



## Steering Committee 'Webinar' Meeting

March 17, 2010

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

**Not Present:** Hubert Gatignon

### **AGENDA**

#### **1. Approval of minutes of October 2009**

#### **2. Requiring decisions**

- 2.1 2<sup>nd</sup> Journal – Hubert Gatignon
- 2.2 Submission Requirements for EMAC Conference – Gabriele Troilo/Sönke Albers
- 2.3 EIASM Agreements
  - EIASM Service level agreement - George Avlonitis and Sönke Albers
  - EIASM agreement of collaboration - Gabriele Troilo

#### **3. Progress report**

- 3.1 Inadequate layout of IJRM as designed by Elsevier – Sönke Albers
- 3.2 EMAC Elections – George Avlonitis
- 3.3 EMAC Survey – Veronica Wong
- 3.4 Head of Marketing Department Forum – George Avlonitis/Udo Wagner
- 3.5 Financials – Sönke Albers
- 3.6 Membership Situation – Udo Wagner
- 3.7 Relationship with ANZMAC – Gary Lilien
- 3.8 EMAC Electronic Resource - Hubert Gatignon

#### **4. Miscellaneous**

#### **5. Date and Time of next meeting**

Copenhagen, June 1 – 10.00 – 12.00

## ACTION POINTS

ACTIONS POINTS	WHO	WHEN
<b>MEMBERSHIP</b>		
To implement the increase in membership fee in the 2011 conference fee. Gabriele will inform Maja of this decision	Gabriele Troilo	Immediate
Paper submission: Decision to adopt a 7 page paper (including title page, body of paper, appendix and references) Nina to adapt the changes in the guidelines and inform conference host 2011	Nina	For 2011 conference
EIASM-EMAC Agreement of Collaboration Gabriele will inform Nicole of the feedback of the Steering Committee to Nicole Coopman for further discussion.	Gabriele	For reporting at next Steering Committee meeting – June Copenhagen
Veronica Wong to pursue potential sponsorship for Heads of Marketing Forum by the Chartered Institute of Marketing	Veronica Wong	Immediate

## MINUTES OF MEETING

George Avlonitis, EMAC President thanked the members for their participation in this first ‘webinar’ meeting. Unfortunately Hubert Gatignon could not attend.

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

No comments were made; the minutes were approved.

*Annex 1: Minutes of Steering Committee meeting – October 2009*

### 2. Issues Requiring Decision

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

In absence of Hubert Gatignon, George Avlonitis presented the progress of the Second Journal. George thanked Hubert for the good job done.

Further to the discussion in October 2009, a lawyer has been asked to look into the contract and has made some changes. All members agreed that the revised contract looks more acceptable.

Veronica Wong, President–Elect pointed out that the success of this venture will depend on the Editor who needs to have a vision and a passion for this initiative and needs to champion it.

The questions that are essential at this stage are

- how to fund the initial stages of the launch
- ensure that the journal is not a secondary journal

- signal the quality of the journal
- . The discussion centred around 2 points,
  - the editor
  - the financial issues

#### *Editor*

Gary Lilien stressed the fact that it is the Editor in chief who gives the reputation of quality to the journal. The Editor should also clearly position the journal. There is not yet a positioning statement and this is a necessary condition for success.

Sönke Albers pointed out that the contract needs to be signed first and then look for an editor. George mentioned that searching for an editor could be done in parallel. As soon as Hubert gets the approval from the Steering Committee, he can start the search process for the editor.

The question then was what would happen in the eventuality of the high calibre editor does not get enough papers by 2012.

Gary mentioned that EMAC could sign a contingent contract. The contract will be in effect once EMAC has a capable editor.

George will inform Hubert about this point.

#### *Financial Issue*

The Second Journal will bring additional expenses to EMAC. EMAC should find alternative ways to raise money to cover the increase in expenses.

Some suggestions were put forward:

- small contribution from the EMAC conference for the second journal
- increase membership fee by 10€

Udo Wagner indicated that at the launch of the Journal, EMAC would not need as much money as for IJRM.

Gabriele is not in favour of asking conference organisers for contribution for the second journal. EMAC needs to find other ways of financing the second journal.

One suggestion was to make the Chronicle online and the money available could be devoted to the second journal. Now that the Chronicle is well known, it could be switched to an online version.

Gabriele also pointed out that it was decided and agreed at the last meeting to increase the membership fee by 10 euros to support the second journal. Gabriele mentioned that Ljubljana is concerned about this increase if it is implemented in the 2011 conference fee. It was suggested to implement this increase in the 2012 conference fee so it takes effect in 2013. It was also mentioned that though Maja Makovec Brenčič – 2011 conference host worries are reasonable, yet this 10 Euros increase will probably not deter people from coming to the conference.

After a brief discussion, it was decided to implement the increase membership fee in the 2011 conference fee. Gabriele will inform Maja of this decision.

This should be communicated at the Copenhagen conference.

#### *Annex 2: Revised contract – 2<sup>nd</sup> Journal*

### **2.2 Conference Paper Submission**

Gabriele Troilo, Vice President Conferences, reported on non-compliance issues for the conference paper submission. He explained the work involved because of non-compliance on the length of papers. There are 2 ways to deal with this issue,

- either adopt a certain flexibility and accept papers that are not fully in compliance
- or provide a template which authors have to follow when submitting their papers

Sönke Albers argued that authors should submit following guidelines otherwise there is no point in putting guidelines. Papers should be in compliance with guidelines He is not in favour of templates as these are not easy to use; authors may use different software systems that are not compatible with templates, hence adding difficulty to the submission process. He suggested implementing a 7 page paper

in PDF. This 7 page will include everything – title page, the body of the paper, appendix and references.

The question is how rigid would EMAC conference administration be on the 7 page paper. What if an author submits a 7 and half paper? How rigid the 7 page compliance should be? Templates make it possible to comply fully with guidelines and avoid extra work for checking papers for non-compliances. The idea is to be more efficient.

After some discussion on the template approach versus the 7 page paper, it was decided to keep it simple and adopt the 7 page (maximum) paper

### **2.3 EIASM Service level Agreement**

George explained that following the discussion at the last October meeting on the new service level agreement as proposed by EIASM, Sönke Albers was requested to look thoroughly in the proposal. Sönke explained that the proposed EIASM service level agreement describes more the duties that EIASM will deliver and does not give any cost. Hence in absence of figures it is difficult to discuss this agreement. However an amount of 48000 Euros was mentioned as the contribution that EIASM would ask to EMAC. It is 4 times the amount of the current contribution. If EMAC accepts this agreement, there would be no money for other expenditure. It would be difficult to increase membership fee to the level of covering the 48000 Euros.

George pointed out that in the last meeting it was decided and agreed that EMAC accepts the increase in contribution but would spread it over 4-5 years. He mentioned also that it is not sustainable for EIASM to provide the services without money contribution.

It was agreed to go back to Nicole Coopman and discuss about the cost issue.

It was decided that Nina would ask Nicole to be more specific about the cost for the Service Level Agreement.

It was then decided to postpone the discussion to the June Steering Committee and make the decision then.

*Annex 3: EIASM Service Level Agreement*

### **EIASM Agreement of Collaboration**

Gabriele reported on the EIASM agreement of collaboration for the organisation of workshops and conferences. He pointed out 2 issues:

- financial responsibility for the organisation of seminars and conferences, sharing costs and profits. This implies that EMAC has to radically change its traditional business model and start taking risks for the organization of conferences. His view is that this is not the EMAC business and EMAC should not pursue in that line.
- property of current conferences/seminars: in the agreement it is mentioned that the current conferences and seminars remain the property of EIASM.

Sönke mentioned as the agreement is written now; it is not a sharing of profit and losses. In case of loss, EIASM recuperates all the costs involved with the organisation of the event.

All members agreed with Gabriele's report. He will inform Nicole of the feedback of the Steering Committee for further discussion.

*Annex 4: EIASM – EMAC agreement of Collaboration with input from Gabriele Troilo*

*Annex 5: Report on EIASM - EMAC Agreement of Collaboration*

### **3. Progress report**

#### **3.1. Inadequate Layout of IJRM**

Sönke Albers brought out the issue regarding the layout of IJRM

The main concerns are:

*Font Size* – Too small font size

*Names Abbreviation* – To have first names not abbreviated. This is important for citations.

This should definitely be applied to IJRM also.

*Abbreviations*: Elsevier has even started to abbreviate the journal names too. If somebody from practice wants to read such an article he or she does not understand anything because of not knowing what all the abbreviations mean

It would be good to have the same layout for both journals and to make sure to have an adequate layout for the second journal too.

#### **3.2. Elections**

The EMAC elections process has gone well.

Sönke Albers mentioned that Gerrit Van Bruggen has accepted the position of treasurer. He is convinced Gerrit would do a good job.

#### **3.3 EMAC Survey**

Veronica Wong has conducted the EMAC 2010 members' survey. She congratulated George and all the people involved in the 2008 survey. The 2010 survey brought some new insights.

- Membership fee: the fee has not increased for a long time – this should be communicated to members.
- IJRM: the perception is that the journal is biased towards modelling papers. However independent observers have found that the percentage of modelling papers and the others is balanced – more of a 1/3 ratio. IJRM is not purely a journal for modelling. This needs to be communicated to the members
- Changes as made by EMAC are positive
- Conferences: overall satisfaction is a bit lower

The outcome emphasises the need to

- draw attention to things that are going well and communicate to the members
- implement the right strategy
- share EMAC successes to the members.

*Annex 5: Report on EMAC 2010 Survey*

#### **3.4 Financial**

Sönke Albers reported on EMAC financial situation. As already forecasted, EMAC is bearing a loss of approx 4000 euros. This is due to the several investments EMAC has made. EMAC has to be more careful in the future with regards to its expenditures.

*Annex 6: Financial report*

*Annex 7: EMAC Financial Situation*

### **3.5 Membership**

Udo Wagner, Vice President Membership reported on the membership situation.

- In an effort to increase membership he has contacted all IJRM board members.
- He also indicated that 250 members joined EMAC independently of conference attendance.
- Overall the membership situation is good, though there are some countries like Scandinavian countries where membership is decreasing.

*Annex 8: Membership Situation*

### **3.6 BIGMAC Protocol**

Gary Lilien reported on the BIGMAC. He explained that there is no general understanding of the procedures.

It is commonly agreed that it is in the mutual interest of both EMAC and ANZMAC to run a joint event/symposium at their annual conferences on a regular basis. The purpose of this protocol is to formalize that agreement. It will give detailed information for the organization of the BIGMAC Symposium.

Gabriele should handle the question of fee with the conference organizer. The next BIGMAC will be organized at the EMAC 2011 Conference in Ljubljana.

All members agree that this is a good start.

Gary also mentioned that MSI special anniversary session might have a conflict with BIGMAC 6 – as it might be scheduled at the same time Hubert needs to ensure that there is no overlap between MSI special session and BIGMAC6.

*Annex 9: BIG MAC Melbourne Report*

*Annex 10: BIG MAC Protocol*

### **3.7 EMAC Electronic Resource**

In absence of Hubert Gatignon, George reported that Hubert has identified an Editor in Chief for the EMAC Electronic Resource - Dr Thorsten Hennig – Thureau ,University of Muenster. So things are progressing in that direction.

### **3.8 Head of Marketing Forum**

George thanked Gary Lilien for his contribution.

The questionnaire is now ready. Some additional questions have been added further to the comments of the Steering Committee.

The following were proposed and agreed:

- Udo Wagner would chair the forum
- The agenda will be drafted from the results of the survey
- Nina will communicate the information on date and time of meeting to the Heads of marketing departments.
- The forum should be incorporated in the conference programme. Nina will communicate with the CBS conference team.

Veronica briefly explained that there is a possibility for sponsorship (may be approx 2000 – 3000 Euros) for the forum by the Chartered Institute of Marketing. One concern was raised about whether this forum can be associated with an external institute. The Heads of Marketing Forum is an EMAC forum and it is

held at an EMAC conference. Veronica will give some thoughts about the potential conflict of interest. It is agreed that in the meantime she can proceed with the sponsorship.

To a question from George on the EMAC Distinguished Marketing Scholar Award., Gary mentioned that he has received some nominations and the process is underway.

*Annex 11: Heads of Marketing Survey Questions*

#### **4. Miscellaneous**

It was agreed that 'webinar' meeting is very convenient and works well. It was decided to make the March Steering Committee meeting a webinar meeting.

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

The date of the next EMAC Steering Committee meetings was announced  
- Copenhagen, June 1, 10.00 – 12.00

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

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **Annexes:**

*Annex 1: Minutes of Steering Committee meeting – May 2009*

*Annex 2: Revised contract – 2<sup>nd</sup> Journal*

*Annex 3: EIASM Service Level Agreement*

*Annex 4: EIASM – EMAC agreement of Collaboration with input from Gabriele Troilo*

*Annex 5: Report on EIASM - EMAC Agreement of Collaboration*

*Annex 5: Report on EMAC 2010 Survey*

*Annex 6: Financial report*

*Annex 7: EMAC Financial Situation*

*Annex 8: Membership Situation*

*Annex 9: BIG MAC Melbourne Report*

*Annex 10: BIG MAC Protocol*

*Annex 11: Heads of Marketing Survey Questions*