

Responsible Research for Business and Management Working Board meeting

Tuesday, September 15, 2020 Zoom meeting

Time: 8:00 am – 10:00 am (Phoenix Time)

MINUTES

Attendees (21): Caryn Beck-Dudley, Leonard Berry, Jaime Bettcher, Mary Jo Bitner, Ruth Bolton, Jerry Davis, Patty Dechow, Bill Glick, Dan LeClair, Rich Lyons, Peter McKiernan, Wilfred Mijnhardt, Mette Morsing, Serguei Netessine, David Reibstein, Jean-Alexis Spitz, Howard Thomas, Michael Toffel, Anne Tsui, Matthew Wood, Maurizio Zollo

Guests (2):

Sri Zaheer (Dean, University of Minnesota, RRBM co-founder)

Lisa Parragh (Imperial College Business School)

Absence (5): Franklin Allen, Michael Brady, Mark Houston, Katrin Muff, Bernard Yeung

Action Items

1. Maurizio to identify UK and European executives for the day 2 panels and also other professional participants. Matthew Wood and Howard Thomas are willing to help, along with Luk and Peter.
2. JAS to help Dave Reibstein to organize the webinar “Responsible research and business education” by Mauro Guillen.
3. WB members to participate in the pilot of the RRBM-Honor Roll in Oct-Nov timeframe.
4. WB members to actively nominate candidates for the WB, with special attention to diversity in discipline, external stakeholders, geography, and ethnic background. Deadline is Oct 15.
5. WB members also are encouraged to consider running for officers. We need new leadership and fresh ideas.

Minutes

I. Introduction

1. Mary Jo Bitner welcomed new member Patty DeChow and asked her to give a brief self-introduction.
2. Patty is Professor of Accounting at the University of Southern California. She is the Managing Editor of one of the top tier accounting journals, Review of Accounting Studies. She has been with RRBM for two years. RAS will have a conference in December, on ESG related topics. She is trying to move the dial a little to promote financial accounting insights on areas that are helpful to society.
3. Mary Jo asked for any feedback on the minutes for the June 9, 2020 WB meeting. There were no changes and the minutes were approved. JAS will post them on the RRBM website.

II. Reporting of On-going Projects

4. Reports on the summits
 - a. RRS2019 – Mike Brady was absent, no report on the brief summary of the 2019 summit. Wilfred Mijnhardt has scheduled a meeting with an editor of BizEd about a blog regarding the RRS2019.
 - b. RRS2020 –

- i. Anne said that feedback report was based on comments from 11 of the 65 participants. There are some very constructive suggestions for both future virtual and in person summits.
 - ii. The We Will report has the statements from all ten small groups. They are inspiring. She wondered if we should have an event (e.g., webinar) next winter or spring to share the actions taken on the We Will commitments.
 - c. RRS2021 –
 - i. Bill said that we have a robust program design already. The important next step is to form the panels of executives.
 - ii. Maurizio has formed a European OC subgroup (Luk and Peter) to identify UK or European executives. He invited anyone on the WB who wish to help. Matthew Wood and Howard Thomas expressed an interest to help.
 - iii. Maurizio introduced Lisa Parragh, a new colleague from Imperial College Business School, who will help with the Local Arrangements logistics.
 - iv. Matthew said that many conferences are not planning on in person through next summer. We may consider postponing the RRS2021 to the fall.
 - v. Caryn said that we should have a better picture by December but encouraged us to plan a hybrid summit as plan B.
 - vi. Meanwhile, Maurizio suggested that we organize one to two high level zoom events, including one that engages external stakeholders.
 - vii. Wilfred agreed that such events are useful to build up energy, especially to have separate ones for deans, editors, and other stakeholders.
 - viii. Dan LeClair reported that GBSN has a new model arranged by stakeholders. It is called GBSN-beyond (gbsn.org/conference/gbsn-beyond/). Its December online conference has three tracks, a) students, b) faculty, c) leaders. Each group works on an experiential project culminating in the presentation at the virtual conference. They also changed pricing from individual to institution to foster solidarity.
 - ix. Wilfred liked the stakeholder-driven approach.
- 5. RRS2022 – Dave Reibstein said the uncertainty makes it hard to plan for 2022, but he asked for guidance on forming a team to coordinate the summit. Dave also reported that Wharton’s new dean Erica James, who started on July 1, 2020, would be very supportive of RRBM.
- 6. Other committee and project reports
 - a. Responsible Research Honor Roll –
 - i. Ruth Bolton reported good progress, and the approach and evaluation tool is ready for a pilot. She said that the WB members will be asked to assist with the pilot by evaluating a few published papers on the assessment form. It will be in Oct/Nov timeframe. Based on feedback and review of the pilot, the HR assessment approach will go to Phase II. Caryn commented that the acronym HR usually means “Human Resources”.
 - ii. Jerry Davis reported that they are also doing a Qualtrics survey that is looking very good.

- b. Responsible Research Metrics and Financial Time Initiative
 - i. Rich Lyons expressed great excitement for the SDG tracking algorithm that Wilfred is doing on a set of journals, e.g., FT50, UTD40. It can provide information on percent of faculty publications that are in the FT journals, and percent of publications that are about any of the 17 SDGs. This can also provide data over time to analyze dynamic changes. Is faculty research following the FT list? This would answer the question of whether FT is having any influence on faculty choice of where to publish their work.
 - ii. Wilfred Mijnhardt elaborated that this is simple analytics on the SDGs to focus or encourage a dialogue on impact. Which journals are publishing SDG related research the most? Which schools are producing SDG relevant research? He has a dashboard and ask everyone to give him some feedback on it.
 - iii. The algorithm is based on a set of keywords associated with each SDG. A paper that has any of the keywords is considered a paper related to the SDG. A caution is that authors can potentially game the system by putting in a set of words related to SDG when the topic of the research is not really about any SDG in a substantive way.
 - iv. Rich remarked that SDG is a good place to start. Responsible research is not only about the SDGs. But this methodology attracted the attention of FT editor Andrew Jack.
 - v. Bill Glick said that FT is going to survey the schools in the fall, alerting them that there will be some measures of impact in the future. There is a window of 8/9 months for FT to come up with a method to measure impact in its future ranking exercise.
 - vi. Bill also pointed out that SDGs may measure relevance, but this method does not actually measure impact.
 - vii. Mette Morsing shared the work at PRME, in revamping the PRME report 2.0. This would include statements of impact. She suggested that we may want to help the schools by developing a common metric so that the report can be used for multiple groups, e.g., AACSB, PRME, FT, etc.
- c. Doctoral Education –
 - i. Anne reported that the task force has two approaches, one on whole courses and the other short webinars. We are focusing on the latter for now. Currently, we are working with two groups of students, in UK and the US. We are planning to develop webinars on how to do research that can move the world. We will draw on award winners and other senior scholars who have done responsible research. We expect the students to take the lead in this initiative and we will support them.
 - ii. Peter McKiernan believed that the doctoral students are a big community and they have a voice to be heard. RRBM can provide a platform for them to have this voice. We might include them in RRBM in some way, formally or informally. The former could be in the form of a RRBM College of Doctoral Students and the latter could be to invite them to join a task force, committees, or perhaps the WB.
- d. North America Deans RRBM Hub –

Jerry reported that this group will include associate deans for research, faculty or impact to share ideas on how to introduce ways to encourage

faculty research focusing on societal impact. It will be an informal network of peers to support each other in changing P&T criteria as an enabler of impact research. An organizing meeting is being arranged in early October.

- e. Pioneering Institutions –
Mary Jo explained that the process and committee for reviewing applications of pioneering institutions are all in place. JAS will ask the current pioneering schools to update their profiles. The update for the Ross School Michigan by Jerry is great.
- f. RRBM Webinars
 - i. Anne reported that we have held three webinars with the first one on the theme of Responsible Research in Pandemic Times, June 16, conducted by Jerry Davis and Peter McKiernan. The first of the three IACMR-RRBM Responsible Research in Management Awards winners webinar was held on Aug 6. The next two are scheduled for Oct 6 and Dec 11. The third is “Doing Research Which Moves the World” held on Sept 9, attended by 230 people, with over 460 registrations. Peter McKiernan, Jen Howard-Grenville (Deputy Editor in Chief for AMJ) and Anne Tsui were speakers.
 - ii. Anne also reported that there will be more webinars on learning how to conduct research which moves the world. This will be led by doctoral students and junior scholars.
 - iii. Mary Jo reported that the AMA-EBSCO Responsible Research in Marketing award winner presentations was held at the Summer AMA conference on Aug 18. She was the moderator with seven award winners presenting pre-recorded videos followed by live Q&A with the presenters. She was told this was one of the best attended sessions at the conference.
 - iv. Dave Reibstein had to leave early, but he is planning a new webinar “Business Education and Responsible Research” by Mauro Guillen, Professor Management at Wharton. JAS will follow up with Dave on arranging this webinar and promotion.

III. RRBM Nominations and Elections

- a. Mary Jo explained the process and timeline of the nomination and election of WB members. She asked for any feedback on the procedure and the draft of the Call for Nominations.
- b. She reviewed the tenure of the 25 board members and the retiring of nine, and a cap of 20 members according to the Bylaws. There will be four vacant positions.
- c. She encouraged WB members to nominate candidates especially in disciplines other than management and marketing, and also diversity in geography and ethnic background. Anne echoed the importance of increasing the diversity of the WB for the diversity of perspectives and attention.
- d. Wilfred and Maurizio both asked if we can include executives, in business, non-profit, NGO, to serve on the WB, to reflect the ecosystem nature of business research. Anne echoed the value of having external stakeholders to serve on the Board, and encourage nominations of external stakeholders.
- e. Bill said that business people may not have the time to devote to RRBM, but it is possible that we can have an advisory board to involve external stakeholders.
- f. The Call for Nomination was approved by the WB. JAS will help to get it out to the RRBM community.

- g. There will be a separate process of officer election. Officers come from current and continuing WB members. Mary Jo and Anne encourage WB members to consider taking up leadership. Anne, Bill, and Mary Jo will not run for officers. Their service of five years is long enough. RRBM will benefit from new leadership and fresh ideas. There is much talent in the WB to lead RRBM to the next level of impact.

IV. New Business

- a. Anne reported that she is discussing with the Academy of Management Fellows group about sponsoring the Responsible Research in Management award. She is optimistic.
- b. Anne said that we will wait for the new leadership team to be elected to work on the Working Board Retreat and Strategy Session. Ideally, it can be held on the day after the RRS2021 (June 30, 2021). If an in-person summit is not possible, then a half day online retreat with the new officers would be very useful.

V. Additional Discussion

- a. Len Berry reported that his group's (group 9) We Will statement included two actions, one of them is to write a paper on "a clean piece of paper approach for assessing and valuing the societal impact of business faculty research." This paper will be published in BizEd- the AACSB magazine.
- b. Peter said the British Research Evaluation Framework has been working on impact for at least ten years. It has multiple definitions of impact. It uses the case study approach. For example, his school has to submit 13 case studies. Len might check it out. The website is ref.ac.uk.
- c. Maurizio agreed, that Imperial College business school has to submit eight case studies. He was impressed by the process and the product. He said that Len's paper may be of interest to the REF group in the UK.
- d. Mette Morsing added that it would be good to invite some of the professors working at the national level in the UK about research impact. For example, Prof. Laura Spence is doing a lot of work in this area. We may consider inviting her to the next RRBM event, e.g., RRS2021.
- e. Bill reflected on his experience with an accreditation review of a school in the UK. Faculty colleagues were eager to have their articles to be selected for the REF's case studies. There are outside and inside reviews as case studies are highly vetted and scrutinized. Overall, there is a lot of judgement involved before a case study is selected to represent the school and then more judgement by outside reviewers assigning a numeric score based on impact.
- f. Peter said that the research has to have been done several years ago before impact can be measured. The impact is over a four- to five-year period.
- g. Bill said that selection of articles for a case study is a good criterion measure for validating measures of societal impact of research.
- h. Anne said she like Maurizio's idea of an impact conference, an event to bring together all those working on research impact to exchange ideas. There are so many groups worldwide looking for the same solutions – what is impact, how do we know, how to we measure without the potential gaming that often accompanies measurement.

IV. Conclusion and Next Virtual WB Meeting

- a. Mary Jo thanked everyone for a good meeting and for their contributions.

- b. Mary Jo reminded everyone to think about the nominations and to think about running for officers.
- c. The next meeting will most likely be in the week of December 14, 2020.
- d. The meeting ended at 10:00 AM, Phoenix time.