**SIM Governance meeting**

August 1, 2021

8:00-10:00 am EDT - Zoom

**Present:**

Colin Higgins

Andy Wicks

Jae Hwan Lee

Amelia Carr

Annie Snelson-Powell

Christina Neesham

Erica Steckler

Jared Peifer

Jill Brown

Julia

Katherina Pattit

Nancy Kurland

Naomi Gardberg

Robbin Derry

Susana Esper

Michelle Westerman

Jo-Ellen Pozner

Nancy Kurland

**Welcome by Andy:**

* welcoming new members (Julia, Jo-Ellen, and Michelle)
* end of tenure
* help ppl stepping into positions next year.

**Christina’s report:**

* PDWs: Comparable to last year. 14 submissions, accepted 12 PDWs.
* 3 extra meetings were sponsored: business meeting, governance meeting, and social.
* About 40 co-sponsored PDWs. In collaboration with 18 other divisions in the AoM, which displays how important and relevant SIM topics are across the Academy. ONE most popular co-sponsor.
* Highlights: contesting CSR, using simulations in teaching business ethics, social impact, humanistic manager, racial justice, meaningful work, business and human rights.
* Also JFC together with ONE, and also together with MOC on ‘reviewing in the rough’.

**Colin’s report:**

* Submissions to SIM went down by 40 percent. In ONE it was down by 50 percent. Overall AoM-wide submissions went down 40-50 percent. Illustrates how much members come to AoM for networking rather than receiving paper feedback
* Symposia acceptance rate was 75%, for papers this was 65%. This is much higher up compared to last year, but quite some pressure from the Academy to meet the cap level. This likely has led to accepting symposia/papers that would otherwise not have been accepted.
* About 30-35% percent of submissions selected ‘other’ for keywords. This suggests that we may have to rethink what we offer as keywords in the list. Things like trust, gender, entrepreneurship, social value seem to be increasingly relevant keywords. We need to capture these better. This is also key for linking papers to relevant reviewers.
* Biggest problem: quality of reviews is abysmal. The numbers of ppl that sign up for review is decreasing. Some reviews were almost shocking and inappropriate. We need to do something about the review process. It’s not exclusive to SIM, but across the board.
* Questions/comments:
  + Naomi would like to contribute to fixing the keyword problem. If a committee will be set up, she would like to be on it.
  + Review quality in ONE is also not great, but difficult to say if it’s really a SIM-problem.
  + Michelle: maybe its worth telling mentors in the DC to talk about reviewing.
  + Christina: heard that also in CMS review-quality was not great. Agrees we should do something training or coaching. Maybe a colloquium on review in December or January.
  + Erica: members want more activities during the year, so a colloquium would be welcome.
  + Robbin: workshop and proactive approach would be very good to address the reviewing problem. Perhaps teaming up with other divisions.
  + Pushpika: did the number of registrations to the conference decrease to same degree as number of paper submissions? It likely went down significantly, but Andy/Colin don’t have the data at hand.

**Katherina’s report:**

* We have the regular awards. Anne Bucholz awards is a bit delayed. The social impact award sponsored by Rutgers will be hold off until there is a physical conference.
* There will be doctoral students presenting their work at business meeting.
* Questions/comments:
  + Jill: which awards come with money? It’s good to distinguish those because they need to apply for sponsorships early. Bentley got tapped for sponsorship of an award, but not again.
  + Amelia: It’s important that the person who works with sponsors, to get in touch with Amelia because Amelia handles the finances for the division.
  + Katherina: It’s not clear what that communication with Amelia should look like. Katherina suggests having a clearer process about how to communicate on these things.
  + Jill: what is key is the transfer of institutional knowledge. We’ve improved in this, but there is room for improvement. We need a place to collect this information.

**Andy’s report:**

* Registrations went up to 50 percent, which is higher than last year and higher than the AOM average. So we have an higher attendance rate from last year, and from Atlanta AoM. So we have done well.
* SIM vs AoM: in Atlanta, Chicago and Boston, SIM was a bit lower than average AOM registrations. But if we look at 2020, 2021 we are actually doing a bit better than a typical other division in the Academy.
* Exploratory committee was an important component of Andy’s tenure, he wants give time to EC to talk about that.
* Another key initiative is Racial Justice initiatives.
* Partnerships with SBE was valued and other partnership with other groups, also in awards.
* We should look for ways that we co do better and provide value for our members.
* How can we do a better job to communicate across years and roles – sharing of institutional knowledge.

**Jill’s report:**

* Was the chair of the nomination committee. Next year will be Andy.
* All digital now, will go from fall-spring. Then we’ll have our vote and bring in two new RAL.
* A lot of knowledge got lost once when there was an unexpectedly early transition of leadership, due to personal circumstances. Jill is very concerned about making sure knowledge does not fall through the cracks.

**Jae’s report:**

* New social media members who have been very active disseminating and promoting members’ requests to post announcements.
* We are the first AoM division that tried the webinar function in Zoom with the Membership committee and racial justice committee.
* There are some volunteers who are happy to help with improving the newsletter. Jae will follow up with them.
* Also working with the chair of the curriculum development committee. How can we provide more resources regarding experiential learning? This year we focused our PDW on simulations specifically. 20 members came, we used the webinar function – attendees used chat, this worked well and we shared about 10 simulations. These resources will be posted on the SIM website.
* SIM website is updated with new tabs: e.g. racial justice. Also some videos posted about the founders of the SIM division.
* Questions/comments:
  + Andy: all reports we compiled now will be posted on the website. Also notes of the meeting will be posted.

Amelia’s report:

* We had about 87408 dollars was available for our use.
* I anticipate we’ll have a good amount of money carrying forward to next year.
* Physical Aom will be more expensive, so we have sufficient resources to cover that.
* Normally (2 yrs prior to the pandemic) we had negatives, so we would go in with a loss. So basically we are much more in the positive, we are in the thousands.
* We’re not even using half of what we’re allocated.
* Questions/comments:
  + Costs are going up compared to prior to the pandemic. So our costs will go up in the future. Good thing is that in the next years we won’t have to worry about things like: can we cover the dinners for DC?
  + Jill: most money goes in the socials: food & drinks. Last year we didn’t have that. Back in the day the money we had was barely enough for this. We can use funds to fund registrations for the AoM, but we cannot use it to fund membership. Relationship with SBE is a delicate one. We funded their social, with the virtual format the question is should we fund them? It seems we’ve funded their social this year and last.
  + Andy: remove from business meeting slide that we’re funding SBE social. Katherina will also have to pick up this topic next year.
  + Robbin was at SBE business meeting and confirmed SBE too is having a lot of excess funds due to fewer expenses on socials. Robbin also appreciated Amelia’s work on keeping track of costs, donations, sponsorships of racial justice events.
  + Andy: values a good relationship with SBE. Andy was in close contact with them. SBE remains open and enthusiastic about our partnership.
  + Christina: What’s the format next year’s conference?
    - Andy expects it will be hybrid, but nobody knows for sure. It will be totally up to what AoM decides. We probably won’t know anything until spring.

**Robbin’s report:**

* Focus of racial justice committee was to put together a series of seminars. The purpose was to increase awareness about research on racial justice that wasn’t really addressed within SIM or the academy.
* 5 webinars on various topics, 2-3 presenters per webinar
* We had between 100-200 registrants. At least half showed up during the webinar.
* Lots of senior scholars, ppl from other fields, familiar faces and not so familiar faces, also lots of graduate and undergraduate students.
* Recordings were posted.
* Sponsorships from the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Notre Dame, the University of Lethbridge, and Duquesne University
* We also tried to encourage people to submit to the JBE special issue.
* Questions/comments:
  + Jill: Do you need new support going forward? A standing committee? It would be great to continue. Webinars were awesome and she would love to see this continue.
    - Robbin: a graduate student expressed interest to be on the committee. If there are ppl who are interested Robbin likes to get in touch.
    - Erica also could suggest some early scholars.
    - Andy will announce in the business meeting and encourage ppl to get in touch.

**Annie’s report:**

* Research PDWs: 40 participants, 20 meetings in pairs. Lots of submissions, and even more mentors. Great that there was so much commitment from senior scholars.
* Pairs were created based on keywords so Annie can feed that back to Colin.
* Mentees massively value workshops. They also feel that this helps when on the job market.
* What if this continues in hybrid form? We lost some more in-person things. We used to have early-idea incubators, which was more like a round-table. We can’t lose that.
* We used to have speed-networking, so we need to think about how to bring that back.
* Annie would normally roll off, but if this continues in online/hybrid format she is happy to continue supporting in the background.

**Jared’s report:**

* DC went very well, Elise was co-organizer
* 44 applicants and accepted 38. 2 people dropped out because they couldn’t register, so down to 36.
* We had applicants who kept on applying, and Jared allowed that. But turned down ppl who wanted to come for the 3rd time.
* Thirteen students (35 percent) were from a university in North America, 23 students (62 percent) from European universities, and one student was from an Australian university.
* Little mismatch between attendants and presenters in terms of locations. Presenters were roughly 60% from North American while attendees were only 40% North American. Not sure if this is just a trend tied to the virtual conference – or something we need to address.
* Jared decided to not ask for reference letters. It’s up to Elise to decide whether she wants to require it again.
* What would we like to maintain in the future in terms of virtual components? Jared would like to go for fully in-person. Zoom marathons are very challenging. Jared cannot think of anything to keep in online format.
* Questions/comments:
  + Robbin: some students really appreciated that it was online because otherwise they would not have been able to participate.

**Susana’s report:**

* JFC with ONE, it’s happening on Wednesday, so it still needs to take place.
* Many applicants but many had to turn down because of overlap with other consortia.
* 15 applications from junior faculty and postdoctoral researchers: eight participants from Europe, five from North America, one from Asia and one from Australia.
* Also received support of 20 senior faculty
* This year committee worked hard to have gender balance, also have scholars from different geographical backgrounds
* This year we wanted to give a theme to the JFC: Reimagining SIM-ONE scholarship
* Some participants received a waiver which gave ppl the opportunity to join the JFC.

**Erica’s report:**

* Exploratory committee initiated by Andy to explore who we are as a division and what we offer to our members. EC consists of Erica Steckler, Pushpika Vishwanathan, Sandra Waddoc, Jean-Pascal Gond, and Emilio Marti
* 155 individuals participated in the research, sought to achieve diversity in terms of gender and geographical background as well as research expertise.
* 5 major areas of consensus:
  + Friendly and accessible division.
  + A need for more activities in between annual meetings. Smaller scale, bottom-up initiated events
  + Networking, career and research development resources
  + Repository of teaching resources
  + Clearer pathways for all members on how to get involved
* Differentiated expectations from different groups. Different groups had slightly different takes on the divisions’ positives, negatives, hopes etc.
* 4 tensions:
  + Embracing pluralism in theory & methods vs. having a few core frameworks and methods
  + Doing research with impact vs. making theoretical & methodological contributions
  + Having a core set of SIM-identified topics & advancing cutting edge research topics.
  + Having clear normative foundations vs being perceived as activist at the expense of rigor.
* EC was very responsive to recommendations by governance committee with respect to who to talk to as part of our research. We talked to almost everyone recommended.
* Questions/comments:
  + Andy: findings connect with earlier conversations about whether it is a problem that we don’t have a dominant paradigm
  + Colin: did we get a sense about something that was wrong and needed to be fixed? Are there things that are problems that we need to fix now, vs things that are nice to have.
    - Newer and more topics.
    - Not be a division divorced from practice.
    - Quality of papers and reviews are perceived as lower than in other divisions.
  + Andy’s motivation: we got some initial ideas about the division and our member’s needs earlier, but we wanted more fine-grained insights. Also SIM topics more widespread in other divisions. Is that a problem?
  + Amelia: would be interested to how many ppl mentioned something as negative. That would help prioritize.
  + Nancy: do you have an action list, things we can quickly pick up on?
    - No, consensus points can be picked up on. But we need a committee to take this work forward.
  + Colin: Can we have chairs of existing committees to pick this up. E.g. the research committee. All these committees are thinking about how to improve.
  + Andy: for business meeting: max 5 slides, main points, e.g. why we’re here and what we did, tensions, and ideas on what members can do and pick up on.

New member introductions by Julia & Jo-Ellen.

Meeting adjourned at 9:58am EDT.