

RRBM 9th team meeting via Zoom
November 6, Tuesday, 2018
10 – 12 noon EDT (7-9 Pacific; 4-6 Brussels)

Participants:

1. Mary Jo Bitner
2. Jerry Davis
3. Thomas Dyllick
4. Bill Glick
5. Peter McKiernan
6. Wilfred Mijnhardt (guest)
7. Katrin Muff
8. Dave Reibstein
9. Jean-Alexis Spitz
10. Anne Tsui
11. Matthew Wood
12. Sri Zaheer
13. Franklin Allen

MINUTES

Action items

1. Peter will invite Verbeke to write a blog on RRBM for the executive audience.
2. Founding members will approach one journal in their discipline to publish a guest editorial about RRBM (see II.A.2 to II.A.4 below)
3. Dave, Matthew and Peter to approach a media (WSJ, FT, consortium of journalists) for a story about RRBM (see II.B.5 and II.B.6 below). Wilfred will help too.
4. Mary Jo will explore an award for responsible research in marketing, and Franklin will discuss an award for responsible research in finance with Maureen.
5. We will form a “working group” in place of “founding members” to oversee projects. We will expand the working group to include new members in different disciplines. We have a good list of nominations from management and marketing. We need nominations from operations and finance.
6. The Ecosystem Summit organizing committee will set a firm date, probably one of the first three Mondays of July.

I. Public relations and communication strategy

1. Peter McKiernan was approached, about two years ago, by a Danish professional journalist (Verbeke) about her interest in rewriting our position paper in to a shorter piece for the business audience. We put that off and Peter had a renewed discussion with her recently.
2. She remains interested in helping RRBM with this public relations strategy.
3. Dave R. asked about the style of her writing and Peter said he likes it.

4. Mary Jo B. also asked if she would be writing for RRBM or about RRBM. Peter will clarify this with her and also ascertain the pro bono arrangement.
5. We suggested that Peter invites her to write a blog for the business audience to be put on the RRBM website.

II. Position Paper and Publishing

A. Dissemination of ideas in the position paper in scholarly journals

1. Following the rejection by Science, where to go next? (Science editor said such papers are of low priority for Science).
2. Chris Tang recommended that we try to publish them as short guest editorials in the top journals. Members could choose an appropriate journal (would be nice to be in the top-top but not necessary) in their discipline to pursue this idea.
3. Anne suggested that the editorial should be centered around the 7 principles, which focus on the process of the research. The editorial should discuss the relevance of the seven principles to the discipline in focus, e.g., finance, marketing, operations, management.
4. The group liked this idea of discipline-focused editorials. Team members should actively reach out to editors in their disciplines. We suggest: Mary Jo and Dave R for Marketing, Serguei and Chris for OM, Franklin and Maureen for Finance, Anne and Bill for management in a US journal, Peter and Thomas for management in an European journal.

B. Dissemination in news media (for the business community and the public)

1. SZ suggested The Wall Street Journal. Matthew W. has contacts at the Economist and the FT. Dave has contacts at WSJ
2. The story for the media has to be individually tailored. Journalists don't want press releases. An interview could also be interesting, if well prepared and with passion.
3. Bill G. wonders if it's the right time to go public to a broader audience. Sri responded that in the US, Higher Education is discredited, it's the right moment to frame the conversation. Matthew W. also considered that the momentum is right in the UK with the issue on public funding.
4. Bill stressed the fact that we shouldn't only add fuel on fire but present positive examples. Anne also wanted to focus on solutions, worldwide. For Mary Jo, the timing is good but we have to have great stories of Responsible Research and to emphasize we want such research to be more of a norm than an exception. Sri added that we should focus on research with an impact to make good stories. Franklin said that we need both good and bad examples of responsible research. The opioid problem was partially caused by research (funded by the drug companies) showing (wrongly) no addictive effect.
5. Dave will check with the WSJ. Matthew will contact the FT. Peter will investigate the consortium of journalists that draft papers for a whole group of journals (Washington Post, Le Monde, ...). Wilfred is happy to help as he has been doing with the last article in Biz Ed.
6. Dave will also investigate a Seminar at Wharton for Journalists and check if RR could be on their agenda.

C. Explore Ford or Carnegie Foundation to commission a study/report on “Management Education and Research in the 21st Century” – a 60-year retrospective and a 60-year prospective.

1. Anne said that the Gordon & Howell report was a shock to business schools in 1959. A new report like G&H might be another shock to redirect business schools away from irrelevance and fetish science toward responsible research. Sri believed that such a shock is good. It might speed up the change.
2. Bill thought he could get support from AACBS to commission such a report.
3. Anne recalled that in 2012, EFMD and AOM commissioned 2 Prof (US/UK) for such a report but nothing resulted. Maybe we could try to get back to them.
4. Mary Jo agreed that this could have a great impact but wondered how we could do it without distraction. We already have a lot on our plates. We would need to bring people outside of the team to champion such a project.
5. Dave worried that the focus of such a report (entire business education) might be too broad and that our message on research could end up getting lost.
6. For Matthew, this is a massive undertaking and we all know that the world will be different in 5 years. Besides, the report will only be read by the same audience we already have. We’d have more impact with good efforts such as AACSB’s Innovation that Inspires (this year it focuses on research).
7. As a conclusion, we decided to keep this project on hold unless we find a terrific potential person to lead it.
8. Anne will send the links to the Gordon & Howell (1959) and the Pierson (1959) reports to the group.

D. Revision of the Position Paper to include conceptual papers

1. Do we need to revise the position paper to formally include the principles for responsible conceptual papers?
2. Neither Mary Jo nor Sri thought that the current version discourages the conceptual papers thus it’s not really worth spending the time.
3. Anne will check the author of the chapter of the edited book on that topic and we’ll hold for the moment.

III. Award Program

A. RRBM-IACMR award

1. Anne reminded us that she was inspired to create this Award by Maureen O’Hara when they met at Cornell in March 2016.
2. Last year, we had the inaugural RRBM-IACMR Award with 35 articles and 10 books submitted out of which 10 articles and 2 books were awarded.
3. We are currently running the 2nd edition (with extended deadline to 24 November), with a second level of review by executives who will evaluate selected finalists on

practical relevance. Anne thanked many founding members for helping with finding executives to serve as reviewers.

4. Anne said that nominations are not reliable (people are too busy to take the time or people are shy to self-nominate). She suggested to have a committee that could identify in the good journals examples of responsible research.
5. Jerry D suggested to engage the energy of doctoral students for such a committee. Excellent doctoral students could take part in the identification of relevant articles in the published scientific literature and given a title that would look good on their resume. The identified articles would then be given to the review committee(s) for evaluation.
6. Anne liked the idea and will suggest it to the awards review committee chairs.

B. Award program in OM and Marketing

1. Anne reported that Sergei Netessine has submitted a proposal similar to the IACMR award with the INFORMS group. It passed the first review and awaiting further evaluation.
2. Mary Jo said that the Sheth Foundation (an institutional partner of RRBM) might have interest in such an award. AMA is possible too. She will discuss with Dave and Len Berry about this idea.
3. Anne asked Franklin to discuss with Maureen O'Hara to explore this award in Finance.

C. Big Award

1. Dave thought that we should find an organization (e.g., Pew) that could sponsor a big prize. This project was discussed at the previous meeting.
2. The big award idea will be discussed again. Individuals should put out feelers to help identify potential sponsors.

IV. RRBM Governance structure

1. There is a need to expand the group to people who have a desire to help and to have the possibility to make sub-groups to be more efficient and more effective. Who can and how to bring more people to the team? How do we organize?
2. Peter noticed that the nominations of new members that have been submitted are not gender balanced and too US-centers.
3. Anne said that founding members will stay founding members forever but some are less active than others and there's a need for a working group.
4. Peter cautioned that we are a very entrepreneurial movement that could encounter difficulties if constrained by another level of governance. Bill noted that the underlying issue is that we need to broaden participation on several initiatives and expressed some legitimacy concerns with some decisions. The word "governance" may sound too bureaucratic, but there may be a need for some institutional structure. Peter suggested that we avoid bureaucracy and continue to foster open collaboration to grow the movement.

5. For the 28 founding members, we could send an “opt in” email to ask them if they still want to stay informed and/or to be active, following Katrin Muff’s example for another group she coordinated.
6. For Dave, the “Working Board” could then be the committed subset of the 28 founders plus other new members.
7. Sri thought that we might need (later) a Board of Advisors.
8. We agree to use the term “Working Group” for now and we need nominations/invitations of people who are willing to join.
9. We need, especially, nominations from Asia, Europe, elsewhere, women, and from Accounting and Finance.

V. Ecosystem Summit July 1, 8, or 15, 2019

1. Wilfred Mijnhardt introduced himself with a few quick comments about his experience from heading ERIM to becoming the RSM Policy Director with a desire to stimulate responsible research. Inspired by [Research Data Alliance](#) (which now has 7000 members), he wants RRBM to evolve beyond a club to a more sustainable organization.
2. To organize the change, the Summit will bring together decision makers of research (editors, deans, association leaders) and obtain a collective commitment, and to design a new ecosystem that revolves around responsible research. The participants will be carefully hand-picked invitees by the Organizing Committee.
3. On the 20th anniversary of ERIM, RSM is proud to host the first RRBM summit and will sponsor 25k€. We still need to find sponsors to provide hotel accommodation for the delegates.
4. After hearing the presentation by Wilfred, Katrin Muff expressed happiness, admiration, and appreciation. Thomas loves the passion, the creativity and the openness of Wilfred while Peter has “120% confidence” in him.
5. Matthew agreed that EFMD can support the Summit.
6. We need to have a set date for the Summit. Several options were considered, June is a busy month, so is September. The second half of July is holidays in Europe whereas there are big conferences in the US in August. Participants will be from the various disciplines. Three dates might be possible: July 1st, 8th and 15th, knowing that none will satisfy everybody. The final decision will have to be made during the next meeting of the Organization Committee on November 12.

VI. Future conferences and next meeting

1. **Next in-person meeting** is set for August 12 in Boston.
2. **Next Zoom meeting** will take place in the week of Feb 4, a doodle will follow.
3. **RRBM at ICAM** in Edinburgh (April 14-16, 2019). Peter and Wilfred can be there to conduct an activity. Anne and Bill will check with AACSB to explore the possibility.
4. The question to organize an Affinity Group within AACSB was discussed. There is one existing group about Management education that could be piggy-backed because it involves the same audience. But Anne thinks we need a separate one because

education and research are different. Wilfred suggested to add the word “innovation” because it adds the impacts notion and is appealing to industry (cf #RRI)

5. **RRBM at EURAM** (June 26-28, 2019, Peter is organizing an EURAM past presidents PDW on RRBM), modeled after the session at AOM with 11 past AOM president that Anne organized with a couple other past presidents.
6. **RRBM at AIB** (June 24-27, 2019), Anne will try to organize something.
7. **RRBM at EFMD Annual Conference** (June 5-7, Lisbon). It’s too late to be part of the EFMD Deans Conference in Shanghai (Feb 2019) that is centered around Chinese perspective but Matthew is in the Steering Committee of the Annual Conference (June 5-7, 2019, Lisbon) and will push for a strategic round table with deans.