In very limited instances an abstention may be appropriate; in which case, the analyst should document why he or she abstained. This will be documented in the vote management software by the proxy department.

WEDGE uses its best efforts to vote proxies; in certain circumstances it may be impractical or impossible for WEDGE to vote proxies. For example, in accordance with local laws or business practices, many foreign companies prevent the sales of shares that have been voted for a certain period beginning prior to the shareholder meeting and ending after the meeting (“share blocking”). Due to these restrictions, WEDGE must balance the benefits to its clients of voting proxies against the potential consequences of a reduced flexibility to sell the shares at the most advantageous time. Additionally, WEDGE may not be able to vote proxies for certain foreign securities if WEDGE does not receive the proxy statement in time due to custodial processing delays.

#### **Quantitative Products (MIC, QVM: Large Cap, QVM: Small-Mid, Enhanced Core)**

WEDGE will generally vote securities held in products that are quantitative in nature in accordance with the Glass Lewis recommended vote. In instances where Glass Lewis votes against the management recommended vote, a reason must be recorded in the vote management software.

For securities that meet certain criteria, the analyst responsible for that product must vote the security. Generally, the criteria for these select securities are:

- WEDGE clients hold greater than 1% of the outstanding shares of the security, OR
- the position size of the security in the portfolio is greater than 1.5%.

### **Conflicts of Interest**

All conflicts of interest are to be resolved in the best interest of our clients.

To alleviate potential conflicts of interest or the appearance of conflicts, WEDGE does not allow any associate or his or her spouse to sit on the board of directors of any public company without Management Committee approval, and all associates have to affirm quarterly that they are in compliance with this requirement.

All associates must adhere to the CFA Institute Code of Ethics and Standards of Professional Conduct, which requires specific disclosure of conflicts of interest and strict adherence to independence and objectivity standards. Situations that may create a conflict or the appearance of a conflict include but are not limited to the following:

1. An analyst has a financial interest in the company or in a company which may be involved in a merger or acquisition with the company in question.

2. An analyst has a personal relationship with someone (e.g. a close friend or family member) who is employed by the company in question or by a company which may be involved in a merger or acquisition with the company in question.
3. The company in question is a client or prospective client of the firm.

If any of the three criteria listed above is met, or if the analyst feels a potential conflict of interest exists for any reason, he or she should complete a Potential Conflict of Interest Form (PCIF - Attachment A). The PCIF identifies the potential conflict of interest and is used to document the review of the vote.

For items 1 & 2 above, the voting analyst is required to consult with an analyst who does not have a potential conflict of interest. If the consulting analyst disagrees with the voting analyst's vote recommendation, a Management Committee member must be consulted. For item 3 above (or any other potential conflict not identified above), two of the three Management Committee members must review and agree with the recommended vote. The completed PCIF is attached to the voting materials and reviewed by the proxy department for accurate completion prior to being recorded in the vote management software.

Due to the importance placed on Glass Lewis recommended votes, it is important that Glass Lewis has procedures in place to mitigate any potential conflicts of interest. The independence of Glass Lewis will be reviewed during each audit of the proxy process.

### **Proxy Voting Records**

As required by Rule 204-2 under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, WEDGE will maintain the following records:

- The Proxy Policy
- Record of each vote cast on behalf of WEDGE's clients
- Documents prepared by WEDGE that were material to making a proxy voting decision, including PCIFs
- Each written client request for proxy voting records and WEDGE's written response to any written or oral client request

### **Policy Disclosure**

On an annual basis, WEDGE will send Form ADV Part 2 to all clients to disclose how they can obtain a copy of the Proxy Policy and/or information on how their securities were voted. Clients may request a copy of the Proxy Policy and voting decisions at any time by contacting WEDGE at the address below.

Attention: Proxy Request

WEDGE Capital Management L.L.P.  
301 S. College Street, Suite 3800  
Charlotte, NC 28202-6002

Via E-mail: [proxy@wedgcapital.com](mailto:proxy@wedgcapital.com)

### **Review Procedures**

Periodically, WEDGE will review proxy voting for compliance with this policy and determine if revisions to the policy are necessary.