RRBM Responsible Research in Business & Management

A Full Report of the First Global Responsible Research Summit

Toward a Responsible and Sustainable Research Ecosystem in Business and Management
June 30—July 1, 2019
Hosted by Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands

Report released on January 10, 2020

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

On the evening of June 30 and July 1, 2019, at the Rotterdam School of Management, The Netherlands, internal stakeholders came together to chart a new path toward RRBM Vision 2030 when business and management research are a true inspiration for business practices that will contribute to economically, socially, and environmentally sustainable societies.

This report is a documentation of the RRS2019 Summit. It serves as the event proceedings and compiles information from the group discussions in an unbiased manner with the intent that it can be used as a resource or reference for special purpose actions.[1] We hope this report will inspire and support others to begin their own internal dialogue about responsible research within their individual communities.

Over the course of the Summit, ten groups tackled Responsible Research from every perspective. This included both the aspirational and high-level issues, and the granular, thornier issues. Two sessions focused on challenges and aspirations with specific ideas to address them (see Tables 1 and 2). Two other sessions focused on solutions, concentrated on actionable ideas, that can be considered by stakeholder groups: deans, senior scholars, journal editors, association and accreditation leaders (See Tables 3 and 4).

- Table 1 (from Discussion Session 1) delineates 'Contributing to a Better World Through Research'. A few concrete ideas to address current challenges include:
    - Updating the promotion system to reward individuals for work on impactful problems;
    - Aligning journal criteria to match societal needs;
    - Creating grants and awards;
    - Working with press, editors, social media, and blogs;
    - Encouraging AACSB to adopt a different definition of what it means to be an 'active faculty member';
    - Creating dedicated editors and reviewer pools who support impact criteria;
    - Educating and mentoring young scholars to conduct responsible research; and
    - How to collaborate among multiple stakeholders in the research ecosystem.

- Table 2 (from Discussion Session 2) outlines 'Visioning Business Research in 2030' – some common visions on the nature and impact of responsible research by 2030 include:
    - Increase visibility of research to different stakeholders;
    - Provide new paths to recognize by society in some way, e.g., such as the demonstrated impact on society/business outcomes;
    - Employ more diverse quantitative and qualitative measures of research impact;
    - Qualify research that has been used in policies or practice;
    - Involve stakeholders in setting criteria for research success;
    - Reward professors for trying new avenues and for their entire portfolio;
    - Develop an evaluation system that measures the entire professor's portfolio, e.g., blogs, podcasts, working with journalists, working with business and nonprofits; and
    - Devise new, more inclusive, metrics to measure research impact that are more inclusive.

- Table 3 (from Discussion Session 3) focuses on 'Measuring Progress in Responsible Research' – major common suggestions include:
    - Determining the readership of the research (policymaker, educator, nonprofit, consultant, politician);

---

[1] Full agenda of the day: https://rrbm.network/taking-action/events/responsible-research-summit-2019/rrs2019-agenda/

- o Employing alternative metrics beyond the typical count metrics, such as:
  - Using the RRBM 7 Principles as a tool to measure responsible research;
  - Social media metrics;
  - SSRN downloads by top 10 financial institutions;
  - Inclusion in doctoral syllabi;
  - Case writing and case adoption; and
  - Awards.
  - o Incorporating Artificial Intelligence to capture new measures of impact;
  - o Using a badge as a stamp of approval of an article showing responsible research; and
  - o Involving review boards in societal/practical ratings.

- Table 4 (from Discussion Session 4) outlines 'Navigating the Transition Toward Responsible Research' – a few frequently mentioned recommendations include:
  - o Joining forces internally and externally;
  - o Spreading the word through conferences/meetings;
  - o Creating responsible research impact awards;
  - o Collaborating with journals to create issues on responsible research;
  - o Implementing pilot programs;
  - o Creating a badge to rate an article on responsible research;
  - o Using the RRBM 7 Principles as a tool to measure responsible research;
  - o Spreading the word through conferences/meetings to involve practitioners and executives; and
  - o Teaching Ph.D. students what impactful research is.

The Summit ended with an empowering 'I Will' session as evidenced by the following comments:
- "The 'I Will' session was extraordinary—never seen anything like this. The whole event exceeded my expectations."
- "The Summit was inspirational, and we walked away with 'I WILL' statements that provided evidence of a highly committed group."
- "RRS2019 exceeded my expectations; the pacing and interaction and design was excellent; I felt every session added value and built meaningfully toward a coherent understanding of challenges and opportunities."

The 'I Will' statements contain specific, concrete actions that members are committed to achieve within their own individual spheres of influence. These actions fall largely into the following categories:
- Introducing journal policies and special issues emphasizing societal impact of research;
- Adding societal impact assessment in tenure and promotion decisions;
- Allocating substantial resources to support Responsible Research;
- Training doctoral students in Responsible Research;
- Revisiting accreditation standards; and
- Developing Responsible Research awards.

The 2019 Summit ended with many actionable ideas, and participants left with their personal commitments, but it was not an end in itself. We will share our progress and continue to broaden our outreach to external stakeholders in the 2020 Summit at Imperial College Business School, London.

Anne Tsui, Wilfred Mijnhardt, and Pursey Heugens, Co-chairs
and the 2019 Responsible Research Summit Organizing Committee

Welcome Letter to the 2019 Responsible Research Summit

First Global
Responsible Research Summit

Toward a Responsible and Sustainable Research
Ecosystem in Business and Management

VISION 2030

June 30-July 1, 2019
Rotterdam, The Netherlands

RRBM

SPONSORS   RSM Erasmus   ERiM Erasmus Research Institute of Management   EFMD   AACSB   RRBM Responsible Research in Business & Management

We extend a warm welcome to this first Global Responsible Research Summit. We have an excellent group of 63 delegates (senior scholars, deans, journal editors, university and association leaders) across five disciplines, 46 institutions, thirteen countries, and four continents. In this Summit, we are charting a new path toward vision 2030 when business and management research will truly be the inspiration for business practices that will contribute to economically, socially, and environmentally sustainable societies.

All the important changes in history were due to the foresight and untiring efforts of a few caring citizens who saw the need for a new social order. We are such a group because we have a common vision that a change in our research ecosystem is critically needed. The status quo of adhering to the problems and theories of the twentieth century no longer serves the needs of business and society in the 21st century. We seize the opportunity to start this transformation by investing our research talents and resources towards addressing the grand challenges of the 21st century. We have the obligation, through our research and teaching, to create positive societal impact, advancing the prosperity of all stakeholders of for-profit businesses, non-profit, and government organizations.

This transformation will not be easy, but with our collective will and wisdom, we will be triumphant!!! Let us roll up our sleeves and make this Summit a watershed event, to pave the foundation for a seismic change in business and management research for the common good.

We are deeply grateful for your participation in this first Global Responsible Research Summit: Toward a responsible and sustainable research ecosystem in business and management.

Anne Tsui   Pursey Heugens   Wilfred Mijnhardt
on behalf of the First Global Responsible Research Organizing Committee

Objectives and Expected Outcomes

The following table gives a summary of the objectives and valuation of the results.

Objectives of the summit	Result
1. Reach a joint consensus on the "what" of Responsible Research and commitment to change towards the anticipated future scenario (Vision 2030 in the position paper), demonstrated via a collective plan to advance credible and useful knowledge, aiming to transition the business into a force for positive change in the world.	Very positive collective dedication reached during the summit.
2. Understand how Responsible Research relates to current themes of the "responsible turn in academia" movement, mostly focused on the "how" in research: e.g., Open Science, Open Access publishing, open data, transparency, and replication requirements.	The bridge between the What and How of Responsible research was built, but the full impact of the relationship will be an important theme for the RRBM roadmap.
3. Define opportunities and roles to contribute to responsible research for internal stakeholders of the Responsible Research Ecosystem (schools, journals, associations, and senior scholars).	Delegates have formulated many important and useful ideas and initiatives for internal stakeholders to take home and start the transition.
4. Identify and explore responsible research metrics that could be used by schools, journals, and associations to measure short-term progress in responsible research and long-term success, e.g., a positive impact on business practices and societal benefits.	Positive start but will be a concurrent theme for the RRBM roadmap.
5. Discuss pilot schemes to advance responsible research at schools and journals with support from associations, senior scholars, and accreditation agencies.	Needs more collective development work based on the foundation laid during the Summit.
6. Share personal commitments to support the Responsible Research movement.	Very strong signal from all delegates via their collective 'I WILL' statements.

The objectives were largely achieved, as can be deduced from the richness of the ideas and suggestions delivered throughout the day. Only Objective 5 was not fully achieved in terms of formal pilot schemes, but the seeds were planted in the individual commitments made at the end of the Summit. Collective efforts are underway in several areas.

Day 1

Opening Session: Invitation to an Amazing Journey

Session Facilitator: Jerry Davis, University of Michigan
Session Co-facilitator: Pursey Heugens, Rotterdam School of Management
Welcome Speaker: Rutger Engels, Rector Magnificus, Erasmus University Rotterdam

This was a "meet and greet" and warm-up session. Participants were asked to introduce themselves, explain their expectations for the Summit, and what they wanted to contribute to the Summit.

The event occurred in the Museum for Architecture, Design and Digital Culture to allow for open discussions about research ecosystems and the advancement of the prosperity of all stakeholders: for-profit businesses, nonprofit, and government organizations.

The museum provided an inspirational setting as it is recognized as a world leader in ecological design; no structure exists in isolation, akin to the RRBM mission to create an ecosystem of business and management research—To work together with stakeholders to create actionable knowledge that inspires business and society to create a better world.

The night ended on a positive note with motivating sharing before everyone retired to prepare for the next day.

Day 2

Introduction Session: Gathering Momentum for Action

Session Facilitator: Ruth Bolton, Arizona State University

Participants gathered in the conference room at the Rotterdam School of Management early on the first day of July. Ruth Bolton asked the participants to share their takeaways or thoughts from the previous evening. The participants were then advised of the expected outcomes from their participation in the RRS2019.

 To include:
- <u>What </u>is Responsible Research?
- <u>How</u> to achieve our goals?
- <u>Who</u> will execute these activities?
- <u>When</u>?

The day was organized into four main sessions, a themed lunch, moving forward, and ending with a closing dinner:

- **Session 1**: Contributing to a Better World through our Research
- **Session 2**: Visioning Business Research in 2030
  Lunch Session: Responsible Research Exemplars
- **Session 3**: Measuring Progress in Responsible Research
- **Session 4**: Navigating the Transition toward Responsible Research (including the Apex of the Summit: Writing and Sharing of the 'I Will' Statements)
- **Moving Forward**: Gathering and Advancing
- **Closing Dinner**: The Promises and Challenges of Academic-Practitioner Collaboration in Knowledge Co-creation and Impact-Driven Business Research

The participants were separated into ten discussion groups. The morning session, Sessions 1 and 2, consisted of a diversity of leadership with varying backgrounds to create ten mixed discussion groups. The afternoon session, Sessions 3 and 4, consisted of ten specific stakeholder groups, each made up of one of the following: Association and University Leaders, Deans, Editors, and Senior Scholars. The ten discussion groups, in both the morning and afternoon sessions, were provided with the participation guidelines and assigned a Ph.D. student/Assistant professor to take notes on the ensuing discussion.

The PPT files and the program booklet for the Summit can be found on the RRS2019 webpage of the RRBM website. [2]

Session 1: Contributing to a Better World through Our Research

Session Facilitator: David Reibstein, The Wharton School
Session Co-facilitator: Patricia Dechow, University of Southern California

The overarching theme for Session 1 was to concentrate on contributing to a better world through research. David Reibstein gave a brief introduction to the challenges of business research to include the grand challenges in our societies, high economic costs of research, and the moral dilemma facing scholars today; research incentives that do not match societal needs. The participants were separated into ten mixed discussion groups. Each group was to address three questions surrounding the topic:

- What are the opportunities for change?
- What are the anticipated barriers or resistance points?
- What are ideas to overcome the strongest resistance, both big ideas and small wins?

Each of the ten groups discussed the three questions. They were asked to identify the two most innovative ideas for each question and present them to all ten groups. These ideas, along with the notes in the group discussion were collected, sorted and analyzed to determine themes/solutions/comments found in each group. Table 1 is a compilation of the information combining those presented by the groups to all delegates in the main plaza, as well as the notes

---

[2] https://rrbm.network/taking-action/events/responsible-research-summit-2019/rrs2019-presentations/

that were taken from the small group discussion sessions. The major points from Table 1 are presented at the end of the table.

Table 1: *Ideas from the Discussion Groups of Session 1 Contributing to a Better World through our Research*

Question 1: What are the opportunities for change?	Question 2: What are the anticipated barriers or resistance points?	Question 3: What are some ideas to overcome the strongest resistance?
Internal Drivers for Change: • Faculty search for meaning/purpose. • We can CHOOSE to do responsible research since we ARE the research and WE control the research supply chain. • Pilot practices from leading journals in business can serve as illustrations and motivators. • General changes (students and younger scholars are motivated and feel responsible for creating a better world). • Faculty have the expertise to support change. • Globalization of academia supports change. *External Drivers for Change:* • Societal expectations. • Good examples can be found in other disciplines, e.g., medicine and hard sciences. • Disrupters such as technology and accreditation standards demand change. • Financial pressures from donors, standards, etc., for what will be supported. • Accrediting agencies emphasis is shifting • Stakeholders support research on grand challenges. • Pressure on teaching to deliver value. • Refer to the generational change; the top 3 topics that concern the Millennials are Climate Change, Global Conflict, and Poverty. • Recognize applied research more. • AACSB to adopt a different definition of what it means to be an active faculty. *Potential Actions/Avenues for Change:* • Online conference/MOOCS to bring young scholars together with stakeholders.	*Internal Barriers/Resistance Points:* • Institutional Rewards/ Incentives/Structures: Faculty have always been cloistered and independent. • Practical matters (incentives, promotion) for junior faculty. • Entrenched Promotion & Tenure/evaluation standards • How do we socialize faculty/doctoral and MBA students? • Who evaluates relevance; what are the measures/ metrics? • Tension between novel vs. original research. • Editorial Review Boards – inertia and resistance. • Journal criteria are not currently aligned with societal needs. *Inertia:* • Fear of change. • Change represents a challenge to identity. • Maturity of fields breeds rigidity. • Faculty themselves are barriers/obstacles: • Need to retool – the investment of time/fear of change. • Why change when successful in the current system? *External Barriers/Resistance Points:* • Business understanding of research. • Who evaluates relevance?	*System Changes:* • Include societal vision statements for P&T. • Work within the system to bring about change: • Special Issues of journals • P&T systems • Funding for responsible research • Outcomes/metrics/incentives need to change. • Learn from first-movers and influencers. • Change promotion systems to encourage individuals to work on impact problems. • Shift the cartels (top-ranked schools). *Socialization of Scholars:* • Courses • Mentoring *Collaboration with Stakeholders:* • Visits and dialogue • Global Responsible Research Institute • Advisory boards *Evaluation Criteria that Reflect Impact:* • Make the case for flexible criteria (schools, faculty). • Need dedicated editors and reviewer pool who support impact criteria. *Make the Case for Change – bottom-up:* • Change agents vs. change observers.

• Grants/Awards and other forms of incentives and recognition of responsible research. • Collaboration with multiple stakeholders • Take advantage of new channels to reach new external audiences. • Create a national/international organization for responsible research OR each school develops a Global Responsible Institute (offer awards, grants). • Work with press, editors, social media, and blogs. • Demand change in tenure requirements. • Promote interdisciplinary research.	• Translational challenges. • Need to change the incentives for tenure and promotion to include the societal impact. • Need to try and create some way to measure (determine) impact. • The average business person, politician, nonprofit do not read journals – how do we change that?	• Treat failure as a learning experience to encourage change. • Find the leverage points for influencers. • Individuals visibly model behavior and advocate change. • Membership to RRBM for academics to demonstrate a "quality seal."

During Session 1, it was noted that the top three concerns of the Millennials today are climate change, global conflict, and poverty; they demand a better world and this has created an opportune time to move the RRBM's Vision 2030—when societal relevance will be a defining feature of business research—forward. The discussion groups were aware that this is an opportunity to act now; to create a culture of responsible and impactful research, but they were also realistic.

They were/are fully cognizant of the barriers entrenched in academia to include: fear, rigidity, tension, inadequate/incorrect incentives, and outdated accreditation standards, to name a few (see Question 2, Table 1 for more detail). Yet, even with this realistic assessment, the discussion groups believed change is possible, as evidenced by the tremendous responses noted in Table 1 to the first question, *What are the opportunities for change*? They, as individuals, could begin to take concrete action in their individual sphere of influence (see Question 3, Table 1 for details).

Session 1 discussions are summarized by the following major ideas for change:

- Updating the promotion systems to encourage individuals to work on impactful problems;
- Aligning journal criteria to match societal needs;
- Offer grants and awards;
- Work with press, editors, social media, and blogs;
- AACSB to adopt a different definition of what it means to be an active faculty;
- Creating dedicated editors and reviewer pools who support impact criteria;
- Educating and mentoring of young scholars on responsible research; and
- Collaboration among multiple stakeholders in the research ecosystem.

Session 2: Visioning Business Research in 2030

Session Facilitator: Anne S. Tsui, University of Notre Dame
Session Co-facilitator: Maurizio Zollo, Imperial College, London

The overarching theme for Session 2 was to concentrate on the vision of business research in 2030. Anne Tsui and Maurizio Zollo gave a brief introduction, followed by the viewing of a video providing visual images of research in business schools in the year 2030—when research is solving many pressing problems such as food and water shortage, sustainable consumption, education, creating resilient and responsible financial systems. The ten mixed discussion groups addressed three questions surrounding the topic:

- What type of research is being published in your school, in your journal, or discussed in the conferences?
- How are scholarly contributions being measured and rewarded?
- What kind of research is being celebrated?

Each group was asked to identify the two most innovative ideas for each question and present them to all ten groups. These ideas, along with the notes in the small group discussion, were collected, sorted, and analyzed to determine major themes. Table 2 is a compilation of this information.

Table 2: *Ideas from the Discussion Groups of Session 2 Visioning Business Research in 2030*

Question 1: What type of research is being published in your school, in your journal, or discussed in conferences?	Question 2: How are scholarly contributions being measured and rewarded?	Question 3: What kind of research is being celebrated?
Stakeholders Are Involved in Research: • Stakeholders fund our research, attend our conferences, and pose topics for research. • Stakeholders demand impact. • Stakeholders clamor for our research findings. • More field collaborative research. • Co-created research is valued. • Portfolio of research at school and field level blends various types of research. *Research that Makes Significant Contributions to Business and Society:* • Less incremental research. • Readable across disciplines. • Transparent and independent. • Potential to be transformative. • Fundamental research with long-term implications.	*For Individuals:* • Use of impact narratives, including stakeholder input. • Repeat business with stakeholders. • Research-driven by practical and theoretical gaps. • Employ more diverse quantitative and qualitative measures of research impact. • Recognize grants and gifts (like engineering/sciences). • Reward individuals for trying new avenues. • Report on impact/contributions to challenges presented in the research. • Value a broader set of measures: well-being (society, individuals), employee engagement, AI.	*Demonstrated Impact on Society/Business:* • Research that has been used e.g., "research in use." • Research that has been communicated, with - impact, outside of the original journal publication, including global outreach. • Research that has been recognized by society in some way. • Research that has a demonstrated impact on society/business outcomes and "make a difference." • Time to impact. *Involving Multiple Stakeholders and/or Disciplines:*

• Research is forward-looking. *Shift in Focus and Process of Research:* • Research is transdisciplinary / interdisciplinary. • Research has implications for policy. • Research to solve world challenges and "wicked problems." • Framing the right question. • Intervention research. • Methods and conceptual frameworks follow the phenomenon. • Research that addresses real problems today. • Research considers multiple alternatives and include competition among theories. • Conferences to focus on problems. • Role of Business Schools could be to integrate findings from multiple perspectives. • Journal of the Big Picture.	• Reward professor for their entire portfolio. • Count impact using a matrix but need to be careful because "wrong" matrices can induce "wrong" behavior. • Citations are important but so is visibility. *For Research/Specific Publications:* • Research clearinghouse with ratings/evaluations (trip advisor model). • Breadth of audiences • Transparency • Include multiple stakeholders • Multiple stakeholder feedback • Involve stakeholders in setting criteria for research success. • Move beyond citations to include visibility of research, blending views of multiple stakeholders.	• Collaborative and cross-disciplinary research. • Celebrate use and impact on multiple stakeholders (diversity of opinions). *Research that Demonstrates a Corpus of Research (beyond individual papers), Including Nonacademic Impact on Society:* • Managers read books, not journals. Need to create reports, social media to measure impact. • Measure impact using podcasts, blogs, working with journalists, the entire professor portfolio.

Session 2 discussion groups began with a discussion about their vision of the type of research being published in journals or at conferences in 2030 and then discussed how research must shift in focus, and process, to get to this vision, to include: research becoming more transdisciplinary/interdisciplinary (more collaborative); research solving real-world challenges and "wicked problems"; and research looking forward into the future.

The discussion groups clearly envisioned a very different research ecosystem by 2030. Their visions of the future are shown in the many detailed reflections (see Question 1, Table 2). To get to the vision, the groups then discussed the new practice(s) and ways of how scholarly contributions will be measured and rewarded in 2030 (see Questions 2 and 3, Table 2).

To summarize the major ideas in Session 2, the groups called for a movement beyond citations to include:

- Increased visibility of research to different stakeholders;
- Research recognized by society in some way, e.g., demonstrated impact on society/business outcomes;
- Employ more diverse quantitative and qualitative measures of research impact;
- Research that has been used in policies or practice;
- Involve stakeholders in setting criteria for research success;
- Reward professors for trying new avenues and for their entire portfolio;
- A revised evaluation system that measures the entire professor's portfolio, e.g., blogs, podcasts, working with journalists, working with business and nonprofits; and
- New metrics measuring research impact that are more inclusive.

Lunch Session: Responsible Research Exemplars

Session Facilitator: Wilfred Mijnhardt, Rotterdam School of Management
Session Co-facilitator: Jean-Alexis Spitz, EFMD

As the participants convened for lunch, Ulrich Hommel, representing EFMD and Stephanie Bryant, representing AACSB, each gave a short statement about the commitment of their respective organizations to RRBM. Then, each of the five scholars representing the five major disciplines within business schools gave a 5-minute talk about a particular project or a program of research that exemplifies the Seven Principles of Responsible Research. Their PPT slides can be found on the RRS2019 webpage. The five Responsible Research Presentations were given by:

> Leonard Berry, Texas A&M University
> Jeffrey Hales, The University of Texas at Austin
> Jennifer Howard-Grenville, University of Cambridge
> Marcin Kacperczyk, Imperial College, London
> Beril Toktay, The Georgia Institute of Technology

Session 3: Measuring Progress in Responsible Research

Session Facilitator: Richard Lyons, University of California, Berkeley
Session Co-facilitator: Tony Travaglione, University of Newcastle Australia

The overarching theme for Session 3 was to concentrate on Measuring Progress in Responsible Research. Richard Lyons gave a brief presentation on the importance of having the right metrics to measure both short-term and long-term impacts of research. The participants were separated into stakeholder groups (Association and University Leaders, Deans, Editors, and Senior Scholars). Each group addressed two questions surrounding the topic:

- Responsible research metrics: What are the 3-5 best metrics already in use? What could be developed over the short term, e.g., 1-2 years, and what would that development take?
- Societal impact metrics: Thinking longer term, what kinds of metrics can we imagine becoming feasible by, say, 2030, and what dimensions of wider societal impact are among the most important under-covered ones?

After discussion, each group identified the two most innovative ideas for each question and presented them to all ten groups. These ideas, along with the notes in the small group discussion were collected, sorted and analyzed to determine major themes. Table 3 is a compilation of the main ideas that emerged from the discussions of the four stakeholder groups, for each question.

Table 3: *Ideas from the Discussion Groups of Session 3 Measuring Progress in Responsible Research*

Question 1: Responsible research metrics: What are the 3-5 best metrics already in use? What could be developed over the short term, e.g., 1-2 years, and what would that development take?	Question 2: Societal impact metrics: Thinking longer term, what kinds of metrics can we imagine becoming feasible by, say, 2030, and what dimensions of wider societal impact are among the most important under-covered ones?
ASSOCIATION AND UNIVERSITY LEADERS *Expand to Include Non-Quantitative Measure of Impact:* • Researchers' qualitative statements based on RRBM principles. • Who cites and how utilized (for responsible research or practice). • External ratings and rewards, funding, etc. • Impact badge for articles. • Include impact on promotions. • External validators of impact (e.g., as in the UK, New Zealand). • Evaluate schools based on overall contribution to relevance and Sustainable Development Goals. *Employ Alternative Quantitative Metrics, Currently Available (beyond typical citation count metrics):* • Signals, e.g., count of awards and badges as examples. • Citations (who cites, where, etc.). • Look to the nonprofits for thoughts on how to measure impact; nonprofits follow how many people read an article (it is not a citation). *Develop an Impact Template:* • Work with third parties to develop new, relevant metrics / impact template. • Make the RRBM 7 Principles into a matrix but do not use numbers / use statements. • Map what is being done in non-business disciplines and other countries.	**ASSOCIATION AND UNIVERSITY LEADERS** *AI Solutions/Metrics:* • AI-enabled solution that automates the process of determining the impact (extent, depth, areas of impact). • AI-based impact metrics (based on RRBM principles). *Awards and Other Indicators:* • A simple count of awards, grants, projects, behavior change. • Awards and recognition by professional associations involving practitioners. • RR-ROI (long term) – acceptability of multiple indicators. • RRBM to provide awards/incentives to develop metrics and best practices. • Revamp criteria for impact at individual institutions.
DEANS *RR Metrics Already in Use:* • Google Scholar, journalists, the conversation includes alternative metric attention. • Expand to Include Non-Quantitative Measure of Impact: • Repeat business – e.g., companies using our services again. • Invitations to speak at professional conferences, teaching and consulting, shape people's ideas and need to be recognized as impactful. • Include who is downloading the research work (government, nonprofit, teacher.....). • Include research appearing in textbooks, government and think tank policy papers. • Case writing and case adoption. • Inclusion in doctoral syllabi.	**DEANS** *AI Solutions/Metrics:* • Google to publish algorithm, readership, journal quality. • AI used to evaluate relevance/impact. • Responsible research badges. • AI used to track downloads by government, nonprofit, teachers..... • AI to track research appearing in textbooks, government and think tank policy papers. *Awards and Other Indicators:* • Credit rating index idea. • KPI tied to a specific agenda, stakeholders, challenges, etc.

- Service to industry (consulting, executive teaching, service on boards). *Employ Alternative Quantitative Metrics, Currently Available:* - Alternative metrics, e.g., semantic scholar. - SSRN downloads by top 10 financial institutions. - Social media metrics.	- Impact case study for each faculty member. - Government policy integration. - Translation/translator index. - Spotlight measures like Google Scholar citations to policy papers, legal cases. - Dashboard of stakeholder metrics. - Practitioner reviews of journal articles pre-publication.
EDITORS *RR Metrics Already in Use:* - Subjective, holistic - Quality/Quantity of publications - Indicators of trajectory - Reviewers assess the potential impact of submissions. *Expand to Include Non-Quantitative Measure of Impact:* - Publications in practitioner journals, attendance at conferences. - Translation of research – global influence. - Involve review boards in societal/practical ratings. - Impact assessment outside of academia. - Executive feedback on research questions/summaries. - Use of research in teaching/blogs. - Question asked – Is it better to influence one thought leader or 100 thought followers? – so perhaps the answer is to give a higher score for where a paper is cited (e.g., government document, other scholars). - Include the number of paper downloads. - Assess the impact of research across disciplines. - Assess the impact on SDG, well being.	**EDITORS** *AI Solutions/Metrics:* - AI-based impact metrics (based on RRBM principles). - Collaborate with Google on new metrics. *Awards and Other Indicators:* - Social network creation/formation. - Genealogy of ideas leading to impact. - Tracking impact around SDGs and practices. - Create a scorecard to help researchers begin their research that they interpret/use as they see fit – create resources and leave it up to the scholar to decide what is/is not acceptable. - Track influence of research across languages. - Evidence of exposure of research to practice. - Research questions to be vetted by external audiences (e.g., executives).
SENIOR SCHOLARS *Expand to Include Non-Quantitative Measure of Impact:* - Researchers' qualitative statements based on RRBM principles. - Question asked – Is it better to influence one thought leader or 100 thought followers? – so perhaps the answer is to give a higher score for where a paper is cited (e.g., government document, other scholars). - Measure both qualitative and quantitative. - Journals ask scholars to write on their use of the RRBM 7 Principles in their research. - Look to the UK for best/current practices. - Develop a framework based on the 7 Principles for assessing schools and individuals. - Evaluate portfolio of work, including multiple outlets for a single idea. - Have letter writers assess based on the 7 Principles. *Employ Alternative Quantitative Metrics, Currently Available (beyond typical citation count metrics):* - Find a way to see if teachers use the research.	**SENIOR SCHOLARS** *AI Solutions/Metrics:* - AI used to evaluate relevance/impact *Awards and Other Indicators:* - Convert the 7 Principles to metrics/index. - Need to decide how to incorporate social media; need to decide how to measure blogs, citations, downloads, podcasts, books, teachers using research – perhaps weight them and give a higher weight to 'who' is using the information (e.g., scholar, government, student, etc.). - Include business and government leaders as sources for tenure letters. - Focus on how research has changed practice or policy.

• Look at nonprofit organization measures of impact (e.g., Impact Story). • Employ measures of readership or usage by policymakers, consultants, and companies.	

Session 3 expanded the discussion of Responsible Research metrics. The groups began to discuss the current metrics in use, e.g., Google Scholar, indicators of trajectory and quality/quantity of publications, and then turned to alternative measures that could be used. All stakeholder discussion groups supported the employment of alternative metrics beyond the current citation counts and called for artificial intelligence to create new algorithms to calculate impact. Further, a call for new impact awards to those engaging in responsible research was made.

It was clear from Table 3 there was a consensus by all the stakeholder discussion groups in Session 3 that a new set of standards was necessary to incentivize more responsible research.

To summarize the major ideas in Session 3, the stakeholder groups suggested the following improvements and innovations for metrics that would assess societal impact:

- Determining the readership of the research (policymaker, educator, nonprofit, consultant, politician).

- Employing alternative metrics beyond the typical count metrics, such as:
  o Using the RRBM 7 Principles as a tool to measure responsible research.
  o Social media metrics.
  o SSRN downloads by top 10 financial institutions.
  o Inclusion in doctoral syllabi.
  o Case writing and case adoption.
  o Incorporating AI to capture new measures of impact.
  o A Badge, stamp of approval, rating an article on responsible research.
  o Involving review boards in societal/practical ratings; and
  o Awards.

Session 4: Navigating the Transition toward Responsible Research

Session Facilitator: Michael Toffel, Harvard Business School
Session Co-facilitator: Zhixue Zhang, Peking University
Speaker: Pursey Heugens, Rotterdam School of Management

The overarching theme for Session 4 concentrated on navigating the transition toward Responsible Research. Pursey Heugens shared how the Rotterdam School of Management successfully made the transition from a low research institution to a productive school in terms of top journal publications. He then explained how Rotterdam embarked on the transition to research with a societal impact, providing examples of successful projects in different disciplines.

The participants were separated into their stakeholder discussion groups (Association and University Leaders, Deans, Editors, and Senior Scholars) and asked to consider what they could do to transition toward Responsible Research.
Each group addressed two questions surrounding the topic:
- What ideas can we try (pilot) for my stakeholder group (journals, schools, associations and accreditations, senior scholars), focusing on "What I, as a dean/editor, etc., can do?
- What approaches or methods can we use to introduce the pilot idea to my stakeholder group (faculty for schools, editorial board for journals, association leadership team, senior scholars)?

Unlike the previous three sessions, the stakeholders did not report back to the large group. Thus, Table 4 represents an analysis of the notes provided by the note-takers of the stakeholder groups. It was clear a consensus that transition toward responsible research was possible.

Table 4: *Ideas from the Discussion Groups of Session 4 Navigating the Transition toward Responsible Research*

Question 1: What ideas can we try (pilot) for my stakeholder group (journals, schools, associations and accreditations, senior scholars), focusing on "What I, as a dean/editor, etc., can do?	Question 2: What approaches or methods can we use to introduce the pilot idea to my stakeholder group (faculty for schools, editorial board for journals, association leadership team, senior scholars)?
ASSOCIATION AND UNIVERSITY LEADERS *Create Awards:* • Impactful research receives awards and grants. • Best practice award vs. best society award. • Give money. *Ph.D. Students:* • Fund Ph.D. students to do impactful research. • Target next generation of students. • Encourage interdisciplinary work. • Communicate new RRBM standards widely. • Put pressure on disciplinary journals, especially those sponsored by the association.	**ASSOCIATION AND UNIVERSITY LEADERS** *Spread the Word through Conferences/"Meetings" to Involve Practitioners and Executives:* • Create a once a year event for faculty to meet executives. • Attend practitioner conferences to create awareness of the research initiative. • Take advantage of the current momentum. • Widely communicate RR criteria and make cases/examples accessible. *Concentrate on Doctoral Students:* • Implement pilot ideas at doctoral consortiums
DEANS *Create Incentives:* • Responsible research badges to articles published in A-Journals and then expand to other journals. • Give money to RRBM-consistent work. • Encourage collaborative (with external groups) work. • Attract scholars who care about society and not only their own careers – have scholars write an impact statement on their CV. • Use accreditation to motivate people/use as a lever of change. *Measure Impact:*	**DEANS** *Join Forces:* • Deans form a collective unit and become allies. • Attract more local businesses, corporations, and other organizations. • Remember "we control the whole supply chain, so all we need to do is change it." *Implement a Pilot Program:*

• Impact can include journals, books, reports, anything with societal impact. • Faculty report on the impact on CVs. *Ph.D. Students:* • Teach what impactful research is.	• Be the first mover of change and make history; leave a legacy. • Implement something small or big – just do it! • Extra bonus in accreditation for RRBM schools.
EDITORS *Editors "Change" Requirements:* • As editors, we can encourage more elaboration on the practical relevance of the search, ask for at least a paragraph. • Create an advisory board, including external stakeholders for journals. • Executives/government provide Initial review of submissions. • Develop a multi-disciplinary group of scholars to deliver a Ph.D. seminar on RRBM. *Create Awards:* • Impactful research receives awards. *Measure Impact:* • RRBM become a credentialing unit along with editors. • Top journals to devote 20% of space to relevant research	**EDITORS** *Spread the Word through Conferences/"Meetings" to Involve Practitioners and Executives:* • Create a once a year event for faculty to meet executives. • Attend practitioner conferences to create awareness of the research initiative. • Give a stage for RR presentations at conferences, and include practitioners. *Join Forces:* • Collaboration of journals, special issues. *Credentialing:* • Build a set of rigor criteria.
SENIOR SCHOLARS *Measure Impact:* • Use the RRBM 7 Principles to evaluate research. *Ph.D. Students:* • Teach Ph.D. students and young scholars what impactful research is. *Spread the Word through Conferences/"Meetings" to Involve Practitioners and Executives:* • Put executives in touch with scholars. • Invite executives to conferences. • Engage department chairs in defining RR for their department. • Create a practitioner guide for articles.	**SENIOR SCHOLARS** *Join Forces:* • Collaboration of journals, special issues. • Organize tenured faculty at your school, across disciplines. *Concentrate on Doctoral Students:* • Ph.D. education could be focused more on current world problems and how to do relevant research. • Educate Ph.D. students on RRBM principles early in their programs. *Credentialing:* • Create a responsible research badge.

The summary of major points and potential actions raised by the stakeholder groups in Session 4 includes:

- Joining forces internally and externally;
- Spreading the word through conferences/meetings;
- Creating responsible research impact awards;
- Collaboration of journals; special issues on responsible research;
- Implementation of pilot programs;
- Creating a badge to rate an article on responsible research;
- Using the RRBM 7 Principles as a tool to measure responsible research;
- Spreading the word through conferences/meetings to involve practitioners and executives; and
- Concentrate on Ph.D. students—teaching Ph.D. students what impactful research is.

The Apex of the Summit: Writing and Sharing of the 'I Will' Statements

As aforementioned, rather than sharing the two most innovative ideas to the ten groups in Session 4, the stakeholder groups reconvened in the classroom. The facilitator, Mike Toffel, asked all the participants to think about one action they each could take to advance Responsible Research. The discussions throughout the day during the previous three sessions provided many possible ideas.

On a piece of pre-printed paper, with the participant's name and photo, each person was asked to complete the sentence that begins with 'I Will.' After everyone had written their personal statement, each was asked to read it aloud. Mike Toffel was the first to read his statement. He invited the first person in row one to continue, then the second person, then the second row, and finally the last person in the last row.

The Ph.D. student assistants collected the sheets from the participants and placed them on the poster boards used for presentations of summary points throughout the day. The participants gathered in front of the poster boards that held the 62 'I Will' statements in preparation for the Reflection Panel. The theme of this Panel was Gathering and Advancing. The full list of the powerful and action-oriented 'I Will' statements (with identifiers removed) can be found on the RRBM's RRS2019 website: https://rrbm.network/taking-action/events/responsible-research-summit-2019/i-will/

Moving Forward: Gathering and Advancing

Session Facilitator: William (Bill) Glick, Rice University
Session Co-facilitator: Jerry Davis, University of Michigan
Reflection Panel Members:
Caryn Beck-Dudley, Santa Clara University
Robert Bloomfield, Cornell University
Eli Jones, Texas A&M University
Qiao Liu, Peking University
Kjell Nyborg, University of Zurich
Linda Price, University of Oregon
Thomas Robertson, The Wharton School
Luk Van Wassenhove, INSEAD

A panel of eight participants gathered to reflect on the Summit, and on how to advance RRBM Vision 2030. The facilitator, Bill Glick, and co-facilitator, Jerry David, asked the panel to reflect on the following questions from the past two days and invited the other participants to react and to contribute:
- What are your two key takeaways?
- What are the next steps for people in your role before the next Summit?
- How can we as a community, support each other?

The entire panel agreed there had to be a change in the institutional culture if the upcoming junior faculty was going to be able to engage in responsible research, and this will require a clear set of steps and actions to be enunciated immediately by all those present. Change was not possible without a cohesive and collective effort to change the incentive system.

Decisively all members concentrated their responses around the following topics:
- Metrics
- Journal practices
- Faculty review process
- Resources and incentive system
- Community/sharing/inclusive
- Accountability

First, a task force would need to develop metrics that would assist researchers in tailoring responsible research into their work portfolio. Second, the journal editors would need to add engaging and practical matters as a criterion to the journals. Third, the business schools would need to change their incentive structures to ensure that responsible research is rewarded. Clearly, no one step could be taken without the other.

Next, it was agreed that the current community must be willing to hold each other accountable by remaining in contact with one another to follow-up on the progress of their individual personal commitments before Summit 2020. It was also agreed that the community needed to expand the consortium for change to include the voices of junior faculty, women, minorities, executives, labor, government, and businesses. The community should also consider institutionalizing RRBM to serve as the mechanism to reach out, plan, and coordinate worldwide

activities for the growing consortium of members to infuse RRBM principles into all business and management research.

Closing Dinner: The Promises and Challenges of Academic-Practitioner Collaboration in Knowledge Co-creation and Impact-Driven Business Research

Session Facilitator: Maurizio Zollo, Imperial College, London
Fireside Speaker: Andre Van Heemstra, Former Global Head of HR at Unilever, Current Chair of the Supervisory Board of Leiden Asia Centre

The closing dinner centered around the promises and challenges of academic-practitioner collaboration in knowledge co-creation and impact-driven business research and how the upcoming 2020 Summit at Imperial College, London, could address this question.

Feedback on the Summit

A week after the Summit, the participants were invited to provide feedback on the Summit. The feedback was inspiring and thought-provoking. A few suggestions on logistics and meeting structure were also provided.

- *Inspiring*:
  - "It was a really inspiring and great conference."
  - "The short talks by relevant researchers at lunch, that was very impressive."
  - "The Summit was inspirational, and we walked away with 'I WILL' statements that provided evidence of a highly committed group."
  - "RRS2019 exceeded my expectations; the pacing and interaction and design was excellent; I felt every session added value and built meaningfully toward a coherent understanding of challenges and opportunities."

- *Thought-Provoking* (what RRBM should do going forward):
  - Determine a way to infuse RRBM principles into ALL business and management research;
  - Establish a RRBM clearinghouse to match researchers and companies;
  - RRBM to create its own journal;
  - RRBM to engage in more social media and Ted Talks;
  - RRBM to open the venue up to more businesses and practitioners;
  - RRBM to provide conferences;
  - RRBM to take on a developmental role to help scholars identify important issues, how to theorize about them, and how to deal with methodological challenges that arise;
  - RRBM to collaborate with other, similar groups, such as HIBAR and NBS;

- o Invigorate commitment and sustain motivation by following up on progress on 'I Will' statements;
- o Broaden global involvement in future Summits;
- o Consider creating task forces to address specific initiatives and/or stakeholder groups;
- o Broaden the audience for future Summits and initiatives to include businesses, government, nonprofits, etc.

- • *Logistics*
  - o "Overall, the event was extremely well run and organized; impressive."
  - o "Liked the compact 1 ½ day format."
  - o "A larger room would be nice, but definitely worked in the smaller space."
  - o "Consider more large-group discussions with perhaps fewer small group breakouts."
  - o "End with 'I Will' statements—this was the high point; the panel was great but could go first."
  - o "Social for final dinner rather than additional content."

The RRBM Board would like to thank all the participants for their insightful feedback that is now under consideration.

Next Steps

The 2019 Summit met its objectives, and participants left with their personal commitments: the inspirational and motivational 'I Will' statements to put into action. However, this is not an end in itself; it is only the beginning of a process. It is an encouraging step, but much more will be necessary to change the research ecosystem. We will share our progress and continue to broaden our outreach to external stakeholders.

A well-defined and unequivocal set of actions was set into motion.

The next Summit will be in June 2020 at Imperial College Business School, London. We will focus on external stakeholders of the research ecosystem, such as funders and business and society representatives, a critical and necessary step to realize the RRBM Vision 2030—when societal relevance is a defining feature of business research.

List of Delegates Participating in the Summit[3]

First Name	Last Name	Title	Affiliation	Discipline	Country
Franklin	Allen	Professor	Imperial College	Finance	United Kingdom
Peter	Bamberger	Professor	Tel Aviv University	Management	Israel
Sudipta	Basu	Professor	Temple University	Accounting	United States
Caryn	Beck-Dudley	Dean	Santa Clara University	Management	United States
Leonard	Berry	Distinguished Professor of Marketing	Texas A&M University	Marketing	United States
Robert	Bloomfield	Professor	Cornell SC Johnson College of Business	Accounting	United States
Ruth	Bolton	Professor	Arizona State University	Marketing	United States
Mike	Brady	The Bob Sasser Professor of Marketing and Chair	Florida State University	Marketing	United States
Stephanie	Bryant	Executive Vice President & Chief Accreditation Officer	AACSB International	Accounting	United States
Yubo	Chen	Senior Associate Dean	Tsinghua University	Marketing	China
Joep	Cornelissen	Professor of Management Corporate Communication Centre	Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University	Communications	The Netherlands
Henrik	Cronqvist	Vice Dean for Faculty and Research	University of Miami	Finance	United States
Jerry	Davis	Associate Dean	University of Michigan, Ross School of Business	Management	United States
Patricia	Dechow	Professor	University of Southern California	Accounting	United States
Charles	Dhanaraj	Professor	Temple University, Fox School of Business	Management	United States
Christopher	Earley	Dean	University of Technology Sydney	Management	Australia
Rutger	Engels	Rector Magnificus	Erasmus University Rotterdam	Management	The Netherlands
Robin	Gauld	Pro-Vice-Chancellor and Dean	University of Otago	Management	New Zealand
Cristina	Gibson	Dean's Distinguished Professor of Management	Pepperdine University	Management	United States
William H.	Glick	Former Dean & H. Joe Nelson III Professor of Management	Rice University	Management	United States
Jeffrey	Hales	Professor	Georgia Tech	Accounting	United States
Pursey	Heugens	Scientific Director ERIM / Dean of Research RSM	Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University	Management	The Netherlands
Andrew	Hoffman	Professor	University of Michigan, Ross School of Business	Management	United States
Ulrich	Hommel	Director of Business School Development	EFMD Global Network	Finance	Switzerland
Mark	Houston	Eunice & James L. West Chair in Marketing	Texas Christian University	Marketing	United States
Jennifer	Howard-Grenville	Diageo Professor of Organisation Studies	University of Cambridge	Management	United Kingdom
Ananth	Iyer	Susan Butler Chair in Operations Management Senior Associate Dean	Krannert School of Management	Operations	United States
Eli	Jones	Dean and Professor	Texas A&M University	Marketing	United States
Marcin	Kacperczyk	Professor	Imperial College London	Finance	United Kingdom
Ajay	Kohli	Gary T. and Elizabeth R. Jones Chair	Georgia Technology University	Marketing	United States
Dan	LeClair	CEO	GBSN	Economics	United States

---

[3] For delegates bio's visit the RRBM website: https://rrbm.network/taking-action/events/responsible-research-summit-2019/rrsp2019/

Qiao	Liu	Dean	Guanghua School of Management, Peking University	Finance	China
Xiong Wen	Lu	Dean	School of Management, Fudan University	Marketing	China
Richard	Lyons	Professor and former Dean	UC Berkeley Center for Executive Education, Hass School of Business	Finance	United States
Wilfred	Mijnhardt	Policy Director RSM	Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University	Management	The Netherlands
Kjell	Nyborg	Professor	University of Zürich	Finance	Switzerland
A.	Parasuraman	Professor & Holder of the James W. McLamore Chair	University of Miami	Marketing	United States
Nicholas	Petruzzi	Professor of Supply Chain Management	Pennsylvania State University	Operations	United States
Linda	Price	Philip H. Knight Chair Professor of Marketing	University of Oregon	Marketing	United States
Stefano	Puntoni	Professor of Marketing	Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University	Marketing	The Netherlands
Dave	Reibstein	The William S. Woodside Professor of Marketing	University of Pennsylvania, The Wharton School	Marketing	United States
Taco	Reus	Senior Associate Editor Journal of Management	Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University	Management	The Netherlands
Joan Enric	Ricart	Professor	IESE Business School	Management	Spain
Thomas	Robertson	Former Dean	University of Pennsylvania, The Wharton School	Marketing	United States
Marc-David	Seidel	RBC Financial Group Professor of Entrepreneurship	University of British Columbia	Management	Canada
Enno	Siemsen	Associate Dean for MBA and Masters Programs	University of Wisconsin	Operations	United States
Richard	Sloan	Accounting Circle Professor	University of Southern California	Accounting	United States
Mark	Smith	Dean of Faculty	Grenoble Ecole de Management	Management	France
Jean-Alexis	Spitz	Coordinator	EFMD	Management	Belgium
David	Stewart	President's Professor Of Marketing and Business Law	Loyola University Maryland	Marketing	United States
Mike	Toffel	Professor	Harvard Business School	Operations	United States
Beril	Toktay	Professor of Operations Management and Brady Family Chairholder	The Georgia Institute of Technology	Operations	United States
Tony	Travaglione	Executive Dean & Pro-Vice Chancellor, Faculty of Business and Law	The University of Newcastle	Management	Australia
Anne	Tsui	Distinguished Professor of Management	University of Notre Dame	Management	United States
Luk	Van Wassenhove	Professor	INSEAD	Operations	France
Jiang	Wei	Dean	School of Management, Zhejiang University	Management	China
Frank	Wijen	Associate Professor of Strategic Management	Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University	Management	The Netherlands
Patti	Williams	Ira A. Lipman Associate Professor	University of Pennsylvania, The Wharton School	Marketing	United States
Matthew	Woods	Director of Operations	EFMD	Management	Belgium
Sibel	Yamak	Professor	Wolverhampton University	Management	United Kingdom
Zhixue	Zhang	President-elect	International Association for Chinese Management Research	Management	China
Maurizio	Zollo	Professor	Imperial College	Management	United Kingdom

Committees

Academic Organizing Committee
Franklin Allen, Professor of Finance and Economics, Imperial College London, UK **Mary Jo Bitner**, Professor Emeritus of Marketing, Arizona State University, USA **Jerry Davis**, Associate Dean of Business+Impact, University of Michigan, USA **Bill Glick**, H. Joe Nelson III Professor of Management, Rice University, USA ***Pursey Heugens**, Dean of Research at Rotterdam School of Management, Scientific Director ERIM, Erasmus University, the Netherlands **Peter McKiernan**, Professor of Management, University of Strathclyde Glasgow, UK ***Wilfred Mijnhardt**, Policy Director, Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University, the Netherlands **David Reibstein**, Professor of Marketing, The Wharton School of Business, USA **Jean-Alexis Spitz**, Coordinator for the RRBM project, EFMD, Belgium **Michael Toffel**, Professor of Environmental Management, Harvard Business School, USA **Tony Travaglione**, Pro-Vice-Chancellor of Business and Law, the University of Newcastle, Australia ***Anne Tsui**, Distinguished Adjunct Professor of Management, University of Notre Dame, USA **Zhi-Xue Zhang**, Professor of Organization and Strategic Management, Peking University, China **Maurizio Zollo**, Professor of Strategy and Sustainability, Imperial College, London, UK * Co-Chairs of the Academic Organizing Committee

Local Organizing Committee	Discussion Session Note Takers
Pursey Heugens, Professor, Dean of Research and Scientific Director ERIM **Wilfred Mijnhardt**, Policy Director **Natalija Gersak**, Director of Research Development and Support **Carolien Heintjes**, Management Assistant **Patricia de Wilde-Mes**, Management Assistant **Krista Schellevis**, Communications Officer **Tineke van der Vhee**, Executive Assistant ERIM	**Alina Andrei**, Ph.D. Student **Radina Blagoeva**, Ph.D. Student **Shara Darr**, Ph.D. Student **Evgenia Dolgova**, Ph.D. Student **Corrina Frey**, Assistant Professor **Nabila Hisbaron**, Marketing Executive RSM **Mingqi Li**, Ph.D. Student **Wenjie Liu**, Ph.D. Student **Riccardo Valboni**, Ph.D. Student **Erik Waltre**, Ph.D. Student

RRBM offers a special thanks to the Rotterdam School of Management for hosting the event, and to EFMD and AACSB for their sponsorships.

Thanks to Mary Jo Bitner, Wilfred Mijnhardt, Alexia Shonteff, and Anne S. Tsui, for their contribution to the preparation of this report.

Post Summit Reports on the Summit and a Word-Cloud

The following articles/blogs are published reporting on the results of the Summit:

RSM Hosts the First Global Responsible Research Summit
https://www.rsm.nl/about-rsm/news/detail/14776-rsm-hosts-the-first-global-responsible-research-summit/

RSM Hosts the First Global Responsible Research Summit
https://blog.efmdglobal.org/2019/08/06/rsm-hosts-the-first-global-responsible-research-summit/

Responsible Research Summit 2019 Brief Report
https://rrbm.network/taking-action/events/responsible-research-summit-2019/

A New Era for Research, BizEd magazine, November issue 2019
https://bized.aacsb.edu/articles/2019/november/a-new-era-for-business-research

The following Word-Cloud was derived from the content of this Report.