



Steering Committee Meeting

Nantes, May 26, 2009

Present: József Berács, George Avlonitis, Udo Wagner,
Hubert Gatignon, Gary Lilien, Sönke Albers, Nina Payen

Apologies: Gabriele Troilo

AGENDA

1. 2nd Journal,
2. EMAC awards

MINUTES OF MEETING

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss some of the issues, mainly EMAC award and the 2nd Journal that were to be presented and discussed at the Executive Committee meeting.

Gary Lilien started the meeting by recommending to always schedule an 'ad-hoc- Steering Committee before the Executive Committee meeting in May as it is more relevant to discuss the main issues that are to be presented and discussed at the Executive Committee meeting. This was approved.

1. EMAC Awards

George reported on the EMAC Distinguished Marketer Award.

Estimated budget

He presented an estimated budget, with the 2 following options:

- either to limit the budget to a Plaque and a dinner
- or to extend the budget to include conference fee, travel and accommodation (budget estimation can be found in the attachment)

The following ideas were explored:

- keep the dinner to a small group – in order to limit the budget
- instead of a dinner, host a cocktail reception – which can be an 'off-budget' item. The institution of the awardee can sponsor the reception.
- Ask Elsevier to sponsor the award (3.000 Euros) - as they indicated that they were interested in this award.

Award Committee

The jury committee can be similar to the IJRM editor search committee.

The chair should be some distinguished academic, who has a 'status' in the field. Example a past IJRM editor; it could/should be a non-EMAC member.

It was decided that the Steering Committee would take on the task of identifying a chair. It was proposed to ask the Dean of Fellows. However this would mean that the EMAC fellows would not be able to participate for the award.

It was finally agreed that the Steering Committee would ask the Dean to propose 2 names (outside EMAC). George would ask Berend Wierenga, the Dean of Fellows prior to the Executive Committee meeting and then would announce it at the meeting.

Annex 1: Minutes of Steering Committee meeting – October 2008

2. The 2nd EMAC Journal

Hubert Gatignon reported on the 2nd journal. He indicated that he has done some prior checking up on this topic with the IJRM current editors and the future editor and with some other colleagues in the 'Behavioural' field. The feedback was overall negative.

Further to that, Hubert has reworked the document to be presented at the Executive Committee meeting. He is expecting some negative feedback and anticipating not to have a general consensus on the subject. He proposed to proceed as follows. He would summarize the conclusions from the second journal committee and be clear about the three options as detailed below for decision by the Executive Committee.

Option 1: The Executive Committee approves in principle the proposal for a second journal as stated in the Committee report and the Steering Committee will negotiate with a Publisher to make the publishing contract decisions.

Option 2: The Executive Committee prefers to wait for a final decision so that the Executive Committee has the opportunity to discuss the full detailed publisher proposal.

Option 3: Based on the work of the second EMAC journal committee, the Executive Committee decides for a No Go.

His recommendation is to then propose Option 1 for discussion and vote. If Option 1 does not get the majority, he would then propose to move to a discussion of Option 2 vs. 3.

Gary Lilien indicated that if he has to vote on the basis on the report, he cannot vote for option 1 as the positioning of the journal is not clear.

Hubert clarified the positioning (see the report in annex).

George indicated that he did not see much cannibalization with IJRM.

Gary then proposed to inform the Executive Committee on the 3 options and make a recommendation for option 2.

The 2 main concerns are:

- if there is an increase in the number of behavioural articles in IJRM, then there is clear cannibalisation.
- it is impossible to have high quality people to publish in the 2nd journal as the good researchers would continue to publish in the top journals.

George mentioned that it might be a more convincing point to announce an editor in chief. Hubert indicated that the procedure to select an editor in chief is a strict procedure and hence it is not possible to announce a name prior to the selection procedure.

The 3 options to be presented to the Executive Committee were discussed. It was finally agreed that Hubert will present the report and will propose the following options;

1. A NoGo decision
2. Agree on the principle of the 2nd journal presented in the report and leaves the specifics to be handled by the Steering Committee
3. There is a potential for a 2nd journal, but prefer to have full information and an offer before a final decision.

Annex 2: Report on 2nd Journal

9. Date and time of Next Meeting:

The date of the next EMAC Steering Committee meetings was announced

- Brussels, October 29, 2009 – 16.00 – 18.00 (following change of date of the Executive Committee as agreed at the Executive Committee meeting)
- Brussels, March 5, 2010 – 10.00 -16.00

The President thanked the members for their attendance and the meeting was adjourned.

Annexes:

Annex 1: EMAC Award

Annex 2: Report on 2nd Journal