

OB Division Executive Committee
Mid-Year Meeting Minutes
November 22 & 23, 2019
Philadelphia, PA

Friday, Nov. 22, 2019 (9 AM – 5:00 PM)

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from OB Exec Meeting in Chicago (9-9:15 AM)

Brad and all

- everyone introduced themselves, explained their role, and why they accepted their role
- Sigal explained the materials we have and the format of the meeting
- minutes from AOM meeting in Boston were approved unanimously

2. OB 5 Year Survey – Methodology and Overall Results and Where are we now as compared to 2014 on the 2019 strategic priorities (9:15-10:15am) – including discussion of OB rep structure

Five year Survey Committee (Sigal, Alex, Andrew, Laura) & All

- Sigal kicked off the five-year review presentation
- discussed changes in membership composition over the last five years; key stat is that international membership has increased by about 11% (10% for AOM overall)
- discussed survey methodology; we launched the week after AOM to capture immediate post-AOM thoughts; made survey more behavioral
- we got a 29% response rate, which is much better than many other divisions
- we need to use traceable links in the future
- results differed across respondents who identified primarily as OB vs. those that did not
- overall satisfaction (“OB members are satisfied with the Division, but aren’t particularly charged up about it”); mid to upper 3’s on a 5-point scale (between neutral and agree); no significant differences from 2014
- we have no downward trends on satisfaction; we’ve gotten better on most everything we measured

-for next five-year survey, we need to add a question: "How satisfied are you with the Academy overall?" to use as a comparison point for OB Division satisfaction

-primary members are more positive than secondary members; key question: do we play to our core members and stay steady OR grow?

-can we categorize our activities that cut across the spectrum? Can we develop specific communities?

-tag line: "OB Division: something for everyone"; we are going to develop the profession; develop professionals; develop communities

-other options: OB Division: "Welcome home"

-OB Division: "Your home base"

-OB Division: "Developing connected researchers" OR "Connecting researchers" OR "A bigger conversation" OR "Where rigor meets relevance" OR "Connecting rigor to relevance"

-Shimul: **Rigor, relevance, and relationships** (we agreed we should pursue this one)

-do we have agreement to not focus on specific communities, OR do we use our size and resources to our advantage and target the larger community?

-we could do more for non-junior people (there are plenty of these); do not have to devote a whole day, which is difficult, maybe a half-day

-there seems to be a lot of interest in micro-communities; hard for a Division to START these, but it may be possible for us to SUPPORT them

-asked respondents what they think is going best and worst as a whole across the entire survey

Best: #1 - Optimistic about the future of the division (3.93 on 5-point scale)

Worst: #1 – Opportunities outside of the Annual meeting to network/collaborate with peers (2.68 on a 5-point scale)

-should we "choose" one of the reps-at-large (instead of using an election) so that we could perhaps include someone not as visible or well-networked; for example, someone from a teaching college; could have them pitch at the annual meetings and then vote

-Thinking Forward question

What does the OB Division need to do to best position itself for the future?

#1 – Close the science-practice gap (38 responses)

What issues should occupy the OB division's time over the next 5 years?

#1 – Research/Publications (45 responses)

Break 10:15-10:30 AM

3. Strategic Planning for next 5 Years (10:30-11:15) - Data and Discussion

A. The program & PDWs

Ron, Daan & Program Team, Five Year Survey Committee and all
Uta & Andrew and all

4. Discussion of OB Division ballot (11:15-12:15pm)

Ashleigh – via skype and all

-Sigal indicated that the committee can send her emails as well as have an open discussion about candidates as to their suitability

Lunch – 12:15 -1:30 PM

4. Strategic Planning for Next 5 Years (1:30-3:30pm) – Data and Discussion

B. Program cont. (if needed), International Outreach, Timing of Job Market, “O in OB,” and more

Sigal, Five Year Survey Committee & all

Program Summary Statistics (Ron leads)

-reviews the trends from 2015 through 2019; symposia submissions are increasing, papers are up and down

-acceptance rates are dropping, particularly for symposia

-discussed how symposia acceptances are managed; e.g., have to coordinate these with other divisions

-4.14 average rating for symposia (4.0 was minimum rating for acceptance); 3.5 for papers (3.3 was minimum rating for acceptance)

-the quality of the reviews for OB submissions are not good; we might want to suggest a NEW system for how we approach these

-have we done enough to empower session chairs?; it's hard to find paper session chairs

-Time allocation units (TAUs) summarize the program time we have; it's been very consistent over the last four years, more symposia in 2019

-PDW Summary (Uta): acceptance rates went down about 10 points; what is our strategic vision for the types of PDWs we want to take on?; we got lucky that the AOM spotlight was inclusion and so was ours; we need to strengthen the connection between OB and AOM; more promotion, perhaps via social media

-Reviewer Statistics (Ron): AOM-level data; various slices of data; reviewers sometime use too many keywords; a lot of time is spent picking reviewers; last year, we used the 2-reviewer process, instead of 3; we should not do this again, as it did not speed up the process at all, there is no reason to do it

-Selected Findings about AOM Program from On-Line Survey (Andrew): how do we make sure we provide value to those we taxing in the PDW portion of the program; people in general are satisfied with OB part of AOM's program

-heat maps show rating strength by color (deeper reds reflect higher ratings); PDWs and symposia are getting higher ratings than paper sessions; however, paper sessions are still rated 3.0 or higher; are there ways to better use our AOM time to deliver more value?

-Uta handled the room assignments for our division; we do have discretion to anticipate session size and plan accordingly

-heat map can help us be more strategic with the PDW offerings; map shows that research and methods have higher "valuable" ratings; teaching lower; overall these ratings are very good (what problem are we solving???)

-Andrew shared findings about post-session paper surveys from 2019; PDWs are most heavily attended (room size factors in); paper sessions have lowest attendance; PDWs and symposia provide more value for participants than paper sessions; attendance at sessions drops off over time; satisfaction stays high, even as the crowd thins (what problem are we solving???); perceptions of value gradually decline across career stages, as later career folks primarily provide content/value

-we should make sure to communicate the specific things we are looking for in PDW submissions

Break 3:30-3:45 PM

5. Strategic Planning for Next 5 Years continued (3:45- 5:45 pm) – Data and Discussion

C. Communications and Continued International Outreach, Timing of Job Market, "O in OB," Communications, Division Rep Structure and more cont...

Sigal, Five Year Survey Committee & all

-data shows that there has been no significant change in people's perceptions of the Division in addressing international members, in particular; Asia is a bit happier than other regions; those outside NA are slightly less satisfied with access to participation in the program; NA still reports being more satisfied, BUT the differences are not that meaningfully significant (although many are statistically significant); participation is skewed toward NAs; people from Asia are happier but they are engaging less

-what is the key takeaway here? What is useful about this? People outside NA are perhaps paying more attention to their constituencies; we created the global committee; we have tried to have OB represented at the AOM regional conferences; internationally-themed PDWs; we don't actually have the budget for a lot more; at next year's India conference we are being asked to have a presence, but how do we fund it?; we can get satisfaction ratings for the six internationally-themed PDWs, need to see these data; AOM is driving all of this but not providing resources to help make it happen

-what is the real goal of this initiative? Is it building social networks, broadening skills, etc.? How would you measure success if you don't know what the actual goal is?

-HR outreach started out well, but it ends up being a domestic conference in another country; it's a group of us traveling around

-OB doc consortium worked really hard to get non-NAs to come to AOM; we are not monolithic; we need to have a lot of different things to satisfy the diverse membership

-Sigal: We need to better determine what the non-NAs want

-One of the biggest issues is offering generic NA programs to non-NAs (e.g., how to get tenure, navigating careers, coursework, etc.); non-NA PhD students would say the doc consortium was waste of time, didn't apply

-We have made assumptions that there is one best career path; there are many other definitions of success

-The danger of being all things to all people is that with limited resources we can easily fail

-Do we have a communication problem? Are we getting the word out about what we do? Is there some low-hanging fruit?

-Don't forget that people come to AOM to learn and appreciate the more NA-oriented approach to research; the ones who don't won't come anyway

-what about flyers/bookmarks that call out the PDWs that are targeted to specific initiatives (e.g., teaching, international, etc.); you do have to register for PDWs in advance though

-it's not clear what the priorities are; how do we know if we've made improvements towards our goals (what are our goals, specifically?)

-could we be trying to solve a problem we don't have???? 70% said we are doing a good job reaching out to international members, up from 64% in 2014

-Examined satisfaction broken down by demographics; males slightly happier than females but not by much; LGBTQ were slightly less satisfied;

-On the “I have confidence that the leadership of the OB Division is steering the division in the right direction,” responses ranged between 3.5 (for LGBTQ) and 3.9 (for Straight) with “prefer not to say” in the middle

-LGBTQ is a category that is less visible; if we are not being aggressive and obvious about inclusion, they won’t feel it; when we put out calls, do we address them directly?

-Sigal presented some job timing data; PhD students said they had the most challenges (as they are on the market); women say there is more challenge to an earlier job market; more challenges than benefits overall; Asia saw more and Europe saw less benefit; heat map asked if you could decide which month would be best to start the job market; most people do **NOT** want August or September; give offer around November/December; as you get more senior, you want it later

-can the OB Division help to set a policy for the start of the job market; can we move AOM meeting to January (just a thought)

Saturday, Nov 23 (9:00 AM – 2:00 PM)

Breakfast – 8:30 - 9:00 AM

1. Discussion and decision about Strategic Initiatives for Next 5 Years and Report (9-10:30)

Sigal, Five Year Survey Committee and all

-discussed structural and operational enhancements

-Cristina: we have added various appointed roles (e.g., COO, CTO, Program Developer) and we are the first AOM division to do this; other divisions are exploring emulating our new structure; integrated Making Connections Committee more strongly into the Exec Team; introduced and expanded student reps; codified and began standardizing roles for all positions; we have become much more professionally structured and organized

-we worked hard to become more strategic and not just put out fires; we put this team in place to do that

-Alex G.: discussed the program team structure and how to handle *AMJ*-like year-long submissions all at once; Alex is working to constantly improve the system; Jessica is Program Developer and Associate Director; Eean Crawford and Lance Frazier are the two Program Developer Specialists

-discussed other things we might do to improve structure; need backup roles for communications and technology; explored the idea of having an assistant for Laura E;

-Sigal suggested we have a discussion in the Spring to explore the various roles and responsibilities for the Reps-at-Large; maybe we need to be clearer about the three different Rep-at-Large positions?; we do let the

three new Reps choose which track they want; we will not reach a conclusion about this in our strategic plan for the next five years, this should be more ongoing

-there needs to be a succession plan for appointed roles; a process of bringing on a replacement to train or shadow the departing person

[SWITCHED BACK TO PROGRAM REVIEW]

Strengthening connection between science and practice

-about 60% of respondents indicated that they would like to be more involved (those who expressed interest were mainly non-NA, female, early career, doc students, younger)

-people seemed satisfied with the level of practical impact the division currently has; we may not need to make a policy statement about what universities should do to accomplish this; but we can emphasize in everything we do how it contributes to the practice of management

-survey results show the more junior people indicate this is more important; more senior folks say it's less important

-there has been a growth in DBA programs

Keeping the "O" in OB: How to ensure that OB theory survives

-there is a growing lack of interest in examining organizational issues and contexts; we have professors training students that are not incorporating the "O"

-Sigal showed average faculty publication rates study from 2010

-the top schools are publishing in more psyc journals and leaving out the "O"; the problem is not constrained to the top schools because (a) they are looked to as role models by non-top schools; and (b) people who are trained at top schools go on to work at many non-top schools

-perhaps we can put some of this language in our domain statement? Need a more rigorous test of this problem (Sigal is working on this project with others)

-could emulate Anne Tsui's efforts that she's made with responsible research; she's had summits with Deans, academics, accreditation boards, etc. that are working together to increase responsible research

-engaging discussion about the various ways to promote the "O" in OB

Break 10:30-10:45 AM

[SWITCHED BACK TO PROGRAM REVIEW]

-satisfaction with plenary was good, but not very well attended by survey respondents (163 attended, 1106 did not); it was a practice plenary, good turnout

-Nataly could tailor our emails to make them look like invitations; people will be more likely to open them; for the spotlight and the plenary

Professional Engagement with the Division

-satisfaction ratings were solid; exception included collaboration outside of the annual meeting

-some indicated that our size worked against networking and engagement

-as far as demographic predictors of social and networking opportunities, nothing significant

Enhancing Community (more of the feel of the community)

-absolutely no change from 2014 (3.16) vs. (3.20 for 2019)

-we had six events (listed on the bookmark) that we tried this year; Adam will find out exactly how many people showed up

-we could do a global speed networking event ("around the world in 90 minutes")

-critical question is: who do they want to meet? Let's look at the data

-some positive change in mentoring from 2014 (2.53) vs. (2.78 for 2019)

-for OB junior faculty consortium, we will do two .5 days, instead of 1.5 days (one for "junior" junior, and one for recently tenured); they could be at two different times or at the same time; we have the mentoring program for the annual meeting but we don't have one for outside the meeting

-moderately satisfied on networking/collaborating outside of the annual meeting

-men slightly (significantly) more satisfied than women on sense of community in the division, but overall people are satisfied

-we could send out an invite to anyone who is an Assistant Professor (maybe even Associate Professors)

-did a factor analysis (oblique rotation) for predictors of satisfaction with sense of community; two factors emerged (engagement and fairness, maybe?)

- are the connections more instrumental or socio-emotional? A lot of qualitative comments were instrumental in nature
- can we create a platform for people to meet up to create thematic symposia?
- at the end of our sessions, can we build in a mini-networking or meet up event? (meet one person new at the end of the session); could be a very powerful symbolic gesture; need to provide some instruction, not just open-ended
- could be better to do more BETWEEN sessions rather than WITHIN sessions; maybe remove last name on name tags and put research interests instead
- Andrew removed his school affiliation at the last AOM and the reaction was "What happened?"
- anything we can add to our name tags to spark conversation; one-word major interest area?
- can we have stations at the social where people can add something to your badge?

Communications and Technology

- communication satisfaction overall is good; as you get more senior, satisfaction drops slightly
- people did express that there are opportunities to refine our digital strategy in terms of middling ratings for usefulness of the website
- 50% of members admit that they open a quarter or less of messages they receive from AOM connect
- we asked how people want to be contacted: Email was #1; LinkedIn was #2; Twitter #3; NAs really want more emails!; but overall everyone prefers email
- we asked for suggestions for improving use of technology and social media
- we need to actually formally assemble a communication/technology team
- someone from OB exec team could curate responses as a moderator to enhance useful content; there is no sense that there is an exec team presence on OB Connect
- Nataly: two primary sources of communication: (a) OB Connect; and (b) emails (informs); OB Division awards email was sent yesterday, 38% of members opened the email already
- Alex G looked at the message board, but there were no actual responses to any posts (maybe they are replying straight to the person, but there are no public replies)

Lunch – 12:00 -12:45 PM

Exploding Offers by Career Stage

- minimum amount of time you think assistant professor job candidates should have between offer and decision point? #1 answer: 2-3 weeks; #2 was 3-4 weeks; #3 was 1-2 weeks
- by region, 2-3 weeks dominated in NA; other regions preferred 3-4 weeks

OB Awards

- Uta: two types of awards (a) OB Publications and (b) Conference-based awards
- Uta and Sigal will choose the Chairs
- we propose half of the committee members and each Chair chooses the rest
- Uta will send names of Chairs and members to executive committee for their feedback
- we decided to keep the word "international" in the best paper with international implications award instead of "global" because global implies you would need many different countries in the paper (when two countries would be fine)
- we need to clarify with AOM to better explain the Dexter award

Big picture: If we are considering "Rigor. Relevance. Relationships" what do we mean? How do we get there?

- didn't get a chance to discuss, but we did submit our ideas in writing to Sigal who will analyze
- shared a slide that Ron created that brought together rigor, relevance, and relationships along with "develop professionals" and "develop profession" and the Why, What, and How; got feedback

What would you like to see in terms of our strategic priorities?

- Celia: creating more opportunities for dyadic connections, especially for early career and junior people
- Denise: (a) creating connections for those outside the AOM meeting (e.g., point of contact before or after the meeting, small panels in person at a location focused on a topic, could do something virtual instead of in person); (b) recognizing multiple career models, paths and engaging them (could do a PDW on this for AOM, those who have students would benefit from learning more about how to mentor them through the different paths)

-Jessica: (a) social media platforms (can't seem to tag anything about the OB Division, very difficult, need to improve) we need use these platforms a lot more; (b) micro-communities (a handful already exist, but we can do more on this, they don't feel like they have a home; can we leverage these, bring them in, help them find a home)

-Adam: (a) strengthening connections (identifying other people with similar interests); research shows that you build bonds by finding common interests; we could add something to the badges that would help identify a similarity; PDWs have shifted away from making connections; we have just recently added back social events but we need a component within the PDWs needs to be explicit

-Laura E.: (a) enable access to the AOM conference (e.g., emailing those whose papers were rejected to see if they could chair a session, provide strategies for playing a role at AOM)

-Ron: (a) organizing all of our activities around a fundamental purpose; (b) advocating for public policy; (c) embracing the diversity of our division of our members, making sure they feel included (developing professionals and developing the profession)

-Becky: (a) webinars should be encouraged; (b) boat tours could be organized by topic (maybe 6 boats instead of one?)

-Keith: (a) are we starting to have a lapse of profession? Thinking intentionally about our membership;
(i) How does our job market work? Finance and accounting are much more disciplined about this
(ii) How are we doing with international or non-NA schools? Imagine a field like engineering saying this (they would be horrified)

-Alex G.: (a) OB is not just about the Academy; could we have a series of webinars that creates connections; could be a variety of topics; (b) what do we do with our program to make it more accessible to make it more engaging and accessible and interesting? Paper sessions were designed for good things, but it's the one thing that people are the least likely to go to

-Brad: (a) how to make sure our PhD students and junior faculty know how to navigate AOM, not feel alienated; (b) we could use personal testimonials about people's stories rather than a how-to guide; (c) social media could be a primary vehicle for this

-Daan: (a) global inclusion; relationship building that helps people develop individually but also helps the field develop more generally; (b) bridging science and practice (but not bringing more practitioners to the AOM meeting); even if members are not asking for this, we can be more convincing; b-schools that do not connect with practice will be out of business

-Sharon: (a) very heavy focus on education and communication about what we offer (we don't know what our members know about...ask them on the survey, did you know about?); (b) micro-communities, we need to play a role in facilitating their formation (how do we make the OB division more relevant to them?); (c) how do we create more engagement for introverts? A lot of what we have is for more extraverted people; (d) we need to focus on engagement for people beyond PhDs and junior faculty

-Uta: (a) how we can use our activities in a more strategic purpose; have PDWs with wider target audiences; make sure we have global reach (how to do research in different countries); (b) how to connect and empower people, like the name tag idea, more round tables in paper sessions

-Alex: (a) support regionalized conferences (exec committee can present at these); (b) how to get most out of AOM (podcasts, pre-conference); (c) impact award that Cristina introduced is a great one, we should have more; demonstrate impact through case studies; have a PDW that gives concrete examples of actual real-world impact

-Andrew: (a) institutionalize OB as a field, strengthen the collective identity of the OB Division (better defining the domains of study, what are our field journals, "going to Academy" vs. "going to OB conference"); (b) OB could have a mid-year conference (like SMS for BPS)...SIOP could be part of this, but it is quite a different conference

2. Conclusion 1:45-2pm

Sigal: Three big themes from last part of the discussion

- a. Community (global, LGBTQ) [also a theme in 2014, ratings were steady...it takes time]
- b. Communication (we've got stuff and we need to get it out there)
- c. OB Identity (we care about organizations in the world, and we want them to do well)