RRBM Working Board September 2019 meeting
MINUTES

September 20, 2019
Time: 10:00 am – Noon (EDT/4-6 pm Brussels)
Location: Zoom Virtual Meeting

Attendees (16): Len Berry, Mary Jo Bitner, Ruth Bolton, Bill Glick, Mark Houston, Rich
    Lyons, Wilfred Mijnhardt, Serguei Netessine, Dave Reibstein, Mike Toffel, Anne
    Tsui, Matthew Wood, Maurizio Zollo, Dan LeClair , Jean-Alexis, Peter McKiernan

Guests: Stephanie Bryant, Executive Vice President & Chief Accreditation Officer,
    AACSB

Also present is Alexia Shonteff who joined RRBM at the end of August as a half time
    Project Director. She is based at the Arizona State University.

Absentees: Franklin Allen, Jaime Bettcher, Mike Brady, Jerry Davis, Katrin Muff

MINUTES

1. **Welcome and introduction – Bill Glick**
     Bill welcomed Stephanie Bryant, Executive Vice President & Chief Accreditation
    Officer, AACSB, to the meeting.

2. **Responsible Research Summit 2019 – Anne Tsui**
    a. Anne reported that a brief report about the Summit was published in the
        Sept RRBM newsletter, with a link to the Summit website. A full draft
        Summit 2019 report was compiled by Mary Jo, Alexia and Anne. It will be
        sent to the Board for review/comments before it is posted on the RRBM
        website. A link to the 'I Will' statements' is included in this report.
    b. Summit 2019 participants were sent an email asking them to respond
        yes/no to the posting of their (edited and anonymous) 'I Will' statement. If
        they did not respond, they were informed it would be posted on the
        RRBM website. Of the 62 participants, 42 authorized their 'I Will' posting,
        15 people did not respond, and one person preferred not to publish it.
        The list of Summit 2019 participants will also be posted on the RRBM
        website.
    c. Wilfred encouraged everyone to send the finalized Summit 2019 report to
        their schools. Anne said that we may send it to our institutional partners
        since the report provides many ideas that they might find useful in their
        efforts to create systems to encourage responsible research.

3. **Responsible Research Summit 2020 – Maurizio Zollo**
    a. Maurizio reported he has organized a local team of 5 people from two
        research centers, Finance and Management, who will be responsible to
        set up the infrastructure managing the Summit 2020 process.
    b. The discussion on who to invite (day 2) has the following main ideas:

i. Maurizio said that we would target 40 non-academic stakeholder invitees, and they would represent: policymakers, business managers, research agencies, NGO's, non-profit and the media.

ii. Ruth stated it will be important to get a few people to join in the early stages of the program design. We want their input early. Anne said that we are considering forming an Advisory Committee consisting of a few thoughtful external stakeholders. They could be asked for input in the beginning and react to preliminary designs along the way. They won't be expected to attend the monthly Organizing Committee meeting.

iii. Bill asked the Board to make recommendations of invitees. Ruth suggested MSI and Conscious Capitalism. Business Roundtable was named and Dave suggested Facebook.

iv. Dave asked if corporate sponsorship would be solicited and Maurizio responded the invitees first need to join the conversation of a complex set of issues and then be asked to engage in sponsorship after they join.

v. Dan LeClair said that we need people who can bridge practice and academic. Mike Toffel has experience bridging such groups (e.g., 50% each group) but getting actual research projects after the conference is not easy. Another effort at Harvard (Retail operations) with 70% practice and 30% academic was more successful. Mary Jo said that the Service Center that she chaired at ASU has some experience to share also.

vi. Anne reminded everyone that the the purpose of the Summit is to build bridges with stakeholders and determine how they can help business schools do research that is more useful to business and society. It is not to expect people engage in collaborative research after the Summit. Maurizio agreed with Anne and stated he would be setting up a phone call to talk further about the list of invitees. He asked the Board to let him know if they wanted to be part of the call.

vii. Leonard reminded the Board that we should invite a few younger academics who will be presenting at Summit 2020. Anne said that they could be the ones to present exemplary research that engage external stakeholders, e.g., co-creation approach.

viii. Wilfred reminded the Board that people from Eastern Europe and Asia need to be invited.

ix. Peter McKiernan said that we might consider inviting the leaders of the Chartered Academy of Business Schools task force which is looking at public impact/public value of business schools.

x. We need to work on the Summit 2020 agenda and have a preliminary version ready to send with the invitation.

xi. Anne advised the Board the OC committee would have their second call on October 1. The Summit 2020 dates will be June 27 (dinner - tentatively), June 28 (1st day), June 29 (2nd day). Internal stakeholders will be invited to the full summit. External stakeholders will be asked to participate on June 28 only. The RRBM Working Board will meet in person on the morning of June 30 at Imperial College following the Summit.

4. **Responsible Research Impact Badge – Len Berry & Ruth Bolton**
    a. Ruth spoke to several publishers and editors at the Marketing Association Meeting and circulated the draft proposal of the RRBM impact badge. From reading the overview proposal, the editors wondered why they would want to do this and the publishers were worried about the speed of the process (speed and simplicity). Following discussion, several were very interested and willing to move forward. Ruth explained to them it is not another review process, and does not require extra work for the journals. This discussion prompted some revisions in the original proposal and the creation of three additional documents that are more focused on particular audiences [all 4 documents were attached to the final agenda prior to this meeting]:
        i. A brief document for journal editors to explain the badge is a positive recognition of an article (on its potential impact)
        ii. A document for authors with
            1. a paragraph for inclusion in journal acceptances inviting authors to apply for RRBM recognition with a link to the RRBM website form.
            2. Text for the RRBM website form for authors submit a 200 word explanation of the merits of their reseach relative to RRBM Principles 1 & 3.
        iii. A document for the review team – a "checklist"
    b. Anne loved the idea and asked what would happen to the 35 papers that have received the "Responsible Research in Management" award – were they going to receive the badge automatically? Bill stated they could either receive the badge automatically or be asked to provide a 200 word explanation why they should receive the badge – it still needs to be determined.
    c. Bill explained that JAS had been successful in crowd-sourcing some interesting images for the badge. For ideal placement of the badge on journal tables of contents, articles, and cv's, there is a severe constraint on size and level of detail of the badge image.
    d. JAS showed the Board an example of an ideal placement of Open Science badges, an evolution of images for the badge design, leading up to two top candidates. [Thanks go to JAS & EFMD for funding the crowdsourcing.]
    e. Mike was concerned with the word 'Impact'. These are new articles and there is no impact yet. Also, the badge only represents RRBM Principle 1 and Principle 3 and leaves out the other 5 Principles. He asked if it was enough to claim the author is engaging in responsible research and how this could represent 'impact'?
    f. Ruth stated the sub-committee had decided to include the word 'impact' as an identifier that 'impact' could, rather than actually, be made. Mike suggested an alternative word could be used.
    g. Maurizio commented there could be an assessment of the research process and to what extent the researcher had included the stakeholder (Principle 5).
    h. Wilfred responded the article was being evaluated on the "what" dimension of the article rather than the "how" dimension.

i. Bill said engagement is another dimension but the badge is only looking at what the author is doing to create impact, in essence, the article (or book, monograph….) is being assessed on how it may create impact.

j. Anne asked if the badge emblem should include P1 and P3 to indicate that it only certifies two of the seven principles.

k. Len said the sub-committee would resolve these issues before moving forward and bring it back to the Board.

5. **Spring meeting (at the U of Michigan) to showcase exemplary responsible research – Anne Tsui**
   Tabled discussion for the next meeting.
   a. Please note that the "Business research for sustainable development: translating insights to practice" (title to be fixed) is scheduled for March 5-6 (Thursday late afternoon to late afternoon Friday). It is co-sponsored by the University of Michigan and Aspen Institute. The premise is to find recently published exemplars of research across all business disciplines that contribute to achieving the SDGs and pair sets of researchers with practitioners (mostly business and policy) who can explain"how this research can contribute to practice." So, a typical panel might be on "job creation" or "enhancing access to health care" or "sustainable production and consumption," and would consist of authors of 3 or so papers reporting applicable research, and 2 carefully-curated executives who have read the work and can explain how it can inform practice. (Aspen knows lots of thoughtful execs who might take on this role.) We also envisioned panels on "How to get research insights to the public" and "How to translate research in the classroom."

   b. ***Please recommend any exemplary papers in your field to Jerry and Jaime. Top candidates for inclusion are RRBM award winners (IACMR, Marketing, & Operations) and published works in other disciplines.***

   c. [Editorial comment from Bill: This would be an excellent opportunity for junior scholars.]

6. **Responsible Research Metrics Google – Rich Lyons**
   a. Rich reached out to Google Scholar and was able to talk to the person who is responsible for reconfiguring the google matrix. Rich was told it had never been Google's intent to build metrics, they had only wanted to promote open access by making research available to the public. However, researchers had asked them to create some metrics. He told Rich that Google would consider creating new metrics that will fulfill two 2 criteria: "density" (useful across a whole range of academic fields) and wide use.

   b. Rich will be introducing him to the Provost and Head Librarian of UC Berkeley. Rich encouraged the Board to introduce their universities to Google. We are most likely to get support and cooperation from Google if we can help them advance open access.

   c. Wilfred stated his university would be very interested, given there are 15 million people placing their research on Google.

   d. Anne stated this could be a major disruption to journals and reminded everyone that RRBM wants to be a facilitator not a proponent of any single idea. She said that the open access movement would work only if

articles on the open platform (even if not published in the traditional format, i.e., journals) were counted towards tenure.

7. **AACSB draft standards highlighting research impact – Stephanie Bryant**
   a. Stephanie shared her Summit 2019 'I Will' statement was to facilitate change in the AACSB standards.
   b. She outlined the revised AACSB Accreditation standards, showing changes in Standard 1, Standard 8 and added Standard 9 (see appendix). These changes are to encourage the schools to focus on the practical impact of the school's research. There is no quantitative metric, but the school can write case studies (Standard 9) to explain how the schools' research (individual faculty, subgroup, or the school level) has impact on practice, policies, or teaching.
   c. She said the AACSB Board will be voting on these changes in April, 2020, and if approved, there will be a tsunami impact since there are more than 856 business schools that will be impacted. The Board agreed this was a huge step forward.
   d. Anne thanked Stephanie for her outstanding work which sets a great example of implementation of an 'I Will' statement. Anne continued this could be written up as a case example for the booklet that will be handed out at Summit 2020.
   e. Peter asked if EFMD is doing something similar. Matthew said that EFMD has focused on impact for many years, but he will look into possible changes in the accreditation standards.
   f. Wilfred expressed a concern that too much business involvement may interfere with academic freedom. He suggested that the standard should mention that schools have to demonstrate "clear rules of engagement" to balance the relationship and maintain academic integrity. Anne concurred and pointed out that Principle 5 – stakeholder involvement – explicitly calls out to the need to ensure that "independence of inquiry" is not compromised. Stephanie said she will look into this.

8. **Enlarging RRBM – Mary Jo Bitner**
   a. Mary Jo reported 41% of the endorsers of RRBM are from the US of which 70% are from management and 7% marketing. Dave asked if there was a way to bring more Finance endorsers since they are the "powerhouse" for many business schools e.g., the influencers of promotion in many business schools. Wilfred agreed and mentioned the UN has a Club looking at responsible research in Finance and Accounting (https://www.unpri.org) and this could be a good time to capture this audience.
   b. Bill agreed and stated a badge for top accounting journals could be a way to spread awareness of RRBM and we already have at least one editor who is positively inclined. Maurizio encouraged the Board to speak at symposiums and conferences about the RRBM 7 Principles.
   c. Anne reminded everyone that the purpose is not so much to enlarge the endorsement but rather to increase the awareness about RRBM.
   d. Dave showed the Board the Financial Times article featuring Bill's comments about responsible research with a link to RRBM. Dave explained the FT is also collecting stories from business schools about the work they are doing to better society. The FT submission date closes

on September 27 and then they will review all submissions and create a report on October 21 in the Financial Times. It was agreed the media is a way to increase the number of people that know about the RRBM work.

    e. Maurizio said that Imperial College has a good relationship with FT, and he will discuss with FT also.

9. Institutionalizing RRBM – Bill Glick
Tabled for next meeting.
University, Individual, and Corporate paid memberships
Foundation and other philanthropic support

10. Media & Partner Relations – Annue Tsui
    a. Anne reported the Network for Business Sustainability reached out to her and Mary Jo to discuss areas of possible collaboration.

    b. The NBS has about 7000 subscribers with about 1/3 academics, 1/3 practitioners, and 1/3 students – their goals include sharing content of sustainability research through interviews and podcasts.

    c. NBS asked if they could reach out to the RRBM award winners to help them to disseminate their research to a pretty large international audience. The Board agreed this was a great idea.

    d. The NBS also asked if a leader from NBS could attend the RRBM Summit 2020 and someone from RRBM attend a conference they will be holding in June 2020 in London, the week before our Summit. Maurizio stated he would be happy to attend on behalf of RRBM. He said the NBS is a great organization to invite to the Summit because they have extensive experience building networks between academia and business. We also agreed to invite an NBS representative (Tima Bansal) to the Summit.

11. Status of other ongoing projects – Anne Tsui
    a. Anne reported that Marc-David Siedel is organizing a special issue among the leading journals in the various disciplines. Every journal should agree to publish at least one responsible research article. All the accepted papers then will be published as a virtual issue.

    b. Anne also encouraged the formation of a consortium of Deans from different business schools in the US working together to pilot some responsible research initiatives. She reported that the top ten Chinese business schools are meeting this December to discuss this.

    c. Ideas to bring in more doctoral students are also being considered, to include, the creation of an education program.

    d. Wilfred suggested research funders could be contacted and asked to include a paragraph in their grant applications asking for the societal impact the research will make.

    e. Len asked what the criteria is for the Pioneer schools. Anne stated there was no specific criterion at this time. It was determined a committee could begin to work on this. Anne asked Mary Jo, and will invite Stephanie to be part of the Pioneer school committee to develop a set of criteria and procedure.

12. Conclusion – Anne Tsui

a. Anne reminded everyone the next Board meeting would be the 1st week of December.
b. Next Face-to-Face meeting all morning, June 30, 2020 in London at the conclusion of RRS2020

Attachment:
AACSB accreditation revision draft (selected pages)