RRBM Working Board December 17, 2019 meeting
MINUTES

Tuesday, December 17, 2019
Time: 8:00 am – 10:00 am (Phoenix Time)
Location: Zoom Virtual Meeting

Attendees (18): Leonard Berry, Mary Jo Bitner, Ruth Bolton, Michael Brady, Jerry Davis, Bill Glick, Dan LeClair, Richard Lyons, Serguei Netessine, David Reibstein, Tom Robinson, Alexia Shonteff, Jean-Alexis Spitz, Michael Toffel, Anne Tsui, Wilfred Mijnhardt, Matthew Wood, Maurizio Zollo

Absentees (7): Franklin Allen, Jaime Bettcher, Mark Houston, Peter McKiernan, Katrin Muff, Howard Thomas and Bernard Yeung.

Action Items
1. Write an Executive Summary for the Full Summit Report – Alexia and Anne
2. Distribute the final Full Summit Report to various groups and ask them to forward to the associate deans of faculty, research and doctoral program, in addition to posting online – Alexia and Anne
3. EFMD and AACSB to create a blog about the Full Summit Report for their members.
4. Develop some short-term societal impact metrics to meet immediate use by many schools which are beginning to revise their faculty evaluation criteria – Rich Lyons and Wilfred
5. The RRBM Honor Roll task force to further refine the proposal and consider Sergeui's question of journal responsible research special issues – Ruth, Jerry, Len, & Bill.
6. Further development of the "Institutionalizing RRBM" idea including exploring the regional footholds in N. America and Europe – Wilfred and Anne
7. Journal Charter proposal by Robin Gauld – feedback to Robin about preliminary reaction and discuss possible revision – Anne
8. Doctoral Education task force to start discussion – Anne, Jerry, Maurizio, Wilfred, Juliane Iannarelli (AACSB, recommended by Tom Robinson), JAS (EFMD).
9. Pioneer School criteria task force – Mary Jo, Wilfred, Anne

Progress of the above action items will be discussed in the March WB meeting.

MINUTES

1. **Welcome and Introduction – Mary Jo Bitner**
    a. Mary Jo welcomed everyone to the final meeting of the year and asked for any revisions to the September 20, 2019 WB minutes. No revisions were suggested; the minutes were approved. – Appendix 1

2. **Distribution of the RRS2019 Full Report – Anne Tsui**
    a. Anne asked for feedback on the RRS2019 full report. – Appendix 2
        i. No comments or changes were suggested by the WB. It was noted that the report is very detailed and not particularly action

oriented. Other means of communicating the essence of the report are needed to motivate action.

    ii.   Ruth Bolton suggested a one-page executive summary should be written to motivate people to want to read the full report and/or take action; it was also suggested that a motivating blog post should also be written for the same purposes.

   b. Distribution of the Full report

    i.   Anne advised the report will be sent to the RRS2019 participants to review/read/comment before the final report would be distributed to others.

    ii.   Anne further suggested that the Institutional Partners (and perhaps founding members and co-signers) to receive a copy with a letter asking them to forward to their Deans, Associate Deans responsible for research and faculty, and PhD Directors.

    iii.   Consider contacting the media (possible press release)

   c. Rich Lyons felt the most important people that need to receive the report are the internal constituents at each of our schools. He stated it is important to explain why they are receiving the report. Mike Toffel asked Rich what he would be telling his internal community. Rich responded that he would inform his internal community there is a new institution, RRBM, that supports the initiative and is gaining traction. He said the report would showcase the RRBM; it would provide credence and visibility.

   d. Matthew Wood agreed and stated a blog post would be the vehicle to introduce the report into the social media. Bill Glick suggested AACSB and EFMD could put a blurb in their newsletters. Wilfred Mijnhardt said that the information in the report is organized by stakeholder groups. It would be easy to search for information relevant for each stakeholder.

   e. Mary Jo summed up the discussion

    i.   An Executive Summary could be included in or with the report explaining its' importance

    ii.   AACSB and/or EFMD could create a blog posting and/or include in their newsletter

    iii.   A cover letter could explain different stakeholders specifically referencing pages of the report pertinent to each group.

    iv.   Individual WB members can send personal emails to their networks and internal stakeholders within their own schools, specifying actions to be taken and including the full report as an attachment.

    v.   Further suggestions to be sent to Anne

3. RRS2020 – Maurizio Zollo

   a. Maurizio reported the organization of the 2020 Summit is proceeding very well. There are now five business advisors who are giving comments on the objectives and how best to organize the Summit to achieve the objectives. We hope to complete inviting external participants in January.

   b. JAS reported there are 45 internal stakeholders (participants of the last Summit and selected Board members) who have confirmed they will be attending.

4. RRS2021 – Dave Reibstein

a. Dave announced The Wharton School of Business is committed to host the 2021 Summit. Anne asked if the Working Board approved – all approved. Dave said Wharton was looking forward to hosting.

b. Anne reported a university in China has offered to host the RRS2022 and wanted to know if it is too early to make a commitment? Matthew, Ruth and Jerry Davis suggested decisions for 2022 needed to be closer to the timeframe given the current political uncertainty. However, the Board agreed a Summit in the Asia Pacific, e.g., China, Singapore, would be something to begin exploring for 2022.

5. **Responsible Research Metrics – Rich Lyons**

   a. Rich stated the collaboration with the Financial Times was a success; commenting the great job Bill and Jerry did working with Andrew Jack at the Financial Times. Rich explained business schools from around the world were asked to send 5 papers that have impact. He said the most interesting finding from this process was how differently the business schools curate their work and how they interpret "impact."

   b. Rich reported he was in contact with the founder of Google Scholar and hoped to have progress to report at the next meeting.

   c. Jerry Davis said he had talked to Clarivate Analytics (they own Web of Science) and found out they do not receive as much traffic since Google Scholar is much easier to use. They are interested in developing research use metrics and are currently working on making their destination easier to use. Jerry will keep in touch with them.

   d. Anne noted that many groups are struggling with how societal impact of scholarship can be measured. She said the deans at the Deans' Summit in China are very eager about responsible research and service to society. Some schools are already redefining the criteria for faculty hiring, promotion and tenure. We should develop something soon if we want to keep pace with some business schools.

   e. Ruth mentioned she had received an email from ASU dean's office asking for articles published since 2018 that promote '*global responsible management'* or *'global social responsibility.'*   PRME seemed to be involved in this request.

   f. Discussion continued that there is a need for immediate metrics, yet, time is necessary to build a "good" metric such that the unintended consequences of a new metric can be thought through before it is widely used.

   g. Wilfred mentioned neuromeric technology (data mining techniques) could be used to form new metrics but it was important to rely on academic intuition too. We could code the topic or questions being studied, e.g., the SDGs. Anne suggested that we can also code the outcomes being studied in the research, e.g., stakeholder wellbeing beyond firm performance or share prices (which benefit the shareholders only).

   h. Mary Jo summarized that Wilfred and Rich will formulate further on the question of metrics and bring back to the WB in March.

6. **Responsible Research Honor Roll – Ruth Bolton and Jerry Davis**

   a. This agenda item generated an extensive discussion. – Appendix 3

   b. Ruth explained why the committee decided to drop the 'Badge' initiative, currently shifting to the term "honor roll" rather than "badge." After

speaking with editors and publishers, it was determined that asking them to determine "potential impact" is nearly impossible, and asking editors to select their "best" articles made no sense given all the articles each editor would be focusing on had been selected and published by his/her journal. Furthermore, Ruth reported they would target a few major leading journals/books before rolling out a formal program and would also open it up to authors (journal and book) to submit their articles for review. Michael Toffel asked if consideration had been made to the scope/number of submissions the committee could receive. Ruth stated they would move forward carefully.

c. Anne stated it is important to maintain the branding of 'Responsible Research' with RRBM and thus prefer the name to include RRBM. Further, she suggested the importance of adding criteria related to rigor, e.g., sound methodology and stakeholder involvement (in the research).

d. Len agreed with Anne that we must be clear this includes both rigor and relevance/impact. Rigor should be explicitly noted in the criteria (even though the honor roll evaluators may not directly assess rigor for most nominated articles (assuming journals have done this already).

e. Discussion then ensued about responsible research; rigor and relevance. It was determined the terminology 'responsible research' and the rigor criteria must be explicit on the new 'Honor Roll' documentation.

f. Anne remarked that this is a critically important initiative because potentially, this Honor Roll can be one of the metrics. These designated articles or books would be eligible for the RR Award in the disciplines.

g. All agreed this initiative would need to be rolled out slowly and carefully aligned with the disciplinary awards already underway. Independently assessing rigor for all submissions could overwhelm our reviewing capabilities and will need to be managed carefully.

h. Serguei said that he and Chris Tang and Michael Toffel are guest editing a special issue on "Responsible Research in Operations Management", using the principles of responsible research as evaluation criteria. He suggested the Honor Roll committee to automatically consider all the articles in this special issue to be eligible for the Honor Roll.

7. **Awards, Journal Special Issues – Mary Jo Bitner**
   a. Mary Jo reported that RRBM's first two initiatives (both started several years ago) were to encourage Special Issues on Responsible Research in top journals (across disciplines) and the establishment of Responsible Research Awards. Both initiatives have been successful and are moving along very well.

   b. The Management award is celebrating its' third year, the Operations award is now in its' second year and the inaugural, Marketing award will be announcing their winners in February after receiving over 70 submissions between late August and October.

   c. Anne mentioned that the Organization and Management Theory Division of AOM is giving out a responsible research in OMT award and the Organizational Behavior Division is giving out an Responsible Research Scholar award (for cumulative work), both to be awarded at the 2020 AOM meeting.

d. With regard to Special Issues, there are many listed on the RRBM webpage in various stages from CFP stage to final publication of several issues.

8. **Institutionalizing RRBM for Stakeholder Value and Building "Institutional Memory" – Wilfred Mijnhardt**

   a. Wilfred reviewed his PowerPoint presentation adapted from the SWOT analysis presentation he had given in Chicago. – Appendix 4

   b. Wilfred informed everyone that RRBM has an opportunity to become the FIRST to create a societal stakeholder group (slide 7 of the PowerPoint) and has an opportunity to reform how business scholars do their work with businesses and coincide with the 2030 United Nations agenda.

   c. He continued the RRBM has the opportunity to impact the next wave of business schools coming into the AACSB and EFMD! To be inclusive to ALL and not just the internal stakeholders.

   d. Wilfred proposed 5 possible routes for institutionalizing RRBM, ppt slide #9: loosely connected network model; club model; platform model; services model; or combination of the first four models. He focused on the Platform Model to illustrate a possible future for RRBM through this route.

   e. The presentation promoted extensive feedback from the Board. Matthew stated Wilfred's proposal is interesting and the EFMD has supported RRBM's work for a long time with the goal of increasing global impact. It was suggested that RRBM work closely with EFMD and AACSB as we move forward.

   f. Maurizio stated Wilfred's proposal is excellent - the vision to move forward a 'Stakeholder Democracy' is consistent with development needs and creates distinct roles in the current system. Maurizio remarked that the RRBM is the ONLY multi-stakeholder group and produced results with only the internal stakeholders at this time!

   g. Maurizio stated the role of foundations is also important and many foundations would be interested in the mission of RRBM. The RRBM has the opportunity to leverage their inclusive nature with the AACSB, EFMD, business schools, businesses, foundations.

   h. Mary Jo asked Wilfred how we would get started. It was determined RRBM could begin to configure itself first in two footholds, one in North America and one in Europe. We can approach a few schools of the founding members in each region and form a consortium with some support to build this regional foothold. Once operating in North America and Europe, it could then be expanded into other areas of the world.

   i. It was decided Anne will talk to Jerry Davis and Rich Lyons for North America and Wilfred will work with Matthew and Peter McKiernan in Europe and discussed at the next meeting.

   j. Len Berry suggested that a significant block of time be allocated at the in-person WB meeting in London to the topic of institutionalizing RRBM and Wilfred's proposal. However, Wilfred will report some follow up actions (e.g., the two regional footholds) in the March WB meeting.

   k. Anne stated we will need to become a 501 C(3) to allow people to contribute tax deductible amounts to RRBM and enable RRBM to search for grants. It will cost RRBM $5000. Mike Toffel mentioned RRBM could raise the $5000 by charging a fee for the 2021 Summit. It was also

suggested each board member could ask their own Dean if they would be willing to assist RRBM in becoming a global platform.

9. **RRBM Projects and Priorities (Mary Jo Bitner, Anne Tsui, Alexia Shonteff)**
    a. Put on Hold - to be discussed in March. For now, if everyone could please review the matrix and let Alexia know if you are properly mentioned on the matrix. – Appendix 5

10. **Requests to RRBM Working Board (Anne Tsui and Mary Jo Bitner)**
    a. Robin Gauld 'I Will' Statement– A Journal Charter – Appendix 6
        i. Anne presented the current 'I Will' statement that Robin Gauld had written but he has had no success in gaining support or involvement from journal editors who attended the RRS2019.
        ii. Michael said much of the language is outside the scope of the RRBM Vision2030 and Len mentioned it is unrealistic to expect the journals to agree to this.
        iii. It was determined that Robin will be informed that he needs to re-write his request to editors in a more positive manner and in-line with the RRBM Vision2030 and re-submit.

    b. Doctoral Education on Responsible Research – form a Task Force
        i. Anne asked for volunteers to for a Task Force to work on a curriculum for PhD education on Responsible Research.
        ii. Anne, Jerry, Maurizio, and Wilfred expressed interest. Tom Robinson said AACSB would like to be involved and suggested including Juliane Iannarelli. Matthew Wood said that EFMD would like to be involved too.
        iii. JAS mentioned that EFMD is holding a conference on Responsible Doctoral Education on May 4-6 and Peter McKiernan will be the keynote speaker.
        iv. An update on the status of this Task Force will be given in March.

    c. Criteria for Pioneer School – form a Task Force
        i. Mary Jo reported we would like to form a committee to determine the criteria for pioneer schools and institutional partners. At this time, RRBM has 7 pioneer schools listed on the website.
        ii. Wilfred and Anne said they would like to join and Mary Jo advised any others interested in joining to contact her via email.
        iii. An update on the status will be given in March.

11. **Conclusion – Mary Jo Bitner**
    a. Mary Jo thanked everyone for a good meeting.
    b. She asked the Board to be certain to respond to the doodle poll for the next meeting in March (the second week) and reminded all the next face-to face meeting would be June 30, 2020 in London.

Appendices:
1. Minutes from September 20, 2019 WB meeting
2. RRS2019 Full Report

3. Documents for the RR Honor Roll (reflecting revisions from 9/20 meeting, external editors' suggestions, & subsequent iterations)
4. PowerPoint 'Towards a Viable Organization Concept for the Responsible Research Management (RM) Transition' from Wilfred Mijnhardt
5. RRBM Project matrix
6. Journal charter from Robin Gauld

The appendices are available by contacting info@rrbm.network.