OB Division Midyear Meeting in San Diego, CA – Minutes
January 30 to February 1, 2015
Jackie Coyle-Shapiro, OB Division Chair

Part 1 – Discussion summary (page 1 – 15)
Part 2 –Reports (page 16-57)

PART 1 – DISCUSSION SUMMARY

A. **Report Out Discussion Points (Jackie)**

Welcome and introductions.

1. OB Program Discussion Points (Kim and Jeff): a) Can tech make the matching of conference submissions to reviewers easier? There are a lot of limitations to the TIM program. b) In 2014 we had no discussion paper sections—should we do the same this year? c) The innovative session design might deal with the issue. This year we will ask session chairs to introduce an innovative format (will talk about it tomorrow). d) All Academy Theme (AAT) sessions are prestigious because only one per division can go, but a challenge arises because they're on Sunday when many other meetings happen.

   DECISION: No discussion sessions again in 2015 and we will submit AAT sessions.

2. OB Doctoral Consortium Discussion Points (Abbie): a) We have an earlier application deadline this year which is March 16 (last year it was in May) to help international students who need to coordinate travel ASAP in the year. One issue is dissertation defenses may not be done yet. We need faculty outreach to publicize earlier date. b) It is very helpful to have a student help with the Doctoral Consortium. Being local would help, but not necessary.

   ACTION: Jackie will send Constant Contact email in mid February of earlier application deadline of March 16, and post on OB web.

   Why doesn't AOM allow exemptions to non AOM editors? ACTION: Jackie will bring this issue up at board of governors meeting.

3. PDW Discussion Points (Nancy). We had a 22% increase in PDW submissions and hours requested so we will have to reject now, which hasn't happened before. We need to develop a process to do this and then in the future notify to membership the selection criteria we will use.

1

4. Junior Faculty Workshop Discussion Points (Leanne A). a) We found consistent feedback that participants wanted more mingle time and more time with fellows and editors. b) Can students select who they'd like to work with? c) We need a drink ticket for JFW attendees. d) Can we lock the fellows in on Friday night? Some PDWs will be in the 4-7 pm range. Maybe we should enter fellows for Friday night, after the deadline. Leanne could contact Abbie after deadline.

    ACTION: Redo survey to assess if content is current, because it was last done in 2011.

    ACTION: Laura will discuss with Leanne the AV specifics, when forms become available. Laura will also make sure we don't get charged for drinks if not used.

5. Awards Discussion Points (Paul T for Scott D). The committees are formed and things are going well. We have a new award this year for mentoring – the committee is formed and has a strong set of nominations. It can be very difficult to get pictures of awardees.

    ACTION: Kim gets scheduling information to Scott, asks him what he asked of his committees, and what he needs by when. Mary will talk with Kim about how to get pictures.

6. Catering Discussion Points (Laura E). Should we do sunglasses again? Yes. Can we do a Canada theme? Maple leafs, or red and white, hockey pucks, maple leaf candies.

    DECISION: Do maple candies instead of chocolates.
    DECISION: We are happy with exec dinner Saturday evening after OB reception.

    ACTION: Laura will find venues for executive dinner Saturday evening of Academy.

7. Treasurer Discussion Points (Bret B). We're in good shape financially, our carry forward is not a problem, we did have some delays in receiving sponsorships, the endowment is down due to a few extra payments, and we need to resolve how we cover the catering person's expenses.

    ACTION: Paul will follow up on any outstanding 2014 sponsorships.

8. Technology Discussion Points (Steve C – Calling in by phone). What is the capability of OB web? Does it have a function to solicit volunteers? Steve indicates that it is an information push out platform, because it only posts like a bulletin board, and has very limited capabilities beyond that. The key issue is to make sure OB web is up to date

because it is a repository to store meeting minutes, podcasts, video clips, etc. We could add a lot more in the future. What would the executive committee like to make of the website?

ACTION – Jackie will send Steve the minutes, and all needed content he requested. Steve will figure out the capacity of OB Web and attend the Executive meeting at Academy so we can make some decisions then.

Steve doesn't need more help right now, but another issue is that we don't have anything documented from an IT perspective. We should start documenting IT best practices. The committee also wants to re-kick off the pod casts. Michael Johnson may be willing to lead the effort.

ACTION: Steve will reach out to Michael to reassess if he will work on podcasts again. Steve will recommend to the committee in August how to improve documentation of best IT practices.

B. **Routine/Old Business (Jackie)**

1. Sponsors. 85% of sponsors carry over. It would be nice to get more sponsors. JOB sponsor went from 10k to 5k. Maybe we can attract sponsors to help get people in from developing countries. Routledge has expressed interested in sponsoring something.

   ACTION: Kim will follow up with Routledge about their interest in sponsoring something.

2. Transition to New Roles (Jackie). We will discuss adjusting roles tomorrow.

3. Volunteers. It would help to have more volunteers, and to improve the process of gathering and utilizing them. Saturday events could use volunteers. Maybe the plenary session too.

   ACTION: Steve will look into how to better manage volunteers through OB Web.

4. Move Midyear Meeting to October or November? It is challenging to have a lot of decisions and coordination needs in the early fall, but we don't meet until January. We miss some deadlines, etc. We may be able to better align strategies if we move it up. We wouldn't have the end of year reports, but we could do that by email, or a conference call if necessary. The desire seems to be to discuss new initiatives, and the meeting in October may help us do that. Maybe we relook at what the executive committee, and each role on the committee does.

5. Plenary Session. Novelty in research: privileging novelty, but too novel gets discounted. Journals want something new, but something new might mean it's irrelevant. Is value of novel research exaggerated? Pragmatism in publishing vs. idealism in creation of knowledge. True or false, is management research valuable for business? A good title might be: "Novelty and the goldilocks effect." Too novel, not enough, or just right. We could pick one ideal person on each side to form a team, they form a team at different career stages, and we'll give input for it. Who to chair each team, perhaps Jeff Edwards and Jeff Pfeffer. The structure would be to take a position and argue it: pro goes, con goes, then both pro and con go again, then we have an open debate. Panelists need to be finalized to go in to printed content by mid-April.

Let's have a debate every year and at the end ask participants for ideas for next year.

A. **Five Year Report (Jackie).**

1. Survey Results. We need to talk about survey results and write a report for AOM. Satisfaction with the division fell from 86% in 2009 (16% response rate) to 78% in 2014 (29% response rate). Have we weakened or strengthened in 5 years? We're doing some things raised in the report, so we should convey that we were aware of some of these things before survey came out, and we're acting on it. Additional correlational data from survey results is reported in Appendix.

   a. **Connection and Involvement**. The belief that OB provides opportunities to get involved rose from 54% to 61% between 2009 and 2014.

   Internationalization. In 2014 the OB membership was 42% non US, up from 38% in 2009. It could be 50/50 by 2020. 60% of OB division resides in the US, and 63% received their degree from a US institution. The OB division's international population is increasing by 12%, while the student population is decreasing by 11%. The report should highlight the 2 PDWs from the international committee which are: (1) international business schools, and (2) publishing in international journals. They also have a social event.

   ACTION – Jackie will go to international committee to follow up with David about international event at Academy. They wanted it off-site and experiential.

   This new committee is excited to serve. The needs within the international community vary considerably. The making connections committee has thrived with excited volunteers and good leadership. What if a successful making connections person could be a rep at large to guide the international committee? Does the international committee have a charge? They're working on their mission and doing something visible. They may submit request for funding at an event at Academy. We

should make our recommendations to them concrete. Should we better embed the international committee in the leadership structure? Maybe their leader should be a part of midyear meeting. We don't know what their needs are. We are anticipating what they want, but they know better what they want. Have the Making Connections Committee and International Committee get together on buddy system for int'l members (buddy/partner).

Survey data suggests there aren't big differences between US and international respondents. We see some bifurcation in the data between some who feel they can get involved, and some who feel they can't. The issue may be more about lack of awareness than lack of opportunities. Some members don't realize that to get involved you need to volunteer.

ACTION: Have International Committee Chair come to midyear meeting and be part of OB Exec. Break International Committee into different regions and ensure that people on the committee are involved in those regions. Have a social event for International.

b. **Volunteering**. There is a pipeline that a lot of people don't know about. For example, the new Doctoral Consortium uses about 65 volunteers. There is a mismatch between volunteer expectations and the desire to get involved. Maybe we should list on OB Web the entire committees of folks getting involved.

Recognition. We should think about doing more to recognize these volunteers. HR division volunteers get a flag on nametag at AOM for recognition. We could hand it out at check in, and have people stand up at the business meeting if they volunteer. Should we do a flag, sticker, or certificate for volunteers? At the reception for best reviewers we ask for pictures and run them through a slide show.

DECISION: Stickers would be easy and effective.

ACTION: Laura check into flags on name tags to give to volunteers for the meeting this year.

Using OB Web to improve volunteering process. We should have a volunteer portal on OB Web that can list various roles, who filled the roles in the past, how to offer to help, etc. Great if there were a button to offer to volunteer through OB Web. It might be intimidating for a member to reach out to a high ranking person and offer to help. We need technology to help us gather and manage volunteers, and we have money to improve our use of technology. We also need a volunteer coordinator. Get info on OB Web and have one overseer of the content/process.

ACTION: On OB Web have a volunteer portal that highlights and/or profiles work of volunteers (e.g., what are the various roles; if you want to be involved in the role, get

info on what it involves, whose done it; lay out the volunteer "pipeline" and how it works; have them provide their contact info and how they would like to be involved). The Past Division Chair will be the Volunteer Coordinator.

Send letters to Deans and Dept Chairs recognizing work of volunteers on OB Exec Committee; give plaques to recognize them at Awards Ceremony each year. They do incredible service for us and we need to better recognize these "behind the scenes" people who make stuff happen!

Increase number of Reps at Large? We only have 6 reps at large (2 lines, 3 year tracks) for the entire OB Division of 6,000 members. The Methods division has 4 reps at large, compared to our 6. But they have 8 paper sessions, compared to our 105. If we had the same number of reps per capita compared to that division we would have 4 positions, and 12 people. Even 1 more person would help. The number or reps at large is limited by the OB division bylaws. But, we should clarify our vision and our needs will come from that.

ACTION: Jackie and Mary will bring up this information with AOM.

DECISION: next year we will look at updating the bylaws which were last updated in 2008.

c. **OB Program**. It seems that the popularity is PDWs, symposia, and then papers. Last year we had a lot of rooms so we had fewer papers in each session. Are there issues in how paper sessions play out? 73% agree that the OB division program is useful, but that was 96% in 2009, so we need to make paper sessions more useful. PhD students need to present, and if we changed it too much a lot of students might not attend. We also might need better tools to help folks navigate and decode the program.

How do we create the right environment to give opportunities, but also create a context where all in an area should be there? We could organize around research streams. Can we list themes in the program? If they're spread throughout the day people will only pick a few, not all, to attend. If the program had themes, and all content in that theme, it would help people come and big names attend. We should advertise theme, and discuss them afterwards. Jackie would like to cover as much ground as possible in her July CC email. We assume that organizing by themes will make them more attractive, but will it? Themes will give a cognitive frame to members. Because there is so much content at AOM, so many divisions, etc. Could have about 7 themes?

We should take a fresh look at what's the purpose of program: developmental, social, and intellectual connections. We don't have enough time after sessions to talk. This is an unmet need at Academy. Maybe we should have more paper sessions with papers at first, then talk for an hour. Should we change to 1 hour sessions with 10 minute presentations? What about more "meet the scholars" session(s)? It could be a paper session, then a meet the scholars panel to discuss issues in the area as a way to meet people. Some PDWs do this now. We should think about positioning for the future by creating/facilitating smaller groups. But, AOM isn't very helpful in allowing small groups to emerge. How can AOM better support small emerging groups?

CONCLUSION: we need to shorten paper sessions, and maybe drive more interactions with folks afterwards.

d. **Programs, Services, and Leadership**. Satisfaction within this area has gone down. 9/12 questions got above 70% for satisfied or higher in 2009, but only 3/12 did in 2014. But, a lot of people did not answer these questions.

Part of problem is people need to present a paper. Maybe everyone does 5 min summary and then open up for discussion. For example, fast facts for 5 minutes each, then open discussion. This is an experimental year to gather bottom up ideas, then try to systematize better structure in following years. How do we maximize the experimental year? Separate session chairs tend to be receptive and responsive but if session chairs are presenting authors, they might not want to innovate. Symposia are better attended than paper sessions.

e. **General Satisfaction**. Question #21: Over 100 say not satisfied with 'sense of community within the division.' Also, Over 100 say not satisfied with 'encouragement from division leaders to form network communities for members like me.' We are so large, so we need to build communities which would be a constructive way to address this concern. Most micro communities form on their own, but we could highlight this to members and show that OB Web supports these initiatives. AOM doesn't have the infrastructure to support them. AOM connect was designed help emerging groups organize, but people didn't use it. So we are saying you should form micro communities, but then AOM doesn't support them well.

ACTION - Mary and Jackie take micro community concerns to board meeting at academy.

Maybe we're doing a better job so expectations have gone up. Maybe the issue is less about international concerns, and more about lesser known schools. Over half of our members have been in less than 7 years, so most respondents would not have answered it 5 years ago.

The report should note that the 5 year survey supports some of the assumptions we've made in last year or too: less program interest, more international attention, etc. The demands on OB division members are going up because of more pressures to perform, publish, etc. Also, 75% of respondents are not tenured. Also, because OB is so big, some members may worry about how do I meet the major scholars?

ACTION: Jackie will send link to report and data in mid-April once Academy has given its feedback

2. How do we get members to comment on the 5 year report? How do we continue the conversation?

3. How have we addressed priorities from 2009?

    a. *Building sense of community*. PDWs, photo booth, sunglasses, explosion of PDW applications has enabled opportunity to foster community (we could find out from those session chairs if other micro communities have emerged), coffee breakouts, partnering with other communities to create infrastructure, essentials of OB, incubators, Making Connections Committee PDWs, this year have 'half way there' which is PhD student focused, OB research incubators (they pre-date 2009, but they matter to addressing 2009 needs), new member network forum, productivity process, mentoring PhD students, building or finding micro communities (some pre-date 2009), Making Connections Committee alternates, associate to full, OB teaching incubator (started 2010ish, good for point 4 for inclusiveness), both DC and JFW have evolved to be more inclusive, increase in size is inclusive, more roundtables is more community.

    b. *How have we increased identity and involvement*? We focus on volunteers, Hot Coffee Cool People, photo booth, sunglasses, picture of reviewers at business meeting, welcome to new members, Essentials of OB Division – to get people involved, New Member Network Forum.

    c. *Creating greater linkages to international members*. International committee, new PDWs, content and character has also changed, recruited more non US scholars for roundtables for JFW and DC, international members on the executive committee.

d. *Including all member types*. More teaching schools are represented. The Doctoral Consortium did a big revamp of their ethics session and the session rating went from 2.0 to 4.5 out of 5. This was a successful initiative. We have added 12 more people to consortium. These have evolved to be much more inclusive. We think they are successful because they're connecting with students on their questions. Inclusiveness, identification, and involvement were all improved. Our PDWs over the last few years have been very responsive to member needs, and we're asking for innovative approaches to paper sessions this year.

e. *Bridging the academic-practitioner gap*. What about real world impact, connecting with practitioners, and connecting to other divisions? The practitioner focus may be the next big thing to address. But, only 5% of OB membership is practitioner, AOM has made it clear that we are not about serving the needs of practitioners. PDWs are one way to talk with practitioners.

Future priorities for next 5 years? We assume we don't want to grow the membership. One priority is to connect better within the division. You can't identify with the whole of OB, you have to identify with a smaller piece of it. Sense of community is too vague. We extend it to context, we know our context is changing and so we are adapting accordingly. Micro communities are an example. Most members want membership to help with research, and connections with people. Inclusiveness is very broad because we need to recognize the needs of all members. People like OB because of our high quality, so we should protect and guard it.

We identified the *lowering student membership*. Emeritus membership has increased as well.

How can we better use technology to do outreach and get volunteers? All organizations struggle with this, how to use tech to advance our interests. We should improve outreach using web technology such as OB web, podcasts, twitter, or skype-like connection tools. We should use social media to more effectively connect with membership.

DECISION: If we need to beef up our technology use, let's do it even if we have to direct money toward it.

A high priority from members' point of view is *broadening range on new topics and diverse methods* (question #28 in survey). It might be an indicator of people wanting access to data with organizations. The practitioner theme works in here. Members would like it if we could better align research with practice. For example, academic people want data, so they connect with practitioners.

A lot of people wrote in that they want the division to *communicate and advocate*. This sentiment is probably getting back to connections. Or was it to influence policy?

Economists have a lot of impact on policy, but we don't. Even though it's a minority perspective, we might want to have someplace that translates research for lay audience.

CONCLUSION: We already know that we want to enhance the program overall and enhance the sense of community. Maybe we have 2 or 3 big categories, and many sub issues under each one.

1- PROGRAM INNOVATION. This is the task category. Why do people join? The program is a vehicle to enhance professional development. Career development, enhancement, services we provide to members, offerings, customer service, access to training and new knowledge, community feeling. Program papers, attending sessions, access to new knowledge, network opportunities, research, and practice so this is structure and content or strengthening research impact.

Do we have a marketing specialist to get our research to news outlets? AOM has someone like this (Ben Haimowitz?). Should we add a PR and Communications person on the executive committee? We should have an "involvement coordinator" who facilitates initiatives like mentoring.

2- COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT. This is the people category. OB web, volunteers, better outreach to members using web technology, improve micro communities, international inclusiveness, inclusiveness to all member types, marketing communications and PR, networking opportunities.

IDEA: in building community we could use the tag line "I AM" such as "I AM OB." It would be easy to put a sticker on nametag I AM OB.

IDEA: we could highlight a member on OB Web.

IDEA: "OB Beer" is a real drink. We could look into this for Vancouver.

ACTION: Help create groups of smaller microcommunities (Academy not totally supportive of microcommunities but we need to be). On OB Web list the microcommunities.

3 - RESTRUCTURE THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. We need 2 new roles: an involvement person and a PR person. Maybe we should involve the international person on committee. The involvement coordinator could focus on networking, coordinating micro communities, and managing volunteers like the intake person. The PR person could be the push out person. We could also propose a program developer and 2 people could serve in this role, and maybe have a non-executive run the dc program. Or, can we change the responsibilities of reps at large to oversee other people doing some of these roles? Adding new reps at large means we have to revisit bylaws.

There are concerns with decentralizing too much because of limited accountability (need one person who is accountable). If the idea is to have volunteering and outreach, then we should structure the executive committee like a top management team with responsibilities. Each executive committee member could have 6 people under their responsibility. They then do the work putting whatever on. Only go to the executive when they need help. So, we could have our reps at large oversee a lot of things. They can take on initiatives, but executive committee should focus on strategy and big picture things.

DECISION: Let's broaden through increasing other people on the executive committee. Every year when we meet at the Midyear meeting we talk about our priorities and check progress against our goals.

Do we want a more seasoned person to take on some of this? We have a lot of great people who have rotated off. They represent a lot of expertise that we don't tap. Maybe after a few years we pull in someone to help out with some things.

The Health and Governance Checklist.

Q1: We will look at bylaws next year.

Q2: We checked the statement and its fine.

Q3: AOM wants to be able to review all contracts for liability, etc.. We had 2 contracts for midyear meeting we should run through AOM.

ACTION: Laura will ask Bret who to route contracts through when she's making them.

Q4: We are reviewing statistics now for the 5 year review. We also discuss trends at all midyear meetings.

Q5: We try to deliver programs/services for all member constituencies.

Q6: Yes, one person is in charge of reviewing financials, the treasurer.

Q7: Yes we follow AOM financial policies and we operate in the black.

Q8: Yes, we encourage outside sponsorship.

Q9: Yes, we have periodic planning, at our midyear meeting.

Q10: Yes, there is a climate of trust and respect among officers.

Q11: Yes, roles are understood. People primer and shadowing.

Q12: Yes, we constantly work on involvement and we are making progress. But, we can't overstep into the GDO division's area. They regularly hold a meeting and some of us have attended. Chairs have attended AOM committee on including, and participated in discussions. We try to broaden who is on the voting slate for officers. Sometimes we ask if they want to be on the slate, but people had to decline.

Q13 No, the current governance and committee structure doesn't serve the division well. We need to make changes.

Q14: Yes, we have a fair and open process for nominations and elections.

Q15: Yes, some programs are dropped, or they don't happen every year. We recently dropped the scientific affairs committee and added some of them to connections committee, because all energy was behind connections committee. The international committee is also based on Making Connections Committee. We added 2 PDWs on international topics. We discussed the ethics example in the Doctoral Consortium where we improved its delivery.

Q16: We don't have any scholarships or travel stipends. PhD student rep at RM division gets a travel scholarship, around $600. This question, and the implied precedent of travel stipends, can help us craft the catering position and its travel stipend.

Q17: Yes, we have a publicized recognition program and criteria are transparent.

Q18: We could do better at providing opportunities for all member types across research, teaching, and practitioner. We're talking about it and we've had more PDWs in the last 5 years that get at it.

Q19: Yes, the services provided extend beyond the annual meeting such as OB Web, the email list serve. But, we need to invest in OB web as it will help facilitate a lot of issues were discussing. We will have the Israel conference. We could offer to cosponsor a Google conference. OMT division started a wiki few years ago which focused on teaching. The challenge is someone has to maintain it.

Q20: Yes, we regularly communicate with members.

Q21: Yes, we actively work to build community. We use Constant Contact for emails and it functions like our newsletter, while most divisions don't use it. We plan to update OB web. Perhaps we could profile a volunteer in our Constant Contact emails. Maybe the volunteer highlight could go in the email after the conference when we wrap up the conference. We could also use OB web as a social facilitator. 'Feedly' is a feed aggregator that might be helpful. Maybe we should use twitter more. The technological tools are all there. We should do more of this and we could also highlight specific segments of the community and practice connections.

Q22: Yes, we actively strive to improve the annual meeting. It requires a lot of work, planning, and volunteers. We are working to make paper sessions more innovative.

Q23: Collaboration with other divisions? We no longer do the joint HR social as they had two socials and were scaling back. Maybe we should partner with RM on ethics and research. We do have a PDW this year on efficient survey measurement. Perhaps it should have gone to RM, and we cosponsor. With our overage or PDW proposals, we could ask RM if they want it.

B. **Strategic Visioning (Jackie/Mary).**
   1. **Student Representative(s) for the Division (Abbie)?** Maybe we should have a student committee? It could feed in like the international committee, and connections committee. They could be a voice of meeting needs of students in the division. Students could help with the DC, JFW, and PDWs. How would this committee function? Would they be elected? Perhaps it would operate like the connections committee. We could have a social committee chair who organizes interviews with award winners. Another student on the student committee could be for technology. If we start with 1 or 2 reps they can always adapt if they need more help.

      ACTION: Jackie will ask Steve to relook at structure of OB Web. How can we facilitate volunteerism through OB Web?

      DECISION: Let's get Abbie a volunteer now and at the next midyear meeting we will flesh out details of a student committee.

   2. **Possible Discussion Topics.**
      a. *Innovative program ideas?* We have new options this year for session chairs: insights first, very short 5 min or less description on each paper, then each go to corner of room to talk with that person group. Half way point to switch. Or they can come up with their own new format. Some have chaired a discussion roundtable and said it was great. Other formats to suggest? Right now up to session chair to organize. We should email those signed up as chair telling what we want them to do, so say yes or no now to get commitment. Number of papers or authors may determine how to do it.

         In reality many sessions will follow the regular format, because it's up to session chairs. Maybe we should reach out to symposium chairs for ideas. If a session is done creatively, we should get some feedback from audience. Can we do online feedback? Qualtrics, or Survey Monkey. We could have students volunteers attend sessions and get feedback.

         ACTION: Jackie to send CC email on novel sessions the end of April or first of May.

Other ideas on program changes? Mary and Jackie can take ideas to Fri eve meeting at AOM. What are these paper session for? Developmental, forum to share feedback, sharing insights. End of the day roundtables to discuss. Or have 20 papers in a session on major ideas, 5 slides max. All sessions are 90 minutes currently. What about 45 min sessions?

b. *How do we better use our resources?* Tomorrow we will discuss how to link resources to initiatives.

c. *Volunteers?* We have discussed this elsewhere.

d. *Ethics issues in the field, some say there is no leadership in the field.* We don't have processes in the field for dealing with ethical issues.

3. **New initiatives for incoming reps at large.** If we want to follow strategic initiatives we need more help. Time is the issue for reps at large, we need to free up time of reps at large to be more strategic. Time commitment can extend across the year. DC is a huge job requiring lots of time. Should PDW stay as rep at large? If we add more reps these things might change. Maybe we only add 2 more reps. who are still members of the executive committee, just not elected. The bylaws state that the executive committee is of elected officers, and the executive committee shall appoint additional officers as needed. We must change bylaws if we add more elected positions, or if we add additional roles we appoint. It's very hard to change bylaws, but people would be open to it.

If we restructure into strategic and operations, then we open up new opportunities with different roles. We could call it the operations committee and they don't have to attend the midyear meeting. Perhaps in the midyear meeting we have an operations part, and a strategy part. Holding the midyear in October will help facilitate strategic focus, because less operations stuff is going on then.

ACTION: adding 1 new rep at large track makes the most sense. Adding 1 three year track means 3 new people eventually. Change the other Rep at Large role to put PDW in the first year rather than the third.

We have a good process for electing people, but we don't have a good process to find volunteers every year. If OB web has a pool of volunteers to pick from, then a committee chair can go to it to gather help.

4. **Anything for Mary and Jackie to bring up with board of governors at AOM?** Maybe ethics and what we need to be doing about it. The 3 major issues in this area are: criteria, detection, and consequences. Maybe we need a place or process for people to raise

concerns. AOM has an ombudsperson for complaints of AOM conference, its submissions, its journals, or other AOM processes. The person has a fiduciary responsibility to investigate the issue, but they will not address anything non AOM. AOM also has 2 ethics committees. The ethics education committee and the ethics adjudication committee. We in OB division identify with certain journals. Maybe when you sign up with OB division you sign some kind of honor statement? Could be an opportunity to partner with the RM division because they are open to collaborating with us. We could link this to the idea of having methods assistance when people need help with methodological challenges.

A. **Slate for Division Officers (Jackie).**

ACTION: Jackie will follow up with individuals identified.

ACTION: Jackie will follow up by email on volunteering and send some signals in terms of what we're going to do.

OB Program Report
Kim Elsbach and Jeff Edwards

I. Submissions

- **1032** papers, compared to 870 in 2014
- **196** 158 symposia, compared to 158 in 2014
- **1269** Total submissions, compared to 1028 in 2014 (23% INCREASE)

II. Reviewers (remember that max number of review assignments changed from 9 to 6 in 2013)

- 1265 reviewers from 52 countries (compared to 1113 reviewers from 49 countries in 2014)
- Average number of _other_ Divisions selected: 1.76
  30% are new reviewers (compared to 42% in 2014) Previous years average = 30%
- 42% are students (compared to 41% in 2014)
- 54% are non U.S. (compared to 54% in 2014, 44.5% in 2013, 43% in 2012, and 37% in 2011)
- 646 (52%) agree to act as emergency reviewer, compared to 566 (51%) in 2014
- 46% agreed to serve as Session Chair and 39 % agreed to serve as a Discussant, compared to 42% for each in 2014.

III. Reviewer Matching Process

- Due to the large number of submissions, and low numbers of reviewers (only 1086 at the time of the reviewer matching process), the default algorithm couldn't assign 3 reviewers to each paper. Also, due to the large number of submissions, the algorithm was run in two groups. This means dividing the submissions into two groups AND the reviewers into two groups. This is done completely randomly. BJ put all papers and most of reviewers into one pool, and took all night to run. Papers ended up with most having 2 or 3 reviewers, a few with 1. BJ put all symposia into a second group with the rest of reviewers, and ran that group. Symposia had a max of 2 reviewers (and many had 0 and 1 reviewers).
- We manually added reviewers to all Symposia and Papers, so that all had 3 reviewers in the end.
- If we want to pool reviewers separately for Symposia vs. Papers for next year, we can do it. Would use the column for reviewer ranking. Jeff should talk with BJ about this if want to do this next year.
- **The Division used 97% of the total 1265 reviewers input into the algorithm.**

IV. Program Components

- A. **Scholarly Program:** Overall Acceptance Rate Target = 50%
  - **Paper Sessions**
  - 2014 Acceptance Rate = 47%
  - Types of Paper Sessions
    - o <u>Divisional Presentation Paper sessions</u>: Accepted papers grouped together by the Division Program Chair. Each session should have a MINIMUM of three papers with one Session Chair.

- o Discussion Paper sessions: Sessions for promising papers that meet the acceptance criteria; focus is on authors receiving feedback. Three to four papers with discussant. Each division may designate up to 10% of accepted papers for this type of session. The Division Program Chairs are responsible for grouping these papers into sessions. AOM staff will schedule the sessions as part of the Sunday program. ==In 2014, OB designated NO Discussion Paper Sessions – Do we still want to do this?==

- **==In 2015 will ask Session Chairs to consider innovative session designs (see below)==**
- *NEW – Innovative Formats for Paper Sessions:* This year, the OB Division is joining an Academy-wide effort to enliven the scholarly paper sessions at the annual meetings by introducing some alternatives to the traditional format (i.e., where each author presents his or her paper for 15 minutes, with discussion and questions at the end). We are using this opportunity to notify submitters about the different, innovative paper-session formats that the OB Division is encouraging session chairs to use at the 2015 meetings. These include:

- A. Short Introductions Plus Break Out Discussion (3-4 papers per session): Presenters of each paper give a 3-minute introduction. After all papers have been introduced, presenters move to break out groups to take questions and further discuss the papers. Audience members can join any group they choose. After 30 minutes of discussion, audience members have the opportunity to switch groups for a second round of discussion.

- B. Insights First Presentations (3-4 papers per session): Presenters devote the first half of their presentation to discussing their insights and findings, focusing what they discovered. Presenters use the second half of their presentation to discuss implications and future research directions. Lengthy literature reviews are not included. Audience members ask questions and make comments between each presentation.

- C. Questions First Presentations (3-4 papers per session): Each presenter starts with a list of 1-3 questions they would like answered about their findings and insights. They then deliver a 10-minute presentation that provides information relevant to answering their questions. Audience members then take up to 15 minutes to provide ideas for answering one or more of the questions. This process is repeated for each paper.

- We expect that the paper session chairs will choose and coordinate the use of these new session formats. Alternative formats may also be proposed.

- **Symposia sessions: 198 submissions received, of which 196 conformed to the submission guidelines and were checked in.**
- 2014 Acceptance Rate = 77 %
- Types of Symposia Session
    - <u>Presenter Symposium</u> involves a series of authored papers on a preset theme. Of the 196 symposia that were checked in, 169 (86%) were presenter symposia.
    - <u>Panel Symposium</u> engages a group of panelists in a formal interactive discussion. Of the 196 symposia that were checked in, 27 (14%) were panel symposia.

B. All-Academy Themed Sessions (Sunday)

1. Nominated symposia must be single-sponsored. They cannot be co-sponsored with any other Divisions or Interest Groups.
2. Each DIG may (but is not required to) nominate UP TO THREE (3) of its single-sponsored, accepted symposia for inclusion in the AAT Program.
3. The AAT Committee will review the nominated symposia with the goal of accepting a MAXIMUM OF ONE (1) nominated submission from each DIG to be included in the AAT Program. The AAT Committee's selection will be based on the relevance of the proposed submission to the Theme.
4. Submitters of nominated symposia will have the opportunity to decline the nomination, thereby keeping the symposium on the DIG's Monday/Tuesday program.
5. If your nominated symposium is accepted by the AAT Committee, you will not be able to accept another symposium onto your DIG's Monday/Tuesday program to replace the accepted symposium now being scheduled on Sunday.
6. Nominated symposia that are accepted for inclusion in Sunday's AAT program will appear on the program as sponsored by the nominating division/interest group and AAT.
7. If your nominated symposium is not accepted by the AAT Committee, you will be responsible for scheduling the symposium on Monday or Tuesday.
8. AAT program schedules the nominated symposia.

D. Awards, Exec Committee Meeting, Plenary, LAA

- **NEW Plenary this year** (Debate: whether or not a focus on "novelty" in research findings/theory building is beneficial or detrimental to the field of OB), followed by Hot Coffee/Cool People Reception.
- **Need to find debaters and structure session (facilitated by Jackie?)**
- Lifetime Achievement Address is Tuesday morning followed by a second coffee reception (Making Connections Coffee)

Business Meetings, Social Events, and Plenary

Day	Event	Time	Set Up	Seating Capacity	Catering	Notes
Saturday	OB Awards and Social	6-8 PM	Theater for Awards, Reception for Social	150 for Awards, 500 for Reception	Yes	Adjoining rooms for Awards and Social. AV for both
Sunday	OB Executive Committee Meeting	12:30 PM – 2 PM	Meeting	25	Yes	
Monday	Plenary - Debate	9:45-11:15 AM	Theater	300	No	Debate pos vs. neg effects of focus on novelty in OB research. AV needed
Monday	Hot Coffee, Cool People Social	11:30 AM - 12:30 PM	Reception	300	Yes	Immediately following Plenary in adjoining room
Tuesday	Lifetime Achievement Award Address (LAA)	9:45-10:45AM	Theater	150	No	AV needed.
Tuesday	Making Connections Coffee	10:45-11:15 AM	Reception	250	Yes	Immediately following LAA in adjoining room

IV. Check-in Process

A. Papers

There was much confusion as the submission guidelines written on the AoM website did not match the "sample" paper and symposium given as pdf's online. This year, I wrote the following to all submitters concerned with this problem: "**Because the AoM written submission guidelines do not match the "sample" paper and symposium pdf's given online, this year, the OB Division will accept papers and symposia that conform to either. Your submission is fine and has been checked in.**"

I have asked AoM to make sure that the "samples" are consistent with written guidelines before 2016.

In 2015 I used the following guidelines to deal with papers that did not comply with submission guidelines:

Type I – Major problems

- **IF the paper doesn't meet the following guidelines**: more than 40 pages, not double spaced (and double spacing will make paper longer than 40 pages – NOTE: single spacing for Abstract and References accepted), no abstract (and inserting abstract from online system will make paper longer than 40 pages), less than 12 point font (and increasing to 12 point font will make paper longer than 40

19

pages), margins significantly small, or no references -- do NOT check it in. If it is before the last day for submissions, send email to submitter explaining problems and ask them to correct, resubmit, and email you when they have resubmitted. If it is the last day for submissions or later, do not check in and do not send email to submitter. Paper will NOT be reviewed and you will send an email template that says why.

* Note – if paper is 41 pages, look and see if last page of text has one line of text. This can happen when converting a WORD to pdf and push a paper over 40 page limit. If this is the case, click on "download original" in the preview screen. This will give you the WORD file for this paper. Remove a blank line somewhere in the WORD document. Then, "upload new version" in the preview screen (you will have to "choose file" and upload it). Make sure you save this new version, check in the submission, and "Save" the entire submission. This should make the paper 40 pages.

* "Edit" the title of all papers sent back to submitter OR not checked in and insert a "*" at the start of the title followed by one word explanation for why it was sent back:

e.g., * LENGTH *Title of the Paper* or * SPACING *Title of the Paper.* Then "Save and Submit" the new title, and "Save" the entire submission. Now, in the "Submission Spreadsheet" those papers that have been sent back to the submitter or not checked in will be easily identifiable by the * and explanation word.

* Keep spreadsheet of all emails sent to submitters about fixing their symposia or papers.

Type II – Minor problems

- IF the paper doesn't meet the following guidelines: no submission #, no title, no page numbers, includes identifying author info, no abstract (and there is room to add the abstract), not double spaced (and there is room to double space), less than 12 point font (and there is room to enlarge to 12 point font) – click on "download original" in the preview screen. This will give you the WORD of PDF file for this paper. Make changes needed (e.g. you can copy the abstract from the online system and paste into the WORD document, you can add page numbers or the submission number. NOTE: for PDF originals you can add page numbers and submission numbers by using "Tools", "Pages", and "Header and Footer"). Then, "upload new version" in the preview screen (you will have to "choose file" and upload it). Make sure you save this new version, check in the submission, and "Save" the entire submission.

Type III – Ignored Problems

- Not in AMJ style for references, tables, and figures– all styles and spacings for references, tables, and figures accepted. Font size for references must be 12 point.
- No page number on first page, but page numbers on all other pages
- No title on first page, but title on second page
- Submission number in upper left hand corner or middle top of first page, instead of upper right hand corner
- No keywords following abstract
- Tables and figures in body of paper rather than at end of paper
*NO DESK REJECTS THIS YEAR.
* 11 papers not checked in in 2015

B. Symposia

- Symposia submissions were evaluated against the guidelines posted on the AOM program website. Of the 198 submissions received, 194 complied with the guidelines and were therefore checked in.
- Several submissions deviated from the guidelines in minor ways. For example, for presenter symposia, summaries of the individual papers sometimes exceeded five pages of text. However, if the average length of the summaries for a given submission was no longer than five pages, the submission was checked in, based on the rationale that the work load for the reviewers depends primarily on the total length of the summaries, as opposed to the length of each summary. This situation affected very few submissions, probably less than five.
- Two submissions deviated from the guidelines in ways that were substantive enough to contact the authors and request a revision. In one case, the requested time was 120 minutes, as opposed to the standard 90-minute block, and in another case, a submission for a presenter symposium did not include the references for the individual papers. Both authors revised their submissions promptly, and they were checked in before the deadline.
- Two submissions were not checked in. In both cases, the submission consisted of a single paper, and based on my correspondence with the authors, they apparently did not understand the format of a symposium. In addition, one of these submissions was not finalized and therefore could not have been checked in, regardless of the content or format of the submission.

V. Follow-up on Recommendations from last year (Recommendations are given in italics)

Papers

1. *Make sure the reference formatting is absolutely clear. THIS WAS OUR MAJOR PROBLEM WITH PAPER CHECKIN THIS YEAR. We suggest the guideline should be single spaced with a line between. Make it explicit in the submission checklist check boxes: "My paper complies with reference format guidelines. The references are single spaced, 12-point font, with a line between each reference."*

2. *For submission numbers, do the same thing we did with papers. Make them write it in. So here it would be: "The submission number [write in the box] is listed in the upper right hand corner of every page of the document."*

* for 2015 I used the guidelines above (under "check in process") for check in.

Program Developer

Following are requests made to Gabe Bramson and the AoM Program Team, followed by his responses.

1. *We would love to be able to put a flag in the system for those that are a problem for check-in. Flags should have color choices (like stars in Gmail). Yellow means the assistant sees a problem (they then note it in the google docs spreadsheet). Blue means the Program Chair has reviewed it and has an email out to the authors (this should be very rare—hopefully we won't have to use it). Red means the Program Chair has reviewed it and it will not be checked in.* **[This is difficult. Not very likely in the current system. – GB]**

2. *We would love (if possible) a popup box for a red flag that lists the problems (violates page limits, no page number, author identifying information included, references not single spaced with a line between, not use 1-inch margins and 12-point font). This should then connect to the Not Checked In email so that when they receive it, they know what the issue is and why they were not in conformance. This would save a lot of email time!* **[This is difficult. Not very likely in the current system. – GB]**

3. *In the statistical information spreadsheet under Finalized OB Submissions by Status we need the "Checked In" number to be broken out by type: "Papers Checked In" and "Symposia Checked In." This is important for OB because we have two different people doing these roles* **[This is done. – GB]**

4. *In the email template it should automatically include the statement: "If you have not yet signed up as a reviewer for conference papers, we would greatly appreciate your help. The success of our program depends on our team of reviewers. If you have not yet done so, I hope you will visit http://review.aomonline.org/ and click the "Sign Up Now" button." Note that each Division could then tailor it to their DIG: "and select the OB Division." This would be for both paper and symposia email templates.* **[Argh. This is a great idea and easy but it slipped through the cracks as far as providing that language in the default email template. Maybe we can find time to add it manually to the email templates already distributed to the divisions before Wednesday when the vast majority of check-in notifications will start to be sent. Worst case is you can add it the OB email if you have not already done so. – GB**

Symposia

Following are the requests made to AoM Program Team, followed by this years' Symposium submission guidelines

1. We request that the formatting instructions for Symposia include the following: (a) require that submission # must be on all pages of symposium, (b) set a 5-page limit for the summary of panelists' discussion (for panel symposia only), (c) dictate that page limits for paper synopses (for presentation symposia) do <u>not</u> include tables, figures, and references, (d) require that symposia be designed to fit a 90 minute time limit.

2. Ask the Academy to reiterate that all submissions must be carefully checked and not checked in unless they comply with all submission guidelines. Make clear that all Divisions need to be vigilant and consistent in enforcement of these guidelines.

3. Below we summarize our recommended changes to the Guidelines for Formatting Symposia:

Formatting your symposium proposal. Please follow these instructions to ensure your symposium proposal is reviewed. Proposals that are not prepared according to these instructions will NOT be reviewed. A symposium submission must include the following and be organized in the following order:

a. *A title page that includes:*

    i. *Title of symposium*

      ii.   *Complete formal names and affiliations of all participants*

      iii.   *List of potential Division/Interest Group/AAT sponsors.*

b.   *Record the 5-digit electronic submission ID number as the header on each page.*

c.   *Three- to five- page overview of symposium. Note that symposia should be designed to fit a 90-minute session.*

d.   *Explanation of why the symposium should be of interest to EACH of the specified sponsors*

e.   *Two- to five-page synopsis of EACH presentation (for presenter symposium only) not including references. EACH presentation may include a maximum of two additional pages of tables and figures.*

f.   *Up to a 5-page summary of the panelists' discussion (for panel symposium only)*

g.   *For everything except references use Times New Roman 12-point font, double spaced, 1-inch (2.5 cm) margin all around, and 8.5" × 11" page setting.*

h.   *Reference section including references across all the presentations, formatted properly (12-point font, single-spaced with a line between each reference, 1-inch (2.5 cm) margin, and 8.5" × 11" page setting.)*

==For 2015: here are the symposia submission guidelines:==

1. **Formatting Your Symposium Proposal** Please follow these instructions to ensure your symposium proposal is reviewed. Proposals that are not prepared according to these instructions will NOT be reviewed.
    a. A symposium submission must include the following and be organized in the following order:
        i. A title page that includes:
            1. the Academy-assigned submission number
            2. the title of symposium (in Title Case)
            3. the complete formal names and affiliations of all participants
            4. the list of potential division and/or interest group sponsors.

        ii. A 3-5 page overview of the symposium. Symposia should be designed to fit a 90-minute session.
        iii. An explanation of why the symposium should be of interest to EACH of the specified sponsors
        iv. *For presenter symposia*: A 2-5 page synopsis of EACH presentation, not including references. Each presentation may include a maximum of two additional pages of tables and figures. OR *For panel symposia*: An up to 5-page summary of the panelists' discussion.
        v. Use Times New Roman 12-point font, **double spaced**, 1-inch (2.5 cm) margin all around, and 8.5" × 11" page setting. References may be single spaced.
    b. The entire submission must be in **ONE** document created in one of the following compatible formats:

      i.   Adobe Portable Document Format (.pdf)
      ii.   Microsoft Word (.doc, .docx)
      iii.   Rich Text Format (.rtf)
c.   Be sure to number all of the pages of the submission.
d.   Make sure to check that the file or document uploaded is virus-free prior to submitting.
e.   After uploading the document, it will be automatically converted to Adobe PDF format. Please make sure that the content of the submission appears and prints correctly as you intended *after* it has been converted by clicking on the "view" button.

2. **NOTE: If any of the above guidelines and formatting instructions in not met, the submission will NOT be reviewed.**

4. Allow each Division to separately send emails noting if symposia are not checked in, even if another Division has checked them in. The system should not remove submissions that have not been checked in by one Division from the "NOT Checked in" email log for that Division, just because they were checked in by another Division.

Emergency Reviewer Assignments

1. *We have to assign a lot of emergency reviewers and it gets confusing to know who we assigned after we have done it. Could you add a date to the Reviewer Assignments page that lets us know when we assigned the reviewer? It would go in the box and could be to the left of the "Pickup Date" column and say "Assignment Date." That will help us see when we made the assignment so we know if that is our emergency reviewer. For this year there were some papers that had 0 reviewers so that when I added in 3 more I ended up with 6, and I didn't know who the new ones were.*

2. *Could we have a way of indicating that the reviewer did not complete the review? That would help us keep track of bad reviewers. This would be different from Decline. This would be "Did not complete."*

<mark>**For 2015 – no progress on this.**</mark>

All-Academy Theme for Symposia

OB had decided not to do AAT because of the problems last year with scheduling (which I think you have now fixed). However, it turned out that we had to do it anyway because other divisions nominated papers for which we are lead. So the Academy needs to make this process clear. We suggest you can either:

1) Not tell divisions they have an option--just tell them all to make nominations. For us, we would have likely nominated the same ones anyway, so this would just mean that we wouldn't be upset that we couldn't opt out b/c it was never an option.

2) If divisions can opt out then they need to tell divisions that ONLY the lead sponsors can nominate.

<mark>*** for 2015 only solo sponsored symposia may be nominated for AAT. So the multiple division issue is no longer there.**</mark>

Finding Session Chairs

1. *We have to do so many session chairs and this process is pretty brutal. We could really use an algorithm match for this part. The algorithm would be to match on: a) top keywords, b) Rule of Three (accepts only)—the desire here is to pick 1 first, then 2, c) Complete OB Reviews—the goal is that they did review for us, d) Division Member?—choose OB Division members. Also important is student status but that really needs to be determined by the Program Chair b/c you want to select for a mix, not do a decision rule on it.*

2. *If we could also have a way to then select a person and have an email template it would be absolutely fantastic*

For 2015: I would like to assign one of the paper authors as session chair in every paper session. Is this OK?

OB Doctoral Consortium 2015
Abbie Shipp and Lucy Gilson

1. The Agenda (see below)
   a. The basic agenda is similar to previous years, based on positive feedback.
   b. We have staffed for the same number of participants we had last year (around 80) with 11-12 roundtable hosts per session.
   c. Like last year, we have left 1.5 hours for lunch and a break, assuming a served lunch. We would like to avoid a lunch speaker given that we received positive comments last year about time for informal discussions. Last year, we tried to create small communities of students with similar research interests, and lunch time conversations are necessary for this goal.
   d. This year, we intend to make three changes:
      i. First, Suzanne Masterson will speak as the JOB representative in place of Neal Ashkanasy, who will be stepping down from his editor role.
      ii. Second, we received feedback that the second day ends too late. Further, although feedback on the work-life session is good, it is a challenging session to relate to the variety of different work-life situations represented by attendees. Therefore, this year, we're making the work-life session a "bonus session," with a focus on "life hacking." We will officially conclude the consortium at 4:00 p.m., but we will invite attendees to voluntarily stay for the bonus session, which will run until approximately 5:00 p.m. This change should also have the added benefit of making this conversation particularly more intimate as we hope that all who stay are interested in the topic. We have discussed this change in the schedule with Jackie and Mary, the keynote presenter for this session (Theresa Glomb), and the faculty panelists. All are interested to experiment with the new format.
      iii. Finally, per Cheri Ostroff's suggestion last year, we are moving the nomination deadline earlier to accommodate international students. Because international students need to make their travel plans earlier, they need to know if they are accepted to the OBDC as early as possible. For 2015, we have moved the nomination deadline from mid-May to March 6 so we can inform attendees of their acceptance by April. This change may have some unanticipated consequences, such as some students not defending their proposal by this date. However, we believe the benefits outweigh the costs. For example, in 2014, it was not possible to use graduate assistants to manage the application process because the deadline fell after the end of the semester. However, with an earlier application deadline, the OBDC organizer can better recruit administrative assistance.

25

2. Call for Nominations (see below)
   a. Our next step is to put out the call for nominations. Last year, our nomination process resulted in 82 nominations. Because we had the space, we did take a number of students who had not yet defended their proposals and/or were not yet on the job market. While this is a large number of students, the organization and schedule of the consortium enables students to meet as many other students and faculty as possible. The only issue we had in 2014 was the room setup (i.e., we had to add 2 additional roundtables at the last minute to accommodate some of our sessions). However, we have noted this in our submission for 2015 and our goal is to maintain the same number of participants. To achieve this goal, we have maintained the following restrictions in the call for nominations:
      - Limit of 1 student per program. No limit per university because it is hard for universities to coordinate across programs and there are rare universities (maybe 10) who nominate students from multiple departments.
      - We follow last year's call in terms of mentioning "halfway there" and "new doctoral student" consortia as alternatives for students who are not in the final stages of their program. We've also added a reference to doctoral consortia offered by "related" divisions (e.g., HR).

3. Collecting and Distributing Participant and Faculty Information
   a. Students submit a one-page vita and a one-page dissertation abstract. Faculty submit a short bio. Speakers may submit presentation materials. All files are submitted via email.
   b. Last year, we used Dropbox to share these materials with participants before the consortium. This seemed to work well.

4. Room and Material Needs:
   a. **Two flipcharts** on Friday from 4:00-7:00 pm and Saturday from 8:00 am-5:30 pm. Having sticky paper on the flipcharts (or tape available) would be useful so that insights can be posted around the room.
   b. **At least 12 roundtables** in the room; it would be nice to have a room that could accommodate 14 or 15 (just in case our numbers grow). Last year, our room was too tight with only 10 tables and capacity of approximately 100. We added more roundtables, which led to the problem of people not being able to easily enter/exit the room.
   c. We also need **3 rectangular tables** for check-in, materials, and faculty panelists.
   d. **Projector and screen** (we plan to bring laptops for presentations.)
   e. A **lavalier microphone** for the main speakers and **two portable microphones** for audience participation.
   f. **Food needs**:
   - Heavy hors d'oeuvres and beverages (soda and wine/beer?) for Friday evening (4:00-7:00 pm). Would like both warm appetizers and cold appetizers. Please include vegetarian options.
   - Continental breakfast for Saturday morning (8:00-8:30 am). Please include vegetarian options, including fruit.
   - Coffee break for Saturday morning (10:00-10:15 am).
   - Served lunch for Saturday (11:45 am-1:15 pm). Please include vegetarian options on the menu (e.g., a buffet that includes salad and several fruit/vegetable options).
   - Soft drink/cookie break for Saturday afternoon (2:30-2:45 pm).
   g. **Drink tickets** for faculty participants (~65)

5. Possible Changes Going Forward

a. Creating and Maintaining Community – Students have indicated a desire to meet other students with similar interests and to maintain those ties beyond the consortium. Currently this happens informally with some success. Should we facilitate this (e.g., could technology be used to create virtual groups or a single space for future communication)?

b. Continue to better address the varying needs within the attendees. For example, international students seem to need more basic information, which U.S. students have already learned in their programs. This action may require greater coordination with David Patient and the new international committee. As another example, the work-life session has been rated highly by those with significant others but some attendees (e.g., single, no dependents, etc.) do not identify with the content. This feedback was given despite our presentations addressing how everyone has some sort of a personal life. We will see if our experiment of making the work-life session a "bonus session" helps given that attendees can choose to stay or go.

Discussion point:

1. **Sponsor:** Will Wiley be our lunch sponsor again?

2. **Help with Consortium**: Last year, Troy Smith a third year doctoral student at Texas A&M volunteered to help. He was <u>excellent</u> but this year he will be in the consortium as a participant. Does anyone know have a student who might be willing to help? It would be good to get a recommendation for a conscientious doctoral student.

Coordinators

Abbie Shipp, Texas Christian University (a.shipp@tcu.edu)
Lucy Gilson, University of Connecticut (lgilson@business.uconn.edu)

Friday, August 7, 4:00 p.m.-7:00 p.m.

Introductions (4:00-5:30 p.m.)
Session 1: Crafting the Right Academic Job: From Job Search to Transition (5:30-7:00 p.m.)

Batia Wiesenfeld, New York U., speaker
Amy Wrzesniewski, Yale U., speaker

Round Table Hosts

Batia Wiesenfeld, New York U. (1)	Kevin Lowe, U. of Auckland (7)
Amy Wrzesniewski, Yale U. (2)	David Mayer, U. of Michigan (8)
Mark Bolino, U. of Oklahoma (3)	Gerardo Okhuysen, U. of California-Irvine (9)
Ethan Burris, U. of Texas (4)	Katherine Phillips, Columbia U. (10)
Cristina Gibson, U. of Western Australia (5)	Lynn Shore, Colorado State U. (11)
Micki Kacmar, Texas State U. (6)	Greg Stewart, U. of Iowa (12)

Saturday, August 8, 8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.

Continental Breakfast (8:00-8:30 a.m.)

Session 2: Research and Publishing (8:30-10:00 a.m.)

Frederick Morgeson, Michigan State U., *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior,* speaker

TBD Editor, *Administrative Science Quarterly,* speaker

Round Table Hosts

Frederick Morgeson (Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior), Michigan State U. (1)
TBD Editor, (Administrative Science Quarterly) (2)
David Allen (Journal of Management), U. of Memphis (3)
Soon Ang (Academy of Management Discoveries), Nanyang Tech U. (4)
Gilad Chen (Journal of Applied Psychology), U. of Maryland (5)

Xiao-Ping Chen (Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes), U. of Washington (6)
Amy Colbert (Academy of Management Journal), U. of Iowa (7)
Bill Gardner (Group and Organization Management and The Leadership Quarterly), Texas Tech U. (8)
Russ Johnson (Academy of Management Review), Michigan State U. (9)
Suzanne Masterson (Journal of Organizational Behavior), U. of Cincinnati (10)
Nancy Rothbard (Organization Science), U. of Pennsylvania (11)
Linn Van Dyne (Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes), Michigan State U. (12)

Break (10:00-10:15 a.m.)

Session 3: Effective Teaching & Supervision (10:15-11:45 a.m.)

Ashleigh Rosette, Duke U., speaker

Round Table Hosts:

Ashleigh Rosette, Duke U. (1)   Marcie LePine, Arizona State U. (7)
John Bingham, Brigham Young U (2)   Olivia A. O'Neill, George Mason U (8)
Mike Crant, U. of Notre Dame (3)   Christine Quinn Trank, Vanderbilt U. (9)
Amir Erez, U. of Florida (4)   Christina Shalley, Georgia Tech (10)
Megan Gerhardt, Miami U. of Ohio (5)   Michael Wesson, Texas A&M (11)
Elaine Hollensbe, U. of Cincinnati (6)

Lunch (11:45 a.m.-1:15 p.m.)

Session 4: Ethics Workshop (1:15-2:15 p.m.)

David Mayer, U. of Michigan, Speaker

Round Table Hosts:

David Mayer, U. of Michigan (1)   Samir Nurmohamed, U. of Penn. (7)
Ethan Burris, U. of Texas – Austin (2)   Olivia A. O'Neill, George Mason U. (8)
Drew Carton, U. of Penn. (3)   Lakshmi Ramarajan, Harvard U. (9)
Jim Detert, Cornell U. (4)   Kristin Smith-Crowe, U. of Utah (10)
Morela Hernandez, U. of Virginia (5)   Steffanie Wilk, Ohio State U. (11)
Jochen Menges, Cambridge U. (6)

Session 5: Brief Comments on Journal Impact (2:15 – 2:30 p.m.)

Suzanne Masterson, U. of Cincinnati, Editor, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*

Break: 2:30 – 2:45 p.m.

Session 6: Special Topics (2:45-3:45 p.m.)

Round Table Hosts:

Erik Dane, Rice U. (1)
Lisa Dragoni, Cornell U. (2)
Jeff Edwards, U of North Carolina (3)
Karen Jansen, Australian National U. (4)
Ronit Kark, Bar-Ilan U. (5)
Marie Mitchell, U. of Georgia (6)

Cheri Ostroff, U. of South Australia (7)
Sharon Parker, U. of Western Australia (8)
Brent Scott, Michigan State U. (9)
Elizabeth Umphress, U. of Washington (10)
David Wagner, U. of Oregon (11)
Steffanie Wilk, Ohio State U. (12)

Concluding Comments (3:45-4:00 p.m.)

Jackie Coyle-Shapiro, London School of Economics, OB Division Chair
Mary Uhl-Bien, Texas Christian University, OB Division Chair-elect

Bonus Session: Life Hacking - Integrating Work with Your Life (4:00-5:00 p.m.)*

Theresa Glomb, U. of Minnesota, Speaker

Panelists:

TaoTao Dong, U. of Connecticut
Brad Kirkman, North Carolina State U.
Beth Livingston, Cornell

AOM ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR DOCTORAL CONSORTIUM

August 7-8, 2015

The 2015 OB Doctoral Consortium will be held August 7 and 8 as part of the pre-conference program at the Academy of Management meetings in Vancouver. The consortium is open to OB doctoral students in the final stages of their programs.

The two-day consortium will begin on Friday afternoon and will continue throughout the day on Saturday - participants must attend both days. The program includes an interesting and energetic mix of presentations, discussions, and interactive sessions designed to launch doctoral students into their academic careers. Faculty presentations and roundtable sessions include topics such as crafting the right academic job, succeeding at research and publishing, preparing for effective teaching, and an ethics workshop, as well as other related topics.

OB is the biggest division in the Academy and in the past few years, we have received more applications that we can accommodate. To keep the faculty-participant ratio to an optimal size, *we will accept only 1 student per program.*

Applicants must meet the following criteria.

1. Be nominated by the program/department. Only one application per program will be accepted (e.g., one from management, one from industrial relations, and/or one from I/O Psychology).
2. Endorsed by the students' academic advisor.
3. *Preference is given to those who have made the most progress toward completing their Ph.D., but have not yet defended their dissertation.* This consortium is for advanced OB students who will be applying for jobs in 2015 to start faculty positions in 2016.

The deadline for receipt of nominations and supporting materials is Friday, March 6, 2015; 5 p.m. Eastern Standard Time (EST).

Schools are encouraged to nominate students in their final year of studies, who are working on their dissertation research, and entering the job market (e.g., in the US, students would typically have defended their dissertation proposal; International students would be writing up their findings and defending their thesis in the near future). For students not at this stage, there is an Academy-sponsored, all-day doctoral consortium for new students (New Doctoral Student Consortium) as well a new half-day "Halfway There" Doctoral Consortium sponsored by the OB Division for students at earlier stages in their programs. There also are a number of consortia offered by other divisions (i.e., HR division).

Please note the OB Doctoral consortium is not open to those who have already completed their Ph.D. degree; new faculty will find the Junior Faculty Consortium more appropriate for their interests.

The consortium begins on Friday, August 7 at 4:00 p.m. and will continue with a full day (8:00 a.m.-5:30 p.m.) on Saturday, August 8. Participants are expected to attend all of the consortium sessions.

Organizational Behavior Doctoral Consortium Nomination Instructions

The Organizational Behavior Doctoral Consortium is designed for students who are in the final year of their doctoral program (i.e., students who are currently on the job market and who have made significant progress on their dissertation/thesis research) and priority will be given to students who have made the most progress toward completing their Ph.D. program, but who have not yet defended their dissertations.

Nomination Requirements: A completed nomination will include four documents:

1. Nominee information (one-page form; see below)
2. The nominee's <u>one page</u> vita/bio in PDF format (longer documents may be rejected). Please name the file with your last name followed by vita (e.g., ShippVita.pdf).
3. The nominee's <u>one page</u> dissertation summary in PDF format (title and abstract is fine; longer summaries may be rejected). Please name the file with your last name followed by dissertation (e.g., ShippDissertation.pdf).
4. Advisor/program chair endorsement (one page form; see below)

The completed nomination should be submitted by the nominating department/school, **via email**, to:

> **Professor Abbie Shipp**
> **a.shipp@tcu.edu**

Application deadline: **Friday, March 6, 2015 (5 p.m. Eastern Standard Time)**

Nominee Information

Student Name:_____

Email:_____

Telephone:_____

Address: _____

University/Program/Dept:_____

Dissertation Title:_____

Dissertation Chair:_____

Please also attach:

1. A <u>one page</u> vita/bio in PDF format (longer documents may be rejected). Please name the file with your last name followed by vita (e.g., ShippVita.pdf).
2. A <u>one page</u> dissertation summary in PDF format (title and abstract is fine; longer summaries may be rejected). Please name the file with your last name followed by dissertation (e.g., ShippDissertation.pdf).

Advisor/Program Chair Endorsement

Student name: _____

Please report on the student's progress:

Completed coursework?

      No _____   Yes _____   NA _____   Date (if yes)   _____

Passed comprehensive exam?

      No _____   Yes _____   NA _____   Date (if yes)   _____

Defended dissertation/thesis proposal?

      No _____   Yes _____   NA _____   Date (if yes)   _____

                          Anticipated date for proposal defense (if no)   _____

Collected dissertation/thesis data?

      No _____   Yes _____   Date (if yes)   _____

On the job market this year (2015), seeking job starting in 2016?

      No _____   Yes _____

Likely date for final dissertation defense?   _____

Please provide a short paragraph in support of this student's nomination for the OBDC:

Nominator Name:_____

Email: _____

Phone:_____

PDW LEAD SPONSORSHIP SUMMARY: 41 submissions finalized/113.5 hours requested (90 hours allocated). 23.5 more hours requested than allocated.

CO-SPONSORSHIP SUMMARY

Total Co-sponsorships allotted: 48
Total Co-sponsorships requested: Unknown until other divisions finish checking in (**93 requests so far**)
   a. Under co-sponsorship system, each division receives a list of sessions that have listed that division as a potential co-sponsor. We can co-sponsor up to 48 PDWs. So far we have received 93 requests. The number may grow as other PDW chairs finalize check ins.
   b. Each co-sponsorship that is accepted costs 1 credit; OB was allocated **48 credits**
   c. Acceptance criteria will follow last year's guideline including where OB fell in the potential co-sponsor rankings and how broad the appeal was.

DISCUSSION POINTS FOR MID YEAR MEETING:

1. We have far more submissions this year and are way over the allocated hours compared to past.
   a. Last year we had 31 finalized submissions requesting 94 hours (we were allocated 88) so we were only 6 hours over the limit.
   b. This year we had 41 finalized submissions requesting 113.5 hours (we were allocated 90) so we are 23.5 hours over the limit (up by 21%).
   c. In the past we were able to reject a few sessions that didn't meet PDW description and request shortening of a few sessions since we were only a few hours over limit.
   d. However, the overage this year will lead us to need to reject many more PDW submissions.
   e. Note: this seems to be a trend. I talked with Marc David Seidel about it and OMT got thirteen more requests this year than last year also with a large discrepancy with hours requested being far higher than their limit.
2. What are the criteria for rejection?
3. Is it OK to ask for PDWs that have overlap to combine?
4. Food is provided only for OB sponsored sessions that are at least 4 hours in length.
5. Request that Essentials of OB precede New Member Networking; any other scheduling issues?

Rule change regarding editors counting if on a PDW is being enforced. Only AOM editors exempt from Rule of 3+3 when participating in a session in their editor role.

The Junior Faculty Workshop is scheduled to take place on Friday evening August 7th (5:00am - 9:00pm) and Saturday, August 8th (8:00am - 5:00pm) followed by the OB reception. A draft of the schedule is included below with a list of Faculty Fellows and editors as far as they have now accepted our invitation. Please understand that this schedule is a draft and the timing of the events may be modified slightly between now and the actual workshop, several names may also need to be added yet to the list of participants.

The junior faculty participants' time commitment for the workshop begins Friday evening around 5:00pm and ends Saturday around 5:00pm. The Faculty Fellows' time commitment for the workshop begins Friday evening around 5:30pm and ends around 2:00pm on Saturday (they do not need to attend the journal editor session or the network/feedback session on Saturday afternoon). The schedule aligns with last year's plan because it worked well. We are continuing the change from last year to reduce the formal commitment on Friday evening to 8:15pm, with informal (casual) networking until 9pm. We would like a bar set up and a free drink ticket for junior faculty and faculty fellows. Last year the drinks were $11.00 and were prohibitive for some to participate.

Participant Networking. The JFW starts with a short icebreaker on Friday evening. Additional time for networking is scheduled at the end of the day on Friday and Saturday.

Welcome Reception/Introductions. The Faculty Fellows will join the participants on Friday around 5:30pm for a reception and introductions.

Faculty Fellow Numbers. We currently have 7 fellows committed to the PDW, and one other "maybe"; so we should be fine even if we have someone cancel. We have asked for 8 tables and it won't be a problem if we have fewer junior faculty per table. We may need to have a backup plan in case last minute conflicts of schedule arrive. It may make sense for next year to NOT include the faculty fellows names on the second day in the AOM submission. It just causes problems. Can we look into this? I did not include the editors' names this year for Saturday.

Participants want more time to mingle with each other and faculty fellows. Ideas on how to incorporate this into the schedule attached?

They want more time to interact with more fellows….maybe there is a way to rotate JF and Fellows more effectively. Ron and I can discuss this

Faculty Panel. Last year, we followed on with the panel format of prior years, which worked well. The three panels followed up by round tables that covered three topics: Conducting High Impact Research, Having Impact as a Teacher and Mentor, and Surviving the Tenure Process and Work-Life Balance. We will have similar panels this year and we will allow time for general questions. Faculty Fellows will each be provided with a lead off question to start the panel. The starter questions are based on prior years and were developed through a survey of the 2011 participants. We should probably do a survey next year of participants to ensure these topics are still current and most important. I'm not sure what has been done this year if anything as far as a survey about these topics.

Editor Round Tables. We have lined up editors/associate editors from *AMJ, ASQ, JAP, JOM, Organization Science, Leadership Quarterly, OBHDP, ORM, AMD, and PPsych* to host a panel and round table discussions. We start off with a general panel and then participants will have the chance to meet with an editor from several different journals. We will do this in rounds ensuring all participants get to interact with multiple editors. Participants want more opps to interact with more editors. Suggestions how we might do this?

Total Number of Participants, Cost, and Selection criteria. We will seek 40 participants at $150 each. The workshop fee has been $150 since 2008. Enrollment was 32 in 2014; 40 in 2012, 41 in 2011, and 38 in 2010. The selection criteria have been discussed over the years. The target audience is participants with at least one year of experience as assistant professors and a maximum of five years out, aiming for a mix of domestic and international scholars. ==How might we get the number back up to 40 this year? Ron and I have posted announcements on the OB and LDRNET listservs, and to all the LQ authors/board members. Other ideas are welcome==.

OB JUNIOR FACULTY WORKSHOP
AGENDA

The Junior Faculty Workshop (JFW) is on Friday evening August 7th (5pm to 9pm) and Saturday, August 8th (8am to 5pm), followed by the general OB reception (INSERT LOCATION HERE).

Your Curators:

Leanne Atwater, University of Houston
Ron Piccolo, Rollins College

Faculty Fellows:

Robin Ely, Harvard University
Keith Murnighan, Northwestern University
Talya Bauer, Portland State University
Susan Ashford, University of Michigan
Phil Podsakoff, University of Florida
Deanne Den Hartog, University of Amsterdam
John Antonakis, University of Lausanne
Dave Hoffman, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill

The following journals will have editors or associate editors represented:

Journal of Management
Academy of Management Review
Leadership Quarterly
Organization Science
Academy of Management Journal
Administrative Science Quarterly
OBHDP
Personnel Psychology
ORM
Academy of Management Discoveries

Friday, August 1, 5:00pm-9pm   **Location: INSERT LOCATION HERE**

5:00-6:00pm   *Welcome, Introductions*

- Participants arrive at 5pm for introductions
- Faculty Fellows arrive at 5:30pm for reception and introductions

6:00-7:00pm   *Dinner & Discussion*

- Topic: How do I develop my research identity?

7:00-8:15pm	*Conducting High Impact Research* **(XXX, YYY, ZZZ)**

- Panel discussion with 3 Faculty Fellows (7:00-7:45pm)
- Round table discussions (7:45-8:15pm)

8:15-9:00pm	*Networking/Cocktails*

Saturday, August 2, 8:00am-5:00pm   **Location: INSERT LOCATION HERE**

8:00-8:30am	*Breakfast*
8:30-9:30am	*Research Group Discussion I*

- Round table discussion with Faculty Fellow about your research papers

9:30-10:45am	*Having Impact as a Teacher and Mentor* **(XXX, YYY, ZZZ)**

- Panel Q&A with 3 Faculty Fellows (9:30-10:15am)
- Round table discussions (10:15-10:45am)

10:45-11:00am *Break*

11:00-12pm	*Research Group Discussion II*

- Round table discussion with Faculty Fellow about your research papers

12:00-12:40pm *Lunch*

12:45-2:00pm	*Thriving in the Tenure Process & Maintaining Balance* **(XXX, YYY, ZZZ)**

- Panel Q&A with 3 Faculty Fellows (12:45-1:30pm)
- Round Table Discussions (1:30-2:00pm)

2:00-2:20pm	*Break*
2:20-4:20pm	*Journal Editors: Discussion & Roundtables*

- Panel discussion and introduction to journals
- Round table discussions with Editors

4:20- 5:00pm	*Networking and Feedback*

<div align="center">

OB JFW To Do List

</div>

October/November   DONE

- *Determine program topics and schedule. We have mostly used the previous year's schedule as a model, and then made changes based on what worked/didn't work so well. At this time, determining the preliminary schedule is also needed, so you can tell faculty fellows not only what role and content but also what timings they are committing to in terms of being present. Minor changes in scheduling are of course not an issue (and most issues might be addressed that way), but if you would prefer to make major changes to the timing/length of the JFW then given that it is a central OB event with a history and a fee, those would need to do be discussed in the OB executive team – a complication is that for the upcoming event any major change in scheduling would need to be decided before the OB midyear meeting . Easier might be to evaluate this coming year whether the current schedule and format still works and fits needs of participants or whether a different format might be better suited in the future (as the setup of the AoM preconference has changed but the format of this session has not).*
- *Invite faculty fellows. The past few years we are noting that people commit to preconference stuff earlier and earlier, so it is a good idea to start early for the faculty fellows as you need a long time commitment from them.*

Example invitation emails and lists of people asked before are available. We have tried to ensure some international participation and gender balance at the fellow level to reflect the division and participants. Be sure to check the rule of 3 for the fellows.

December DONE

- *Get the editors panel in place. They do not have the rule of 3 problem, so can commit to more sessions.*
- *Discuss with the OB PDW Chair how to best submit information for the program and what is needed. This has to be done by the January deadline. It isn't always perfectly clear what has to be submitted and that has been confusing in the past. At the very least you need a basic description of the event, the hours, and the names of presenters (but not an abstract or a 3 page description). The basic description of the event, the hours, anticipated (and maximum) attendance, and names of presenters seem key. In discussing the room size realize that there are also meals served (so large tables needed) and fellows and editors are also there so it should not be too small (if it is a bit larger this also helps catering not to be too obtrusive in changing things for breaks in the back of the room).*

January/Feb DONE

- *Prepare a short report on the upcoming JFW for the midyear Executive Committee meeting (contains schedule and topics, fellows and editors who have committed, nr of available spots for junior faculty). Will be due mid-January, immediately following the PDW submission.*
- *You may get some emails from the OB PDW Chair about schedule conflicts for editors (but remember that the editors do not have the rule of three problem and the pdw chair needs to organize issues if they occur). There may also be some scheduling issues to take into account with the fellows to work out if they also committed to PDWs (the pdw chair can help minimize these by planning their pdw at other times then their jfw commitment if possible).*
- Faculty and Editor Participants can be added or deleted in March as the program goes live.

March/April

- Prepare the call for attending for the junior faculty participants. Have the call posted to the OB website and prepare text for the constant contact message that will be sent out by the OB Division Chair. Who do I contact to do this? You will want to get these out before the PDW registration site goes live in mid-March. You could also post the call on relevant list serves etc several weeks later.
- Be sure to let the OBPDW Chair/Catering Coordinator know if you need any special AV requirements (e.g., flip charts and markers, etc.);   These went into the submission….elsewhere too?
- Include something explicitly in the registration process to check everyone's dietary requirements (vegetarians, allergies). Also make sure to check dietary issues with faculty fellows as they are too are there at meal and break time.
- You need to use the AoM PDW registration website as we are collecting a registration fee and everyone needs to register there and pay. Look for an email from the AoM Registrar (XXX?) about setting up the centralized registration system information (and whether you want a waitlist etc). You will want to have junior faculty register for the sessions in advance, and you will want to control registration by having them need a registration code from you. This will also give you access to the registration site so you can see who has registered and who hasn't by the deadline. We found that XXX can open it again even after closing if need be. Discussion point: some system of acceptances is needed. Either you could wait until all applications are in before making acceptances like the OBDC or have an explicit system of first come first serve that is clear and mentioned in the call (this is in case there are too many applications - this year we let a few extra on, but attendance of the whole conference was down due to location, so nr of applications may be higher next year). A waitlist may be of use, as some people that really almost meet the formal criteria such as being faculty member for a year can be let on if there is room or refused if not. It is a good idea to decide on how to do this beforehand so that can be communicated to applicants. You of course also need confirm receipt of materials of all junior faculty and either immediately or later send out acceptances and registration codes and if needed rejection emails.

May/June/July

- Manage the email flow as the deadline approaches.
- Have an assistant (preferably ;-) create a spreadsheet to capture key information of each applicant to be used in matching them to fellows. It is useful to check it against the list of emails to ensure everyone is listed.
- Once the applications are cut-off, the RA finalizes spreadsheet. Then match the junior and senior faculty in research groups. Send out info packages which outline to fellows and junior faculty members to which research groups they belong and that share all the materials, schedule, and room, research statements etc.
- Provide fellows with more detailed info on what is expected of them and examples of starter questions for the panels (examples from previous years are available).
- Let the Catering Coordinator know the number of attendees for meal planning purposes (and here the dietary info comes in again which is needed early July to meet AoM catering deadline). Make sure to ask for extra tea as that is always gone quickly.
- Request drink tickets from Catering Coordinator as thank you gifts for faculty.

August

- Send out reminder emails to all with time and place.
- Take note cards and printouts of handouts to the session.

After the Consortium

- Send thank you emails and send short report to OB division chair for fall newsletter.
- If this document is of use, update/improve and pass on to next coordinators. ☺

Scott DeRue

Summary

- Committees for conference and publication awards are completely formed.
- Committees for conference awards will receive their papers on Feb 23 and return all evaluations by Mar 16.
- Committee members for publication awards have been assigned their journals; nominated articles due Feb 15; final set of articles to be evaluated and winner selected by Mar 16.
- Hannes Leroy managing OB mentorship award and on schedule to select winner by Mar 16. Received 10 nominations (good quality among nominees).
- Paul managing the two scholarship awards; coordinated with him on committee members.
- Coordinate with Kim on dates for all conference awards.

Key Issues / Questions

- Do we have all sponsors secured? My understanding was that sponsors were outside of my responsibility, so I have not done anything in regards to sponsors. The website lists sponsors as indicated below, but I am not sure if those are confirmed or not and how those sponsorships get paid.

CONFERENCE AWARDS

Best Paper Award
(sponsored by the OB Division)

      Committee: Vijaya Ventakaramani, Daniel Cable, John Matheiu, Jean Bartunek, William Maddux, Sue Ashford, John Hollenbeck

Best Dissertation-based Paper Award
(sponsored by **Wiley-Blackwell** on behalf of the *Journal of Organizational Behavior*)

      Committee: Jennifer Nahrgang, Mo Wang, Lisa Dragoni, Cindy Zapata, Sewon Kim

Best Paper with International Implications
(sponsored by the OB Division)

      Committee: Dong Liu, Daniel Skarlicki, Gilad Chen, Daan Van Knippenberg, Bart de Jong, Riki Takeuchi

Outstanding Practical Implications for Management
(sponsored by the **Mercer Workforce Sciences Institute**)

      Committee: Alicia Grandey, John Wagner, Mark Griffin, Kay Bartol, Joshua Margolis

Most Innovative Student Paper Award
(sponsored by **SAGE Publications**)

      Committee: Mike Mannor, Dave Mayer, Ned Wellman, Spencer Harrison, Don Conlon, Nathan Podsakoff

Best Symposium Award
(sponsored by **Cambridge University Press**)

      Committee: Dave Waldman, Marie Mitchell, Elizabeth Rouse, Brent Scott, David Sluss, Leigh Tost

PUBLICATION AWARDS

<u>Outstanding Publication in OB</u>
(sponsored by **Emerald Group Publishing** on behalf of the *Journal of Managerial Psychology)*

> **Committee**: Ethan Bernstein, Emilio Castilla, Ethan Burris, Jason Colquitt. Jim Detert, Chris Barnes, Sabine Sonnentag, Hui Liao, Stephen Humphrey

<u>Outstanding Practitioner-Oriented Publication in OB</u>
(sponsored by **the Management Education Research Institute [GMAC]**)

> **Committee**: Gretchen Spreitzer, Sim Sitkin, David Day, Rick Guzzo, Dave Hofmann, Gianpiero Petriglieri

Note: if there are any questions during the meeting about committee membership or timelines for a given award, Paul has access to view my Google Sheet where all of the information is stored.

Laura Erskine

The main events that will involve catering and/or audio/visual needs include:

- Junior Faculty Workshop (dinner, cash bar, breakfast, AM break, lunch, PM break, microphones, flip charts)
    - Will OB pay for one drink ticket for each of the participants?
- OB Doctoral Consortium (apps, breakfast, AM break, lunch, PM break, microphones, flip charts)
- OB-sponsored PDWs
    - The Productivity Process
    - Halfway There But Now What
    - Others?
- OB Reception (apps, cash bar, drink tickets)
- Lifetime Achievement Award (full video recording)
- Hot Coffee, Cool People (photo booth, coffee, pastries)
- Any new events that are added in 2015
- Network of Leadership Scholars (apps, cash bar)

Topics to discuss at the mid-year meeting include:

- Sunglasses?
- Scheduling dinner at AOM (on Saturday night again)?
- Appoint a new catering person?

Two statements are included in the appendix for your information. Below, I provide a summary review of our financial situation. The division continues to be in great shape financially. Once AoM credits the allocation, we should have $147,933 in our total operating fund account. Last year at this time (2013) we had $143,348, and in 2012 we had $129,393. Our three primary sources of funds are our division allocation, sponsorships and fees for the annual meeting, and any carry forward (CF).

- The 2015 membership allocation is determined using the July 1, 2014 membership count; this year our count is 6,255 (up exactly 8) and our allocation at $11 per member (unchanged from last year) plus the $500 given contribution is $ 69,305.
- This year we had some delays in collecting some sponsorships, which will need further follow-up. Overall our sponsorship income recorded on the books this year is $13,500. Last year we had $17,794, (but note this included $500 for this year).
- There has been concern about our carry forward (CF) limitations in the past, so I wanted to clarify this issue.
  - Our CF is calculated using this formula: CF = End of year net funds balance (last year's carry forward amount) + 50% of allocation + sponsorship money collected.
  - Therefore, for 2014 we could carry forward no more than $74,132 + $34,609 + $17,794 = $126,535. We are carrying forward approximately $78,628, well within the limit.
  - However, given the spirit of this rule, we should also note that our carry forward amount has increased significantly since its level in 2012. This year, the CF didn't increase as much as it did the last two years, but still did increase $4,497.

Our major expenses are the annual meeting and the midyear meeting.

- The annual meeting food and beverage total for 2014 is slightly below 2013. Total meeting expenditure for 2014 is also slightly below 2013.
- Midyear meeting expense was up for 2014. Note that the 2014 number includes $1,770 for the 2015 meeting (paid as a deposit) but even without that would be relatively high.

Questions/Issues for discussion

- Endowment
  - The endowment, which had traditionally been used to pay the $1,000 Cummings Award, has also been used during 2013 and 2014 to pay for travel expenses to the annual meeting for the necessary attendance of some appointed board members whose schools won't pay for their attendance. This was approved by the EC, but required a special dispensation from AoM.
  - Overall, this decision has resulted in a significant decrease in the endowment balance (as detailed below). Generally speaking, the endowment balance in previous years was simply the previous year's balance, plus interest, minus the award payment, until 2013 and 2014 when these additional payments were also included.
    - Endowment balances at the end of the year:
      - 2008 - $34, 128
      - 2009 - $33,459
      - 2010 - $33,189
      - 2011 - $32,833
      - 2012 - $32,470
      - 2013 - $28,571
      - 2014 - $23,243

Thank you for the privilege of serving with you on the OB Division EC.

Respectfully submitted,

Teresa Rothausen, outgoing OB Division Treasurer

Annual Catering and Other Costs for OB Academy Events

Event	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
OB Doctoral Student Consortium & Reception	$11,849.03	$9,707.89	$11,015.85	$11,678.55	$14,412.22	$15,198.93
Half-way There Consortium/PDW	4,630.71	4,421.53	1,323.90	1,429.50	1,143.28	1,213.53
OB Jr. Faculty Workshop	10,277.16	8,342.13	9,244.28	10,395.08	7,990.20	8,610.04
OB/HR Member Reception	3,422.78	3,800.00	3,818.44	5,381.54		
OB Division Awards Celebration	11,469.87	13,585.85	17,258.00	12,801.02	17,854.96	17,808.29
Joint OB/HR/OMT Jrnl Editor's Panel	602.82					
OB New Member Networking & Research	571.91	533.18			1,158.16	
OB Thank-you Coffee	640.56	428.37				
OB Making Connections Coffee Break	1,691.44	702.25	793.00	1,308.40		
Hot Coffee Cool People					1,264.80	1,704.97
Leadership Reception (NLS)	1,954.15	3,310.06	1,830.00	1,735.00	4,118.00	4,338.48
PDWs (2014: Prod Process)			2,257.00	3,714.60	2,893.59	2,673.49
Misc AV	90.00	1,047.71	995.00	1,862.25		250.73
Subtotal; Academy Managed					50,835.21	51,798.46
SPECIAL ITEMS (not including EC dinner)						
Shipping and things like banners, chocolates, napkins	1,086.63	1,339.97	687.00	652.88	1,239.87	2,132.90
"Staff Expense"					3,605.43	4,328.05
Total Costs	$48,287.06	$47,218.94	$49,222.47	$50,958.82	$55,680.51	$58,259.41
less hotel catering adjustment				-$2,087.26		
				$48,871.56	$55,680.51	$58,259.41
less Revenue: sponsorship, ldrship reimburse, PDW reimb, and participant fees (2013 note, includes NLS sponsorships)	16,950.00	16,060.06	13,150.00	13,400.00	24,123.54	18,860.00
Net Costs	31,337.06	31,158.88	36,072.47	35,471.56	31,556.97	39,399.41

ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR DIVISION
Allocation, Revenue, & Expense Trends

	2002	2003	2004	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
REVENUE							**				
RESERVE BALANCE FORWARD	$21,634.92	$16,145.55	$12,674.51	$32,377.24	$49,293.11	$49,179.48	$48,956.76	$49,480.89	$60,582.73	$74,130.56	$78,627.75
DIVISION ALLOCATION	34,385.00	35,231.00	38,075.00	49,730.00	52,412.00	53,969.00	55,985.00	69,206.00	68,810.00	69,217.00	69,305.00
TOTAL OPERATING FUNDS	$56,019.92	$51,376.55	$50,749.51	$82,107.24	$101,705.11	$103,148.48	$104,941.76	$118,686.89	$129,392.73	$143,347.56	$147,932.75
OTHER REVENUE											
SPONSORHIPS				18,000.00	14,100.00	10,810.06	7,000.00	8,000.00	17,793.54	13,500.00	
JFW / PDW FEES				5,400.00	2,850.00	5,400.00	6,300.00	5,850.00	6,330.00	5,360.00	
MISC				900.00							
TOTAL OTHER REVENUE	1,575.75	0.00	4,170.76	24,300.00	16,950.00	16,210.06	13,300.00	13,850.00	24,123.54	18,860.00	
TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE	57,595.67	51,376.55	54,920.27	106,407.24	118,655.11	119,358.54	118,241.76	132,536.89	153,516.27	162,207.56	
EXPENSE											
ACADEMY CONF - CATERING				38,085.23	48,287.05	47,218.93	49,222.47	48,871.56	50,060.69	47,732.07	
ACADEMY CONF - AWARDS				3,267.36	3,250.84	7,460.60	5,794.50	7,773.87	6,862.78	6,567.90	
ACADEMY CONF - OTHER				3,062.00	2,456.15	2,695.47	2,935.40	3,908.56	5,484.77	6,199.29	
MID-YEAR EC MEETING				11,728.59	14,681.68	13,143.78	9,499.00	11,525.56	14,578.03	19,554.67	
COMMUNICATION				1,772.34	1,049.91	883.00	1,309.50	874.61	974.00	1,868.38	
MISC				198.61	750.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,425.44	1,657.50	
TOTAL EXPENSE	(21,450.12)	(38,685.86)	(43,958.45)	(58,114.13)	(70,475.63)	(71,401.78)	(68,760.87)	(72,954.16)	(79,385.71)	(83,579.81)	
Endowment Adjustment*				1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00		1,000.00			
NET FUNDS	$36,145.55	$12,690.69	$10,961.82	$49,293.11	$49,179.48	$48,956.76	$49,480.89	$60,582.73	$74,130.56	$78,627.75	
							**				
ENDOWMENT FUND BALANCE				$34,128	$33,459	$33,189	$32,833	$31,833	$28,011.28	23,243.45	

* The lifetime achievement award comes from the OB Endowment fund. During 2013 and 2014 we also paid some special expeses from the endowment. In those years when it is initially paid from the operating funds an adjustment is made to "replenish" the operating acct.
** The Academy posted $2,886.98 of 2011 transactions in 2010. Thus, their '10 & '11 balances and transactions amounts are different than these Finan. Statements. 2011 end bal. is same.

Academy Allocation:											
Membership					5,768	5,941	6,165	6,246	6,210	6,247	6,255
$ per member					$9.00	$9.00	$9.00	$11.00	$11.00	11.00	11.00
					51,912.00	53,469.00	55,485.00	68,706.00	68,310.00	68,717.00	68,805.00
Plus lump sum					500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00
TOTAL ALLOCATION					$52,412.00	$53,969.00	$55,985.00	$69,206.00	$68,810.00	$69,217.00	$69,305.00

OB Student Representative Proposal
Abbie Shipp

(On agenda for Saturday afternoon visioning discussion)

Should OB have a Student Representative? The following is from RMNet: Call for Student Representative

The Research Methods Division is soliciting nominations for two student representatives.

Student representatives are non-voting members of the Research Methods Division Executive Board. The intent of having student representatives is to gain assistance with managing RM Division matters, but also to expand the reach of the RM Division to help and represent the interests of student members.

Specifically, the formal responsibilities of student representatives are as follows:
1. Assist the PDW Chairperson with support of the PDW program both before and at the annual Academy meeting.
   - Promote the RM Division during the PDW program.
2. Assist with the RMD Doctoral consortium.
3. Represent student interests to the Executive Committee.
   - Present the Student Representative report at the Executive Committee Meeting at the annual Academy meeting.
4. Chair a committee of student RMD members. The committee's goal is to achieve increased awareness of and membership in the Division amongst student members of the Academy.
   - Create and manage outreach efforts to student members of the Academy.
   - Promote the RM Division to students.
5. Other general board duties as needed.

The selection guidelines for student representatives are as follows:

1. The individual must have completed a minimum of 1 year of doctoral studies.
2. The individual must NOT be graduating in the following year.
3. The person serves a minimum of 2 years, and a maximum of 3 years.
4. The RM Division has the desire not to have more than one student from a single university, and also to represent the broad interests of the division. We thus specifically seek students from a diversity of schools, from around the world, with qualitative and/or quantitative interests, and who study micro, meso, and/or macro topics.

The selection process is as follows:
1. Nominations are welcome from any Research Methods Division member, including student members.
2. Self-nominations are acceptable.
3. Nominations should be accompanied by a vita and a one page letter from the student outlining qualifications for the position.
4. Nomination should include or be accompanied by a recommendation from a faculty member describing the student's qualification for the position.
5. Student representatives will be selected by the voting members of the Research Methods Division executive committee.

Because the student representatives are expected to be available for the AOM conference, and particularly for the entire time of the PDW sessions, the position has a $650 stipend to assist with these expenses.

Please send nominations to me, at mcs5@cornell.edu. Nominations and materials are due by September 26.

Thank you for your membership and support of the Research Methods Division.
Sincerely, Michael Sturman, Past Division Chair

Plans for 2015 for OB Tech Team:

- ✓ Recruit webmaster → complete (Todd Weber)
- Get all information on website updated (see below)
- Document processes on "biz ops" for team
- Reinitiate podcasts/videocasts

Website updates requiring Exec Committee assistance:

About the OB Division

- Need a general review of the pages here, including:
    - Directory of journals up to date?
    - Any revisions in bylaws since 2008?
    - Meeting minutes - January 2014 (and 2015, once produced)
    - Meeting minutes - August meetings? (2010, 2012, 2013, 2014)
    - Revision needed for five-year report?

Committees

- Review and amend as needed (non-elected positions?)

Awards

- Need information/develop pages for Service Awards and Best Reviewer Awards
- Update awards pages with 2014 winners for all categories
- Need video of 2013 and 2014 Cummings award presentations

FAQ

- Review and amend as needed

Restructure of OB Executive Committee Roles

Roles

- Reps at Large will no longer coordinate Doctoral Consortium (DC) and Junior Faculty Workshop (JFW)
- Reps at Large will take on new in their first 2 years on EC
- DC and JFW will each be coordinated by 2 co-chairs, who will be appointed by EC
- EC will develop a list of potential chairs for DC and JFW at midyear meeting
- DC and JFW co-chairs must be OB members
- DC and JFW co-chairs will serve 2 years. In year 1, they will serve as junior coordinator shadowing the senior coordinator. In year 2, they will serve as senior coordinator
- Past OB chair (year 5 in track) will be responsible for contacting new DC and JFW chairs after midyear meeting to solicit agreement
- Past OB chair will serve as liaison between DC and JFW chairs and EC

Timeline for Transition

2014-2015
Rep at Large roles remain the same
Past Chair (and EC) begins finalizing new initiatives
Midyear meeting – develop list of potential chairs for DC and JFW. Past Chair contacts.
One chair each for DC and JFW will be appointed (junior chair).

2015-2016
1st year Rep at Large begins working on new initiatives
2nd year Rep at Large coordinates DC or JFW as senior chair, working with newly appointed Non-EC chair
3rd year Rep at Large coordinates PDWs or Award Committees
Past Chair helps organize new initiatives for Reps
1st year DC and JFW chairs (junior chair) begin, working with appropriate Rep at Large
Midyear meeting – develop list to appoint next junior DC and JFW chairs.

2016-2017 – Transition complete
1st year Rep at Large new initiatives
2nd year Rep at Large continues with new initiatives
3rd year Rep at Large coordinates PDWs or Award Committees
Past Chair serves as liaison for DC and JFW chairs
1st year DC and JFW chairs begin as junior chair
2nd year DC and JFW chairs continue as senior chair
Midyear meeting – develop list to appoint next junior DC and JFW chairs

New Initiatives

Determining new initiatives will occur during midyear meeting. Some new initiatives may take place over several years, and continue as new Reps come on board and old Reps cycle off. Other new initiatives may be shorter term, finished in one year, and another initiative started in the second year as Rep.

EC will need to determine the first 2 new initiatives to start by Aug 2015.

Initiatives raised at 2014 midyear meeting:

1. OB Presence at international conferences (e.g., EAWOP, EGOS)
2. Cross Division Partnering (e.g. with HR on international events)
3. Fund scholarships to AoM from emerging economies
4. Internationalization of the Division (outreach initiatives)
5. Enhancing research-practice partnerships (e.g., partnering with PhDs in the practitioner community)
6. Policy Issues (e.g., employment policies) The economists exert significant influence over policy decisions and should OB have a greater voice in policy issues? Could OB partner with other divisions to pursue this?
7. Visibility of OB Division within media outlets and impact of OB more generally
8. More material on website (e.g. teaching materials)
9. Ethics (publishing, research methods, etc)
10. Symposia/PDWs that should be included at AoM (e.g. Where is OB going?)

Another possibility: An OB Buzz online publication, loosely based on the idea of TIP from SIOP. Could have sections with perspectives from around the world. For example, Phd Training with 3 articles from around the world. A current topic with 3 perspectives from researchers in 3 different countries. Meet a researcher, with 3 people from 3 different countries. Hot topics, etc.

Chair Track 2014-2015
Yr 1 Symposium chair
Yr 2 Program chair
Yr 3 Minutes; LAA and Cummings
Yr 4 Chair
Yr 5 General mentor/resource; Work on ideas for new initiatives to pursue; Liaison for IC

Chair Track 2015-2016

Yr 1 Symposium chair
Yr 2 Program chair
Yr 3 Minutes; LAA and Cummings
Yr 4 Chair
Yr 5 General mentor/resource; Help organize new initiatives for 1st year Reps; Liaison for IC

Chair Track 2016-2017

Yr 1 Symposium chair
Yr 2 Program chair
Yr 3 Minutes; LAA and Cummings
Yr 4 Chair
Yr 5 General mentor/resource; Liaison for DC, JFW, IC

*Note that year 3 was purposely left light as recovery after program chair year

Rep Track 2014-2015

Yr 1 DC junior person	Yr 1 JFW junior person
Yr 2 DC senior person	Yr 2 JFW senior person
Yr 3 PDW chair	Yr 3 Awards

Rep Track 2015-2016

Yr 1 New initiatives	Yr 1 New initiatives
Yr 2 DC senior person	Yr 2 JFW senior person
Yr 3 PDW chair	Yr 3 Awards

(Non-EC chairs begin as junior DC and JFW, working with the respective Rep)

Rep Track 2016-2017

Yr 1 New initiatives	Yr 1 New initiatives
Yr 2 New initiatives	Yr 2 New initiatives
Yr 3 PDW chair	Yr 3 Awards

(New Non-EC begin as junior DC and JFW chairs, working with the prior year DC or JFW person who is now the senior chair)

Issues for discussion

1. **Connection & Involvement**
   61% of members agree or strongly agree that Division provides good opportunities to get involved but only 43% believe that they are part of the Division and activities; 59% wish they were more involved.
   2009-2014
   54% ->61% of members agree or strongly agree that Division provides good opportunities to get involved
   54%-> 59% wish they were more involved.

2. **Volunteering**

   69% of respondents reported that they have never volunteered (71% in 2009)

3. **OB Program**

   70% satisfied and above with traditional paper sessions and 69% for symposia. 42% satisfied or higher with plenaries (note 48% reported N/A to this question)
   70% satisfied and above with overall access to participation on the program (84% in 2009)
   73% agree and above that the Division's overall program at Academy is interesting and useful to me (96% in 2009)
   37% reported reviewers offered useful feedback (45% neutral)
   37% reported that the Division needs more of an international focus (43% neutral)
   TLC Conference – 56% did not know about it and 5% attended

4. **Programs, Services and Leadership**
   % satisfied
   42% foster good relations with other divs/interest groups
   47% opportunities (outside AoM) to network/collaborate
   47% encouragement from div leaders to form network communities
   42% responsiveness of div officers to member concerns
   47% ability to become leaders in division
   47% opportunities to influence the division

   Comparison to 2009 (9/12 questions received 70% or higher in 2009 compared to 3/12 in 2014)

   % agree or higher
   Greater focus on real world problems and practitioner issues (53%)
   OB Division addresses needs of international members (36%)
   OB Website – source of useful information (40%)
   Size as strength (49%)
   Size as weakness (25%)

5. **General satisfaction**

   68% disagreed with "it seems that other divisions/interest groups have more to offer their members". 87% disagreed in 2009

78% at least satisfied with membership of Division, 19% somewhat satisfied and 3% not satisfied. 86% satisfied in 2009

6. **Open ended questions:**
   Top 5 likes about Division: 1. Community and involvement 2. Quality of OB AoM program 3. Relevance of topics of research 4. Access to latest research 5. Networking opportunities

   Top 5 least likes: 1. Limited sense of community due to size 2. Lack of awareness of how to become involved 3.OB program could be improved 4. Focus on US centric 5. Inclusion barriers for non US members, lesser known schools and individuals

   What does the division need to do to best position itself for the future?
   Top 5 themes: 1. Relevance to practitioners and real world impact 2. Improve communication and member engagement 3. Broaden international profile 4. Cross division collaboration 5. Create smaller groups and community

   What issues should occupy the division's attention over next 5 years?
   1. New topics and diverse methods
   2. Practical application value and collaboration with practitioners
   3. Drive culture of inclusion
   4. Internationalization and global focus
   5. Member development and support

   What can the division do tomorrow?

   1. Communicate and advocate
   2. Practitioner collaboration
   3. Program improvements
   4. Inclusion
   5. Division structure & focus

   How could division improve its use of technology?

   1. Specific social media tools (website, Facebook, twitter)
   2. Changes unnecessary
   3. Connecting members with members

   Any other comments

   1. Thank you to Division
   2. Improve AoM program
   3. Help members get involved

How have we done since 2009? What are future priorities for the Division over the next 5 years?
1. Continue to build our sense of community
2. Increase identification and involvement of members
3. Create greater linkages to our international members
4. Improve a sense of inclusiveness of different member types
5. Further bridge the gap between research and practice

APPENDIX A
REGRESSION OF OVERALL OB DIVISION MEMBERSHIP SATISFACTION ON FACET SATISFACTION COMPONENTS

FACET SATISFACTION COMPONENTS	b	se		t	p
CONNECTION	0.22	0.03	0.29	7.22	0.00
COMMUNICATION	0.18	0.03	0.24	7.18	0.00
INVOLVEMENT	-0.01	0.02	-0.02	-0.59	0.56
PROGRAM	0.09	0.02	0.13	4.53	0.00

$R^2 = .30$

CORRELATIONS OF FACET SATISFACTION WITH OVERALL OB DIVISION MEMBERSHIP SATISFACTION

FACET SATISFACTION COMPONENTS	N	MIN	MAX	MEAN	STD	COR
CONNECTION	1324	0	5	2.28	1.17	0.50
COMMUNICATION	1321	0	5	2.69	1.17	0.47
INVOLVEMENT	1313	0	5	2.16	1.39	0.39
PROGRAM	1452	0	5	2.45	1.33	0.37

FACET SATISFACTION ITEMS WITHIN EACH COMPONENT

CONNECTION	N	MIN	MAX	MEAN	STD	COR
Sense of community within the division	1368	0	5	2.48	1.32	0.53
Encouragement from division leaders to form network communities for members like me	1352	0	5	2.17	1.44	0.42
Efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions/interest groups	1354	0	5	2.47	1.49	0.42
Opportunities outside of the annual meeting to network/collaborate with peers	1354	0	5	2.23	1.41	0.41
Welcoming of members from various demographic groups	1359	0	5	2.55	1.55	0.41
Efforts to reach out to international members	1359	0	5	2.23	1.58	0.35
Opportunities for members like me to receive mentoring	1348	0	5	1.85	1.47	0.33

COMMUNICATION	N	MIN	MAX	MEAN	STD	COR
Level of communication received from the division	1350	0	5	2.91	1.26	0.46
Usefulness of website	1349	0	5	2.51	1.51	0.38
Quality of newsletter	1349	0	5	2.69	1.44	0.35

	N	MIN	MAX	MEAN	STD	COR
Value of listservs	1344	0	5	2.66	1.72	0.31

INVOLVEMENT	N	MIN	MAX	MEAN	STD	COR
Opportunities to influence the division	1344	0	5	2.01	1.60	0.36
Selection process for awards and recognition	1342	0	5	2.32	1.75	0.34
Fair and open elections	1351	0	5	2.89	1.73	0.33
Ability of interested members to become leaders in the division	1345	0	5	1.94	1.67	0.32
Responsiveness of division officers to member concerns	1342	0	5	1.65	1.78	0.26

PROGRAM	N	MIN	MAX	MEAN	STD	COR
Overall access to participation on the program	1517	0	5	2.84	1.60	0.41
Social and networking opportunities	1523	0	5	2.65	1.65	0.38
Traditional paper sessions	1522	0	5	2.78	1.53	0.35
Symposia	1516	0	5	2.73	1.76	0.30
Discussion Paper sessions	1520	0	5	2.46	1.65	0.26
Professional Development Workshops (PDWs)	1522	0	5	2.49	1.83	0.25
Cross-Divisional Paper Sessions	1512	0	5	2.03	1.77	0.20
Plenaries	1511	0	5	1.69	1.75	0.15