**August 19, 2018 – finalized minutes**
Responsible Research for Business and Management Team meeting
Monday, August 12, 12:30 pm-4:30 pm
University of Notre Dame, Chicago Campus

**On-site attendees:**
Rashad Abdel-Khalik (Accounting, UIUC)
Jaime Bettcher (Aspen Institute Business and Society Program)
Ingmar Bjorkman (Dean, Aalto University)
Jerry Davis (Management, University of Michigan)
Bill Glick (Management, Rice University)
Kate Hazelwood (Editor, RRBM)
Dan LeClair (EVP, AACSB)
Ira Solomon (Dean, Tulane University)
Jean-Alexis Spitz (RRBM Coordinator, EFMD)
Anne Tsui (Management, Notre Dame University)
Dirk van Dierendonck (Vice Dean, Rotterdam)
**Special Guest:**
Markus Scholz, —Observer from the University of Applied Social Science for Management and
Communication, Vienna
**ZOOM Participants:**
Mary Jo Bittner (Marketing, Arizona State University)
Peter McKiernan (Strategy, Strathclyde University)
David Reibstein (Marketing, Wharton)

In this set of minutes, we present the Action Items before the detailed minutes.

**Action items:**
1. Anne, Bill, and Jerry to work with Wilfred Mijnhardt to further develop the Research Ecosystem
   Summit with specifics on participants, venue, dates, and funding.
2. Bill and Jerry to develop a proposal for Social Impact badges, including criteria and publication
   vehicle.
3. Ira to work with Ingmar, Sri and other deans to explore and develop a proposal for a "BIG" award for
   responsible research.
4. Dave continues his efforts to convene an editorial meeting at Wharton. Jaime Bettcher of Aspen-BSP
   is encouraged to support this effort by possibly co-hosting this meeting.
5. Anne and Bill to work with Tony Roche at Emerald and Cynthia Nalevanko at Sage to involve other
   publishers to join the RRBM movement.
6. Jerry and Ingmar to explore the feasibility of a deans conference to be held in one of the future
   AACSB or EFMD deans and directors conferences.
7. Ira to explore how to pursue RRBM participation among university presidents.
8. Every founding member of RRBM to identify two to three key influencers to pursue for joining the
   RRBM governing board and send nominations to Anne by the end of October.
9. The next meeting will be on ZOOM in November. We will discuss the progress on the above action
   items and also the publication plan (the item we skipped in the Chicago meeting).
10. Anne will send a Doodle to the team in mid September.


**MEETING MINUTES:**


**I. Welcome and introduction – Dan LeClair**

11. Dan welcomed all participants.
12. Dan applauded the efforts of RRBM members, noting that the group has made significant strides in a short time; as a 19-year veteran of AACSB he has seen how difficult it is to drive innovation in academia.
13. Dan noted that RRBM members shouldn't underestimate the power of establishing and connecting other parts of the ecosystem to each other; he sees the innovation that is starting to foment in the industry around responsible research—a notable feat in an industry that has challenges in innovating. He added AACSB members are inspired that RRBM remains committed to its mission and growth.

## II. RRBM Status Report – Anne and JAS
1. Anne introduced the "observer" – Markus Scholtz who is conducting a study on social movement with his doctoral student Maria Riegler. They are including RRBM in their research. He is a non-participant observer at this meeting.
2. Anne reported on AOM PDW - 150 people attended the two AOM PDW sessions; the morning session with 11 past presidents of AOM was full house. The two sessions were full of tremendous energy and ideas.
3. JAS reported on the website.
   i. The Website is becoming livelier.
   ii. JAS is receiving more and more suggestions for readings to put on the website from endorsers.
   iii. There is however much work to be done on the website: There's always a need for new posts and he requested that members actively blog on the site.
   iv. Mary Jo Bittner's blog post "Life is too short" remains the most read and most shared.
   v. We will feature Rashad Abdel-Khalik's book when it comes out in October.
4. JAS noted that he is becoming stretched too thin with RRBM and needs support. This, he and Anne noted, is a resource problem.

## III. Expansion of Diversity of Endorsers
Anne asked for insight into diversifying RRBM's footprint from attendees by discipline/organization.
1) Accounting:
   a) Ira Solomon agreed that there are strands of research that look at policy setters but they are limited. Typical faculty members have figured out how to succeed with the current system—they're well paid and have no incentive to change a system that has rewarded them. He said the current research model in business schools is not sustainable.
   b) Rashad said getting endorsers from accounting is difficult. At the recent *AAA* meeting, of a stack of 400 RRBM flyers that he brought to the meeting, only about 100 were taken. Biggest hurdle to adoption of RRBM is that promotion and tenure practices in the US don't provide incentives for professors to do research that is genuinely useful.
   c) Ira believes we could have more buy-in with more clarity around what "responsible" means—language that is more easily digestible for a wider audience.
2. Marketing:
   a) Dave Reibstein reported on an Editors' Summit (March, 2018) at Temple University—Translational Research Workshop—that had a couple hundred attendees. He chaired a panel of editors in which he laid out the issues around responsible research and asked the editors if we were addressing these issues. His observation from the responses was that the editors did not see a problem.
   b). Dave just attended American Marketing Association in Boston, at which there were two sessions regarding a forthcoming special issue in the *Journal of Marketing*. The sessions included the editor and leading marketing scholars and were well attended. Response was very enthusiastic. The Boston sessions had the feel of a pivotal moment in the discipline. However, a large challenge remains: many journal editors are reluctant. Jerry Davis reported that based on his experience as an editor, it is difficult to get associate editors and reviews to agree to make major changes.

c). Dave is working to get support to sponsor an event at Wharton with journal editors in a cross section of fields to see how we can effect change. The Wharton Dean is conceptually supportive but hasn't dedicated resources or actions to a conference as yet—not for financial reasons but likely because deans don't want to take a position on what academia should be working on, which is precisely what Reibstein believes they should do. Dave hasn't encountered opposition to the event among the administration, but, rather, a lack of enthusiasm.

d). Bill Glick noted that as a former dean, he could attest that if five senior faculty members approached him, saying, 'this would go a long way in gaining program recognition,' he would pay attention. Bill noted also that for a dean, if the school is seen as supporting RRBM, this goes over well with donors; it also goes down well with state legislatures that fund public universities. Anne encouraged Dave to include Serguei Netessine (an OM faculty at Wharton) in the discussion with the dean. Anne asked if perhaps Aspen might co-sponsor the Wharton event. Dave said that would help but he would like to have the full support of the dean and take a leadership position.

3. Bill reported that he heard about the Marketing Science Institute as a good model to help business research to be more relevant for business. Dave Reibstein said he was a former director of MSI.

4. Jaime Bettcher of Aspen, who replaced Claire Preisser as Program Manager of the Business and Society program, reported on two initiatives that align with RRBM's principles. One is a semi-annual symposium connecting research and teaching to practices (BSP is co-organizing a conference with the U of Michigan in October, 2018 on Inequalities and the Changing Nature of Work) and the other is a weekly digest on "Ideas Worth Teaching".

## IV. Pioneering Schools and Impacting Academia

1. Jerry Davis reported that, under the aegis of the university president, the University of Michigan has invested significantly in poverty solutions; this support at the highest level has created opportunities throughout the university to do new and different things. On the B-school side, that includes, among other things: a) Incorporating practice (or other 'majors' or 'individual merits') as a component of faculty contribution and evaluation. For full and chaired professors, 40% of performance is based on teaching, while 40% could be based on impact on practice.

2. Jerry is open to organizing a summit of deans to show case Best Practices in Impact in association with RRBM. Per Ingmar, such conferences would need to be based in a location convenient for global scholars, reflecting International schools' rebranding of themselves as proponents of social change. An option would be to attach the conference to another one that already drives participants (e.g. ICAM) and to specifically target a new interest group of Associate Deans of Impact, …

3. Dan LeClair said that AACSB could include RRBM (specifically the principles for responsible research) in their "Innovations that Inspire" program. There is a process in place to nominate innovations and select the best. Each cycle, AACSB receives several hundred applications and they select 30 best. They could be innovations in responsible research.

4. Ira's perspective on pioneering schools is that a new approach is needed to drive pioneer efforts. People are addressing issues of Epsilon research, which is low risk; schools should tackle bigger issues. As an example, the accounting industry operates under accounting rules tied to pre-digital economy. He saw three opportunities to explore, a) an Aspen Institute five-year series that tackles the larger issues around research affecting each of the disciplines; b) approach university presidents (through AAU) to support responsible research from an ethical perspective; and c) encourage AACSB to emphasize social impact in its accreditation standards.

5. Rashad expressed concern regarding the efficacy of a top-down approach, citing lack of progress he's seen in his 25 years on Financial Economists Roundtable on numerous issues discussed there.

## V. RRBM Awards

1. Anne provided update on IACMR award on "responsible research in management". The 2017 program was reasonably successful. IACMR is committed to repeat this in 2018 and will experiment with including a review of "usefulness" on the finalist papers by a board of executive reviewers.

2. Ira proposed that we think about a new award "something very grand," with a financial incentive. As we have a lot of universities whose administrators have embraced RRBM. What if we had 20 business schools to support such an effort @$5000—a $100,000 award, for example, to get the attention of scholars?
3. Jerry said he'd like to see the award go to interdisciplinary research, while Ira would like to keep it more inclusive – both disciplinary and inter-disciplinary research should be considered. Ira also does not want it limited to junior faculty.
4. Ingmar would like to see the award encourage other schools to have their own awards.
5. Mary Jo mentioned that the Sheth Foundation (an RRBM institutional partner) gives out an annual award for transformative research a senior scholar. She will discuss with Sheth about a junior scholar award for responsible research in marketing (supporting one who works on a superordinate problem.)

**VI. Ecosystem proposals; collaboration with publishers and possible conference(s) and Summit**
1. Bill introduced a proposal for a Responsible Research Ecosystem Summit, from Wilfred Mijnhardt (Rotterdam).
    a) The summit would bring together people to define what the architecture—vis a vis accreditation, publication, funding, and criteria for tenure—would actually drive responsible research.
    b) Dirk spoke to the positive impact of Rotterdam's new mission "A Force for Positive Change" and the thinking around it. "We've seen results on a recruitment level for faculty and students," he said. "The motto is serving as a signal to attract the kind of people we want."
    c) Jerry advocated an approach of 'if you could start with a blank sheet of paper to create a new ecosystem, what would it look like?' It could comprise the insight of perhaps 20-25 people and suggested that in planning such a conference we should determine what the highest impact thing we could do if all the right people were in the same room.
    d. Anne suggested that we go outside known channels to find others who might be interested that we haven't established ties with yet.
    e. Attendees agreed to pursue the idea of a summit further, encourage Wilfred to help define a list of participants, when, where and how, including funding.
2. Discussion turned to the conference with journal editors that Dave Reibstein discussed earlier.
    a). Rashad noted that short tenure of journal editors limits the impact we could have on an editor level; he also thinks it would be difficult for editors to attend a conference due to heavy workload.
    b). Ingmar agreed this could be a barrier and it would create a lot of work and need for commitment, but it's worth floating.
    c). Anne asked if pursuing publishers and associations (that publish journals) might be the way to get around the brief tenure aspect of journals' editors.
    d). Mary Jo advocated for including past editors also, who are influential scholars and who can give their insight and discuss barriers to adoption.
3. Anne reported on her meeting with Cynthia Nalevanko, Senior Editor of the Journals Division at Sage, who is onboard with RRBM's mission.
    a). Anne invited Sage to be an institutional partner. Cynthia said she will discuss with her colleagues.
    b). Sage is currently developing a program to identify articles in Sage journals that address social issues or have the most (social that go beyond academic citations) impact.
    c). Cynthia said that in her experience deans are aware of the need for credible research but they're waiting for a solution to present itself; their hands are tied by faculty demands—which is why, Anne and Cynthia agreed, RRBM needs to continue its grass roots efforts to onboard scholars.
4. Anne introduced an email from Tony Roche, Emerald Publishing, for a partnership with RRBM to promote responsible research. The group discussed the importance of engaging many publishers. We should identify the publishers of the journals on the FT list.
5. The group discussed the idea of a "Business Journal Relevance Index" from Robin Gauld, Dean of the business school at the U of Ortega, NZ.
    a). Ingmar said that the idea is great, but implementation will be difficult.

b). Anne was concerned that at the journal level, such an index could be gamed like the citation index. She saw the merit of such idea at the article level.

c). Bill mentioned the work at the Center for Open Science. It gives out three types of badges (open data, open materials, and preregistration) at three levels. For the first level, authors self-declare in following the transparency standards. This may be a possible model for a societal impact badge that authors or editors can use to flag articles that exemplify responsible research.

d). The challenge is in defining the criteria for social impact. Dirk mentioned the Estoril and Corporate Knights as examples of indexes and efforts in the space.

e). Bill asked for a proposal to develop this badge; Jerry said he would join Bill to discuss this further and prepare a proposal for the next RRBM meeting.

6. Bill reported that the AACSB Accreditation Standards Committee is at work. Dan said that such a review happens once every ten years. It is a real opportunity to include responsible research and societal impact in the revised standards, especially the three usefulness principles.

7. Bill proposed reaching out to special interest groups, including those within AACSB, of vice chairs (etc.) to onboard them with RRBM/topic of responsible research.

8. Ira said that the real key is to bring on board university presidents through the AAU and make an appeal to ethics, the reward of reputation and positive perception from state legislatures that fund public universities.

**VII. Review, Priority and Future Meetings**

1. Ingmar stated that there has been lots of progress; the question now is not whether to go forward but how to go further. He stated that it is time to put together a more structured plan and asked if there is a need to formalize this.

2. Bill said that as a group we need to grow in size and governance, and asked the group how we should select people we really want to invite to come onboard.

a). Dan noted that the group has discussed sub-committees in the past. Its time to put in place.

b). Bill proposed putting together a group of 20-30 people on a governing board.

c). We agreed that each founding member nominates two or three to join the governing board and submit the names to the founding group for approval before invitation.

d). Mary Jo suggested we follow our original model to ensure diversity across disciplines, regions etc.

3. Rashad asked us to have a clear definition of "responsible research" to help us avoid confusion in moving forward. Defining "responsible" in terms of contributing to UN's SDGs is a good start. We might include other lists. The World Economic Forum publishes a list every year also. Jerry reminded us that the SDGs are very inclusive of all forms of sustainability, including economic, social and natural. Dirk said that the SDG provides a good language to talk about responsible research and education.

4. Jerry thought that we would be in a better position to move forward once we achieve a big milestone and have a set of metrics.

5. Dan asked that moving forward to make quarterly meetings via Zoom, in order not to lose momentum. The group agreed.

***Agenda item not discussed due to lack of time and to be discussed in next meeting (except item c which requires immediate action):
**Position Paper and Publishing**
   a) Dissemination of ideas in the position paper in scholarly journals (e.g., as letter to editors or guess editorials) or in news media (e.g., New York Times Science section or Financial Times Management section).
   b) There is a new article in HBR by Shapiro and Kirkman. Should we try the 2000 word version (Science) with HBR?
   c) Request to reprint the position paper in an edited book "Responsible Research for Better Business" (see attachment 2).

d) Explore Ford or Carnegie Foundation to commission a study/report on "Management Education and Research in the 21$^{st}$ Century" – a 60-year retrospective and a 60-year prospective. Analyze the need and discuss steps to transform business research to be responsible to both science and society. Need volunteers to lead project.

**Questions for further discussion:**
1. How to disseminate the RRBM ideas in the position paper into the journals of all the disciplines and reach other stakeholders? We need a strong and robust dissemination plan for the ideas in the position paper.
2. How best to drive engagement outside current RRBM leadership; how to drive further participation among the 1000 community members?
3. How might we better utilize our institutional partnerships? How do we identify the resources or interests of each partner that we might leverage?
4. Have we accurately identified which aspects of the ecosystem are most likely to have the largest near-term impact?
5. As we move forward, what would be the right governance structure and plan?
6. How do we increase staff resources to pursue the work of RRBM, both website and programs. Background: JAS has 10-15 hours a week for RRBM, a contribution by EFMD. In the past, he had given more time to RRBM than committed. Recently, he has more responsibilities at EFMD beyond RRBM. As we increase visibility and programs, we need more (not less) of JAS' time to update and improve the website and support related activities. Realistically, we need a program manager (full or part time) to pursue, explore, follow up on opportunities, and manage all the activities beyond the website. This way, JAS can devote to website related activities. Due to security reason, only JAS is allowed to work on the website.