Corporate Governance Of Cummins Inc Company

Posted on September 6, 2019

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/corporate-governance-of-cummins-inc-company/

Introduction

Corporate governance determines how Cummins Inc. is directed, monitored, and held accountable as it balances shareholder interests with obligations to employees, customers, suppliers, regulators, communities, and the environment. That task is unusually complex for a global power-technology company because Cummins operates mature engine and power-system businesses while investing in lower-emission and zero-emission technologies. Governance therefore involves more than approving financial statements or appointing executives. The board must oversee capital allocation, product safety, emissions compliance, technology strategy, cybersecurity, workforce capability, supply chains, ethics, and long-term transition risk. Cummins' current governance framework relies on a predominantly independent board, specialized committees, published governance principles, and company-wide standards of business conduct. Jennifer Rumsey serves as chair and chief executive officer, so independent oversight is especially important when the chair and CEO roles are combined. The central question is not whether one formal structure is universally superior. It is whether directors possess sufficient independence, information, expertise, and authority to challenge management and ensure that strategic decisions reflect both durable corporate value and the real social consequences of the company's products and operations (Cummins Inc., 2026a).

Board Independence Must Be Operational, Not Merely Numerical

A board can satisfy formal independence requirements and still fail if directors defer excessively to management or receive incomplete information. Effective independence depends on the quality of questioning, agenda control, executive sessions, succession planning, performance evaluation, and access to risk information. Cummins combines the chair and CEO roles under Jennifer Rumsey while using independent board leadership and a board composed primarily of independent directors. This structure can support unified strategic communication, but it also increases the importance of a lead independent director and committee chairs who can organize discussion without management controlling every issue. Directors need enough time and subject knowledge to understand a company whose risks span manufacturing, emissions regulation, software, global supply chains, energy

transition, labor, and product safety. Annual election or evaluation processes provide mechanisms for accountability, yet governance quality should be judged by how the board responds to difficult information rather than by the existence of formal procedures. A useful board culture rewards dissent when evidence warrants it and expects management to explain assumptions, alternatives, and unresolved risks instead of presenting only the preferred decision.

Committees Translate Complex Risks Into Focused Oversight

Cummins uses specialized board committees to examine areas that would be difficult for the full board to review in equal depth. Audit oversight addresses financial reporting, internal controls, external audit, compliance, and related risk. Finance oversight considers capital structure and major financial decisions, while compensation and talent oversight connects executive incentives with leadership development and succession. Governance and nominating functions address board composition and governance standards. The company's safety, environment, and technology oversight is particularly significant because product compliance, emissions, engineering, and emerging technologies affect both social impact and financial performance. Committee specialization, however, can create fragmentation if directors assume that a risk belongs entirely to one group. Cybersecurity, for example, affects operations, finance, products, and customer trust; climate transition affects strategy, capital allocation, technology, regulation, and workforce skills. The full board therefore needs integrated reporting that shows how committee-level findings connect. Committee mandates should clarify responsibility without becoming organizational silos. Strong governance occurs when specialized review improves the quality of full-board judgment rather than allowing directors to avoid collective accountability for material corporate risks.

Business and Society Meet Most Clearly in Products and Employees

Cummins' relationship with society is visible through what its products enable and what they impose. Engines, generators, components, and power systems support freight, agriculture, construction, public transport, industry, and electricity generation. These activities create economic value while also producing emissions, resource use, noise, and safety risks. Governance must therefore ensure that product quality, regulatory compliance, environmental performance, and customer reliability are treated as strategic responsibilities rather than public-relations topics. Employees form another central connection. Cummins requires engineering, manufacturing, digital, service, and commercial skills that are changing as technologies evolve. Workforce transition can create both opportunity and disruption. Board oversight should consider safety, turnover, critical skills, training, inclusion, restructuring, and whether incentives encourage workers to report quality or compliance concerns early. Ethical culture cannot be measured simply by counting hotline reports because low reporting

may indicate either few problems or fear of retaliation. Directors need context, investigation quality, retaliation data, and evidence that senior leaders are subject to the same standards as everyone else. Social responsibility becomes credible when operational decisions reinforce published values even when doing so creates short-term cost.

The Energy Transition Is a Capital-Allocation and Governance Problem

Cummins faces the strategic challenge of serving customers that still depend on diesel and natural-gas equipment while investing in technologies intended to reduce greenhouse-gas and local air-pollution emissions. Batteries, fuel cells, electrolyzers, lower-carbon fuels, and advanced internal-combustion technologies develop at different speeds and depend on infrastructure, regulation, customer economics, and supply chains. Governance should therefore avoid two symmetrical errors: assuming legacy technologies will remain dominant indefinitely or assuming every emerging technology will scale according to an optimistic timetable. Scenario analysis can help directors test capital plans under different fuel prices, emissions rules, charging or hydrogen infrastructure, customer adoption rates, and geopolitical supply conditions. The board must decide which capabilities to build internally, where partnerships are preferable, which investments should be scaled, and when underperforming initiatives should be reconsidered. Transition plans also affect employees and communities tied to existing manufacturing. A credible strategy therefore links technology choices with workforce planning, supplier development, safety, and financial discipline. Sustainability commitments become meaningful when they are reflected in research budgets, product decisions, capital expenditure, and measurable operational performance.

Supply Chains, Cybersecurity, and Human Rights Expand the Governance Perimeter

A global manufacturer depends on suppliers for metals, electronics, software, logistics, components, and specialized services, so corporate risk extends far beyond facilities directly owned by Cummins. Supply-chain governance must address continuity, quality, sanctions, corruption, labor practices, environmental harm, and human-rights concerns. A supplier code establishes expectations, but purchasing practices can undermine those expectations when buyers demand unrealistic prices or delivery schedules that encourage unsafe shortcuts. Boards should therefore ask whether procurement incentives are consistent with published standards and whether high-risk materials or regions receive enhanced due diligence. Digitalization expands the perimeter further. Connected engines, remote diagnostics, factory automation, cloud systems, and artificial intelligence can improve performance while creating cybersecurity, privacy, intellectual-property, and operational risks. Directors do not need to become engineers, but they need enough technical literacy to ask how systems are tested, who owns incident response, how suppliers are assessed, and how software

updates are secured throughout a product's life. Governance increasingly depends on understanding interdependence because one weak vendor or compromised digital service can interrupt production or affect customers across multiple markets.

Executive Incentives and Stakeholder Claims Need Transparent Tradeoffs

Executive compensation influences what management prioritizes. Financial measures such as revenue, earnings, cash flow, and returns remain important, but incentives can create harmful behavior if short-term targets reward delayed maintenance, excessive cost cutting, weak product controls, or underinvestment in transition. Nonfinancial measures can broaden accountability when they are material, clearly defined, and independently verifiable. Safety, quality, strategic milestones, workforce development, or environmental performance may belong in incentive systems when directors can measure them reliably. Stakeholder governance also requires honesty about tradeoffs. A plant closure may improve competitiveness while harming workers and a local economy; an accelerated technology transition may support environmental goals while increasing near-term costs; a supplier change may reduce risk but disrupt communities. No serious governance framework can promise that every decision benefits everyone. The board's responsibility is to understand who bears costs, consider mitigation, and explain the reasoning supporting a decision. Stakeholder language becomes meaningful when it improves information and accountability rather than functioning as a claim that conflicts do not exist. Transparent tradeoffs are more credible than broad declarations of universal benefit.

Conclusion

Cummins' governance challenge is to supervise a global industrial company whose products remain economically important while technology, regulation, and social expectations are changing rapidly. A predominantly independent board, specialized committees, codes of conduct, and formal risk processes provide the architecture for oversight, but structures matter only when directors receive candid information and use independent judgment. The combination of chair and CEO roles increases the importance of strong independent board leadership, effective executive sessions, and committee authority. Governance must integrate financial performance with product safety, environmental compliance, workforce capability, cybersecurity, supply-chain responsibility, and the uncertain economics of the energy transition. Cummins also illustrates why business and society cannot be treated as separate spheres: the company's strategic decisions affect mobility, employment, emissions, communities, and infrastructure, while social and regulatory changes directly affect future cash flows. The quality of governance will therefore be visible in outcomes rather than titles—safe and compliant products, resilient operations, disciplined investment, credible transition plans, ethical conduct, and transparent responses when corporate interests and stakeholder interests do not align

perfectly.

References

Cummins Inc. (2026a). *Governance and Board of Directors*.

Cummins Inc. (2026b). *2025 Annual Report*.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *G20/OECD Principles of Corporate Governance*.