

The Responsible Science committee meeting

August 8, Monday, Anaheim

11:30 am – 3:30 pm

Courtyard Anaheim Resort Conference Center, Studio Room
2045 South Harbor Blvd., Anaheim, CA

Present:

Scholars: Mary Jo Bitner (marketing, ASU, US), Jerry Davis (management, Michigan, US), Thomas Dyllick (management, University of St. Gallen), Katrin Muff (BSL, Switzerland), Anne Tsui (management, Notre Dame, US and China),

Deans: Ingmar Bjorkman (Aalto, Finland), Gerry George (SMU, Singapore)

Institutions: Bill Glick (Rice U and AACSB), Dan LeClair and Patrick Cullen (AACSB), Magda Wanot (EFMD, Brussels), Jonas Haertle (PRME, UN Global Compact)

Special guests: Mary Ann Glynn (Program Chair, AOM)

Absent:

Scholars: A. Rashad Abdel-Khalik (Accounting, U of Illinois, UC), Franklin Allen (finance, Imperial College, UK), Mats Alvesson (management, U of Lund, Sweden), Peter McKiernan (strategy, Strathclyde, Scotland and Australia), Serguei Netessine (operations, INSEAD, Singapore), Maureen O'Hara (finance, Cornell, U.S.), Dave Reibstein (marketing, Wharton, US), Chris Tang (OM, UCLA)

Deans: Hongbin Cai (Peking U), Xiongwen Lu (Fudan U), Ira Solomon (Tulane), Xiaobo Wu (Zhejiang U), Bernard Yeung (National University of Singapore), Sri Zaheer (Minnesota)

EFMD: Howard Thomas, Ulrich Hommel

Minutes

The notes in [xxx] are Anne's after-meeting responses/comments when preparing the minutes.

I. Introduction

1. We welcomed Mary Ann Glynn, Vice President and Program Chair of the Academy of Management, as a special guest of our meeting.
2. We welcomed Magdalena Wanot from EFMD who attended on behalf of Matthew Wood.

II. White paper discussion (document 1, led by Gerry George)

Gerry George asked for comments and reactions to version 2 of the paper. The comments and discussion points are organized along major themes and different sections of the paper:

1. Tone, terms, and orientation of the paper
 - a. Thomas Dyllick echoed Peter McKiernan's August 1 email comment on v2. The tone is too tame. The paper needs to be more forceful, e.g., state boldly what business schools need to do to reach vision 2030, to achieve the 17 SDGs, or engage in responsible science.
 - b. Dan LeClair, on the other hand, said the tone is right. It should be positive and open possibilities of things that business schools can do to make a better world. The theme of diversity is important. It suggests that our research should be broader than just

- publishing in A journals.
- c. There seems to be a consensus that the tone of the paper should be positive but also can be direct, bold and inclusive of all possibilities. Katrin Muff first raised this point, believing that we should motivate people with the positive vision and also by providing examples of things that are already being done. Others agreed with this sentiment.
 - d. Dan asked if this paper is about business schools or about any management education providers. [Anne: Since the problem pertains to university-based business school research, this paper should focus on business schools in universities rather than other forms of management education providers such as corporate universities or for-profit business schools without a research mission.]
 - e. Dan asked if we would agree to the view that business is a means to a better society. Therefore, business schools and their research are means to better business, which in turn contributes to a better world. We agreed to this view and we should state this view clearly in the beginning of the paper.
 - f. Jonas Haertle asked who is the “We” in the paper. Does the term ‘we’ refer to the ‘academics’ or ‘practitioners’, or both. [Anne: The term refers to the community of scholars in business schools and who engage in social science research, as well as all other stakeholders of the research eco-system.]
 - g. Katrin Muff asked for the meaning of “responsible science”. It is in the first paragraph of the white paper (but we should add the words “defined as” to make it clear): “science that produces reliable knowledge with relevance for addressing challenges important to business and society.”
 - h. There was also a question about management schools some of which have less a pure “business orientation” (focusing on for profit, shareholder-focused firms). We agreed to treat business schools and schools of management synonymously. [Anne: We might use “business and management” together in the white paper. We also might add a note in the paper that we use the term business school to refer to both.]
2. Research priority to support “responsible science”
 - a. Jerry Davis suggested that we might boldly state that business schools should orient its research to achieving UN’s 17 Sustainable Development Goals.
 - b. Dan responded that this might be too narrow, and both Bill Glick and Anne Tsui agreed. He emphasized that we should encourage diversity in research programs and priorities, including the option to support the SDGs or to help organizations to make the most profit. This is consistent with the ‘diversity’ principle in the paper.
 - c. There was a general discussion of the value of including multiple types of scholarship under the responsible science umbrella – to include a diversity of scholarship and types of contributions, not only publications in top journals.
 3. Section B Principles of “responsible science”
 - a. Several suggestions were made to fine-tune the wording on the principles. For example, for Principle 2, add “or problems” to “topics”.
 - b. For Principle 1, add “and create better futures” at the end of the Implication paragraph.
 - c. For Principle 6, we might add “diverse forms of impact” in addition to “diverse forms

- of dissemination.”
- d. For Principle 7, the word “enlist” should be changed to “involve” or “partner with” to signal a collaborative relationship with stakeholder groups.
 - e. Dan asked if these are principles of business schools or principles of research. Do these principles apply only to business schools or to any level (individual, school, government, nation) involved in business research? [Anne: Since this paper focuses on the problem of research in university-based business schools, the principles apply to research activities within these business schools.]
4. Examples of how to practice “responsible science”
 - a. We should identify associations or organizations practicing responsible science. Mary Jo Bitner reported that AMA’s winter conference in Feb 2017 will have the theme of “better marketing for a better world”; Bill Glick mentioned that NSF has now a “broader impact criterion” in evaluating research proposals. Jonas Haertle said that UN has developed a set of Principles for Responsible Investments. One person mentioned Ford Foundation is supporting research consistent with the idea of “responsible science” (not sure who said this, need to find out more about this.) These examples can be added in an appendix.
 - b. Katrin Muff suggested that we look for examples of organizations, individuals and schools that are practicing responsible science and share these examples – if not in the paper, later on the website and in other communications.
 - c. We might also add examples or scenarios of tenure cases consistent with responsible science. The examples should include tenure in research strong schools, research moderate, and even examples for teaching faculty with some research expectations.
 - d. Bill Glick suggested that we should encourage schools to periodically post a “Report of Responsible Science” similar to the “Report of Responsible Management” by PRME members. Perhaps this can be included as part of the “Actions” and later included in the accreditation materials.
 5. Section C Actions by stakeholders toward Vision 2030.
 - a. We should add “publishers” to group 1 “journal editors”, since many journals by published by commercial (e.g., Wiley, Elsevier) or university press (e.g., Cambridge, Oxford).
 - b. Add “government” to group 5 “funding agencies”, since in many countries (e.g., UK, Australia, European countries), government is the major source of research funding.
 - c. Group 6 “scholars themselves” – add specific actions similar to the other group, e.g., pursue important research, review manuscripts using criteria consistent with responsible science.
 - d. Add “Other external stakeholders” as group 7. This would include business groups, civil societies, etc.
 6. Section D Current Research Eco-system
 - a. Thomas Dyllick asked if this section is necessary. Would it be better to delete it?
 - b. Mary Ann Glynn said that scholars are used to starting a paper with a problem statement before the solutions. Anne said that a majority of the team members preferred to start with paper with a positive tone and a positive vision of the future.

The problem should be presented in the later part of the paper.

- c. After some discussion, we agreed to keep this section but to reduce it substantially, focusing on inter-connected nature of the current eco-system (oriented toward A-journals), suggesting the need for coordinated actions by all stakeholders to orient research eco-system toward responsible science.
- d. Dan asked if we could add a brief discussion on “what’s the impact of current research?” [Anne: Peter McKiernan once shared that in the most recent UK’s REF assessment, business research scored the lowest on social impact, compared to all other disciplines, natural and social. Cary Cooper reported at the “research impact symposium” at AOM on Monday morning that of the 100 A journal articles, only about 30 passed the social impact scoring. We can report these data in an appendix.]
- e. We also agree that we need a brief problem statement focusing on the “systems” nature of the problem. This can be put in the Overview section.

7. Section E Conclusion and a more modest scenario 2030
 - a. Replace the “modest scenario” with a positive ending.
 - b. Add a Call to Action section.

III. The Delphi report discussion (document 2, led by Anne Tsui)

1. Gerry George asked if the Delphi report will be part of the paper. Anne said that Delphi report is long (26 pages) and only some the results are in the white paper. It would not be appropriate to include it in the position paper, but will be available upon request.
2. Anne asked for feedback on the two negative comments about items consistent of two or more ideas. Gerry George said that Delphi is meant to solicit tentative ideas and not strong statistical conclusions. Mary Jo concurred. The consensus is that the report is fine as is.
3. Gerry suggested that we might consider submitting the Delphi study to AMLE (Academy of Management Learning and Education journal) for possible publication.

IV. Grand Challenges Special Issues (discussion led by Mary Jo Bitner)

Mary Jo Bitner reported on the progress of this initiative.

1. She said that the American Marketing Association leadership and JM editor have expressed interest in this idea and tentatively plan to have a special issue in Journal of Marketing on grand challenges in marketing. The plan is to announce the Call for Papers at the Feb 2017 AMA Winter conference. In 2018, it is possible that there could be a forum on papers accepted for this special issue in the winter AMA conference.
2. She corresponded with Serguei Netessins about the Operations Management journals. Serguei was not optimistic about such an issue in any of the OM journals. Most of the OM journals have many special issues in the coming two years. He said that there was concern that such an issue may not draw many high quality submissions.
3. Anne and John Child submitted a special issue proposal to Jason Shaw, new editor of AMJ, on “income inequality in organizations”. Jason Shaw agreed in principle and is in the process of revising the Call for Papers to expand the theme to “income inequality and sustainability”.
4. Mary Ann Glynn reminded us that there are several special issues on inequality already, including Organization Studies, Organization Science, Journal of Management Studies, and Human Relations (July 2015, Inequality and Management).
5. Anne discussed with Andy Van de Ven, the editor of AMD, who is willing to consider a

proposal for a special issue in AMD on the theme of “Research on United Nation’s Sustainable Development Goals”. Anne is thinking about scholars who might be suitable guest editors for such a special issue, and encourage them to develop a proposal for AMD.

6. Mary Jo asked if we should coordinate the special issues among different journals and issue a joint call for papers. This is an attractive idea but logistically may be challenging. Proceeding separately seems to be a practical approach.
7. Mary Jo also asked if we would invite non-A journals to publish such special issues. The answer is yes. The question is how to approach them. [Anne: Mary Jo may wish to write a proposal to invite journals to publish such a special issue, similar to AMJ, with or without guest editors.]

V. White paper dissemination methods and website (document 3, discussion led by Bill Glick)

1. Bill asked for feedback on the five alternative dissemination ideas suggested in document 3. Should we use one or more? Which one should we start with?
2. Anne said that we could organize forums at the various association conferences (accounting, finance, marketing, operations, management) to discuss the white paper after it is finalized.
3. Mary Jo will try to organize a special session to discuss the ideas in the white paper at the Feb 2017 AMA winter conference. Dan LeClair may consider organizing a forum at the Deans’ conference on Feb 6 and 7, 2017 in New Orleans. Matthew Wood might organize a forum at the EFMD Deans’ conference on 2 – 3 Feb 2016 in Slovenia.
[Anne: We should encourage our accounting, finance, and OM team members to organize similar forums at their respective association conferences in 2017.]
4. We discussed the urgent need to build the responsible science website to host the white paper and associated documents as well as other resources. Ideally, it should be an independent website (not subsumed under another group) but all supportive groups would have a link to it.
5. Magdalena Wanot will talk with Matthew Wood about the possibility of EFMD to provide help in designing this website. We need a scholar, possibly a member of this project team, to serve as the project leader for building this website.
6. Dan LeClair reminded us that the bigger challenge is the maintenance of this website in the long-term, both in terms of technical support and content update.
7. How to create awareness of the white paper and website was also discussed. Various approaches including e-mail, LinkedIn and other means are possible, but this will be an important next step after we have the website, or considered during the website design.

VI. Conclusion and next meeting (discussed led by Dan LeClair)

1. Dan asked if we could create a LinkedIn group for this project team and later transition into a community of scholars who support responsible science.
2. Katrin used a German analogy of the barrel of water where the last drop causes the barrel to overflow (similar to the expression “the last straw that breaks the camel’s back”). We don’t know what will be the “last drop” in moving this vision forward, but we are hopefully close! There is a lot of water already in the barrel.
3. The next meeting will be on Sunday, Feb 5, 2017 in New Orleans, at the location of the AACSB Deans’ Conference, Hilton New Orleans Riverside, 11:30 to 4:00 pm.

VII. Action steps

Based on the above minutes, the following are action steps for the next six months.

1. August 30, 2016: Identify a scholar volunteer to lead the website project. AACSB and/or EFMD to provide technical support to start building the website.
2. September 15, 2016: Decide if the Delphi report could be submitted as a paper (Peter)
3. September 30, 2016: Revise the white paper (Anne, Gerry and Jerry)
4. October 15, 2016: Review and approval by the project team members.
5. Oct to Dec 2017: Invite feedback on the white paper – v3 from opinion leaders of the key stakeholders: senior scholars, deans and associate deans of research, journal editors, business executives, accreditation agencies, funding agencies, media such as FT and Businessweek that publishing business school rankings (Anne, Dan, Matthew, and others).
6. Jan 30, 2017: Finalize white paper based on consultation feedback (Anne, Gerry and Jerry).
7. Jan 31, 2017: Complete Beta version of the website for the Community for the Advancement of Responsible Science in Business Schools (CARS/BS) website. (Project leader).
8. Feb 2017: Hold “responsible science” forums at AMA, AACSB and EFMD.

Expectation of the following six months:

9. March 2017: Complete the CARS/BS website.
10. March to July 2017: Leading scholars, schools, and other individuals /groups to visit website, read white paper, and sign support of the principles of responsible science.
11. August 2017: Wide dissemination of white paper link to website for comments and signatories of support to the principles of responsible science.
12. Throughout 2017-2018:
 - a. Continue social movement to seek signatures of support for the principles of responsible science.
 - b. Organization forums at the various association conferences and other venues.
 - c. Continue special issue call for papers on grand challenges in business and society.

Documents for discussion during meeting:

1. White paper v2
2. Delphi Report
3. White paper dissemination methods