

Responsible Research for Business and Management Working Board meeting Minutes

August 12, Monday, 12-4:30 pm

Location: Room 206 Egan Research Center, Northeastern University, 120 Forsyth St.,
Boston MA 02115.

On site attendees: Len Berry, Dan LeClair, Jaime Bettcher, Jerry Davis, Bill Glick, Jean-Alexis Spitz, Anne Tsui, Sri Zaheer, Maurizio Zollo, Mike Toffel

Guest: Munif Mohammed

Agenda

1. *Welcome and introduction*

Bill shared that this is the last face-to-face Working Board meeting held at the Academy of Management conference location. The next and future annual face-to-face meetings will be held in conjunction with the annual Summit.

2. *Responsible Research Summit 2019*

- a. Anne reported on a brief summary of the Summit, based on the outcomes and follow up feedback from 17 participants.
 - i. The focus of this Summit was on usefulness, not on credibility. The objectives were fully achieved.
 - ii. The opening session was held in an architectural museum. The idea of design for the future is very suitable to kick off the Summit, which has the overall goal of designing the ecosystem of business research to influence a specific future.
 - iii. The full day July 1 has four sets of discussion sessions: opportunities, future, metrics, and next steps, ending with an "I will" statement by each participant.
 - iv. Five themes emerged from the 61 statements by stakeholder groups: editors, deans, university/accreditation leaders, and senior scholars, and doctoral education.
 - v. Anne provided a few examples of these themes, e.g., some deans indicated that they would add an impact statement on the annual review or promotion packets; university leaders will allocate a larger budget to responsible research: a few senior scholars will develop doctoral Seminars or courses.
- b. We discussed the idea of elevating individual actions to the collective level.
 - i. Examples are a coalition of journal editors to work on journal policies on responsible research, or a consortium of deans to design a process to include impact into the annual review or promotion evaluations.
 - ii. Sri Zaheer said that changing promotion is too hard but focusing on the annual review process could work. Faculty engaging in practice could be included in the service component of the review. We start with annual review, and then P&T will follow.
 - iii. Jerry Davis shared that his school (Michigan) has included a "Practice" role, separate from Service. Outreach to practice (journal, press, boards, consultancy) is a parameter of evaluation, especially for senior faculty.
 - iv. Len Berry will talk to Eli Jones about introducing societal impact into the annual review process. Sri will talk to her associate dean.

- v. Bill asked if an affinity group can be formed within the AACSB dean. Sri said that we could organize the research deans.
- vi. Anne reported that the associate editor of ASQ is taking a lead to organize a special for a few leading journals in all the disciplines. He would ask each journal to agree to publish at least one article in the journal and package all of them in one virtual special issue.
- vii. Anne wished that the deans would organize into a consortium (as the four Chinese deans at the Summit plan to do in China). Len Berry said he would talk to his dean Eli Jones about forming a group of deans to develop an alternative model for faculty research that emphasize responsible research.
- viii. Anne also said that some senior scholars want to focus on doctoral education. She will talk to those scholars, including Len, about a task force to develop a doctoral curriculum on responsible research, which could include seminars, courses, summer school, reading list or sample curricula.
- c. Communication plan
 - i. Anne said that we are preparing a report of the Summit to be put on the RRBM website and featured in the September RRBM newsletter. It will include publishing the anonymized “I “ statements. At the end of this list, the reader will be asked to write his or her own “I will” (to advance responsible research. JAS is developing the Summit page and the online form for the new “I will” statements. Anne will seek approval from the Summit participants to publish the 61 anonymized I will statements.
 - ii. Len said that it is time to open up RRBM more. He said that in Marketing, there is the daily ALMAR news. He can put an announcement in it about RRBM. He said that hundreds would sign up immediately. JAS (and Anne) will send a sample RRBM introduction for Len to use.
 - iii. For media, Matthew Wood has written to Financial Times right after the Summit. We will ask Matthew Wood and Dave Reibstein to follow up.
 - iv. Maurizio asked if we can present RRBM to a group of deans. Sri replied yes and she would try to arrange that to such groups as M7, B10, etc. We would frame in a positive way (innovating rather than fixing a problem, showing how we can matter).

3. *The Second Global Responsible Research Summit 2020*

- a. Maurizio Zollo explained the objectives and a preliminary plan. It will shift the conversation from the internal (academic) transformation towards the external engagement of our stakeholders.
 - i. We expect that 60% of the RRS2019 participants will attend the RRS2020, and we invite ten additional scholars/deans who could not attend RRS2019 and asked to be invited to the next one. We would have 40 internal stakeholders. We can invite 40 from among the senior managers, policy makers, funding agencies (government), private foundations, NGOs, publishers, and media. We aim for 80 and will cap at 100.
 - ii. Jaime Bettcher asked “What is the value proposition” for practitioners to want to come to the Summit? Munif Mohammed suggested that invite the board members. They tend to have bigger pictures, concerned with longer-term strategies, and they may have more time. Jerry Davis said that we can focus on corporate executives in the UK. It might be hard to attract US executives. Len suggested that we identify major US corporations with operation in London.

- iii. Len Berry encouraged us to have two full days to make the long trip worthwhile for most participants. We confirmed two full days of Sunday 28th June and Monday 29th, 2020. Tuesday, June 30 am would be the Working Board meeting.
- iv. Len Berry reminded us that we need to encourage junior faculty to start early in responsible research. It is too late to start after tenure. Mike suggested that we invite five to six junior scholars to the 2020 Summit. Ideally, we will invite those who are award winners of responsible research, especially using engagement scholarship design. They would be the lunch presenters. We will invite them to participate in the two-day Summit.
- b. Maurizio said that RRS2020 will follow the design of the 1st summit which worked well.
 - i. Session 1: Focus on various alternative forms of stakeholder engagement in research including engaged scholarship, knowledge co-creation, demand-driven research. The (mixed) groups will discuss the barriers of engaged research, and the enablers or levers to remove those barriers.
 - ii. Session 2 will move from the “what” to the “how”. What can we (stakeholder group) do to enable or facilitate co-creation or problem- or phenomenon-based research rather than “fill the research gap”? Discussion will use stakeholder groups.
 - iii. Lunch will showcase examples of engaged scholarship by junior scholars.
 - iv. Session 3 will focus on a proposal for a Business Research Institute, modeled after the Marketing Science Institute with dedicated corporate partners. Discussion will use mixed groups to do a SWOT analysis and provide feedback on the plan.
- c. Session 4 will focus on the problems that can be best addressed by co-creation with practitioners (business or non-business). Ideally, it ends with the “I will” statement. This means that we need to create a moment or an idea that will make the “I will” statement meaningful to all the participants.
- d. Len Berry encouraged us to create a booklet to be distributed before the summit with “I will” accomplishments. This could be an impressive and inspiring document and may catch media interest.
- e. The next task is to form an organizing committee. (After the meeting, Anne spoke with Maurizio and encouraged him to identify two faculty colleagues and one staff person to be on the Organizing Committee. RRBM will try to identify at least one member from each discipline.)

4. *Engaging External Stakeholders – Business Research Institute Idea*

- a. Len Berry explained the Marketing Science Institution.
 - i. It was founded in 1961, based in Boston, that connects businesses from all over the world with academics to fund and guide marketing research. It is also to build trust between academics and businesses.
 - ii. It has about 60 firms are involved. In addition to an annual fee, they also commit to sharing data and granting access to research. Members are usually the firms’ Directors of Marketing Research.
 - iii. Every two years, the group publishes a list of research priorities to evaluate grant applications. There is also an MSI Young Scholars Program (3-6 post PhD), an annual conference, working paper publication series (before publishes in academic journals, awards to dissertations and articles.
 - iv. It now has 11 staff members. It is a “Go-to” organization, very prestigious.

- b. Our discussion turned to the meaning and feasibility of this BSI idea.
 - i. Jerry asked if this BSI idea is a project for RRBM or is it an independent effort. Anne replied that this would be an independent effort, but we can provide support and facilitate its development. Dan agreed that RRBM is to highlight, to plant the seed, and to connect.
 - ii. Munif said that we can target companies in the Business Council for Sustainability Development. The IIRC is another example. They are experimenting with changing metrics on sustainability. Maurizio said that the European Society for Business and Society is another example.
 - iii. Dan further reminded us that RRBM is not about “Do goody” and to avoid our efforts be dominated by CSR types. Mike Toffel said that we should set the boundaries and discuss this in the next Working Board meeting.
 - iv. Sri believes that RRBM tries to create culture change among academics, to focus on whether research is having an impact on society. She believes that business is a force for good. We should pursue alliances with business to get the word out.
 - v. Mike Toffel remarked that change in the supply side is not enough; we need demand side. Scholars are not trained to do research outside of the literature; demand side can enhance supply side behavior. Maurizio agreed that demand side is necessary, understand business problems, funders can define priorities.

5. *Responsible Research Impact Badge*

- a. Jerry Davis reported that the proposal was well received at the Summit. Several editors have signed up already.
- b. It is a low effort but high impact vehicle (least effort on the editors) Have agreement of a list of top journals to agree (to attract attention).
- c. We will solicit two volunteer reviewers per discipline, ideally two former editors of top journals.
- d. Mike encouraged us to set clear boundaries. Can we assume that method is always sound for articles in top journals? What if we find out post badging that the method in a badged article is bad or wrong? Do we remove the badge?
- e. The solution is that we must be extremely clear that the badge is for topic (usefulness) only and not on method (credibility).
- f. Maurizio asked about special topic journals such as Journal of Business Ethics, Business and Environment. Do we badge the entire journal?
- g. Len Berry agreed that we start with top (generalist) journals. We try it out and later decide how to expand.
- h. We also need to be very clear if a paper has societal impact. Jerry said that we will develop a long list of questions for the author to complete.
- i. Another suggestion is to use two reviewers for each paper. If two reviewed said yes, then it is clear. If one yes and one no, then some discussion is necessary.
- j. Len suggested that Ruth Bolton and David Stewart (marketing) would be great reviewers. Sri suggested one retired colleague that would be a great reviewer.
- k. JAS will arrange the badge design, using crowd source.

6. *Spring meeting to showcase exemplary responsible research*

- a. Jerry Davis reported that Michigan and BSP of Aspen will organize a responsible research conference in March, 2020.

- b. Academics will present their research, with both academic and executive commentators.
- c. Participants could be some of the responsible research award winners, AACSB awardees for Innovations that Inspire, and the authors of the AMD special issue on UN SDGs.
- d. There will be discussions about translation, scaling and teaching of responsible research findings.
- e. Len Berry and Mike Toffel insisted on the importance of RRBM branding on this conference.

7. *Responsible Research Metrics*

- a. Anne reported that Rich Lyons has written a letter to Google Scholars, asking for a meeting with the chief to discuss creating metrics for research with societal impact.
- b. Sri and others asked to see this letter. (see attached)
- c. If we don't get a response from Google Scholars, Sri suggested that we should target other visible groups that might report metrics for evaluating research impact.

We began some discussion on the following topics, but several members had to leave early for Academy presentations. We decided to address the remaining agenda items at the September Zoom meeting that Bill will organize.

8. Enlarging cRRBM

- a. Institutional Partners
- b. Pioneer Schools
- c. Pioneer Journals
- d. Endorsers
- e. Expanding Task Forces & Review Panels beyond the Working Board

9. Institutionalizing RRBM - Jerry Davis

- a. University, Individual, and Corporate paid memberships
- b. Foundation and other philanthropic support

10. Status of other ongoing projects – Anne Tsui

- a. Awards – Management, OM, Marketing
- b. Journal Special Issues
- c. Management of RRBM & 501 (3c) status
- d. AACSB draft standards highlighting research impact

4:30 – 5:00

11. Conclusion – Anne Tsui

- a. Priorities
- b. Next Virtual meeting early September 2019 – TBD – to cover and follow up on any remaining agenda items from August
- c. November WB meeting
- d. Next Face-to-Face meeting late June 2020 in London