



## Steering Committee Meeting

Brussels, October 29/30, 2009

**Present:** George Avlonitis, Veronica Wong, Udo Wagner,  
Hubert Gatignon, Gary Lilien, Nina Payen, Sönke Albers

### ***AGENDA***

1. Approval of the minutes of the ad-hoc Steering Committee Meeting – May 2009 – Nantes
2. Head of Marketing Department Forum - Udo Wagner
3. Reporting from V.P.Publications – Hubert Gatignon
  - Publication 2<sup>nd</sup> Journal- New Editor Search Committee
  - EMAC Electronic Resource – Search process for editor
4. EMAC Distinguished Marketing Scholar Award– George Avlonitis/Gary Lilien
5. EMAC Conference 2010 – Sponsorship
6. EMAC Member Rate - Elsevier
7. EMAC General Assembly
8. Cooperation with EFMD  
Partnership with CMO
9. EIASM – EMAC Service level Agreement  
EIASM – EMAC Agreement of Collaboration
10. Date and time of next meeting

## ACTION POINTS

<b>ACTIONS POINTS</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>WHEN</b>
<b>MEMBERSHIP</b>		
<i>EMAC Survey</i> General EMAC Survey	Veronica Wong	To report results at next Steering Committee meeting – March 2010
<b>EMAC Heads of Marketing Forum</b> To design a questionnaire for the Heads of Marketing Forum  National Reps to provide info on Heads of Department in their respective countries	George Avlonitis  Udo Wagner	To report results at next Steering Committee meeting – March 2010
<b>EIASM Agreement of Collaboration</b> To circulate the collaboration agreement with the context	Gabriele Troilo	Report at Steering Committee meeting – March 2010
<b>EIASM Service level Agreement</b> Sönke to look into the agreement	Sönke Albers	Report at Steering Committee meeting – March 2010
<b>EMAC 2010 Conference</b> To inform Suzanne Beckmann to schedule a slot for the EMAC Distinguished Marketing Scholar Award in the conference programme	Gabriele Troilo/George Avlonitis	Immediate
To inform Suzanne C. Beckmann about the non-approval of sponsorship for the EMAC 35th anniversary at the Conference in Copenhagen	George Avlonitis	Immediate
<b>Review process</b>		
To implement a new review form for the 2010 EMAC Conference	Nina Payen	Immediate

## MINUTES OF MEETING

George Avlonitis, EMAC President thanked the members for their attendance.

He opened the meeting by informing the members that further to an email and a meeting he had with Nicole Coopman, EIASM Director, EIASM has sent in a new service level agreement to EMAC with a significant increase in EMAC's contribution to EIASM. All the details can be found in the annex 1. Commenting on this significant increase, George mentioned that it is normal that EMAC should be paying EIASM for its services. However it seems difficult, nearly impossible to double the contribution amount for next year. His position is to come to the amount proposed by EIASM over a 3-5 years period. Some questions were raised:

- Is the proposal an appropriate cost allocation?
- Do we have reasons to question these figures?

It was decided that Sönke will look more thoroughly into the proposal and will get back to Nicole Coopman for any clarification and will report back to the Steering Committee

*Annex 1: EIASM Service Level Agreement*

George indicated that point 2 on the agenda – the report by V.P. Publications will be addressed the next day prior to the Executive committee meeting – as Hubert Gatignon will join the meeting by then.

## **1. Approval of the minutes of the Steering Committee meeting – May 2009**

The point on implementing a steering Committee meeting before the Executive Committee at the Conference in May was approved.

No other comments were made; the minutes were approved.

### *Annex 2: Minutes of Steering Committee meeting – May 2009*

## **2. Heads of Marketing Forum**

Udo Wagner reported on this new EMAC initiative. No much progress was made.

He pointed out that the Heads of Marketing Forum would be an additional service to EMAC members but would not really have an impact on membership. George Avlonitis stated the purpose of the forum which is mainly to discuss common issues marketing departments face, for example joint doctoral programme, faculty recruitment, promotion criteria, rewards, career development faculty / doctoral exchange, joint research activities.

Gary Lilien indicated that this initiative could only work if it is not an abstract idea and EMAC members could connect with it.

The discussion then focuses around the following points:

- the need to have a champion for this initiative. The name of Graham Hooley was mentioned
- national coordinators need to commit themselves in identifying the heads of marketing department in their respective countries
- the need to have a definite agenda for the forum

Gary Lilien proposed to organise the forum as a 'by invitation' activity.

There could be a poll prior to the conference to identify what are the 3 top issues affecting the marketing department in 3-5 years. The results of the poll could then form the agenda of the forum.

George agreed with the idea, pushing it one step forward by proposing to design a questionnaire for the heads of department and run it together with the survey that would be conducted early next year by the President-Elect Veronica Wong.

Gary also mentioned that the survey could be a benchmark instrument. This would add value for the heads of department. This could be done on a regular basis.

The question of waiving the conference fee for those who attend the forum was briefly raised, but it was decided not to waive the fee.

The following decisions were agreed on:

- George will design a questionnaire and will head up the poll.
- The survey will be blended with an invitation to attend the meeting at the conference. Gary Lilien will provide a letter.
- The survey will be conducted after Christmas and results will be shared at the next Steering Committee in March 2010.
- The national representatives will identify the heads of marketing department of their respective countries.

## **4. EMAC Distinguished Marketing Scholar Award**

George Avlonitis reported on the second new EMAC initiative - EMAC Distinguished Marketing Scholar Award. He indicated that both Elsevier and SAGE rejected the request for sponsorship. Emerald was

quiet keen on it because they want to have closer ties with EMAC. He also indicated that Emerald is proposing to sponsor a 'book series' from the papers of the conference. Gary Lilien explained the business model of book series that some publishers adopt. The publisher get the book series into libraries and then 6 months later publish the hard bound and/or soft copies. The Scientific Committee agreed in principle with the book series, but this would take some time to pursue. Gabriele declared that EMAC should review its business model, be more proactive, and define a package of proposals for a publisher. The question was again raised on whether paper copy of IJRM is really useful – as we are now in paperless world. This might save money for EMAC which it can invest elsewhere. Sönke explained Elsevier pay 35000 Euros for the Editor and 32000 guaranteed revenue as royalty for EMAC. On the other hand they perceived revenue mainly from the print IJRM versions. Should this not be the case, then their whole business model is not working.

It was decided to go ahead with the Distinguished Marketing Scholar Award, with or without sponsorship. EMAC can self finance the award for the first edition. The details for the award can be found in the annex 3 – report from Gary Lilien on the Award. The schedule of the award is as follows:  
December 1, 2009: Call for Nominations  
March 1, 2009      Nomination Due Date  
April 15, 2009      Winner Notified  
EMAC Copenhagen: Winner Honored at Dinner and at Research Lecture

Suzanne C. Beckmann should be informed that she needs to schedule a slot for the award in the conference programme. This could be a special session.

Some other points were raised at this stage:

- The teaching portal: EMAC has invested a lot in terms of money and time in the portal and a decision should be made as to its future. It does not seem to have worked so far.
- A necessity to prioritise the different ideas, second Journal teaching portal, book series

To summarise the Scientific Committee agreed to go ahead with the award with or without sponsorship with the name 'EMAC Distinguished Marketing Scholar Award' and if there is a sponsor, then it would be EMAC Distinguished Marketing Scholar Award – sponsored by XXX' The name would remain the same for a period of 3 years.

*Annex 3: EMAC Distinguished Marketing Scholar Award*

## **5. EMAC 2010 Conference – Sponsorship**

There was a request made by Suzanne C. Beckmann for EMAC to sponsor the social event on the occasion of the 35th EMAC anniversary. The question whether EMAC would sponsor this event was raised. This might create a precedent. Furthermore EMAC needs to be careful about its expenses as it has this year experienced a loss. The current EMAC budget situation can be used to explain why EMAC cannot sponsor this event. Suzanne will be informed about it.

*Annex:4: EMAC 2010 Budget estimation*

## **6. EMAC member rate - Elsevier**

EMAC received a request from Elsevier to increase the member (???) The Elsevier contract specified that they would hold the rate of €50 for three years from 2006 and then reconsider it. From 2010 Elsevier has proposed a rise of 4% to €52. It was generally agreed that EMAC should accept it. It will have an impact on EMAC expenses, but there is nothing that EMAC can do about it.

Sönke stressed the fact that EMAC should in the medium term balance its budget again.

*Annex 5: Elsevier Member rate*

## **7. Cooperation with EFMD**

EMAC received a request for closer relationship with EFMD. In principle the Scientific Committee is not against it. However the proposal should be carefully looked at. Gary Lilien as V.P. External Relations will send a response to EFMD.

*Annex 6: EFMD reciprocal agreement*

## **8. Review process**

Further to the decision made at the October 2008 meeting, in an effort to improve the quality of the review process Hubert Gatignon and Gabriele Troilo have evaluated the process. Gabriele Troilo reported on the improvements that have already been implemented and proposed some further improvements. The improvements which have already implemented are a better identification of the area of specialisation of the reviewers, this will enable a better allocation of reviewers for the papers.

The improvements proposed are:

- New evaluation scale for the review process: Gabriele and Hubert have designed a new evaluation form with a set of specific questions distinctive for 'purely conceptual' papers and 'empirical' papers. This would enhance the quality of the reviews. These new enhancements would be highlighted in the guidelines for the reviewers and for the track chairs.
- For implementation for the 2011 conference: to improve the quality of reviewers, they would need to indicate 3 publications.

Followed a discussion on the new review form. Following points were raised

- From a perspective of an editor the new review scale is great, but it does not help for the papers at EMAC
- There was a proposal to take out the overall recommendation on acceptance /rejection from the evaluation form. It will put more responsibility for the track chairs who would need to make the final decision. The idea is the reviewer makes a recommendation and the track chair takes the decision.
- Another issue was brought up – reviewers do not pay enough attention when evaluating a paper. They focus on the 'overall' recommendation – rather to the other specific questions on the evaluation form.
- Would the new review form solve the problem of differences in reviews (like the -4 & +4). Probably not.

The Steering Committee approve the implementation of the new review form. It was decided to propose the new evaluation scale to the Executive Committee.

*Annex 7a: New Evaluation Scale*

*Annex 7b: Note to reviewers – Proposal*

*Annex 7c: Report from V.P. Conferences*

## **9. EIASM Agreement of Collaboration**

Gabriele reported that he has received an agreement of collaboration from EIASM for the organisation of workshops and conferences. As the Scientific Committee did not receive the agreement prior to the meeting, they could not discuss the agreement without knowing the context of this proposal.

Decision was taken to look more thoroughly in this agreement. Gabriele would circulate the agreement with a note explaining the context.

*Annex 8: EIASM Agreement of Collaboration*

## **10 EMAC General Assembly**

It was proposed at the last Steering Committee in Nantes to discuss the issue of low attendance of the General Assembly and what could be done to increase attendance.

Several suggestions were made:

- schedule the GA after a plenary session at the conference
- schedule the GA after the Executive Committee
- Publish the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting to the members – who can comment and make proposal before the General Assembly. Members would feel more engaged in the discussions and decisions of EMAC

However it should be noted that if there is a change in the GA, for example an electronic GA, then this has to be changed in the Statutes or by way of a change in the by-laws.

## **3. Report from V.P. Publications**

### **IJRM**

Hubert Gatignon reported on the IJRM. The transition from the editors has gone smoothly. He mentioned that Elsevier is trying to cut down on the support they provide to the journal. This has been a tough year for Elsevier too. With the new electronic system for submission, some savings can be done.

### **EMAC 2<sup>nd</sup> Journal**

Hubert reported that both Elsevier and SAGE have rejected the proposal for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Journal and Emerald has not responded. However EMAC has received one interesting proposal from NOW Publishers. Their proposal focuses on the following:

- The publisher will be responsible for all elements of publication including editorial management, production, marketing, sales and distribution.

- Compensation: The publisher will pay a royalty of 7.5% on all sales

The publisher will provide the Editor-in Chief an annual stipend of €2000.

- The society (EMAC) will guarantee a minimum of 1000 members' online subscriptions at €10 per member with a minimum guarantee of €10000.
- The publisher will offer the members individual print subscriptions for €40 per annual subscription.

Followed a general discussion on this proposal:

- Gary Lilien asked more information about their publishing mechanism. Hubert will get more information on that.
- Sönke raised the following issue: with this contract it is mandatory that all members (the minimum guaranteed of 1000) subscribe. It should be noted that this year EMAC has a loss and needs to be more careful about its expenses
- Hubert indicated that it is EMAC choice to decide whether it wants to offer this second journal for free to its members.
- It seems from the proposal that even if EMAC owns the title, in practice the publisher owns the journal (see point 21 in the contact proposal)

It is widely agreed that the second journal should neither affect IJRM nor the EMAC financials.. One way of covering the increase in costs would be to increase the membership fee/ EMAC has been charging 90€ membership fee for several years without any increase. So it could be time to increase the fee.

On the assumption that EMAC will not receive another proposal, Hubert wanted to have the consensus from the members whether 1) to discuss this proposal at the Executive Committee and 2) to discuss the possibility of increasing the membership fee.

This was generally agreed.

Gary proposed to present the proposal as a credible offer from NOW Publishing. The Steering Committee will be gathering more information and will start the negotiation so as to get an agreement within the next months. In case of positive agreement, then there would be a need to increase the membership fee by 10€.

### **Electronic Resources**

Hubert Gatignon briefly reported on the Electronic Resources. The search committee for an editor in chief was appointed. They have come up with a few names, but the process is slow. More information will be provided at the next meeting.

*Annex 9: Report from V.P. Publications*

### **11. Miscellaneous**

No points were raised

### **12. Date and time of Next Meeting:**

The date of the next EMAC Steering Committee meetings was announced

- Brussels, March 5, 2010 – 10.00 – 16.30

No further points were raised and the President thanked the members for their attendance and the meeting was adjourned.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Annexes:**

*Annex 1: EIASM Service level Agreement*

*Annex 2: Minutes of Steering Committee meeting – May 2009*

*Annex 3: EMAC Distinguished Marketing Scholar Award*

*Annex 4: EMAC 2010 Conference – Budget estimation*

*Annex 5: Elsevier member rate – proposal from Elsevier*

*Annex 6: EFMD Reciprocal Agreement*

*Annex 7a: Report from V.P. Conferences*

*Annex 7b: Review process: New Evaluation Scale*

*Annex 7c: Review process: Note to reviewers - proposal External Relations*

*Annex 8: EIASM Agreement of collaboration*

*Annex 9: Report from V.P. Publications*