



Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting, October 28, 2011

Present: Sönke Albers, Roland Rust, Gabriele Troilo, Gerrit Van Bruggen, Peter Verhoef, Udo Wagner, Veronica Wong, Nina Payen

AGENDA

1. Welcome

Minutes of previous meeting - May 2011, Ljubljana

2. Issues requiring decisions

- 2.1 EMAC 2nd Journal - Progress Report – *Sönke Albers*
- 2.2 EMAC Executive & Steering Committee meetings in Lisbon – *Veronica Wong*
- 2.3 Climber Community – *Veronica Wong*
- 2.4 EMAC Membership Survey – *Udo Wagner*

3. Issues for reporting and updating

- 3.1 Elections – *Veronica Wong*
- 3.2 New EMAC Fellows – *Veronica Wong*
- 3.3 Financials – *Gerrit Van Bruggen*
- 3.4 Membership – *Peter Verhoef*
- 3.5 External Relations – *Roland Rust*
- 3.7 Conferences – *Gabriele Troilo*
- 3.8 IJRM Editor - *Sönke Albers*

4. Misc

5. Date and time of next meeting

- March 2012, web/teleconference
- May 22, 2012, Lisbon, Portugal

Action Points – Steering Committee Meeting – 28 October 2011

ACTIONS & DECISIONS

Actions	Who	When
<p><i>Awards</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To draft a formal policy and procedures for awards - To be taken as a point on agenda for Steering committee meetings 	<p>Peter Verhoef & Roland Rust</p> <p>Nina</p>	To present at next Steering Committee meeting
<p><i>2nd Journal</i></p> <p>To give one more try Decision Go/No G at Steering Committee in Lisbon</p>	Sönke Albers	To report at next Steering Committee meeting
<p><i>IJRM</i></p> <p>To negotiate new contract with Elsevier</p>	Sönke Albers	To report at next Steering Committee meeting
<p><i>IJRM</i></p> <p>Search for Editor To draft a protocol for the search for Editor</p>	Sönke Albers	To report at next Steering Committee meeting
<p><i>Steering and Executive Committee Meetings</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To keep the Executive Committee meeting at the Annual Conference as it is currently – same time - Steering Committee Meeting – from 09.00 to 12.00 - to give a report of the Steering Committee meeting to the Executive Committee 	<p>Nina Payen</p> <p>Nina Payen</p> <p>Veronica Wong</p>	Immediate (as soon as minutes are done by Nina)
<p><i>Climber Community</i></p> <p>To inform Melanie Zaglia on the decision to continue the event during the conference but to have 2 sessions instead of 1. The event should be self supportive</p>	Veronica Wong	Immediate
<p><i>Membership Survey</i></p> <p>To give feedback to Udo on the specific questions discussed at the meeting (Question 22 & 23)</p>	ALL	Deadline for deadline – 14 November
<p><i>Membership</i></p> <p>To prepare breakdown of conference delegates vs. delegates with accepted papers</p>	Nina	End of November

Decisions taken at the Steering Committee meeting – 28 October 2011

Awards:

Decision was taken to make the implementation of awards in a formal way (proposal, acceptance by the Steering Committee)

2nd Journal

Decision on GO/NO GO for the EMAC 2nd Journal the 'Journal of Marketing Behaviour' to be taken at the next Steering Committee

Based on new development with ACR who decided to set up a task force to investigate whether they can launch their own new journal, the decision was taken to give the journal (Editor search) a new try.

However the decision of Go/No Go should be taken at the next Steering Committee meeting.

Climber Community

Following decisions were taken:

- EMAC will not fund the Climber Community. It should be 'self supportive'
- The event should be kept within the annual conference, but with 2 sessions instead of one.

MSI Sponsoring

2000 Euros for MSI sponsoring every second year

MINUTES OF MEETING

The EMAC President Veronica Wong opened the meeting and welcomed all members and a special welcome to the new members on board. She briefly mentioned the decisions on the EMAC Meetings taken at the last Steering and Executive Committee meetings. There are as of now no interim Executive Committee in October, except if called for. The Steering Committee is now a full day meeting in October. However this new format requires that decisions taken at the Steering Committee should be presented in a timely manner to the Executive committee to ensure a smooth communication flow.

1. Minutes of Meeting – May 2011, Ljubljana

A slight rectification was made to the minutes as to Point 3.1 – Elections. Peter Verhoef as newly elected V.P. Membership was not listed in the list of newly elected Vice Presidents. This will be corrected in the minutes.

The subject of EMAC awards was brought up.

Peter Verhoef raised the question on EMAC policy and strategy on awards. There have been a few awards introduced in the recent years. In the coming years there would be most probably new initiatives for new awards. As the number of awards seems to be increasing, there is a need for a written policy, for example a proposal for an award needs to be a formal written one, which would require a thorough examination, a vote, an approval, for example, by two-third of the Steering Committee or the Executive Committee. EMAC needs to determine which body – the Steering or the Executive Committee has control of approval on a proposal for an award.

Veronica explained briefly the award 'policy' in the past was more or less linked to a sponsorship. She also explained that the Susan Douglas Award was 'a bit' rushed in. The proposal came from the EMAC fellows and the project was implemented quickly. Sönke Albers indicated that there needs to be a cooling

down period after a proposal is made. It should also have a clear positioning. As there will be more instances where awards will be proposed, a more formal policy is required.

After some discussions on a few points namely the consequences of naming an award after a person, the role of the Steering Committee vis à vis the EMAC Fellows in terms of awards initiatives, a proposal for a procedure for EMAC awards was put forward, as follows:

- Proposal for an award has to be made formally, in writing
- The award would not be presented in that same year of the proposal
- A vote would take place 6 months after the proposal
- The approval would require 75% of the votes.
- A formal document on a procedure/policy for awards should be drafted and put as an item for discussion for the next Steering Committee meeting.

It was decided that:

- Peter Verhoef and Roland Rust would draft the policy document.
- Procedure for EMAC awards would be added as a point for discussion for the next meeting.

Followed a brief discussion of sponsoring awards. Roland Rust explained the different types of sponsorships, mainly the endowment sponsorship (financial requirement) and annual sponsorship, EMAC should decide the type of sponsorship best suited for the association. This could be included in the procedure. It was also agreed that EMAC would not go for too many awards but a few more prestigious ones would be an asset and this concluded the discussion on the EMAC awards.

Decision: Peter Verhoef and Roland Rust would draft the a policy document on EMAC awards.

No further points were raised and the minutes were approved.

Annex 1: Minutes of Steering Committee – May 2011, Ljubljana

2. Issues requiring decisions

2.1 EMAC 2nd Journal & 3.8 IJRM Editor

Points 2.1 and 3.8 on the agenda were reported by Sönke Albers, V.P. Publications

3.8 IJRM Editor

Marnik Dekimpe's term of office as Editor of IJRM will end next year. Following the procedure in place, the search for an editor has started. The following steps have been taken

- The search of editor has been initiated - so far there are 5 inputs, plus 1 which has contacted Sönke directly.
- A search committee has been appointed, consisting as usual of two past editors, Jan-Benedict Steenkamp and Hubert Gatignon and Sönke. Stefan Stremersch, past IJRM editor was not approached as he is not very connected to the EMAC community.
Sönke explained that there are not a lot of choices for the search committee; it's more like convincing the person to be part of the committee.
Suggestions of other potential member were made; Peter Verhoef, Bart Bronenberg, Luk Warlop.

The process seems to be fine, as it is hard to find good people to do the job.

Sönke is currently doing some benchmark with other associations, like AMA, Marketing Science, with regards to the editorial support they have. These associations have shared their insights. He stressed the importance of discussing editorial support before negotiating with the potential editor.

Udo Wagner questioned the appointment of Jan-Benedict Steenkamp in the committee. It was also pointed out that the search for editor and the decision are done by a very small group of people and

always the same people. Should this be the protocol, then it should be changed. Sönke explained that the appointment of Jan-Benedict Steenkamp is based on the fact that he has been a former editor and he has good connection with the U.S, which is an asset for IJRM. He also stressed that searching for an editor is an important and sensitive task and it has to be done by some people with big capacity. It is a confidential process.

Followed a discussion in which the members of the Steering Committee shared their views on this sensitive point. Following remarks were made:

- The search committee, as appointed, is an excellent one with top level people
- EMAC is a community of 1000 people and it can choose within that community and yet Jan-Benedict Steenkamp seemed to be chosen all the time. EMAC needs to be more open.
- Some steering committee members have shown their disappointment in this procedure, while acknowledging that from a formal point of view, the procedure is fine.
- The issue is that the few but important decisions are taken by the same small group of people; it is important to have new people on board.
- The difficulty is that the current situation/procedure might create frustrations in the long term; there is no problem to open up.
- While there is no criticism on the journal itself, the issue is about the procedure of appointing the editor.
- In view of the points shared above, there is a need to differentiate the issue:
 - o Is the problem more of a 'personal' matter on the person in the search committee?
 - o Or is it a problem of the same small group people making the decisions?

Roland explained the procedure at AMA – The V.P. Publications appoints a search committee consisting of a couple of former editors and the head of AMA. He also mentioned that it is a good idea to have past editors and to keep the group small (3 people).

Sönke indicated that he accepts the comments made by the members and is trying his best in this task. Peter Verhoef added that there might be a need to have more rotation in the composition of the search committee in the future.

Veronica pointed out that Sönke has acted in accordance to the current protocol. She added that the discussions show that EMAC needs to look into this protocol. With new members on board on the Steering Committee it might be the right time to do so. If the general idea is that the protocol is not doing the job, then it needs to be rethought.

So far the Journal has in no way suffered from this; on the contrary it has developed into a more international journal.

To the question of the number of 'really' interesting papers in the journal, Sönke replied that that this might be subjective, but pointed out that the impact factor is increasing.

Roland added that Marnik has done an excellent job and there are some interesting controversial papers. It is a high risk- high return strategy and may be the only way for IJRM to differentiate itself.

Marnik has constantly encouraged people to send their best papers.

Roland also mentioned that there is some misconception on IJRM. Peter Verhoef added that this misconception is a bit historical, but now IJRM is broader. Sönke mentioned that he has discussed some issues, among which the type of papers, with the potential candidates, It is clear that IJRM should differentiate itself, have more risky papers.

To conclude on this subject, the following points were made clear:

- The protocol followed for the search for IJRM editor, the appointment of the search committee is in line with the protocol.
- The issue on the composition of the search committee, as raised in the discussion, should not lead the committee to be dismantled.
- The protocol should align with the way EMAC is managed. There is a need to look at some alternate protocol.

A last question was raised on the contribution of Elsevier. Sönke reminded that Elsevier has tried to increase the member rate. This has not happened under the current agreement. However the current contract needs to be renegotiated. He will try to get concrete figures before doing the negotiation. The business model has changed. The number of downloads has increased.

2.1 EMAC 2nd Journal - Journal of Marketing Behavior

Sönke Albers reported on EMAC 2nd Journal. It has been and is a difficult task to find an editor. He indicated that he has changed the composition of the search committee.

He has not started the search for an editor yet. Roland Rust has informed him that ACR and MSI might be interested in co-sponsoring the journal which would facilitate the search for an editor. He has set up a conference with the president of ACR, MSI people, Don Lehmann and Roland. The initiative seems a good idea. However unfortunately, ACR decided to set up a task force to investigate whether they can launch their own journal, which they are interested in owning. The majority of ACR are not in favour of the managerial relevance that EMAC has attached to its 2nd Journal.

Now EMAC is facing a situation with the following decision making options:

- either to wait, maybe for a long time (2-3 years) with uncertain outcome
- start the editor search again with a new search committee
- abandon the launch of the journal.

Roland mentioned that the ACR project might not happen. At this stage without ACR, MSI will probably not join the initiative.

It was agreed to give the search for editor another try and if it does not work, then the project would be stopped.

Sönke mentioned also that he has some interesting names as potential candidates but is not sure whether they would be interested.

Udo Wagner is in favour of giving the project another try. Gabriele pointed out that the fact that ACR has found the opportunity for a new journal is a good signal for the EMAC's initiative.

The new search committee will comprise of Don Lehmann, maybe Gilles Laurent. He asked for suggestions from members of Steering Committee.

Some other suggestions related to IJRM were made:

- Offer online IJRM as part of the membership fee and members pay an additional amount for paper copy.
- Suggestion for an I-pad journal

Decision: It was decided to give the project one more try and have Go/No Go decision at Steering Committee meeting in Lisbon.

Annex 2: Report form V.P. Publications

2.2 EMAC Meetings at the Conference

At the last EMAC Steering and Executive Committee Meetings, decisions were taken to change the structure/frequency of meetings.

Until now the executive committee meetings took place twice a year, a one-day interim meeting in October in Brussels and the afternoon meeting at the conference. The current meetings are scheduled as follows: Tuesday (start day of the conference) Steering Committee meeting in the morning from 10.00 – 12.00 and the Executive Committee meeting from 14.00 – 17.00. Due to the decision to stop the Executive Committee meeting in October, it was generally agreed then to extend the Executive Committee meeting at the conference. However, there is a time conflict as several members of the Steering/Executive Committee are also involved in the Doctoral Colloquium which ends on the Tuesday

lunch time. Moreover, the Doctoral Colloquium lunch on Tuesday is also attended by the Fellows.

Decision: Due to the timing issue, it was decided to keep the time of the Executive Committee as it is currently, that is, 14.00 -17.00. The Steering Committee meeting would be scheduled from 09.00- 12.00

2.3 Climber Community

Veronica Wong reported on the Climber Community. Following the successful event at the conference, Melanie Zaglia has sent some requests to the EMAC Steering Committee, as follows:

- The possibility to set up such an online platform for the climber community, embedded within the official EMAC website. In case the current website doesn't offer such features, some financial resources would be needed to set up this platform. Melanie Zaglia and Sylvia von Wallpach would offer to maintain this platform.
- The possibility for the Steering Committee to support an extended Climber Community meeting prior to the conference, with a request for a financial support. Members would pay an additional fee for participation; however there would be a need to fund some of the travel costs of the speakers. Other costs might include the classroom(s) and drinks for coffee breaks.

Gerrit Van Bruggen is in favour of the Climber Community initiative and would encourage the initiators to continue. However he indicated that, though there should be no problem to support a 'Climber Community' section of the EMAC website, the initiative, in general, should be self supported and EMAC cannot fund the initiative.

Sönke added that the online platform is similar to the 'teaching portal' and is a bit skeptical about it. However it's up to them to champion it. As for the Climber Community to be organized as an event prior to the conference, it will simply add an additional financial burden. However they could have 2 sessions at the conference (instead of one) and it could be organized as the BigMac.

Decision: The Climber Community should be kept within the annual conference, but with 2 sessions instead of one and it should be 'self supportive'.

Annex 3: Report on Climber Committee

2.4 EMAC Membership Survey

Udo Wagner presented the EMAC membership survey which is conducted every second year by the President –Elect. He has reworked the 2010 questionnaire. Some questions have been skipped and new ones have been added, such as the questions number 22, 23, 27.

Discussions centered on some specific questions:

- Question 23: this question might feed in the 'dissatisfaction', mainly transparency, selection of committee, issue about award being named after a person ...
- Preference over a shorter questionnaire

It was also pointed out that the EMAC Steering Committee is not involved in the IJRM and the Jan-Benedict Steenkamp awards. EMAC V.P. Publications should do something about it.

To the question of the purpose of the survey, Udo explained that conducting a membership survey every two years shows to EMAC members that the association 'cares' about its members opinions.

Udo asked the members to send him their feedback to the different questions that seem problematic.

Annex 4: EMAC Membership Survey

3. Issues for reporting and updating

3.1 Elections

The EMAC 1st round of elections took place. Unfortunately, though several nominations were received for the position of V.P. Conferences, so far no one has accepted their nomination. It is becoming urgent to find a candidate for this position. Veronica, as well as Sönke, has contacted Maja, but she has declined the offer. There should be more coordinated effort from the Steering Committee in identifying potential candidates prior to the elections. For the position of V.P. Conferences, some names were suggested, Philip Stern, Elisa Montaguti, John Roberts. After a brief discussion, Andras Bauer, conference host of the 2010 EMAC Regional conference, was proposed. Veronica would contact Andras.

Peter Verhoef proposed that elections should be a fixed point on the agenda of the Steering Committee meeting in May.

Annex 5: Results of 1st round of elections

3.2 New EMAC Fellows

Gilles Laurent, Dean of EMAC Fellows has sent in the report on the recent Fellows Election. After two rounds of votes, the current Fellows elected Rod Brodie and Udo Wagner. Final results for the election of two new EMAC Fellows must be approved by the Executive Committee. The members congratulated Udo Wagner.

A question was raised on the approval process of the fellows' elections by the EMAC Executive Committee. It was generally agreed that this decision should remain with the EMAC Fellows. EMAC Executive Committee should be informed but they do not need to approve it.

Decision: EMAC Fellows elections should remain with the Fellows. Steering Committee takes notice of the results. The Executive Committee should be informed, but they do not need to approve it.

Annex 6: Report from EMAC Fellows

3.3 Financials

Gerrit Van Bruggen, EMAC treasurer, reported on EMAC financial accounts. He explained that the forecasted deficit is around 9000 Euros. It is better than what was expected, as both the 2010 annual conference and the Regional Conference had a good attendance.

Probably next year the situation would be less good due to a lower attendance of the 2011 annual conference and regional conference, increase in the EIASM contribution and an additional expense in the form of taxes to be paid on royalties.

Overall, things are going as expected.

In regards to the EMAC Regional conference, the following support was reconfirmed, that is, a financial support of up to 5000 Euros maximum which comprise:

- 2 nights accommodation for the Doctoral seminar faculty
- Bursaries
- Discount of doctoral seminar students attending the main conference,

and following same decision as applicable for the main conference.

Annex 7: Financial situation

3.4 Membership

Peter Verhoef, V.P. Membership reported on the membership situation.

He reconfirmed the fee increase

- 100 Euros for the 2013 membership (applicable on the conference fee of the 2012 conference)
- 125 Euros for 2014 membership (applicable on the conference fee of the 2013 conference)

The question of a yearly increase of the membership fee versus a high increase at one time was raised.

It was decided to 'wait and see' as the situation might evolve. It was proposed that Gerrit Van Bruggen would propose a plan, a long term forecast. Gerrit indicated that he needs to see first how the VAT issues work out and the impact of the increase in contribution from the conference host. He also pointed out that the lead-time when implementing decisions prevent EMAC from necessary immediate changes/outcomes, especially in case of membership.

Sönke made a suggestion to give the Steering Committee the right to increase the membership up to 5 Euros per year and have the right to implement it.

Gerrit indicated that, with all the measures that EMAC has taken, it should see the outcomes in 2014. He proposed to put forward Sönke's proposal in 2013.

Peter was pleased to report on the increase in membership. The question of the membership being dependant on the conference attendance was raised.

It was proposed to make a breakdown of the conference delegates versus delegates' attendance with accepted paper.

Annex 8: EMAC membership situation

3.5 External Relations

Roland Rust, V.P. External Relations reported on the activities in his portfolio.

Some new initiatives have been initiated

- Partnerships for the Journal of Marketing Behavior

There was a potential partnership between ACR, MSI and EMAC on co-branding EMAC 2nd Journal. The situation has evolved in the meantime, as discussed in point 2.1

- Partnership with MSI

MSI is tentatively planning a conference in Paris in October 2012 on the topic of academic and professional work on consumer insights, and the magnitude of the trade between the two perspectives. MSI is exploring whether EMAC would be interested in a co-host role. This could take the form of getting EMAC speakers on the conference. EMAC would present a list of potential credible names. The value of this initiative for EMAC is to get the association linked to MSI, and to interact with practice. Overall, all members approve this initiative.

Continuing Initiatives

- McKinsey Partnership

The partnership currently centers on the EMAC McKinsey Marketing Trends survey and the EMAC McKinsey dissertation award. .

McKinsey Survey- 123 responses were received. The concern voiced is that the survey is seen as being too much 'company' focused.

Sönke indicated that he was not impressed by the survey. He was expecting a more insightful one.

Peter Verhoef indicated that the next step is to look into the results. The idea was to compare the business side and the academic side.

McKinsey Dissertation Award. The award is running successfully. It gives an increase in visibility for EMAC among practitioners.

Partnership with ANZMAC

BIGMAC will be held at ANZMAC in 2012 and at EMAC in 2013

ANZMAC has asked why the Australian and New Zealand members were not eligible for the EMAC McKinsey Dissertation award. The reason is that the dissertation is supported by the EMEA (Europe, Middle East, Africa) group/department of the McKinsey Company and consequently only candidates from these regions are eligible.

Annex 9: Report from V.P. External Relations

3.6 Conferences

Gabriele Troilo reported on the conferences.

He participated in the EMAC Regional conference in Iasi, Romania. It was a well organized conference.

He raised the issue of the Doctoral seminar students who do not have access to the journals. EMAC should be able to help them in some way, may be by allowing them access to more resources.

Future Regional conference

- 2012 – Belgrade University in Serbia. The contract has been signed.

- 2013 - Poland is a potential candidate.

The EMAC regional conference is now on track and is working fine. Papers submitted come from countries other than only CEE region.

Annual Conferences

2014 Conference: Valencia has informally accepted the contract, with the contribution of 40,000 Euros.

Doctoral Colloquium – Andreas Hermann, Doctoral Colloquium chair, has proposed to increase the number of faculty back to 18. He has actually already informed the faculty members.

Gabriele mentioned that the deficit of the Doctoral Colloquium is around 3,000 Euros which is more or less what is forecasted. The Annual conference in a way subsidises the Doctoral Colloquium.

4. Miscellaneous

Two points were raised:

- The possibility that the Chartered Institute of Marketing (CIM) in the UK, would like to work with EMAC. Veronica had some ‘unofficial’ contact with them. They are prepared to allocate around 15000 GBP to link with an association.

In the case of EMAC, this could take the form of sponsoring awards or funding the Climber Community.

- The KAMS Symposium at the EMAC 2012 conference. Udo briefly indicated that this is now in place.

5. Date and time of Next Meeting:

The date of the next EMAC Steering Committee meetings

- March 22, 2012 , Thursday - 16.00 – 17.00 (conference call)
- May 22, 2012, Tuesday – 09.00 – 12.00

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

Annexes:

Annex 1: Minutes of Steering Committee meeting – March 2011

Annex 2: Report from V.P. Publications

Annex 3: Report on Climber Committee

Annex 4: Membership Survey

Annex 5: Results of 1st round of elections

Annex 6: Report from EMAC Fellows

Annex 7: Financial situation

Annex 8: Membership Situation

Annex 9: Report from V.P. External Relations