Meeting minutes revised after review by and discussion with Katrin Muff, Bill Glick and JAS
August 27, 2017 FINAL version

Responsible Research for Business and Management meeting
August 7, Monday
Time: 1:30 – 5:30 pm
Location:
Room 1442 Robinson College of Business. Georgia State University, 35 Broad Street NW, Atlanta, GA 30303.

On site attendees: Mary Jo Bitner, Ingmar Bjorkman, Jerry Davis, Thomas Dyllick, Gerry George, Bill Glick, Dan LeClair, Katrin Muff, Jean-Alexis Spitz, Anne Tsui, Sri Zaheer
Skype attendees: David Reibstein, Miguel Padro (Aspen, guest)
Include some comments from Skype conversation with Howard Thomas with Anne Tsui on July 23, 2017
Absentees: Franklin Allen, Mat Alvesson, Hongbin Cai, Jonas Haertle, Ulrich Hommel, Xiongwen Lu, Peter McKiernan, Serguei Netessine, Maureen O'Hara, Ira Solomon, Chris Tang, Matthew Wood, Xiaobo Wu, Bernard Yeung

Actions from the Atlanta meeting:
1. Follow up with more consultations from Accounting scholars, deans and leading scholars (David Reibstein, Ingmar Bjorkman, Ira & Rashad, Katrin, Sri, etc.), and business leaders (Thomas Dyllick). Please refer to the bottom of page 2 to middle of page 3 of the Minutes for details.
2. Anne and Jerry will revise the white paper, and attempt a two-page version for others to comment and improve upon. (We may have to wait till the consultation is completed before we can finalize the white paper).
3. Bill to create a "positive societal impact" badge and criteria, working with COS.
4. Katrin will create a video on RRBM for social media (see last page for the text to be read).
5. Bill and Thomas will develop criteria for nomination of pioneering schools.
6. Invite David Reibstein to develop a proposal for engaging journals to support responsible research.
7. Invite members of each discipline to publish an editorial in their lead journals, e.g., Mary Jo Bitner and David Reibstein for Marketing, Chris Tang and Serguei Netessine for Operations, Maureen O'Hara and Franklin Allen for Finance, Jerry Davis for Management & Organization (e.g., ASQ), Rashad Abdel-Khalik and Ira Solomon for Accounting.
8. Anne will work with IACMR to develop the "Responsible Research in Management" Award.
9. Thomas Dyllick will explore a possible special issue in AMLE with a focus on "From responsible research to responsible education".
10. JAS to start developing the RRBM website for wide dissemination of the white paper and for sharing of support, endorsement, best practices, and other activities.
11. Mary Jo Bitner and David Reibstein will follow up with the editor of the Journal of Marketing about a special issue on Grand Challenges or related topics.
12. Next meeting will be at the EFMD Deans Conference on Jan 24 pm or Jan 25 am in Munich.

Questions for further discussion:
1. How to engage those who signed up to join the RRBM community (about 80 of them as of August 7, 2017)?
2. Should those who decline to co-sign asked to reconsider by sending them the revised version of the white paper?
3. Should conceptual papers be included in RRBM, if so, how?
4. Ideas to seek risk free endorsement of RRBM from junior faculty and doctoral students.

Minutes

I.   Welcome and introduction – Dan LeClair
   1. Dan welcomed all participants and expressed optimism about the project.
   2. However, he emphasized that we cannot rely on one group for change.
   3. For example, AACAB faces many pressures as well and it tries to emphasize diversity and inclusion.
   4. Schools may push back on new standards, e.g., the standard learning assessment was a good lesson about the need to involve the schools in the development. A standard proposal after extensive vetting is more likely to be accepted.
   5. Anne replied that our consultation process with the white paper may be similar to the vetting process, but we need to do more.

II. White paper consultation progress – Anne and JAS
   1. Anne reported that we have 77 cosigners representing 17 deans, 5 presidents, provosts or director-generals, with 12 from the Marketing discipline, 10 in finance and economics, 15 operations, supply chain, and technology, and 32 in business, management, IB, and entrepreneurship. We have only two in the accounting discipline.

   2. We discussed the distinction between authors and co-signers.
      a. The latter group is not the original authors but they provided comments that we use to revise and finalize the paper. Therefore, they are listed as cosigners. We need to decide if we will list them separately (as cosigners) or merge their names with the original 28 and treat all as authors.
      b. We also discussed the distinction between personal signature and institutional support. All authors and co-signers are personal and their endorsement does not represent their institution. Institutional support is shown by the appearance of the institutional logo on the "Supporters" page of the rrbm.network website.

   3. We discussed who are missing from this 'author' group. Clearly, we need to add accounting scholars. We identified a few special names to add:
      a. Bill Boulding of Duke and John Quelch (Dave Reibstein's students and he will contact them).
      b. Tiff Macklem, dean of Rotman School, U of Toronto (Need a volunteer to contact him)
      c. Sanjay Gupta of Michigan State, he agreed to read and comment (Sri Zaheer will contact him).
      d. Ilan Mihov, Dean of INSEAD (Gerry George will contact him)
      e. Stef van de Velde, Dean of Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus (Thomas Dyllick and Ingmar Bjorkman will contact him).
      f. Katrin is happy to invite Angel Cabrera, the President of George Mason University. Katrin also suggested that we invite The Executive DBA Council (Executive DBA Member Schools) to support RRBM (http://www.executivedba.org/members/). Katrin will follow up.
      g. David Reibstein expressed concern about over emphasis on Deans.
      h. We probably should get more business leaders. One possible group is the successful EMBA students. Sri pointed out that not too many business leaders know about academic research. Perhaps we can ask Jonas Haertle to identify a few business leaders who are strong supporters of Global Compact. Thomas Dyllick knows Lisa Kingo, the head of UNGC, very well. Perhaps he can reach out to her and ask her to identify and solicit up to ten high caliber business leaders interested in and understand business research.
      i. Sri suggested that we ask Ellen Glazerman for help (ellen.glazerman@ey.com). She is responsible for Accounting accreditation (AACSB?). Anne will follow up with Dan and

involve Ira Solomon and Rashad to invite more accounting scholars. Anne will follow up with Ira and Rashad about the RRBM panel members at the AAA conference in early August.

j. Are there any schools in Africa we might want to also include in the consultation? Anne knows the previous dean, Stella Nkomo, of the business school at the University of Pretoria. Anne will contact Stella to reach the current dean. Katrin can reach the dean of the University of Stellenbosch through her contacts who are ethics and leadership professors. JAS can also ask Matthew Woods for African nominations.

4. One issue we did not discuss: How to engage those who join the "community? When reviewing the meeting notes, Katrin suggested that we could engage these people as ambassadors to encourage people to sign up on the website to support the project after we have the final version of the white paper and the website is open to the public.

III. White paper writing and dissemination – Jerry

1. Jerry asked for feedback on the revised version based on the feedback from the consultants.

a. Jerry mentioned one comment is hard to respond. The consultant said that we are a group of "elitists" or we are addressing a 'big school' problem (those who aspire to publish in A journals) and have ignored many smaller schools (or schools outside of the USA that need to do research important to their local community). Bill Glick said that we should give recognition to smaller schools or schools in some regions that are very responsible to local needs for solid management knowledge and scientific approaches to solving local business problems and meeting local needs.

b. Anne responded that we want to emphasize the value of "diversity" in research approaches, philosophical perspectives, methods, rather than suggesting that there is one best way (i.e., the North American way). We should make it clearer that research must address the needs of the local business community as well as global development.

c. Sri said that the paper is good but it does not convey a sense of urgency. Our research enterprise is in trouble. We are spending a lot of money for very little return. Dan said that in business schools, "great minds are under-utilized". Talents are fleeing the business schools and we will not attract the best minds if the situation does not change. Anne said that the urgency is in the last section: Consequences of "Do nothing". Perhaps we need to add a few sentences in the Executive Summary to emphasize the urgency of the problem.

d. Sri also asked us to change or remove the word "dubious" in the paper.

e. One consultant has the impression that we are asking the evaluation committee to put more value on the lower tier journals (and thus lower the standard for research). Instead, this consultant said that we should change the A journals. Perhaps we can make it clearer in the white paper that we are not suggesting to lower the standards for research.

f. Dan further advised the importance of guarding the "independence" of business school research and not only do what business wants us to do. Anne echoed the importance of guarding against the tyranny of the requirement to only publish in a narrow set of journals. Perhaps we can add a sentence of two about the importance of "autonomy of inquiry" so that the faculty scholars have the freedom to pursue problems of importance with broader societal impact.

g. Katrin asked us to reconsider the "credibility" idea in the white paper. Our main focus is "useful" research even though credibility of knowledge from research in clearly foundational. She worried that that the credibility focus will weaken the message on the usefulness goal. Anne agreed that usefulness is the primary focus of our project but if we do not include the credibility dimension for responsible research, we would lose credibility with the scholarly community at large. The credibility issue is important for empirical social science. Bill and Jerry agreed that we cannot afford not to include credibility as one of the two key ideas in the definition of responsible science. Anne asked if we might consider reversing the order of the

two words and define responsible research as the production of useful and credible knowledge. Hence the title would be "A vision for responsible research in business and management: Striving for useful and credible knowledge".

    h. We agreed to accept the revised White Paper after final correction by Anne and Jerry.

2. The conversation moved to a discussion of dissemination of the white paper ideas.
   a. Dave Reibstein asked us to focus on the journal editors. We should convince the editors to add a review criterion on the articles' societal impact. Gerry George did that for AMJ during his term as editor by adding an impact criterion on the review form. Reviewers tend not to care about societal impact of research. This suggests that reviewer training in addition to adding a societal impact criterion, might be necessary. Anne said that we need to influence associations and publishers to add this "impact" criterion in their journal review process.
   b. Katrin said that we should encourage journals to publish papers addressing grand challenges of society, such as the SDGs. AMJ did that in the Dec 2016 issue. Sri said that we need to encourage problem-focused research. Gerry said that 95% of AMJ submissions currently are not problem-focused (they are literature-focused or inspired). Mary Jo said marketing journals are mostly problem-driven.
   c. Dave Reibstein made another suggestion. He said that we should find money to fund research on important problems, especially interdisciplinary research.
   d. Gerry mentioned that there are some important topics that should be studied, such as impact investing, sustainability accounting, and gender balance and finance.
   e. Anne reported her conversation with Howard Thomas. Howard said that the JAM idea is not practical for disseminating the white paper. It is expensive and it still requires reaching the right audience. The JAM used an open signing up method, which is not practical for RRBM.
   f. We did not discuss the agenda item: how to get risk free support from junior faculty and doctoral students.

3. We then discussed the additional writing plan proposal
   a. Katrin suggested that we make a video with distinguished scholars or executives reading one sentence of a paragraph of responsible research. This video can be distributed through social media to draw attention to the RRBM project. Everybody agreed that this is a great idea. Katrin volunteered to coordinate the production of this video and will need everybody's timely response. Katrin subsequently drafted a 200-word statement to be read. Please refer to the appendix of this document on page 7.
   b. Instead of a five-page version, it was suggested that we create a two-page Executive version. It is essentially the expansion of the executive summary in the white paper.
   c. We discussed the idea of an editorial in the main journals of each discipline. Mary Jo Bitner said that she and Dave Reibstein are planning such a piece in one of the marketing journals. She said that the editor of Journal of Marketing totally support the initiative personally, but he hasn't signed yet because he is an editor and does not feel comfortable signing. Mary Jo was not sure that JM would be open to an editorial on this topic. However, she said she was invited by the Journal of Marketing Science to write an editorial. She will work with Dave Reibstein on this piece.
   d. We discussed the merit of the "letter to the university presidents and provosts". The deans might not like this idea. Anne clarified that this is for information and seeking support to potential changes toward RRBM in the business schools. We will hold on this idea till later.
   e. Thomas Dyllick supported the idea of a special issue in AMLE (Academy of Management Learning and Education). The theme could be "From responsible research to responsible education". Peter McKiernan is interested in this idea as well. Thomas will work with Peter to follow up with AMLE editors.

f. Miguel Padro suggested (in an email to Jerry Davis during the meeting) that we might consider a story about the white paper ideas in The Atlantic, Fortune or Bloomberg? These kinds of publications can sometimes generate some ripple coverage elsewhere and could at least generate some energy and dialogue around the effort.

g. We discussed the small book idea. The group suggested putting this on low priority for now since we don't have the human resources to work on this project.

IV. RRBM implementation ideas – Bill

4. Bill reported on his discussion with the Center for Open Science (COS). It has over 2900 journals that have signed up with COS to promote transparency in research reporting. It has now three badges that journals can put on their accepted papers: Pre-registered (of the hypotheses of a study), Open data (to allow reviewers to replicate the analyses), and Open materials (additional information, protocols, additional analyses).

a. Bill discussed the idea of a "positive societal impact" (PSI) badge for articles that address important problems with relevance for policies or practices. (Bill and Anne discussed and suggested that we change the term "social impact" to "positive societal impact" to avoid misunderstanding that this project is only about social outcomes and exclude economic or environmental outcomes.) We agreed that this is a great idea. We need to develop the criteria, the standards, and the process to give such badges to accepted articles. It is best to let the journals to evaluate the articles and award the badges. On the COS website, it states that : Each journal may choose to award badges based on a simple author disclosure statement or through independent peer review.

b. COS is working on a new ranking of journals based on transparency. Anne is attending the meeting for this on Sept 5 and 6 in Charlottesville, VA.

2. The next topic is the Pioneer schools. Bill briefly described the idea and invite feedback.

a. Dan said that AACSB could include this in their "Innovation that inspires" program. There is a process in place to nominate innovations and select the best. Each cycle, AACSB receives several hundred applications and they select 30 best. They could be innovations in responsible research. Al Renshaw at AACSB is responsible for this program. Bill asked if responsible research could be a program parallel to rather than subsumed under innovations that inspire program. Dan is concerned about branding. Bill will follow up with Dan about this idea.

b. JAS said that he could also ask Matthew Woods if RRBM could be one of the category of the Excellence in Practice Awards or another Outstanding Research Award given by EFMD (https://www.efmd.org/research/awards).

c. While awards could be at the article level, individual level, or program or school, we agreed that the pioneering school idea should be school level. What policies and practices at the school level encourage, support, and reward responsible research?

d. We briefly discussed the criteria for pioneering schools. They should include credible research as minimal criteria and then include positive societal impact criteria. Bill Glick and Thomas Dyllick will work on a proposal to identify nomination criteria for pioneering schools.

3. RRBM awards –proposal from IACMR

a. The International Association for Chinese Management Research (IACMR) submitted a proposal to RRBM for a "Responsible Research in Management Award". Anne briefly described the proposal. The nominations could be published or accepted papers and books. If the timeframe works, the award winner (e.g., top 3) may be invited to give their papers or research outcomes at the 2018 IACMR conference in Wuhan, China.

     b. Sri Zaheer said that this is an excellent idea and would like to see it experimented whereas Jerry was skeptical about it as there are so many Awards already and the impact of such awards on research remains unknown.

     c. Anne said that the criteria used to evaluate papers or books could be the same in the evaluation of the "positive societal impact" badge with Open Science.

     d. ==One issue that we did not have time to discuss but important to IACMR is about conceptual (e.g., AMR) paper. Can conceptual papers meet the criteria for responsible research?== Based on subsequent input from Katrin and discussion with Bill, we agreed that we should be inclusive. Anne will bring this question to the entire team for discussion. Meanwhile, we will try to develop criteria to assess the "credibility" dimension of conceptual papers.

4. Lastly, Anne reported that the Irish Journal of Management will have a special issue on "Responsible Research in Management". Peter McKiernan is involved in this.

5. ==Deans and editors meeting – this is put on hold for future discussion.==

VI. Website update – Jean-Alexis (JAS)
1. JAS described the necessary changes to the RRBM website after we have the final version of the white paper along with shorter versions.
2. The COS website is a good template but RRBM will have its own unique features.
3. We discussed if the website should be designed for groups or for activities. JAS encouraged us to use "Activity" oriented design so that no one is discouraged from reading different sections of the website.
4. The website will have sections for reading and comments on the white paper ideas, on statements of support, and on blogs about responsible research.
5. Any one who expresses support of RRBM or endorsement, the website would put the support on their Facebook or other social media. This could include invitation to read and endorse RRBM on that individual's social media site.
6. JAS is working on a social media strategy, including the video discussed earlier, links to Linkedin, Youtube, FaceBook, Twitter, etc.
7. Katrin encouraged us to contribute to a Blog (TBC) (an entry of 500 words, one single-spaced page). If we have 26 blogs (provided by every founding member of RRBM), we can have one blog every two weeks for 2 years. That is highly doable but needs commitment. Anne said that we also can recruit those who have signed up to join the community of RRBM (during the consultation stage) to contribute blogs as well.

VII. Next step – Gerry George
1. Gerry led a discussion on assessing the progress of RRBM. He said that we are making progress and there is real opportunity going forward. Therefore we should continue but we might consider outsourcing some activities (e.g., Awards, …).
2. We agreed to have the next meeting on January 24 pm, or January 25 morning (the Deans conference will begin on January 25, 10:30 am) in Munich, Germany, the location of the EFMD annual deans and directors conference.

A Vision of Responsible Research in Business and Management: Striving for Useful and Credible Knowledge

SUMMARY PARAGRAPH FOR RECORDING & VIDEO

(221 WORDS = 1.5 MINUTE)

Imagine a world where business schools and management scholars have transformed their research in order to contribute with credible research to societal well-being, addressing the Grand Challenges of our times. We call this vision Responsible Research in Business and Management! We believe that responsible research can inform and enable business to become powerful means for a better world. And not only business; responsible research can also influence communities, cities and policymakers! Help us transforming business and management research to achieve this vison by 2030! Until then, we have just bit more than a decade to get there. So much change is needed in the academic landscape and beyond, involving many stakeholders. For one, we need research to be guided by its societal relevance and ensured by its quality. We need changing incentives and culture around publication to promote and enable responsible research. This starts with PhDs and their education and has broad implications in appointments and promotions. It means orienting research so that business schools contribute useful and credible research to support humanity's highest aspirations while respecting the planetary boundaries. Voice your support by endorsing our white paper and join our community for more! This is a call for action so that the *responsible research ecosystem* transforms business and management research to become a force of good toward a better world!