

Responsible Research for Business and Management Working Board meeting

Tuesday, December 15, 2020 Zoom meeting

Time: 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. MST

MINUTES

Attendees (17): Caryn Beck-Dudley, Leonard Berry, Mary Jo Bitner, Ruth Bolton, Michael Brady, Jerry Davis, Bill Glick, Dan LeClair, Rich Lyons, Peter McKiernan, Wilfred Mijnhardt, Serguei Netessine, Jean-Alexis Spitz, Howard Thomas, Anne Tsui, Daniele Williams, Matthew Wood,

Absences (10): Franklin Allen, Jaime Bettcher, Patty Dechow, Mark Houston, Mette Morsing, Katrin Muff, David Reibstein, Michael Toffel, Bernard Yeung, Maurizio Zollo

Minutes

I. Introduction

- a. Mary Jo Bitner welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Daniele Williams and thanked Caryn for arranging the administrative support. A special thank you to Matthew and JAS for supporting RRBM. A brief explanation of a few absences was given.
- b. Mary Jo asked for any feedback on the minutes for the September 15, 2020 WB meeting. There were no changes, and the minutes were approved. JAS will post them on the RRBM website.

II. RRBM Nominations and Elections

- a. Report on RRBM Working Board Election Results (Mary Jo Bitner for Nominating and Elections Committee)
 - i. Mary Jo discussed the nominations process and outcome. The Nominations and Elections Committee (N&E) included Patty Dechow, Serguei Netessine, Matthew Wood, Bill Glick, Anne Tsui, and Mary Jo Bitner. We received 26 nominations, submitted to the nominations website by October 15.
 - ii. The N&E committee spent a lot of time deciding on the type of ballot to use. To achieve the desired diversity of the working board, the committee decided to use a fixed slate instead of a competitive ballot. We can revisit changing the type of ballot for the next election if desired since the type of ballot is not specified in the bylaws. The ballot consisted of 11 candidates, seven of whom were current members of the Working Board seeking reelection, and four were new members nominated for a first term. The criteria the committee used to finalize the slate were diversity of disciplines, geography, gender and ethnicity. Right now, the Board is dominated by management. Among the four new nominees were two in Marketing, one in International Business, and one in Finance and Economics. The committee also considered the background of the scholars and the universities they represented as well as looking for candidates with some experience with RRBM. In terms of the 26 nominations, 22 were from outside of the U.S., with most of them from Europe. About half of the nominees were from management. There were only three women nominated.
 - iii. Eighteen members of the current 25 member WB voted unanimously via electronic ballot to elect the 11 nominees.
 - iv. The following individuals were elected to the Working Board for a second term: Jerry Davis, Bill Glick, Peter McKiernan, Serguei Netessine, David Reibstein, Anne Tsui, and Matthew Wood.
 - v. The following individuals were newly elected to the Working Board for a first term: Agnieszka Chidlow (International Business, UK), Michael Haenlein (Marketing, France), Andrew Karolyi (Finance, USA), and Sergio Olavarrieta (Management, Chile).
 - vi. Mary Jo mentioned that we may want to discuss forming an advisory board, as suggested in the bylaws, to take advantage and use the talents of board members as they roll off the board.
- b. Confirmation of RRBM Officers (Bill Glick for Nominating and Elections Committee)

- i. Bill presented a wonderful set of new officers – David Reibstein (Marketing, Wharton) as Chair, Michael Toffel (Operations, Harvard) as Vice Chair, Matthew Wood (Management, EFMD) as Secretary and Patricia Dechow (Accounting, University of Southern California) as Treasurer. This is an outstanding group to lead the WB and RRBM. Anne Tsui and Bill Glick will serve as Past Chair on the Executive Committee, each for one year (2021, and 2022, respectively).
- ii. Bill remarked that we have great talent on the board recruited on the basis of lifetime achievements. As some members begin thinking of retiring (Bill, Anne, etc.), we need to more actively engage people at earlier career stages to build leadership for RRBM's transition from founding to future. We need to get fresh faces and start looking to recruit good people to engage into RRBM projects. There are a number of initiatives that would benefit from the involvement of junior scholars or at least those at the mid-career level.
- iii. Matthew commented that RRBM would not be where it is today without JAS; he's been vital. He loves RRBM with a passion and will definitely be involved in the role Matthew will be taking as Secretary. There's no way he can do this without JAS. He believes the group has good momentum and will have a real impact on research.
- iv. Bill seconded Matthew's comment. JAS has provided substantive contributions to numerous documents; makes sure everything is positioned properly and engaging.
- v. Mary Jo asked for any other questions or comments, and stated that many people who were absent expressed their excitement and are looking forward to working together.
- vi. Anne expressed gratitude to Mary Jo's leadership, and doing an awesome job. Her style, carefulness, thoughtfulness, and high quality.
- vii. Mary Jo thanked Ann and stated that it was a great team effort.
- viii. Bill asked for a motion to accept the new slate of officers and the vote passed.
- ix. Mary Jo stated that there will be five members on the Executive Committee (the four new officers and the past chair).
- x. We have overlapping board members and officers. All of us on the current board are encouraged to assist the new incoming board as they start up.
- xi. Mary Jo wanted to open the discussion about the overlapping period of first six months of 2021 that Bill mentioned earlier.
- xii. JAS shared the bylaws onscreen. *"New board members shall take office six (6) months after election."*
- xiii. The new officers' term starts on January 1, the first six months is a transition, working with the current board, and preparing to take over on July 1.
- xiv. Ruth echoed that the new and old teams should be working closely together in the first six months of 2021. All agreed.

III. Status of Ongoing projects and report on Action Items since September 2020 meeting

a. Summit Reports and Actions

i. RRS2021 – Internal stakeholder summit April 26 (Anne)

1. Anne discussed the panels and inviting speakers. She thanked the Sub-Committee for making good progress. The title is *Responsible Research Academic Summit: Experiences and Best Practices*. The April Summit will begin with an opening video, three live panels, two breakout sessions, and a closing video.
 Panel 1: Deans actions to encourage and support research with impact.
 Panel 2: Academic Association leaders– What they are doing to advance responsible research.
 Panel 3: Scholars– Three scholars will share their stories about their personal engagement in pursuit of research with societal impact.
2. Invitations for Panels 1 and 2 are confirmed. Anne expected to confirm the third speaker on the second panel by Dec 21.
3. Mary Jo asked about the general invitations. Anne replied that it is planned for mid January.

4. Anne explained that there will be an open invitation to the RRBM community. In addition, we are compiling a list of leaders of key associations and editors of top journals of each of the disciplines.
 5. Ruth said she has an email list of about 200 from the five major Marketing associations. She will check and add editors if they are not on the current list.
- ii. RRS2021 – External stakeholder summit (Bill Glick)
1. Bill stated that the External Summit is going to be June 28th and 29th for three hours each day. The same time slot as the academic summit. We will differentiate between the two events with different labeling. The first is going to be the Responsible Research Academic Summit and then the subtitle will change from year to year. The June Summit is designed as a collaboration with external stakeholders. To reinforce this intent, Maurizio suggested naming it the Responsible Research Roundtable (RRR). In November the committee generated a wonderful list of potential speakers.
 2. Ruth asked about who the attendees will be. She encouraged creating a list to ensure diversity and inclusion. Ruth will share what she did for marketing academic leadership, and this would provide a model for developing a similar kind of list of practitioner participants. We should find a systematic way to go through different organizations and identify people who we may want at this Summit. The Marketing Science Institute has a lot of executives associated with it. We might go to some industry organizations associated with other disciplines. We should get the Working Board members involved in generating a list of practitioners. If we have a good list of speakers we could really encourage some executives to join in from industry or government.
 3. Bill agreed this is a great idea. He confirmed that the intent is to make the invitee list more inclusive, targeting anyone who attends the academic summit and extend the invitation externally.
 4. Ruth stated that starting early is best because the emails are not in a list. We will have to research and compile the email lists.
- iii. RRS2022 – Current plans for 2022 at Wharton (Dave Reibstein)
1. Mary Jo shared that Dave was unable to attend due to intensive teaching this week. She asked Serguei if there are any updates.
 2. Serguei replied that it is still early to plan for the 2022 summit. He is confident that Wharton will pull off a good summit.
- b. Other committee and project reports
- i. Responsible Research Honor Roll (Bill Glick)
 1. Bill shared the group has an instrument to rate articles using a pilot study with a random sample of articles published in 2019-2020
 - ii. Responsible Research Metrics (Rich Lyons and Wilfred Mijnhardt)
 1. Rich congratulated Wilfred on the wonderful work of creating software to map published research against the 17 SDGs. Wilfred and Jerry Davis were featured in a recent FT article written by Andrew Jack, the Education Editor of FT.
 2. Wilfred said the revised accreditation standards have great impact. The work he is doing on mapping research and SDG also go into the PRME reporting space. We have a global platform now. We should think of more products to keep this forum alive and pushing towards responsible research.
 3. Wilfred further reported that he has made new software which can index entire dissertations. He has mapped 20 years of dissertations against the SDGs. We can create a DNA map of entire works. We can discuss this at the summits with global stakeholders.

4. Jerry commented that when Andrew Jack said he was contemplating how FT can improve the journal list, he warned Andrew that the survey on the list might release a flood of energies among editors and professional associations.
5. Wilfred suggested to FT that they make the list more inclusive.
6. Rich was thinking about rigor and relevance. He said we must be careful to remain focused and avoid the perception that we have lowered rigor by an expanded journal list.
7. Anne was concerned about getting involved directly with the journal list of FT. RRBM does not take a position on journal lists.
8. Bill believed that Andrew is looking for ideas and he has been pretty open in this process. One of the other questions in the FT survey is how to measure societal impact in a credible fashion. This is a type of crowdsourcing of ideas of how we can do this better.
9. Wilfred would like to see, as part of the (June) summit, a group forum on impact with selected people on a set of metrics or approaches that fits the principles of responsible research. We might even have a separate summit on this topic.
10. Anne agreed with Wilfred on this and encouraged Wilfred to take lead in designing such a summit. It could be a 90-minute summit that is a joint activity of RRBM, AACSB, EFMD, and PRME. Wilfred agreed that we can do this.
11. Regarding the June summit, Anne said that Jeff Hale is going to talk about measuring impact of non-financial performance of corporations through the SASB platform. He has ideas to share about measuring social impact of our research.
12. Caryn mentioned an article in Nature about “responsible metrics”. She further shared that AACSB is also doing a societal impact seminar that will involve business leaders. She will provide more information when it becomes available.
13. Wilfred mentioned a workshop on impact leadership and strategies where a wonderful diversity of stories was shared. Leaders telling stories about their accomplishments in impact. A very valuable form of sharing among leaders.
14. Matthew doesn’t think there is any harm in sharing the FT survey with the wider community along with the two FT articles (they are on RRBM website already).
15. Jerry shared that he, Bill, and Rich have been in conversations with Clarivate, which owns Web of Science, to see if we could develop impact metrics more thoughtfully using tools of big data, tracing the societal impact of ideas outside of academia. One way would be a sort of a hackathon where you give people common data sets and said, come up with the best metrics. Let's figure out at the article level, how do we track impact beyond academia, using the tools that you've got. For example, can you see the tracking of ideas from Journal articles to conference calls that CFOs and CEOs have with analysts to the business press, to the industry press and back again. Make it into a contest and use commonly available data to see if teams can come up with better metrics, and the best entry wins. We're still in early discussion stages.
16. Bill mentioned a study by Bornmann et al., (2019) that shows “altmetrics” (mentions on social media) had zero predictability in terms of articles that have really high societal impact.
17. Mary Jo congratulated everyone for putting in great effort on this challenging, but clearly extremely important topic for RRBM and the entire research community.

iii. North America Deans RRBM Hub (Jerry Davis)

1. Jerry reported that the purpose of the Deans Hub was to introduce changes at the school level. If we really want to change the eco-system for research, school evaluation standards are going to matter a lot. We need change agents at each school. Standard Nine of the revised AACSB accreditation enables change agents within the school itself. We have gathered a few associate deans, those that oversee faculty evaluation. They include Stanford, Johns Hopkins, Texas

A&M, Wharton, Duke, Michigan, Rice. This group meets roughly bimonthly, the current focus is on creating a menu of possible action ideas for schools to use.

2. Bill mentioned that it is interesting to note that there is a group of Chinese deans that pulled together an infinitive group like this already. They have operated pretty much autonomously from the North American deans.

iv. RRBM Webinars

1. Anne reported that the webinar series started in June with a program by Peter, Jerry and JAS. It was a wonderful kickoff for the webinar series. We have sponsored 10 webinars over 6 months. Ibrat Djabbarov, a student from Cranfield Business School, has organized most of these sessions.
2. Anne went on to report that five webinars have been planned for the first half of 2021. Three of these are by Mats Alvesson, who is a co-signer on the position paper. They are about qualitative methods and theory building. Mats is an outstanding scholar and RRBM should be happy to brand these as RRBM-supported webinars.
3. The fourth webinar will be a second Dare to Care Research Cafe, which is inviting the winners of the Responsible Research Award to tell us more about how they did the research and conversation going deeper into the research.
4. The fifth one that we have planned is by Andy Hoffman at Michigan. He has a new book "Engaged Scholar". His webinar will be in April or early May.
5. We still have the planned webinar on Business Education and Responsible Research by Mauro Guillen, to be organized by Dave Reibstein.

v. Responsible Research Awards

1. Anne reported that this award in Management was first introduced in 2017, and the International Association for Chinese management research sponsored it. Even though the association is for Chinese management primarily, they are willing to expand the award to anywhere. After three years, IACMR suggested that we have a global management association or group to sponsor it.
2. Anne approached the Academy of Management Fellows group. It has a new dean of the Fellows, our colleague Dan Siegel, Dean of the Policy Studies School at ASU who is an RRBM endorser. Through his support, the Fellows voted positively to sponsor this award. We have a committee now and the Call for Nominations will be publicized this week. This group agreed to sponsor it for three years and evaluate its continuation after that.
3. Mary Jo gave a brief update on the marketing award. The Committee met this month and has chosen the award winners for this second round of AMA-EBSCO awards. The awards will be publicly announced at the AMA Winter Conference in February. The AMA in general and the AMA Academic Division in particular have enthusiastically taken on this award and the committee was outstanding.
4. Serguei announced the Third Annual Responsible Research in Operations Management Award is also Calling for nominations. It has become a standard annual award. He further reported on the special issue of the M&SOM Journal on the theme of Responsible Research in Operations Management. The deadline was September 1st. There were 51 submissions. There are enough submissions to publish a special issue. It's going to be a nice special issue.

IV. New Business

Doctoral dissertation scholarship project (Anne and Jerry). Anne assumed the WB members have read the proposal (which was attached to the meeting Agenda email). She gave a few updates:

- a. The deadline has been postponed from July 1 to December 1 for several reasons. First, most students in the US take their qualifying exam in summer, late spring, or early fall. They start to think about the dissertation topic or write the application after this exam.

- b. The second reason is that the Philosophical Foundation course, which we will recommend students to take, cannot be offered in spring 2021. Anne was able to arrange for it to be taught by a faculty in the Management Department at ASU. Students outside of ASU (the scholarship applicant) can participate as auditors.
- c. There has been some discussion about opening up the scholarship to other disciplines. It makes sense. These justice issues supported by the scholarship cut across disciplines. Due to the small number of scholarships, after discussing offline with Serguei and Mary Jo, we decided to keep it within Management the first year. With experience and more funding, we may consider opening it up to students in other disciplines.
- d. Anne has approached KMPG about sharing the Call for Applications with students in the PhD Project. Opening this opportunity to minority students would be consistent with the theme of the scholarship, which includes racial justice issues.

V. Other questions/comments

- a. Jerry shared that The World Economic Forum is working with the big four accounting firms to create a set of ESG metrics that are a lot more thoughtful and a lot more aligned. There was a business roundtable statement about the role of corporation "is to create wealth for everyone". It feels like now is really the time for RRBM and it feels like we have the wind at our back. In some ways, we were ahead of the curve. It feels like the world is really catching up. Every CEO now is talking about impact. With the new AACSB Standards on societal impact, all of these things are coming together. We should discuss how best to exploit that. It is great to recognize that we are part of the zeitgeist out there.
- b. Rich elaborated on his comment in the chat (see below). He said that he sent a recent FT article related to RRBM (Jack, 2020) to one of his donors. Rich remembers the donor expressing years ago some skepticism with the impact of the research that is happening in the business school that Rich was the dean of. He sent him the article and added that the donor might want to check out RRBM. Rich encouraged us to do the same. This is an email we can write in two seconds and people like that may want to put some financing behind us.
- c. Anne encouraged the Executive Committee to consider a fundraising project.

VI. Conclusion – Mary Jo Bitner

- a. Mary Jo expressed excitement for our new Working Board members and Officers. We will welcome them formally in our March meeting. The current officers will start working closely with them and make sure we have a good transition.
- b. Well wishes for a wonderful holiday season were extended. 2021 will be better. The meeting concluded with season's greetings.

VII. The next Virtual WB Meeting – March 2021.

Zoom Chat Comments:

- Caryn Beck-Dudley:
Article in Nature mentioned by Caryn on "responsible metrics":
<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-020-00647-z>
- Rich Lyons:
Funding RRBM: One idea I'd like to suggest to fellow Board members, given our collective fundraising experience, is to send the wonderful FT article to a donor or two that has ever expressed concern about research impact, with a closing note in the email that directs them to the RRBM site.
- Matthew Wood:
The Financial Times survey on societal impact of research
https://survey.ft.com/jfe/form/SV_8qBwlr4MLqwwQaV

- Peter McKiernan:
The UK REF has been dealing with IMPACT for a decade now, see: <https://www.ref.ac.uk/events/ref-impact-workshop-18-january/>
- Jean-Alexis SPITZ:
All recordings from the webinars that Anne mentioned are now online on the RRBM website:
 - <https://www.rrbm.network/taking-action/events/online-events/>
 - <https://www.rrbm.network/readings/videos/>
 - <https://www.rrbm.network/taking-action/events/online-events/dare-to-care-research-cafe/>
 - Andy Hoffman's upcoming books <https://www.rrbm.network/readings/books/>

Additional References:

- Bornmann, L., Haunschild, R., & Adams, J. (2019). Do altmetrics assess societal impact in a comparable way to case studies? An empirical test of the convergent validity of altmetrics based on data from the UK research excellence framework (REF). *Journal of Informetrics*, 13: 325-340.
- Jack, A. (2020) Weighing up business schools' work on sustainability. *Financial Times*, December 6, 2020. <https://www.ft.com/content/6b499b5b-76fc-4fee-9684-f8055e52c46e>