

RRBM Working Board March 10, 2020 meeting  
MINUTES

Tuesday, March 10, 2020

Time: 9:00 am–11:00 am (Phoenix Time/Pacific Time USA)

Location: Zoom Virtual Meeting

Attendees (18): Len Berry; Mary Jo Bitner; Ruth Bolton; Michael Brady; Jerry Davis; Bill Glick; Dan LeClair; Rich Lyons; Wilfred Mijnhardt; Katrin Muff; Dave Reibstein; Alexia Shonteff; Jean-Alexis Spitz; Howard Thomas; Mike Toffel; Anne Tsui; Matthew Wood; Maurizio Zollo

Absences (7): Franklin Allen; Jamie Bettcher; Mark Houston; Peter McKiernan; Serguei Netessine; Tom Robinson; Bernard Yeung

Actions Items:

1. Mike Brady to develop a marketing piece for the RRS2019 full report.
2. Wilfred to write a blog about the Summit full report and post in the spring issue of BizEd, or AACSB and EFMD blog.
3. Anne, Bill and Maurizio to report back to the WB about the next steps for the RRS2020 Summit by March 30.
4. Anne, Bill and Mary Jo will begin steps to set up a WB Strategic Retreat once the Summit OC determines their next steps.
5. We encourage Dave to form a RRS2021 task force to discuss and develop the theme of the two-day event, and possible open content for day 2. Ideally, a developed draft “Announcement” to be completed by May 1, if possible.
6. Wilfred and Rich will take into consideration the comments made and continue to work on the Metrics and report back to the WB.
7. The Honor Roll committee will analyze the SDG exposure of the articles published in the last two years in the RRBM journals, work on the suggestions made and report back to the WB.
8. The Pioneer School committee will consider the suggestions made and revise the concept and implementation of pioneer schools.
9. Anne and Alexia will complete the bylaws and constitution to then be sent to the WB for approval before the end of March.
10. Everyone to read the RRBM Projects and Priorities matrix, and send comments, suggestions and answers to the questions to Mary Jo and Alexia within the next few weeks.

Minutes:

1. Welcome and introduction (Mary Jo Bitner)
  - a. Mary Jo welcomed everyone to the meeting.
2. Review and approve Dec 17, 2019 Working Board minutes

- a. Mary Jo asked if there were any revisions to the minutes. Anne asked to review the 'To Do List'.
- b. The RRS2019 full report was sent only to the WB members and asked them to forward to their school's leadership. Anne requested the WB for additional ideas on disseminating the RRS2019 report.
- c. Ruth suggested a more inviting/motivational one page executive summary be written. Anne asked if the Marketing colleagues on the WB could help with this marketing effort (after the meeting, Mike Brady told Mary Jo that he is going to help).
- d. There was no action on creating a blog on the full report by EFMD and AACSB for their members. Wilfred stated he would try to write about the Summit report and post in the spring issue of BizEd or on the AACSB (and EFMD) blogs.
- e. All the other items are on the agenda of this WB meeting
- f. The minutes were approved with no changes. (Alexia, on the Minutes, please do not indicate what actions have been taken on the to do list after the meeting. Minutes are a record of the meeting. We will post the Minutes on the website without any notation in it. Please remove the notation on the to do list before your send it to JAS for posting. Thank you.)

### 3. Information Items

- a. Mary Jo asked everyone to review the RRBM updates.
  - i. Distribution of the RRS2019 Full Report, including Executive Summary – Full Report is now posted on the RRBM website and was sent out via social media (Facebook, LinkedIn.....) – Read more [here](#)
  - ii. 2019 M&SOM Society Award for Responsible Research in Operations Management was announced. Read more [here](#)
  - iii. 2020 AMA-EBSCO Annual Award for Responsible Research in Marketing. The inaugural recipients of the AMA-EBSCO Annual Award for Responsible Research in Marketing were announced at the American Marketing Association's Winter Academic Conference in San Diego, CA in February 2020. The award honors two distinguished winners, seven winners, and five finalists. Read more [here](#)
  - iv. IACMR/RRBM Responsible Research in Management - the winners of this third annual award were announced on March 1, 2020, honoring three distinguished winners, eight winners and seven finalists. Read the detailed list of winners, the review process, and the list of academic and executive reviewers [here](#).
  - v. The conference held by the Aspen Business & Society Program in partnership with Ross School of Business at University of Michigan and RRBM March 5 and 6, 2020 – Read more [here](#)
    1. Jerry and JAS reported briefly about the success of the Aspen Business & Society conference.
  - vi. Chinese Business Deans' Summit on Responsible Research Echoing the first Global Summit of RRBM, the first Chinese Summit on the theme of

'Management Research for a Better Society' was hosted by the School of Management at Zhejiang University on December 12, 2019. Read more [here](#)

1. Anne reported on the Chinese Summit held on December 12, 2020. The ten top schools are very committed to the RRBM Vision and have been able to come together to form a critical mass to lead the change.

#### 4. Status of Ongoing Projects

##### a. Updates on RRS2020 (Anne Tsui, Bill Glick, Maurizio Zollo)

- i. Maurizio stated the outbreak of the corona virus may still be an issue by the end of June. Len Berry encouraged us to make a decision as soon as possible and to decide a date by which the decision will be made. . Dave, Ruth, Howard, and Matthew noted their universities and organizations were cancelling events and limiting travel.
- ii. Options mentioned including postponing it to the end of summer or an online version. Jerry is positive of this based on the experience in the Michigan conference. JAS said that it was like 80 in person participants and 20 online. If the ratio is 80 online and 20 in person, then it would not work for the Summit.
- iii. Mike Toeffel suggested rather than an 'either/or' the Summit could be held online for one day and then postpone the full summit for a later date.
- iv. Anne said the Summit OC will be meeting next week on March 17. Maurizio added that we will try to make a final decision by Easter (April 12) when more data would be available.
- v. Mary Jo summed up that the Summit OC would make the decision and would report back to the WB before Easter or earlier.
- vi. On a more positive note, Maurizio reported that the an IBM executive will join the Summit.

##### b. Working Board Retreat – June 30, 2020, following RRS2020 in London (Anne Tsui)

- i. Anne proposed the WB spend a day to view the progress RRBM has made over the last 5-6 years, our current position, how to be more effective and strategic for the future years. RRBM had used the "touch the stone while crossing the river" approach. It worked till now and RRBM needs to leverage itself to move change forward in a more strategic way. Len and Howard agreed that a retreat is timely.
- ii. The WB is in agreement a retreat is necessary and will determine date/time once the 2020 Summit OC determines the next steps.

##### c. RRS2021 at Wharton – input on dates (Dave Reibstein)

- i. Dave suggested June 27-28 for the 2021 Summit. Given the possibility of more participation, it could increase the number of participants three-

fold which will affect the number of rooms needed. Dave will check into this at Wharton for the days currently selected.

- ii. Anne explained that many people have asked to participate in the Summit. Others have suggested to have a RRBM conference where people can present papers. We need to consider at least opening one of the two days to anyone who wish to come.
  - iii. Dave mentioned that we may need to use hotels, but we stated a preference to hold the Summit on-campus. (If Wharton has an auditorium for a few hundred and if we can get a few seminar rooms for day 2, then this would work.)
  - iv. More discussion off-line is necessary to determine the possible theme and content of the RRS2021 including one open day. (We may need to form a RRS2021 task force to determine the theme ASAP.)
- d. Responsible Research Metrics – Metrics and Google Scholar and other (Rich Lyons and Wilfred Mijnhardt)
- i. Rich explained the joint work between himself and Wilfred had led them to realize there was a fracture between professional development and performance evaluation. Professional development focused on a scholar's life dreams/ambitions while performance evaluations focuses on output (number of publications). Metrics have been used as a score card and fail to look at the richer, collective research of the scholar. They realized they needed to reframe the use of metrics for to self-development. One possible metric is the ratio between the google scholar citation (social impact metric, influence beyond academic circles) to SSCI citation (academic impact metric).
  - ii. Wilfred said that while students must subscribe to the constraint of the institution, they also have the power to write their own path. How do they want to evolve as a researcher over their lifetime – to view the bigger picture.
  - iii. Anne loved the idea and said this self-development orientation could be incorporated into the Doctoral training currently under discussion. Bill agreed that the individual taking the initiative, rather than just the Deans, over their life work was tremendous.
  - iv. Mary Jo added as more journals showcase these great examples of business research papers and the AACSB standard changes will also help the young scholars coming into the system.
  - v. Dave R. asked if there was a meta-metric to evaluate a university research governance guidance. Rich and Wilfred said they were not aware of one and felt this was a great idea.
  - vi. Rich stated that he has encouraged Berkeley to include a one-page "social impact" in the faculty's annual review statement. Dave asked how many schools are doing this. (Eli Jone's I will statement is to write this for himself and encourage his faculty to do the same. We can follow up.)

- vii. Wilfred said that RRBM can create a “research government guideline” to help deans to manage the research portfolio of the school.
  - viii. Mike Toffel said he can share how HBS includes the social impact in its faculty evaluation process.
  - ix. Dan LeClair agreed that developing metrics for a professional development focus is better than performance evaluation focus. This information could be used confidentially.
  - x. Mike Brady suggested a conversation could be started to help differentiate two faculty members with seemingly identical records; to include appreciation of the work that is both academically rigorous and socially impactful.
  - xi. Jerry added that Michigan added a fourth dimension of ‘Practice’ to the scholarly evaluation system but it is not a metric and the deans are struggling to interpret it.
  - xii. Anne asked how other disciplines, especially other professional schools like medicine, engineering and law, evaluate research contributions. Wilfred stated they have as many problems as business.
  - xiii. Wilfred reported a way to track the content of published work against the 17 SDGs. There is a preliminary analysis of 4000 articles published in the UT Dallas’ journal list.
  - xiv. Wilfred and Rich will continue to work on “impact metrics”.
- e. Responsible Research Honor Roll (Ruth Bolton, Jerry Davis)
- i. Jerry reported the committee had received editor push back with their original process and decided to create something to recognize scholarly work without engaging with journals. Phase 1 evaluates 4000 articles published in 2018 and 2019 in the UT Dallas list of 24 journals using an algorithm to cross the papers with SDGs. .
  - ii. Anne asked if we could use the RRBM list of 35 top journals in the five disciplines. Len agreed since the UTD list does not include some top journals in marketing. Mary Jo agreed that the RRBM top 35 journals should be used.
  - iii. Mary Jo also added it will be important to distinguish the Honor Roll from the RRBM awards. Mike Brady agreed and added the journal editors must be held responsible to showcase papers with social impact.
  - iv. Mike Brady said that editors want to promote good work. This honor roll recognition would help the journal to contribute to the conversations on important topics.
  - v. The Honor Roll committee will take under advisement and continue on with their work.
- f. Criteria for Pioneer Schools task force (Mary Jo Bitner)
- i. Mary Jo reviewed the basic criteria/definition for a Pioneer School, explaining they would represent schools that are taking significant

actions to promote responsible research and ultimately will incorporate the RRBM mission within their governance. Mary Jo stated the label was being used to celebrate innovative actions being taken by schools.

- ii. Mike Toffel commented the definition is very important and to be certain it is a novel group of schools being labeled as a pioneer school. He said the pioneer idea may imply that there would be no need to track the progress of the schools overtime.
- iii. Dave suggested that pioneer is not a categorical variable and it should be a continuum. He recommended some sort of scoring like the Olympics. Also, an action could be at the department level and so it is not the whole school.
- iv. Katrin said we may separate early lead schools from followers. She would be happy to assist with coming up with different ranges for the schools.
- v. The Pioneer School committee will take under advisement and continue on with their work and report back to the WB.

- g. 501 (c)(3) - Working on paperwork to become a public charity (Anne Tsui, Alexia Shonteff)
  - i. Anne reported the RRBM is now set up as a LLC and has an EIN and application for nonprofit status with IRS is underway.
  - ii. The bylaws and constitution must first be completed and approved by the WB before the nonprofit application can be submitted. Katrin said she will be happy to send a copy of bylaws and constitution of a non-profit she has created to assist in the endeavor.
  - iii. A copy of the bylaws and constitution will be sent to the WB for approval within the next month.

5. RRBM Projects and Priorities (Mary Jo Bitner, Anne Tsui, Alexia Shonteff)

- a. We do not have time to discuss this agenda item. Mary Jo asked the WB members to please review the Prioritizing RRBM Initiatives/Creating Project Teams/Task Forces and think through the following questions and send comments and suggestions to Mary Jo and Alexia.
  - i. Does the matrix accurately and completely cover the things we are currently doing?
  - ii. Is anything, or anyone, left off?
  - iii. Which of the current projects provide the most return to RRBM and Vision 2030?
  - iv. How do we keep the momentum going on key initiatives and projects?
  - v. How do we determine which new projects to pursue?
  - vi. How can we involve new people in our initiatives?

6. "I Will" statements from RRS2019 –to be discussed at the next WB meeting

7. Conclusion

- a. Mary Jo thanked everyone for being on the call. The call adjourned.
- b. The next WB meeting will depend on the Summit and the June 30 WB retreat. Regardless, we need to have the next quarterly WB regular meeting in June.