

Responsible Research for Business and Management Working Board meeting
MINUTES
September 29, 2021

Date: Wednesday, September 29, 2021
Time: 11:00 AM-1:00 PM, New York Time

Attendees:

Caryn Beck-Dudley, Leonard Berry, Ruth Bolton, Michael Brady, Aggie Chidlow, Jerry Davis, Bill Glick, Michael Haenlein, Juliane Iannarelli, Andrew Karolyi, Peter McKiernan, Wilfred Mijnhardt, Mette Morsing, Serguei Netessine, Sergio Olavarrieta, David Reibstein, Michael Toffel, Anne Tsui, Matthew Wood, Maurizio Zollo, Jean-Alexis Spitz (JAS), Whitney Sutton

Absences:

Patty Dechow

Action Items:

1. Anne Tsui will share information on the Dissertation Scholarship with the board members so they can distribute through their channels. Specific offers of follow-up included Michael Haenlein (ELMAR), Peter McKiernan (BAM, EURAM), Mike Toffel (ARCS), and Maurizio Zollo (SMS).
2. The Research Funding team (Dave Reibstein and Peter McKiernan, with support from Maurizio Zollo) is encouraged to consider suggestions for developing a list of funding targets, a concept paper, and/or models or templates for organizational support.
3. Bill Glick and Ruth Bolton will re-educate the board members on the Responsible Research Honor Roll initiative, including criteria to be selected and expectations of reviewers.
4. RRBM events should incorporate, as appropriate, opportunities for deans and others to engage in conversation about societal impact metrics for responsible research.
5. Jerry Davis and the North American Business Deans team will research what outlets or news curations Deans are reading to find the best publications outlet for content supporting deans to orient toward research impact.
6. Mike Brady will continue work begun to develop an approach for Responsible Research Marketing.
7. Matthew Wood and JAS will follow up with RRAS 2021 participants regarding progress on their "I Will/We Will" statements.
8. Maurizio Zollo and Bill Glick will share the slides of the working progress from the RRR to Dave and/or Whitney, to share with the WB members.
9. WB members are asked to send suggestions for RRS 2022 speakers or output directly to Dave Reibstein.
10. Jerry Davis will continue to keep the WB apprised of future developments related to the impact metrics hackathon.
11. Wilfred Mijnhardt will share details about the Scholars at risk with the members so we can begin discussing involvement.
12. Michael Haenlein and Aggie Chidlow will connect with Anne regarding the presentation request for Philippine College of Management.

Minutes

1. Welcome

Dave Reibstein welcomed everyone and thanked all members for being a part of the board, especially given that everyone has numerous other obligations. He shared his great appreciation for every member and all that each contributes to RRBM.

2. Review and approve July 1, 2021 WB meeting minutes

Feedback on the minutes for the July 1, 2021 Working Board meeting was requested. There were no changes and the minutes were approved on September 29, 2021 at 11:07am EDT. JAS will post them to the RRBM website.

3. Questions from Committees/Project Leaders (*there are references in the chat document*)

- a. RRBM Doctoral Education, Dissertation Scholarship: *How can we spread the word and attract many strong applications, especially from prestigious programs?*
 - i. Anne Tsui shared that the scholarship program has been shared with the RRBM community, but broader exposure is needed to attract applicants. This is an expensive

- project and there is a concern that it isn't reaching all potential candidates. The Deadline is December 1st and applications will be accepted beginning in November.
- ii. Michael Haenlein suggested announcing it through discipline specific newsletters. Caryn Beck-Dudley asked if the PhD Project had received; Anne Tsui confirmed it had. Wilfred Mijnhardt asked if we should ask all professors that supervise doctoral students to register for RRBM. Maurizio Zollo asked if we tried each of the AoM divisions and the specialized academic associations in management, marketing, finance. Anne Tsui noted it had been shared with numerous AOM discussion forums. Ruth Bolton noted that prestigious programs are well-funded so other benefits (e.g., visibility) should be emphasized. Several board members offered to reach out to different networks including: Michael Haenlein (ELMAR), Peter McKiernan (BAM, EURAM), Mike Toffel (ARCS), and Maurizio Zollo (SMS). Aggie Chidlow suggested that WB members promote it via Twitter. Mike Brady suggested targeting "RRBM friendly" journals such as JPP&M and TCR in marketing. Anne Tsui thanked all for their help and said information would be shared with all board members following the meeting so they could share as appropriate.
 - iii. Wilfred Mijnhardt noted that there are no PhD students on the WB, and asked if there should be. JAS said that this question had also arisen in response to the recent call for nominations, and might be addressed during a later agenda item.
- b. Research Funding: *Any suggestions of potential resource pools (foundations and corporate foundations)?*
- i. Dave Reibstein introduced the topic by framing the question as whether RRBM can find organizations that are willing to support RRBM, especially its awards programs (dissertation and best paper), hosting events, etc. It would be great to find organizations supportive of the notion of wanting academia, business, education, Maurizio and research to help address some social issues to have an actual impact. Who would be the best organizations that we should identify? Michael Haenlein asked if this would be of interest for MSI or Sheth or if we are looking more for corporate sponsors? Wilfred Mijnhardt asked if it is only funding or access to resources, like data access?
 - ii. Peter McKiernan noted that when searching for money it is helpful to know what the money is for and to be specific when targeting organizations. He suggested that the group create an outline with 3-4 areas for funding, using this to identify potential foundations.
 - iii. Mike Toffel suggested creating a list of about 10 things that the money might support and shop those ideas around to the foundations to see where they have greatest interest.
 - iv. Maurizio Zollo suggested writing a concept document covering what is proposed, why it matters, and potential impact, as a starting point when connecting with the organizations. He offered to help reach out to a few foundations, including WBCSD, WEF.
 - v. Ruth Bolton, as President of the Sheth Foundation, added that they are providing support to RRBM and have encouraged all of the marketing organizations to submit proposals for things that align with RRBM principles. She believes some models might help, in the form of a template or 2-page proposal might help.
 - vi. Andrew Karolyi suggested RRBM might benefit from connections gained through involvement at the 2022 CEMS conference.
- c. Responsible Research Honor Roll: *We are seeking additional members for the committee to form an inaugural review board.*
- i. Bill Glick explained that the concept of the Honor Roll is to recognize work within publications aligning with the RRBM principles. It is not an award system per se, but a broader based recognition system. The pre-test is still in process and will enable the team to evaluate their initial approach and decide how to move forward. The initiative needs additional committee members—particularly individuals with past editorial roles and familiarity with how to get reviewers to respond.
 - ii. Ruth Bolton noted that the review process for this initiative is a rapid review that should take no more than an hour. The team reviews existing, published articles that are aligned with the RRBM principles and rates them according to a scale for each of the seven principles. There is a desire for many articles to achieve the Honor Roll. Peter McKiernan said from his experience, this existing system works well and is quick.
 - iii. Dave Reibstein suggested that listing them on the website as reviewers could be a way of valuing reviewers.
 - iv. Sergio Olavarrieta asked what documents are reviewed (i.e., previous papers). Ruth

- Bolton responded that it is just the published article.
- v. Mike Toffel suggested changing the name of the role from “Review Board” to something that has a different connotation and more accurately reflects the type of effort required. Sergio Olavarrieta suggested maybe keeping the name (because it provides the incentives) and clarify the job.
 - vi. Caryn Beck-Dudley asked how editors might be incentivized to nominate articles.
 - vii. Wilfred Mijnhardt said he shared a sheet with SDG maps of 6K FT50/UTD articles with Jerry Davis; did that help to get the best on top? Mike Brady suggested encouraging editors to ask a team member to help identify papers, perhaps even establishing a new role to ease the burden off editors.
 - viii. Ruth Bolton and Bill Glick will share criteria for the honor roll and expectations of the review committee members with WB members following the meeting.
- d. Responsible Research Societal Impact Metrics: *How should RRBM be engaging this opportunity most productively? Are there any hazards to be aware of?*
- i. Bill Glick referenced a recent hackathon meeting involving a stellar group of organizations and individuals; it is clear that this problem has a lot of attention and tremendous opportunity but no magic bullet; there is convergence on the need for “a basket of metrics.” Andrew Jack is committed to doing something within the context of the FT.
 - ii. Anne Tsui cautioned that the FT ranking system is controversial in terms of serving business schools.
 - iii. Wilfred Mijnhardt reinforced the diversity of metrics currently being referenced for societal impact among different groups, and Maurizio Zollo noted that the diversity among participants will help bring different capabilities and assets to the question.
 - iv. Andrew Karolyi would welcome the opportunity to convene a group of fellow deans to endorse a collective recommendation of RRBM in order to guide the FT/Andrew Jack.
 - v. Ruth Bolton said that since this topic is a moving target, shouldn't we participate to learn and engage with relevant constituencies without necessarily a more explicit goal?
 - vi. Dave Reibstein asked if there are other ways for RRBM to be engaged or things that RRBM should be concerned about?
 - vii. Andrew Karolyi asked if it would be productive for the WB to endorse an approach, i.e. Wilfred Mijnhardt's metrics system or something emerging from the hackathon, and offered to help convene deans for this purpose. Wilfred Mijnhardt said we need to use what is there already as much as possible.
 - viii. Maurizio Zollo said the content of this conversation would be of interest to deans at RRBM events and encouraged continued conversation in these venues. The question is not which system to adopt and which to dismiss, but rather what combination or integration of approaches will help to solve the problem.
 - ix. Caryn Beck-Dudley offered that the non-academics who are doing research on this are using sophisticated tools in AI, web crawling, and text recognition and encouraged academics not to reinvent the wheel.
- e. North America Business Deans: *Best publication outlet for “How-to guide for new impact-oriented deans”?*
- i. Anne Tsui mentioned that the group has circulated a document synthesizing ideas from across Summits, including mention of a deans' column. Is there a public place that the WB recommends this could be published?
 - ii. Caryn Beck-Dudley suggested publishing/blogging on AACSB sites or an upcoming associate deans conference. Matthew Wood suggested the EFMD blog and strategic deans programme. JAS suggested the RRBM blog. Andrew Karolyi suggested sharing with a regular meetings of top business school deans gathered by the Aspen Institute's Business & Society Program. Leonard Berry suggested that RRBM publish it as a way to get the name out to deans. Aggie Chidlow suggested the Times Higher Education (THE) in the UK. Caryn Beck-Dudley suggested *Poets & Quants*.
- f. Responsible Research Marketing: *Does this approach seem reasonable?*
- i. Mike Brady was tasked to think about the marketing of RRBM, and started thinking about this within the marketing discipline, recognizing signs that more awareness of RRBM within the marketing discipline was needed. Reaching out to friends within the network, he asked: *What could RRBM do to be more salient in the marketing academy?* The feedback

- received fell into two categories: Events and Journals, and included aligning with groups that we know are RRBM friendly like Transformative Research group, and developing a special interest group within AMA.
- ii. Mike Brady described doing a search on “RRBM” in marketing journals, noting that certain journals are very aware of RRBM and promoting it, and others are not. He asked for feedback on whether, if gaps are found in that journals are not publishing RRBM related content, the group should first target awareness building efforts at the journals with the biggest gaps. Michael Haenlein said he believes the fact that the label RRBM may not be used does not necessarily imply that such content is not published in those journals, though he agreed there is a problem in that journals are not necessarily taking advantage of linking related content/special issues to RRBM.
 - iii. Ruth Bolton suggested that special sessions at conferences, with senior academics introducing cutting edge research by younger scholars, are important for generating buzz. Anne Tsui suggested social media.
 - iv. Andrew Karolyi suggested that past winners publicize testimonials or blog posts about the award-winning research, perhaps with help from their schools’ communications teams. Leonard Berry agreed, noting little publicity of previous RRBM awards.

4. RRBM Event Updates

- a. 2021 RRAS:
 - i. Matthew Wood and JAS have drafted an email message regarding updates on the “I Will” statements that will be shared soon with the participants. Once responses are returned, this will be highlighted on the website. There has been one communication sent to the participants back in July that was well received.
 - ii. Anne Tsui also noted that the full report for the summit is now available online and includes the “I Will” statements.
- b. 2021 RRR:
 - i. Bill Glick mentioned they are also at the stage of doing follow ups for the participants.
 - ii. Maurizio Zollo shared that extensive work has been done to summarize and synthesize the 112 ideas generated on the two questions from the event. In the future there will be a bigger question for the board to address about institutionalization of this second type of summit. Bill Glick and Maurizio Zollo will share the PPT being developed that summarizes these ideas.
- c. 2022 RRS – Update on 2022 Responsible Research Summit at Wharton
 - i. Dave Reibstein asked WB members to send him suggestions for what kind of output should come from the next event. Work is underway to plan for the June conference, with Serguei Netessine, to identify and invite speakers. He asked if there are suggestions for individuals to invite, or critical aspects to cover. Bill Glick suggested identifying speakers from the hackathon. Mike Toffel suggested a session on “what we should do LESS to enable us to MORE responsible research”, and a session to update on the hackathon. Dave Reibstein also suggested including Andrew Jack from the FT.
 - ii. Anne Tsui suggested a theme for the summit emphasizing Progress in Responsible Research.
 - iii. Dave Reibstein highlighted that Mette Morsing and Aggie Chidlow will be getting more involved. The conference is intended to be in person, though that could change.
 - iv. Leonard Berry recommend a video highlighting key speaker comments to be shared with those who could not attend. Anne Tsui responded that these are on the to do list. Also, the website has the RRAS brief report and videos of the keynote sessions, though not widely distributed; a PR person for more outreach would be helpful.
- d. Hackathon and Impact Measurement:
 - i. Jerry Davis described an effort coordinated by Andrew Jack, global education editor for *Financial Times*, who is exploring alternatives to counting articles in a select list of journals as part of the rankings. Alternatives turn out to be hard. Jerry Davis has done a lit review on impact metrics and what one can do. Earlier today Andrew convened 15 entities that have been giving thought to how to measure impact of research. We are pretty good at counting outputs, citations, and social media pick-up. Beyond that, there is a lot of focus on evaluating content to determine potential impact. It will take effort to get to metrics that are not game-able and do not misalign incentives. The goal of the

hackathon is to find the right metrics that would point to a reasonable causal model for outcomes with impact; this is tricky.

- ii. Dave Reibstein asked if impact means societal impact, or if it could mean impact that goes through business (i.e., an improvement in business performance). Jerry Davis reminded the group of intersections between both within the details of the SDGs, i.e., #8 is about job creation and #17 about institution building.
- iii. Anne Tsui noted reminded that Principle 1 of RRBM is about “service to society”, and that in the RRBM awards we ask authors to tell us the ‘impact’ the paper has had on practice. Some of them have impressive impact already. For example: is the research on the right question, is it disseminated widely, do any companies or government use it?
- iv. Mette Morsing noted that we often account for activities and not impact, which takes time. How do we deal with time? Might we consider potential impact, asking author to address the potential impact of his/her research?
- v. Peter McKiernan noted that the UK REF case studies take a longer term view.
- vi. Wilfred Mijnhardt added two comments: Impact is not backward looking, it is looking forward; impact leadership is when people create opportunities for others. We may only be able to measure relatedness to the SDGs and not impact to SDGs.
- vii. Anne Tsui said that to her, looking at the question being asked in the research (e.g., related to SDGs) is the best way to look to potential positive impact, as well as how solution oriented it is. Dave Reibstein and Michael Haenlein questioned whether SDGs were too narrow. Anne Tsui said the SDG list is very inclusive, but other grand challenges could be relevant.
- viii. Maurizio Zollo noted the tension in the continuum between finding the right fair investment of time and resources to do the output assessments required to benefit from the rankings.
- ix. Jerry Davis that next steps following the hackathon will be for different groups to work in parallel to recommend metrics that FT might use. He and Anne Tsui both noted the need for caution that the RRBM connection to the FT’s ultimate metrics not be misunderstood.
- x. Jerry Davis will keep the RRBM working board members updated.
- xi. Bill Glick noted that this exercise is likely to yield a basket of potential metrics, from which the FT will select their preferred metrics.

5. RRBM Board Elections

- a. [Call for Nominations](#) – due by October 15, 2021 to fill two spaces for next term
- b. Anne Tsui briefly explained the call for nominations and process and asked for the working board member to consider the need for working board members to have staggered terms. Ruth Bolton said it is normal for boards to set terms so that an equal number end each year. Wilfred Mijnhardt cautioned that if people who are ending terms are in projects, this will hurt the project. Ruth Bolton suggested that instead of rotating people off when their term is over, they could move to an Advisory Committee.
- c. Anne Tsui also asked board members to consider what kind of new talents and disciplinary diversity (especially finance, accounting, and operations) would be needed on the Board. She emphasized that outgoing board members would still have many opportunities to stay significantly involved. Michael Haenlein asked if we want to consider geographical diversity. Ruth Bolton suggested that people who have just stepped down from a leadership position in the discipline would be good nominees.
- d. Ruth Bolton suggested creating a small panel of doctoral students that the board can consult, rather than having them join the board. Caryn Beck-Dudley supported this idea.
- e. Matthew Wood noted that the initial response to the call for nominations has been very strong.
- f. Anne Tsui said that the number of openings would be determined soon based on whether any WB members plan to end their terms early or seek reelection.

6. General Discussion

- a. Bill Glick shared that Andrew Jack has secured funding for research publications awards and is interested in RRBM members to help review on the committee. This will not be restricted to RRBM award winners but rather an open call. Jerry Davis confirmed that the call is live on the FT website and asks for self-nominations.
- b. Wilfred Mijnhardt introduced the Scholars at Risk initiative and posed whether there is an

alignment of values with RRBM. Dave Reibstein asked that he share information with the WB to support a future discussion.

- c. Anne Tsui asked the WB's reaction to doctoral student involvement on the board. Ruth Bolton suggested a small advisory panel of doctoral students that the Board would consult.
- d. Anne Tsui asked if anyone would be in a position to give an RRBM presentation to the Philippine College of Management. Michael Haenlein and Aggie Chidlow will follow up.

7. Dave Reibstein concluded the meeting with a message of appreciation to the board members, and a request for feedback. He expressed appreciation for the board members that did not have a presentation role today, reinforcing the other ways that they are contributing and can be involved. He welcomes suggestions.

8. **Next Virtual WB Meeting** – December 8, 2021, 11:00-1:00 NY time