

**Agenda: OB Division Executive Committee Midyear Meeting**  
**Jan 24-25, 2014**

**A. Welcome and Brief Updates (Paul)**

Paul extended a very warm welcome to committee members and thanked the committee for their outstanding work, commitment, enthusiasm and untiring support.

**ACTION:** Paul to send OB Primer to new committee members

**B. Division Issues & Updates (Paul)**

1. Richard is stepping down from his role so we need a replacement for his multiple roles (social media, podcasts, OB meeting technologist, photographer, OB Web). Co-ordination is needed between the social media and OB web role and the job incumbent in the latter role could take responsibility for this. Paul is following up with a number of volunteers.

Steve Charlier (Georgia State)

Laurie Crandall (Case western)

Thomas Whittaker (Duke)

**ACTION:** Paul to follow up with Steve on role and based on that (e.g., if willing to take on the OBWeb portion or not) with Laurie and Thomas.

2. Award and Event Sponsorships (see B1)

a) New Sponsor for the Lifetime Achievement Award. The Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior (AROPOB) to sponsor the LAA for the foreseeable future. AROPOB will be present at the OB Awards and reception, at the LAA and AROPOB materials can be included in the packet given to students at the doctoral consortium. The AROPOB logo can be displayed at the hot coffee social following the LAA.

DECISION: The amount of the LAA award will remain at \$2000.

b) Current status on awards. The EC discussed potential avenues for additional sponsorship such as i.e. Google. Sponsorship for an award that recognizes collaborative research between between practitioners and academics will also be explored.

**ACTION:** Kim to ask Shona Brown to consider sponsorship for the division.

The EC discussed the amount of the awards at \$500 and whether the Division should approach more consulting firms for sponsorship.

**ACTION:** Paul to approach Sage for additional funding for other activities.

The EC discussed a potential new award for best book published in prior 2 years with the view of exploring sponsorship **from Google or Amazon.**

**ACTION: Kim and Amy to develop proposal so that if we go ahead, it is announced at the OB Awards and Ceremony in Philadelphia.**

3. Award Ceremony and Events
  - a) Decision taken to keep the Award Ceremony/Reception Change on Saturday based on positive comments received.
  - b) LAA – timing. Historically on Tuesday, but could draw more members if it was moved to Monday morning.
  - c) The plenary session is currently being used for the LAA but worth exploring other options such as a panel with high profile speakers on trends/directions for OB (where are we? and where are we going?) which would be of interest to the members more broadly and provide a distinctive session.

**DECISION: To move LAA to Monday morning and revisit the nature of the plenary session next year.**

4. AOM New Doctoral Student Consortium
  - a) Representative from the MCC to attend.
  - b) Request for OB funding support for the New Doctoral Student Consortium approved.

**ACTION: Paul to ask Jennifer to send some-one from MCC to the new doctoral student consortium.**

5. Conferences (OB Division Beyond the Annual Meetings)
  - a) 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Israel Organizational Behavior Conference (IOBC) – OB Division is named as a sponsor/partner (no financial support requested/provided)
  - b) Should OB support/sponsor other conferences? (SEE Categories of new initiatives)
6. International Committee restart – (Broad charge of how to reach international members)

**ACTION: Jackie to spearhead and EC asked to give names of potential members for the international Committee.**

7. Revising Executive Committee Roles
  - a) Managing and maintaining database of volunteers
  - b) Handling LAA & Cummings Award Committees (See Cheri's idea – B2)

The roles of the chair track have changed over the years. The Past Division Chair picks a chair of each of the 4 award committee chairs (LAA, Cummings, best publication and best practitioner) and then the committee chair takes over and manages the rest of the process. The Rep-at Large would chair the remaining 6 conference awards. This would free up the past division chair to take on additional roles (mentoring current chair, contacting sponsors and new initiatives for example).

The EC discussed potential ways of restructuring roles so as to allow greater scope for pursuing new initiatives for members. JFW and DC are well solidified so these could be delegated to a volunteer with a rep at large overseeing the process which would free up time for the rep at large to get involved in new initiatives. A discussion of whether rep at large could engage in new initiatives as delegating to a volunteer would present additional challenges in terms of the selection of scholars to participate in JFW and DC.

One proposal is to have 2 volunteers on 3 year track to do JFW and DC which would allow the rep at large to get involved in special initiatives. The challenge would be how to manage the coordination issues between rep at large and volunteers for JFW and DC?

**ACTION:** Sub committee (Cher, Paul & Amy) to outline new roles for Rep at large and report back to EC.

**ACTION:** Mary to investigate the possibility of changing the executive meeting to Sunday morning at the Academy contingent upon incoming and outgoing chair meetings.

**c) Categories of new initiatives**

1. OB Presence at international conferences (e.g., EAWOP, EGOS)
  2. Cross Division Partnering (e.g. with HR on international events)
  3. Fund scholarships to AoM from emerging economies
  4. Internationalization of the Division (outreach initiatives)
  5. Enhancing research-practice partnerships (e.g., partnering with PhDs in the practitioner community)
  6. Policy Issues (e.g., employment policies) The economists exert significant influence over policy decisions and should OB have a greater voice in policy issues? Could OB partner with other divisions to pursue this?
  7. Visibility of OB Division within media outlets and impact of OB more generally
  8. More material on website (e.g. teaching materials)
  9. Ethics (publishing, research methods, etc)
  10. Symposia/PDWs that should be included at AoM (e.g. Where is OB going?)
- 8. Making Connections Committee (see B3)**  
Committee is doing a fantastic job! New PDW this year on mentoring PhD students.
- a) New PDW, basics of OB to be scheduled prior to new member research forum
  - b) Make use of volunteers (e.g., AOM hospitality suite)
  - c) Size of committee

**ACTION:** Paul to check size of committee with Jennifer

**9. EC dinner at AOM**

**DECISION:** Saturday evening after reception.

**C. Financial Report (Teresa)**

Division doing well financially; reserves are building and so need to be conscious of this. Expenses are holding steady

Discussion:

a) Additional detailed expense reports? Useful for Division Chairs.

b) Resolution of payments out of the endowment?

c) Sponsors write their checks to OB Div of AOM.

d) Download award winners (with names and paper titles) directly from the system to a spreadsheet?

**D. Budget Issues and Possible New Initiatives (Paul, Teresa & Group)**

See B above.

a) Revising ideas for utilizing OB reserve funds.

Ideas? Create Foundation and/or use extra OB \$ to help fund student research, attendance at DC, or JFW for scholars from emerging OB countries without funds (e.g. Africa, Pakistan).

b) Book series

c) Enhance science-practitioner links

d) Research Mentor – senior member volunteers to read and give feedback on paper or proposal for those who don't have strong advisors or faculty in program

**E. Slate for Division Officers (Paul and group)**

1. Representatives at Large

2. Division Chair

*In separate excel file*

**F. Activity Reports/Updates**

1. PDWs (**Amy**)

88 hours allocated by AoM. 30 PDW at 92 hours so need to shorten some PDWs to meet 88 allocated hours.

a) Rejecting sessions that don't fit the PDW description and/or shortening of sessions

b) MCC continues to submit superb PDWs & popular repeats

c) Solicited a repeat of an academic-practitioner session (#23). #16 is also focused on academic-practitioner collaborations.

- d) Postpone soliciting an internationally-focused PDW until the international committee has been established.
- e) Food only for OB-sponsored sessions that are at least 4 hours in length?.
- f) Other requests – video conferencing, conference fee waivers (we get 5 and have used 3), \$10 registration fee for one session which is acceptable. The EC had a discussion on the availability of Wifi in meeting rooms and recognized the normally hotels do not provide it which leaves the only option to allow for internet connection is a hired wired connection (or availing of a hot spot).
- g) Rule change – only editors and associate editors of Academy publications are exempt from the Rule of 3+3 when participating in a session in their editor role.

**ACTION: Paul to approach Board of Governors about rule of 3 applying only to Academy Journals and ask for dispensation for all journal editors.**

**ACTION: Jackie to ask International Committee to submit an International PDW in 2015.**

**ACTION: Mary to be mindful of PDW scheduling conflicts with JFW and DC. Essentials of the OB Division to precede New Member Networking Session, as in the past.**

**ACTION: Amy check with AoM what guidelines are posted about food.**

## 2. Program (Mary & Kim)

- a) Checking in process: Papers
  - 23 papers not checked in (Of these 8 were not finalized and 15 did not meet submission criteria: 4 violated page limits, 2 had author identifying information, 9 had no submission number)
  - Referencing formatting an issue and submitters used single space referencing

Overall, checking in process improved over last year and the submission checklist has helped. However, referencing is an outstanding issue.

- b) Checking in process: Symposia
  - 4 symposia not checked in due to lack of conformance to requirements (2 contained 1 paper; 1 did not specify why the symposium should be of interest to the OB Division, and 1 exceeded the 5 page limit on the overview and two paper synopses
  - Many components of submissions not specified in the Academy guidelines, including (a) no mention that submission # must be on all pages of symposium, (b) no mention of page length for summary of panelists' discussion (for panel symposia only), (c) no mention that page limits for paper synopses (for presentation symposia) must include tables, figures, and references, (d) no mention of time limit for symposia (90 minutes). No symposia were rejected or asked to be modified with respect to any of these issues.

Overall, lack of specification in Academy guidelines on submission requirements for symposia is the main issue.

c) Recommendations:

- i Reference format part of paper submission checklist. For example, “My paper complies with reference format guidelines. The references are single spaced, 12-point font, with a line between each reference.”
- ii Submission ID Number on every page part of symposia and paper submission checklist. For example, “The submission number (write in the box) is listed in the upper right hand corner of every page of the document.”
- iii Send reminder to follow guidelines on the Sunday before the submission day.
- iv Program Developer changes – a) need flag as a way of signaling different requirement problems; b) in the statistical information spreadsheet under Finalized OB Submissions by Status we need the “Checked In” number to be broken out by type: “Papers Checked In” and “Symposia Checked In.” as two different people doing these roles c) the email template it should automatically prompt submitters to sign up to review d) allow each Division to separately send emails noting if symposia are not checked in, even if another Division has checked them in.
- v Below is our recommended changes to the Guidelines for Formatting Symposia:

**Formatting your symposium proposal.** Please follow these instructions to ensure your symposium proposal is reviewed. Proposals that are not prepared according to these instructions will NOT be reviewed. A symposium submission must include the following and be organized in the following order:

- a. A title page that includes:
  - i. Title of symposium
  - ii. Complete formal names **and affiliations** of all participants
  - iii. List of potential Division/Interest Group/AAT sponsors.
- b. **Record the 5-digit electronic submission ID number as the header on each page.**
- c. Three- to five- page overview of symposium. **Note that symposia should be designed to fit a 90-minute session.**
- d. Explanation of why the symposium should be of interest to EACH of the specified sponsors
- e. Two- to five-page synopsis of EACH presentation (for presenter symposium only) **not including references. EACH presentation may include a maximum of two additional pages of tables and figures.**
- f. **Up to a 5-page** summary of the panelists' discussion (*for panel symposium only*)
- g. For everything except references use Times New Roman 12-point font, double spaced, 1-inch (2.5 cm) margin all around, and 8.5" × 11" page setting.
- h. **Reference section including references across all the presentations, formatted properly (12-point font, single-spaced with a line between each reference, 1-inch (2.5 cm) margin, and 8.5" × 11" page setting.)**

vi The Academy needs to reinforce complying with submission guidelines

**DECISION: OB Division should pay for check in helpers for each program chair. Budget to be given to program chair to help out with the checking in process.**

The EC discussed current trends in reviewing (increase in new reviewers students and international reviewers) and how to improve the quality of the reviews as well as reviewer pool.

**DECISION** Eliminate discussion papers from the scholarly program. The Division will not submit up to three symposia to all academy sessions due to the implications for scheduling.

### 3. Doctoral Consortium (**Nancy & Abbie**)

- a) Sponsor: Wiley, Journal of Organizational Behavior will sponsor DC and impact factor presentation to continue.
- b) Ethics Session: Paul and Nancy are in touch with the AoM ethics liaison so that we can revamp the ethics session in light of feedback from last year's participants with the view of having OB Division members run it.
- c) Size: 80-90 participants. When number reaches 90, need to reconsider the format.
- d) Catering issues: soft drinks at all breaks (in addition to water)
- e) Help with Consortium: Troy Smith a third year doctoral student at Texas A&M has volunteered to help out. [tsmith@mays.tamu.edu](mailto:tsmith@mays.tamu.edu). Should we ask April Schantz who helped last year? [aschantz@fiu.edu](mailto:aschantz@fiu.edu). Ideal to have some-one to shadow for first year and then help it out.

**Key changes:** Neal Ashkanasy issue. He wants to do it and give him feedback on issue about last year.

**Fixing ethics module.** Theresa (AoM staff) worked with past ethics committee and last committee had different philosophy that was not interactive. This year, OB Division running the ethics session themselves (Deb Rupp) and Don Palmer (UC Davis), Jason Colquitt.

**Nancy and Laura to liaise over catering issues (breakfast, soft drinks)**

**ACTION: Nancy & Abbie to design this ethics session**

**ACTION: Paul & Jackie to be at DC Friday 5pm**

### 4. Junior Faculty Workshop (**Scott & Leanne**)

- a) Changes from last year: Friday to end at 8.15pm and then run networking. Greater interaction opportunities.
- b) Guidelines for participants – how to get most out of JFW?
- c) JFW to prepare questions in advance and pass them onto the Faculty Fellows

**ACTION: Paul and Jackie to be at JFW 5pm on Saturday**

**ACTION: Leanne to do survey in 2015 to assess the relevance of the topics/sessions covered.**

Action: Scott & Leanne to make fellows aware that participants may not come from Tier 1 schools. In 2015, reflect this in the faculty fellow selection.

ACTION: JC-S Are we serving the needs members? (e.g., JFW in non Tier 1/non research intensive)? Investigate in the 5 year strategic review

#### 5. Catering (Laura)

Catering costs increase when onsite last minute orders are made.

Action: Amy and Laura to discuss combining PDWs to get food

- a) Increase budget for OBDC (breakfast is an issue)
- b) Increase budget for Hot Coffee, Cool People as it is getting more popular
- c) Chocolates – let Laura know which event chocolates should be at
- d) Drink tickets (will depend on hotel rules). For the last 2 years, the Division has provided its own drink tickets and we are only charged if the tickets are redeemed. Drink tickets are great idea when the division is only charged when they are redeemed.

DECISION: Photo booth and video of LAA to continue to be funded

ACTION: Laura sunglasses with Liberty Bell

#### 6. Awards (Cheri & Deanne)

- a) Status report. The members of the awards committees are nearly finalized.
- b) AOM changes in conference paper award nominations on submission system. The Academy has changed the selection process for nominating a paper for awards so that submitters can only choose one category. The implication of this is that only 5 student papers have been nominated for best student paper and therefore have reduced the pool of nominees.
- c) Rollovers for LAA (should we adjust the number?) The committee can rollover 5 nominees twice. The EC discussed a proposal to rollover up to 8 nominees and this decision can be made by chair of committee and also the Past Division Chair.
- d) Should self-nominations be allowed for LAA and Cummings with the nomination letter written by the candidate? EC discussed and are of the view that self nominations should not be permitted.
- e) How can we increase the pool of nominees? 13 nominations for LAA but this year the number of nominees for the Cummings Award is lower (around 9 compared to 10-15 usually).

Action: Communicate that Cummings Award can be awarded up to 12 years post PhD.

Action: change language on OB web so that no self nominations are permitted

Action point: Paul contact AoM and let them know that confining submitters to nominating their paper for one award is not a good idea as it significantly reduces the pool of nominees



**B1. Award and Event Sponsorship**

**2014 OB DIVISION SPONSORSHIPS**

Activity	Amount	Sponsor	Contact Information			Notes
			Contact	Other	Company	
<b>Award Plaque Title</b>						
Best Paper	\$500	<b>OB Division</b>	OB Division Chair		OB Division	
Best Symposium	\$500	<b>Cambridge University Press</b> ; new in 2012	Paula Parish, Senior Commissioning Editor - Business &	Kate McCarty (kmcarty@cambridge.org)	Cambridge University Press	
Best Dissertation-Based Paper	\$500	<b>Wiley-Blackwell</b> on behalf of the Journal of Organizational Behavior (Neal Ashkanasy, editor)	Hester Tilbury	Verity Warne, Divisional Marketing Mgr (vwarne@wiley.com)	John Wiley	
Most Innovative Student Paper	\$500 in books	<b>Sage Publications, Inc.</b> ; new in 2011	Pat Quinlin, Senior Acquisitions Editor		<b>Sage Publications, Inc.</b>	
Best Paper with International Implications	\$500	<b>OB Division</b> . prior was Emerald Group Publishing on behalf of the Leadership and Organization Development Journal	Zoe Sanders (zsanders@emeraldinsight.com)		OB Division	
Outstanding Practical-Implications for Management	\$500	<b>Mercer Workforce Sciences Institute</b>	Rick Guzzo	Haig Nalbantian	Mercer	
Outstanding Publication in Organizational Behavior	\$500	<b>Emerald Group Publishing</b> ; Journal of Managerial Psychology. (was \$1000 prior to '11)	Zoe Sanders		Emerald Group Publishing	
Outstanding Practitioner Oriented Publication in Organizational Behavior	\$500	Management Education Research Institute ( <b>Graduate Management Admission Council</b> ), was \$800 in '12	Rachel Edgington, Market Research & Analysis	Devina Oliver (doliver@gmac.com)	Graduate Management Admission Council	
Cummings Scholarly Achievement Award	\$1,000	<b>OB Division Endowment</b>	OB Division Chair		OB Division	
Lifetime Achievement Award	\$2,000	<b>Annual Review of Org Psychology &amp; OB</b> -- prior was OB Division in '11 and '10; McKinsey & Co. in '09. Elsevier in '08 and before.	Jenni Rankin (Fred Morgeson, Ann Review of Org Psych & OB Editor)		Annual Reviews	
<b>Events</b>						
Lifetime Achievement Award Coffee Break	\$1,000	<b>Journal of Management</b> (Portland State University in '08 and previous years)	Deborah Rupp - Editor			
OB Reception (Saturday)	\$3,000	SUNY Buffalo School of Management and Center for Leadership & Org Effectiveness	Paul Tesluk		SUNY buffalo	
Doctoral Consortium	\$5,000	Journal of Organizational Behavior: <b>\$10K before 2010</b>	Charolette (Charlie) Stone		JOB	confirmed 1/15, invoice to Charlie
Leadership Reception	\$2,000	<b>Elsevier</b>	Publishing Editor-Social Sciences		Elsevier	
Leadership Reception	amount over \$2,000	<b>Inst for Innov. Ldrshp</b> -- Univ. of Neb. New in '10	Mary Uhl-Bien		University of Nebraska	
Book Raffle	2 sets of 5 books	<b>Stanford Press</b> , new in 2012	Margo Beth Fleming			

change University of Nebraska to FIU and the contact is Garth Headley.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>B3. Making Connections Committee</b> <b>Jennifer Nahrgang and Ron Piccolo</b></p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

For AOM 2014, we have organized the following PDWs and other events.

Professional Development Workshops (PDWs)

- Halfway There: Cindy Zapata, Ned Wellman, Maribeth Kuenzi
- OB Research Incubator: Ron Piccolo, Steven Whiting
- From Associate to Full and Beyond (2014): Rosalind Chow, Christopher Porter
- New Member Networking Forum: Bart de Jong, Kristie Rogers
- Essential of OB Division - Shannon Taylor, Adam Stoverink, Jenni Carson Marr
- OB Teaching Incubator: Michael Johnson, Robert Litchfield, Jen Leigh
- Productivity Process: Jaron Harvey, John Sumanth
- Mentoring PhD Students: Jennifer Nahrgang, Crystal Farh, Samir Nurmohamed

Related Events

- Junior Faculty Informal Dinner: Jennifer Nahrgang, Crystal Fahr & Eean Crawford

The MCC committee includes 20 members, which help to organize the PDWs listed above. In 2013, the following changes were made to the MCC Committee:

- Integrated the OB Teaching Incubator and The Productivity Process into the MCC committee.
- Added a new PDW “Essentials of the OB Division” at the request of the OB Executive Committee. Around 40 individuals participated in the new PDW.
- Expanded the Junior Faculty Informal Dinner to a second cohort of junior faculty

New in 2014

In 2014, we will add a new PDW “Mentoring PhD Students.” The session is planned for 2 hours and targeted at junior faculty who are beginning to mentor doctoral students. Our goal would be for the “Mentoring PhD Students” to be scheduled after the Productivity Process PDW in order to market the two PDWs together.

The purpose of the session is two-fold: First, to present the scientific findings of mentoring research and second, to offer practical advice on mentoring doctoral students. After introductions, Susan Murphy will discuss the scientific findings of mentoring research (15 minutes). The session will then include a panel discussion (30 minutes) and round table discussions (45 minutes) from individuals with a successful history of mentoring graduate students. The panelists and round table discussion leaders include “pairs” of faculty mentor-student mentee who can speak to both the role of faculty mentor and student mentee in the mentoring relationship and provide practical tips on mentoring graduate students. The “pairs” will include: John Hollenbeck – Jason Colquitt, Jeff LePine; Jason Colquitt – Jessica Rodell; Jeff LePine – Eean Crawford; Keith Murnighan – Madan Pillutla; Connie Wanberg – John Kammeyer-Mueller, Jing Zhu; Blake Ashforth – David Sluss.

We will also organize the “From Associate to Full and Beyond” PDW in 2014, which is offered every other year. In 2015 this will be replaced by the Microcommunity PDW.

**MCC Committee Members\*:**

Rosalind Chow (Carnegie Mellon University), Bart de Jong (VU University Amsterdam), Crystal Farh (Michigan State University), Jaron Harvey (University of Wyoming), Michael Johnson (University of Washington), Maribeth Kuenzi (Southern Methodist University), Jen Leigh (Nazareth College), Robert Litchfield (Washington & Jefferson College), Jenni Carson Marr (Georgia Tech University), Jennifer Nahrgang (Arizona State University), Ron Piccolo (Rollins College), Christopher Porter (Indiana University), Kristie Rogers (University of Kansas), Adam Stoverink (Northern Illinois University), John Sumanth (Southern Methodist University), Shannon Taylor (University of Central Florida), Ned Wellman (Arizona State University), Steve Whiting (Indiana University), Maia Young (UCLA), Cindy Zapata (Georgia Tech University).

\*Contact list of MCC committee members and mission statement in Appendix 1

**C. Financial Report**  
**Teresa**

Two statements are included in the appendix 2 and 3 for your information. I can also provide more detailed reconciliations upon request. Below, I provide a summary review of our financial situation.

The division continues to be in great shape financially.

Once AOM credits the allocation, we should have \$149,603 in our total operating fund account. Last year at this time we had \$129,393.

Our three primary sources of funds are our division allocation, sponsorships and fees for the annual meeting, and any carry forward (CF).

- The 2014 membership allocation is determined using the July 1, 2013 membership count; this year our count is 6,247 and our allocation at \$11 per member (unchanged from last year) is \$ 69,217.
- Sponsorships had been dwindling for a couple of years but now they have not only recovered but soared past prior levels at \$24, 122, (note this includes \$500 for next year and sponsorship for the NLS event).
- There has been concern about our carry forward (CF) limitations in the past, so I wanted to clarify this issue.
  - Our CF is calculated using this formula: CF = End of year net funds balance (last year's carry forward amount) + 50% of allocation + sponsorship money collected.
  - Therefore, for 2013 we could carry forward no more than \$60,583 + \$34,405 + \$13,850 = \$108,838. We are carrying forward approximately \$80,390.
  - However, given the spirit of this rule, we should also note that our carry forward amount has increased by \$11-14 K each of the last two years (2013 and 2014) after three years of holding steady (2010-2012). However, there is precedence for this as in 2008 and 2009 the CF amount also increased significantly.

Our major expenses are the annual meeting and the midyear meeting.

- The annual meeting food and beverage total for 2013 is slightly below 2012, and 13% below estimated. Total meeting expenditure for 2013 is virtually exactly the same as 2012, with some categories shifting slightly up or down.
- Our midyear meeting expenses have been holding steady since 2008.

**Questions/Issues for discussion**

- What other detailed expense reports would help you?
- Resolution of payments that this year came out of the endowment?
- Any objections to having all sponsors write their checks to OB Div of AOM?
- Is it possible to download award winners (with names and paper titles) directly from the system to a spreadsheet?

**F1: PDW Report  
Amy Colbert**

**Lead Sponsorship Summary:** 31 submissions finalized/94 hours requested (0 accepted – that will happen in February; 88 hours allocated)

#	ID	Last Name	Hours	Title	New or Repeat?	Requests
1	10017	Marques	2	Using Words as Tokens of Appreciation	New	Food (turn down)
2	10232	Potosky	2	Teaching Organizational Behavior (OB): Approaches for Students in Different Types of Organizations	New	Food (turn down)
3	10237	Taylor	2/1.5	Essentials of the OB Division	Repeat/MCC	
4	10348	Cameron	2	Innovative Teaching of Positive Organizational Scholarship in the Management Classroom	Repeat	
5	10517	de Jong	2/1.5	OB New Member Networking and Research Forum	Repeat/MCC	
6	10875	Litchfield	2/1.5	OB Teaching Incubator	Repeat/MCC	\$10 reg fee
7	11135	Makino	3	A Field Guide to Experience Sampling Methods Using Mobile Devices and Smartphones	New	
8	11178	Rothbard	3	Organizational Behavior Division Doctoral Consortium	Repeat/OB	Food
9	11208	Schinoff	3	New Directions in Positive Relationships at Work	Repeat	
10	11209	Rothbard	9.5	Organizational Behavior Division Doctoral Consortium	Repeat/OB	Food  Michael Pratt, Belle Rose Ragins, and Don Siegel – Add as Editors
11	11681	Burriss	4	Managing Field Research: Strategies for Partnering with Organizations to Gain Access to Data	Repeat	
12	11833	Langelett	2	How Do I Keep My Employees Motivated? An Application of the Practice of Empathy-Based Management	New	Food (turn down)

OB Division Mid-Year Meeting, Jan 24-25 2014

13	12508	Zapata	4	Halfway There, But Now What? Advice for Pre-Dissertation Doctoral Students (5th Annual)	Repeat/MCC	Food
14	12530	Leicht-Deobald	3	Thrive! Energizing Ourselves and Others as Academics	New	
15	12697	Searle	4	Diversity of Trust: Current and emergent issues in the field	New	
16	12958	Purvanova	2	Researching Virtual Teams: Tips and Strategies from Virtual Teams Scholars and Practitioners	New	Video conferencing? 3 conference fee waivers
17	13548	Dasborough	2	Some Words of Advice: A Mentoring Session to Promote High Quality Leadership Research	Repeat?	
18	14095	Nahrgang	2	Mentoring Graduate Students: Tips, Best Practices, and Life-Changing Stories from the Experts	MCC	
20	14449	Atwater	4	OB Junior Faculty Workshop	Repeat/OB	Food
21	14487	Akan	2	Using Concescent Conversation to Understand and Explain a Team from Hell Experience	New	
22	14533	Atwater	9	OB Junior Faculty Workshop II	Repeat/OB	Food
23	14581	Stimmler	2.5	Research in Practice: Connecting Theory and Work Through Academic / Practitioner Collaborations	Repeat OB-solicited	
24	15360	Clapp-Smith	4	Congratulations, You Got a Revise and Resubmit! Now What?	Repeat	
25	15632	Haas-Edersheim	2	Values as an Integrative Mechanism	New	
26	15637	Grote	2.5	Innovation versus risk – all the same for teams?	New	
27	15880	Tobias	3	Researching Organisational Mindfulness and Mindful Organising: Theory, Method, and Practice	New	
28	16236	Whiting	2	OB Research Incubator	Repeat/MCC	
29	16586	Nippa	3	Employee Loyalty and Organizational	New	

				Commitment Revisited- Exploring Future Research Opportunities		
30	17016	Chow	2	From Associate to Full... and Beyond	Repeat/MCC	
31	17153	Harvey	4	The Productivity Process: Research Tips and Strategies from Prolific Junior Faculty	Repeat/MCC	Food
32	17631	Zarzecka	2	The Effect of Senior Manager's Network Utility on Firm Performance	New	

### Co-sponsorship Summary:

**Total Cosponsorships Allotted: 47**

**Total Cosponsorships Requested: unknown until other divisions finish checking in**

**Total Cosponsorships Charged: TBD**

- a. Under the co-sponsorship system, each division receives a list of sessions that have listed that division as a potential cosponsor
- b. Each co-sponsorship that is accepted costs one credit; OB was allocated 47 credits.
- c. Acceptance criteria will follow last year's guidelines including where OB fell in the potential cosponsor rankings and how broad the appeal was.

### Discussion Points

- a) Rejecting sessions that don't fit the PDW description and/or requesting some shortening of sessions should allow us to accept all that fit the criteria.
- b) MCC continues to submit superb PDWs and we have a number of very popular repeats.
- c) Solicited a repeat of an academic-practitioner session (#23). #16 is also focused on academic-practitioner collaborations.
- d) Postponed soliciting an internationally-focused PDW until the international committee is up and running. May want to do this for 2015.
- e) Food is provided only for OB-sponsored sessions that are at least 4 hours in length. Is this OK? Will turn down the rest.
- f) Other requests – video conferencing, conference fee waivers (we get 5), \$10 registration fee
- g) There will be the usual coordination issues once we accept sessions. Will request that Essentials of the OB Division precede New Member Networking Session, as in the past. Any other potential scheduling issues?
- h) Rule change – only editors and associate editors of Academy publications are exempt from the Rule of 3+3 when participating in a session in their editor role.

**F2: Program**  
**Mary Uhl-Bien & Kimberly Elsbach**

**I. Submissions**

- 870 papers, down about 3% from 2013 (895)
- 158 symposia, up about 3% from 2012 (153)
- Total submissions 1028, down 2% from 2012 (1048)

**II. Reviewers (remember that max number of review assignments changed from 9 to 6 in 2013)**

- 1113 reviewers from 49 countries (down from 1384 reviewers from 55 countries in 2013)
- Average number of *other* Divisions selected: 1.68
- 42% are new reviewers (compared to 31% in 2013) which is high compared to previous years where it has been typically around 30%
- 41% are students (compared to 38% in 2012 and 2013)
- 54% are non U.S. (a significant increase from 44.5% in 2013, 43% in 2012, and 37% in 2011)
- 566 (51%) agree to act as emergency reviewer, compared to 668 in 2013
- 42% agreed to serve as Chair and 42.5% agreed to serve as facilitator

**III. Reviewer Matching Process**

- All went smoothly. BJ and Gabe ran the algorithm with no problems. The Division used 1057 (96%) of the total 1105 reviewers input into the algorithm.

**IV. Program Components**

**A. Professional Development Program (Friday & Saturday) the same as in past years**

**B. Scholarly Program:**

- Target acceptance rate is 50%
- Two Types of Paper Sessions:
  - Divisional Presentation Paper sessions: Accepted papers grouped together by the Division Program Chair. Each session should have a MINIMUM of three papers with one Session Chair.
  - Discussion Paper sessions: Sessions for promising papers that meet the acceptance criteria; focus is on authors receiving feedback. Three to four papers with discussant. Each division may designate up to 10% of accepted papers for this type of session. The Division Program Chairs are responsible for grouping these papers into sessions. **AOM staff will schedule the sessions as part of the Sunday program.**
- No change to Symposia sessions



### C. All-Academy Themed Sessions (Sunday)

- Held on Sunday from 11:30-6:00
- Submitters must choose between submitting to the All-Academy program or the Division
- Process for Division:
  - Each division may nominate **up to three** of their *accepted* symposia (**not** PDWs or papers) for the All Academy Theme program on Sunday.
  - At most **one** nominated symposium may be selected by the All Academy Theme Committee for the Sunday program. Nominated symposia that are **not** accepted for the All Academy Theme program **will be returned to the nominating division** for inclusion on its Monday and Tuesday program.
  - A replacement is **not** allowed on a division's Monday / Tuesday program if a nominated symposium **is** accepted for the All Academy Theme program.
  - (Note that this caused scheduling problems last year—my recommendation is that we not do this.)

**D. Plenary session** – We need to tell them when we want to hold it.

## IV. Check-in Process

### Papers

- 23 papers not checked in. Of these 8 were not finalized and 15 did not meet submission criteria (4 violated page limits, 2 had author identifying information, 9 had no submission number)
- The biggest problem was reference formatting. People single-spaced references with no line between, which gave them an unfair advantage because they had more pages (in some cases this gave them 4 more pages). I could not reject these papers because the guidelines are not at all clear and people were all over the place. However, I could not accept them as is. So this created major work in emailing authors. We should never do this again—we need to get it fixed for next year.
- If they submitted before the deadline I emailed them to fix the problem asap if they want it checked in. After the deadline I stopped doing that except for reference problem. I sent a personal email to those who were not checked in telling them why the day before I sent the email template from the system.
- People cheated in all kinds of ways on space issue (playing with font size, playing with margins, playing with line spacing). I suggest we address this in the future after we get the major issues covered. I suspect that once people realize how serious we are about enforcing and that we are rejecting papers that do not comply these problems will lessen and we will be able to address them.
- In no case did I have a complaint or a single problem with anyone. Every single person was highly apologetic for problems. They were also accepting that the fault was theirs. I asked

them to spread the word that they need to clearly follow the guidelines or they will not be checked in.

### **Symposia**

- Many components of submissions not specified in the Academy guidelines, including (a) no mention that submission # must be on all pages of symposium, (b) no mention of page length for summary of panelists' discussion (for panel symposia only), (c) no mention that page limits for paper synopses (for presentation symposia) must include tables, figures, and references, (d) no mention of time limit for symposia (90 minutes). No symposia were rejected or asked to be modified with respect to any of these issues.
- I sent emails to 12 early submitters (those who submitted by at least Jan. 12<sup>th</sup>) whose symposia were not in compliance with Academy guidelines. In all but one case, these submitters responded by fixing their submissions, and they were checked in.
- Four symposia were not checked in: two because they had only 1 paper in the submission of a presenter symposium (presenter symposia must include "a series of authored papers on a preset theme"), one because it did not specify why the symposium should be of interest to the OB Division, and one because the overview and two paper synopses were significantly over the 5 page limit.
- Of the four symposia not checked in, three were also submitted to other Divisions, and all three were checked in by these Divisions (even though they violated the Academy guidelines for submission). This means these Divisions either did not carefully check the submissions for compliance with the Academy guidelines, or they checked them in despite their non-compliance with these guidelines. Either way, this is a problem because if OB complies with the guidelines, but other Divisions don't, then we look like the bad guys, and submitters learn that they don't have to comply with the guidelines. I have sent an email to tech support and Debra Shapiro noting this.
- For the three symposia not checked in by OB that were checked in by other Divisions, I was not able to use the email template provided by the Academy, because once one Division checks in a submission, it is considered "checked in." I asked about changing this, and Gabe said he thought it would be confusing for submitters to get some emails saying the submission was checked in and others saying it wasn't. I don't think this would be a problem if the email said which Division it was checked in to, but this is a discussion for next year. I sent personal emails to all those not checked in by OB (that were checked in by other Divisions), explaining why I did not check them in.

## **V. Recommendations for Improving Check-In Process Next Year**

### **Papers**

1. Work with Academy to get the reference format absolutely clear. It should be single spaced with a line between. Make it explicit in the submission checklist check boxes: "My paper complies with reference format guidelines. The references are single spaced, 12-point font, with a line between each reference."

2. For submission numbers, do the same thing we did with papers. Make them write it in. So here it would be: “The submission number (write in the box) is listed in the upper right hand corner of every page of the document.”
3. Send the reminder to follow guidelines email on the Sunday before, like I did this time. Warn them that section breaks can interfere with submission numbers in the headers and they need to check for that before they submit. Also warn them that when the paper converts to pdf in the system it can run over and they need to check it carefully before they submit; no papers over 40 pages will be checked in.

### **Program Developer**

1. We need to be able to put a flag in the system for those that are a problem for check-in. Flags should have color choices (like stars in Gmail). Yellow means the assistant sees a problem (they then note it in the google docs spreadsheet). Blue means the Program Chair has reviewed it and has an email out to the authors (this should be very rare—hopefully we won’t have to use it). Red means the Program Chair has reviewed it and it will not be checked in.
2. We need a popup box for a red flag that lists the problems (violates page limits, no page number, author identifying information included, references not single spaced with a line between, not use 1-inch margins and 12-point font). This should then connect to the Not Checked In email so that when they receive it, they know what the issue is and why they were not in conformance. This would save a lot of email time!
3. In the statistical information spreadsheet under Finalized OB Submissions by Status we need the “Checked In” number to be broken out by type: “Papers Checked In” and “Symposia Checked In.” This is important for OB because we have two different people doing these roles.
4. In the email template it should automatically include the statement: “If you have not yet signed up as a reviewer for conference papers, we would greatly appreciate your help. The success of our program depends on our team of reviewers. If you have not yet done so, I hope you will visit <http://review.aomonline.org/> and click the "Sign Up Now" button.” Note that we would then add: “and select the OB Division” to tailor it to our Division. This would be for both paper and symposia email templates.
5. Allow each Division to separately send emails noting if symposia are not checked in, even if another Division has checked them in. The system should not remove submissions that have not been checked in by one Division from the “NOT Checked in” email log for that Division, just because they were checked in by another Division.

### **Symposia**

1. Ask the Academy to make sure the formatting instructions for Symposia include the following: (a) require that submission # must be on all pages of symposium, (b) set a 5-page limit for the summary of panelists' discussion (for panel symposia only), (c) dictate that page limits for paper synopses (for presentation symposia) do not include tables, figures, and references, (d) require that symposia be designed to fit a 90 minute time limit.
2. Ask the Academy to reiterate that all submissions must be carefully checked and not checked in unless they comply with all submission guidelines. Make clear that all Divisions need to be vigilant and consistent in enforcement of these guidelines.
3. Below is our recommended changes to the Guidelines for Formatting Symposia:

**Formatting your symposium proposal.** Please follow these instructions to ensure your symposium proposal is reviewed. Proposals that are not prepared according to these instructions will NOT be reviewed. A symposium submission must include the following and be organized in the following order:

- i. A title page that includes:
  - i. Title of symposium
  - ii. Complete formal names **and affiliations** of all participants
  - iii. List of potential Division/Interest Group/AAT sponsors.
- j. **Record the 5-digit electronic submission ID number as the header on each page.**
- k. Three- to five- page overview of symposium. **Note that symposia should be designed to fit a 90-minute session.**
- l. Explanation of why the symposium should be of interest to EACH of the specified sponsors
- m. Two- to five-page synopsis of EACH presentation (for presenter symposium only) **not including references. EACH presentation may include a maximum of two additional pages of tables and figures.**
- n. **Up to a 5-page** summary of the panelists' discussion (*for panel symposium only*)
- o. For everything except references use Times New Roman 12-point font, double spaced, 1-inch (2.5 cm) margin all around, and 8.5" × 11" page setting.
- p. **Reference section including references across all the presentations, formatted properly (12-point font, single-spaced with a line between each reference, 1-inch (2.5 cm) margin, and 8.5" × 11" page setting.)**

**F3. OB Doctoral Consortium**  
**Nancy Rothbard and Abbie Shipp**

1. The Agenda (see below)

- a. The basic agenda is similar to previous years based on positive feedback.
- b. We have staffed for the number of participants we had last year (around 80) with 10-12 roundtable hosts per session.
- c. Like last year, we have left 1.5 hours for lunch and a break this year, assuming a served lunch. We would like to avoid a lunch speaker. We got positive comments about having time for informal discussions over lunch last year. This year, we plan to try to create some small communities of students with similar research interests, and lunch time conversations are necessary for this goal. If JOB would like to have someone speak briefly as the editor of the *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, as a 15-minute agenda item, please see below **(point 1d and Discussion point#1)**.
- d. We intend to make two key changes. First, we intend to invite Suzanne Masterson as the JOB representative in place of Neal Ashkanasy who will be stepping down from the editor role there.
- e. Second, we are working with the AoM ethics committee to change the ethics session. Paul and Nancy have been in contact with Debra Shapiro about this and she put us in contact with Terese Loncar who will work with us on a revised approach that includes using and referring to, as a backdrop, the AOM Code of Ethics and other related resources as well as using division members to deliver this session. We do not yet know who will be staffing the ethics workshop so that is something we need to discuss and get feedback on at the meeting. (see **Discussion point #2**).

2. Call for Nominations (see attached)

- a. Our next step is to put out the call for nominations. Last year, our nomination process resulted in 93 nominations. We did not take the 6 who had not yet defended their proposals and who were not yet on the job market, which resulted in a total of 87 students – a few were not able to make it to Orlando and so we ended up with about 85 students in the room. While this is a large number of students, it seemed very manageable with the set up we have (i.e., 12 round tables that can comfortably seat 96). Our goal for this year is to maintain that number. To achieve this goal, we have maintained the following restrictions in the call for nominations:
  - a. Limit of 1 student per program maximum. No limit per university because it is hard for universities to coordinate across programs and there are rare universities (maybe 10) who nominate students from multiple departments.
  - b. We follow last year's call in terms of mentioning "halfway there" and "new doctoral student" consortia as alternatives for students who are not in the final stages of their program. We've also added a reference to doctoral consortia offered by "related" divisions (e.g., HR).

- b. If we do get more nominations than last year, what is the maximum number of students that we should take (especially considering budget constraints)? (see **Discussion item #3**)
3. Collecting and Distributing Participant and Faculty Information
  - a. Students submit a one-page vita and a one-page dissertation abstract. Faculty submit a short bio. Speakers may submit presentation materials. All files are submitted via email.
  - b. Last year, we used Dropbox to share these materials with participants via Dropbox before the consortium. This seemed to work well.
4. Room and Material Needs:
  - a. Two flipcharts on Friday from 4 – 7 and Saturday from 8 – 5:30. Having sticky paper on the flipcharts (or tape available) would be useful so that insights can be posted around the room.
  - b. At least **12 roundtables** in the room; would be nice to have a room that could accommodate 14 or 15 (just in case our numbers really grow). We also need **3 rectangular tables** for check-in, materials, and faculty panelists.
  - c. Projector and screen (We'll plan to bring laptops for presentations.)
  - d. A wired microphone for the main speakers and two portable microphones for audience participation
  - e. Food needs:
    - a. Heavy hors d'oeuvres and beverages for Friday evening (4-7 pm).
      - i. Would like both warm appetizers and cold appetizers. Food was very good last year. However, we ran out of food.
      - ii. Soda and wine/beer? (See **Discussion point #5**)
    - b. Continental breakfast for Saturday morning (8-8:30 am). We ran out of food here too last year.
    - c. Coffee break for Saturday morning (10-10:15 am)
    - d. Served lunch for Saturday (11:45 am-1 pm). Lunch was delicious last year!
    - e. Soda/cookie break for Saturday afternoon (3:45-4 pm)
  - f. Drink tickets for faculty participants (~60)
5. Possible Changes Going Forward
  - a. More opportunities for networking – up front “getting to know each other session”.
  - b. Creating and Maintaining Community – Students have indicated a desire to meet other students with similar interests and to maintain those ties beyond the consortium. Currently this happens informally with some success. How could we facilitate this? Could technology be used to create virtual groups or a single space for future communication? (see **Discussion point #6**)

**Discussion points:**

- f) **Sponsor:** Will Wiley be our lunch sponsor again? **Have we spoken with them about Suzanne doing the impact factor presentation instead of Neal?**

- g) **Ethics Session:** Paul and Nancy are in touch with the AoM ethics liason so that we can revamp the ethics session. Suggestions for revamping and staffing with OB Division members?
- h) **Size:** Based on the past two years, we expect about 80-90 participants. If we see an increase in nominations, what is the maximum number of participants we should accept? And what further criteria should we use to select them? We have been using whether they are on the market and/or have defended their proposal.
- i) **Late Applications:** We had 1 student who applied late last year. Should we include more information in the AoM program to help students understand that they can only attend if they have been nominated by May 16 and have been accepted?
- j) **Soft Drinks vs. Wine:** One issue at the consortium last year was lack of drinks in the room during the breaks and the sessions. People were quite thirsty (and mentioned it in the evaluation comments as well). My preference would be to have soft drinks at the breaks and meals as well as water. I understand that this might be expensive in terms of the budget, but feel it is important and I would rather forgo having wine on the Friday evening session so that we can have soft drinks throughout. What are our options here?
- k) **Responding to Feedback from Participants:** Any suggestions on a good networking exercise to do at the beginning and suggestions on how to create small communities within the larger group and how to maintain these contacts?
- l) **Help with Consortium:** Troy Smith a third year doctoral student at Texas A&M has volunteered to help out. [tsmith@mays.tamu.edu](mailto:tsmith@mays.tamu.edu). Should we ask April Schantz who helped last year? [aschantz@fiu.edu](mailto:aschantz@fiu.edu) . I am assuming that Andy who helped last year wouldn't want to do it again, but if he did that would be great.

ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR DOCTORAL CONSORTIUM  
2014 Academy of Management Meetings in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
August 1 & 2, 2014  
LOCATION: TBD

**Coordinators**

**Nancy Rothbard**, U. of Pennsylvania ([nrothbard@wharton.upenn.edu](mailto:nrothbard@wharton.upenn.edu))  
**Abbie Shipp**, Texas Christian University ([a.shipp@tcu.edu](mailto:a.shipp@tcu.edu))

**Friday, August 1, 4:00 p.m.-7:00 p.m.**

*Introductions (4:00-5:30 p.m.)*

*Session 1: Crafting the Right Academic Job: From Job Search to Transition (5:30-7:00 p.m.)*

**Amy Wrzesniewski**, Yale U., speaker  
**Batia Wiesenfeld**, New York U., speaker

**Round Table Hosts**

Amy Wrzesniewski, Yale U.	Batia Wiesenfeld, New York U.
Greg Stewart, U. of Iowa	David Mayer, U. of Michigan
Kevin Lowe, UNC-Greensboro	Micki Kacmar, U. of Alabama
Lance Ferris, Penn State U.	Jeff Thompson, Brigham Young U.
Ethan Burris, U. of Texas	Michelle Duffy, U. of Minnesota
Katherine Phillips, Columbia U.	Lynn Shore, Colorado State U.

**Saturday, August 10, 8:00 a.m.-5:30 p.m.**

*Continental Breakfast (8:00-8:30 a.m.)*

*Session 2: Research and Publishing (8:30-10:00 a.m.)* – Note: Presenters and roundtable hosts in this session are editors. Thus, their participation does not count toward the Rule of Three.

**Michael Pratt**, Boston College *Administrative Science Quarterly*, speaker  
**Frederick Morgeson**, Michigan State U., *Personnel Psychology*, speaker

**Round Table Hosts**

Michael Pratt, Boston College	Frederick Morgeson, Michigan State U.
Amy Colbert, U. of Iowa	Linn Van Dyne, Michigan State U.
Belle Rose Ragins, U. of Wisconsin	David Allen, U. of Memphis
Stuart Bunderson, Washington U.	Ingrid Fulmer, Rutgers U.
Xiao-Ping Chen, U. of Washington	Suzanne Masterson, U. of Cincinnati
Gilad Chen, U. of Maryland	Don Siegel, SUNY-Albany

*Break (10:00-10:15 a.m.)*



***Session 3: Effective Teaching & Supervision (10:15-11:45 a.m.)***

**Ron Piccolo**, Rollins College, speaker

**Round Table Hosts:**

Chris Quinn Trank, Vanderbilt U.  
Amir Erez, U. of Florida  
Ashleigh Rosette, Duke U.  
Christina Shalley, Georgia Tech  
Elaine Hollensbe, U. of Cincinnati  
Marcie LePine, Arizona State U.

Megan Gerhardt, Miami U. of Ohio  
Michael Wesson, Texas A&M  
Mike Crant, U. of Notre Dame  
Ron Piccolo, Rollins College  
Mark Mortensen, INSEAD  
Tim Baldwin, Indiana U.

***Lunch (11:45 a.m.-1:15 p.m.)***

***Session 4: Work-Life Balance Panel (1:15-2:15 p.m.)***

**Abbie Shipp**, Texas Christian U., speaker  
**Kenneth G. Brown**, U. of Iowa, speaker  
**Amy Kristof-Brown**, U. of Iowa, speaker

**Panelists:**

Theresa Glomb, U. of Minnesota

***Session 5: Brief Comments on Journal Impact (2:15 – 2:30 p.m.)***

**Suzanne Masterson**, U. of Cincinnati, Senior Editor Journal of Organizational Behavior (Have not confirmed this with Suzanne yet)

***Break: 2:30 – 2:45 p.m.***

***Session 6: Special Topics (2:45-3:45 p.m.)***

Elizabeth Umphress, U. of Washington  
John Bingham, Brigham Young U.  
Cheri Ostroff, U. of Southern Australia  
Erik Dane, Rice U.  
Lisa Dragoni, Cornell U.  
David Wagner Singapore Management U.  
Jeff Edwards, U of North Carolina

Marie Mitchell, U. of Georgia  
Dan Bachrach, U. of Alabama  
Brent Scott, Michigan State U.  
Ronit Kark, Bar-Ilan U.  
Steffanie Wilk, Ohio State U.  
Jill Perry Smith, Emory U.

***Break (3:45-4:00 p.m.)***

***Ethics Workshop: (4:00-5:00 p.m.)***

Not sure who is staffing this yet

***Concluding Comments/Evaluations (5:00-5:30 p.m.)***

Paul Tesluk, U. at Buffalo, OB Division Chair

## **AoM ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR DOCTORAL CONSORTIUM**

**August 1-2, 2014**

The 2014 OB Doctoral Consortium for doctoral students in the final stages of their programs will be held on August 1 and 2 as part of the pre-conference program at the Academy of Management meeting in Philadelphia.

The consortium includes an interesting and energetic mix of presentations, discussions, and interactive sessions designed to launch doctoral students into their academic careers. The consortium will begin on Friday afternoon and will continue throughout the day on Saturday. (Participants must attend both days.) The program will include faculty presentations and roundtable sessions on topics such as crafting the right academic job, succeeding at research and publishing, preparing for effective teaching, and managing work-life issues, as well as other related topics.

OB is the biggest division in the Academy and in the past few years, we have received more applications that we can accommodate. To keep the faculty-participant ratio to an optimal size, ***we will accept only 1 student per program.***

Applicants must meet the following criteria.

1. Be nominated by the program/department. Only one application per program will be accepted (e.g., one from management, one from industrial relations, and/or one from I/O Psychology).
2. Endorsed by the advisor.
3. *Preference is given to those who have made the most progress toward completing their Ph.D. program but have not yet defended their dissertation.* This consortium is for advanced OB students who will be applying for jobs in 2014 to start faculty positions in 2015.

**The deadline for receipt of nominations and supporting materials is Friday, May 16, 2014; 5 p.m. Eastern Standard Time (New York City).**

Schools are encouraged to nominate students in their final year of studies, who are working on their dissertation research and entering the job market (e.g., in the US, students would typically be entering their fifth year having defended their dissertation proposal; International students would be writing up their findings and defending their thesis in the near future). For students not at this stage, there is an Academy-sponsored, all-day doctoral consortium for new students (the New Doctoral Student Consortium) as well as a new 4-hour "Halfway There" Doctoral Consortium sponsored by the OB Division for students at earlier stages in their programs. There are also consortia offered by related divisions, such as the HR division. Please note that this consortium is not open to those who have already completed their Ph.D. degree; new faculty will find the Junior Faculty Consortium more appropriate for their interests.

The consortium begins on Friday, August 1 at 4:00 p.m. and will continue with a full day (8:00 a.m.-5:30 p.m.) on Saturday, August 2. Participants are expected to attend all of the consortium sessions.

## Organizational Behavior Doctoral Consortium Nomination Instructions

The Organizational Behavior Doctoral Consortium is designed for students who are in the final year of their doctoral program (i.e., students who are currently on the job market and who have made significant progress on their dissertation/thesis research). We strongly encourage students who are at an earlier stage in their doctoral studies to consider the New Doctoral Student Consortium (for students just beginning or completing their first year) or the Organizational Behavior Division's "Halfway There" Doctoral Consortium (for students completing coursework and just starting their dissertation/thesis research). Students in related fields, such as HR, are encouraged to consider doctoral consortia in those areas as well. Priority for OB Doctoral Consortium will be given to students who have made the most progress toward completing their Ph.D. program, but who have not yet defended their dissertations.

**Nomination Requirements:** A completed nomination will include four documents:

1. Nominee information (one-page form)
2. The nominee's one page vita/bio in PDF format (longer documents may be rejected). Please name the file with your last name followed by vita (e.g., RothbardVita.pdf).
3. The nominee's one page dissertation summary in PDF format (title and abstract is fine; longer summaries may be rejected). Please name the file with your last name followed by dissertation (e.g., RothbardDissertation.pdf).
4. Advisor/program chair endorsement (one page form)

The completed nomination should be submitted by the nominating department/school, **via email**, to:  
**Professor Nancy Rothbard, [nrothbard@wharton.upenn.edu](mailto:nrothbard@wharton.upenn.edu)**

Application deadline: **Friday, May 16, 2014 (5 p.m. Eastern Standard Time)**

### Nominee Information

**Student Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Email:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Telephone:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Address:** \_\_\_\_\_

**University/Program/Dept:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Dissertation Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Dissertation Chair:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Please also attach:**

1. A one page vita/bio in PDF format (longer documents may be rejected). Please name the file with your last name followed by vita (e.g., RothbardVita.pdf).
2. A one page dissertation summary in PDF format (title and abstract is fine; longer summaries may be rejected). Please name the file with your last name followed by dissertation (e.g., Rothbard Dissertation.pdf).

**Advisor/Program Chair Endorsement**

**Student name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Please report on the student's progress:**

Completed coursework?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ NA \_\_\_\_\_ Date (if yes) \_\_\_\_\_

Passed comprehensive exam?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ NA \_\_\_\_\_ Date (if yes) \_\_\_\_\_

Defended dissertation/thesis proposal?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ NA \_\_\_\_\_ Date (if yes) \_\_\_\_\_

Anticipated date for proposal defense (if no) \_\_\_\_\_

Collected dissertation/thesis data?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ Date (if yes) \_\_\_\_\_

On the job market this year (2014), seeking job starting in 2015?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_

Likely date for final dissertation defense? \_\_\_\_\_

**Please provide a short paragraph in support of this student's nomination for the OBDC:**

**Nominator Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Email:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Phone:** \_\_\_\_\_

**F4. Junior Faculty Workshop 2014**  
**Scott DeRue and Leanne Atwater**

The Junior Faculty Workshop is scheduled to take place on Friday evening August 1<sup>st</sup> (5pm to 9:00pm) and Saturday, August 2<sup>nd</sup> (8am to 5:00pm) followed by the OB reception. A draft of the schedule is included below with a list of Faculty Fellows and editors as far as they have now accepted our invitation. Please understand that this schedule is a draft and the timing of the events may be modified slightly between now and the actual workshop, several names may also need to be added yet to the list of participants.

The junior faculty participants' time commitment for the workshop begins Friday evening around 5pm and ends Saturday around 5:00pm. The Faculty Fellows' time commitment for the workshop begins Friday evening around 5:30pm and ends around 2:00pm on Saturday (they do not need to attend the journal editor session or the network/feedback session on Saturday afternoon). The schedule aligns with last year's plan because it worked so well in prior years. The only change from last year is reducing the formal commitment on Friday evening to 8:15pm, with informal (casual) networking until 9pm. We received feedback that Friday could be shorter and end earlier (and a desire to have more informal interaction), so we shortened Friday but kept the opportunity for informal network with senior or junior faculty.

Participant Networking. The JFW starts with a short icebreaker on Friday evening. Additional time for networking is scheduled at the end of the day on Friday and Saturday.

Welcome Reception/Introductions. The Faculty Fellows will join the participants on Friday around 5:30pm for a reception and introductions. Paul and Jackie, can one or both of you join us for the kickoff?

Faculty Fellow Numbers. We currently have 6 fellows. We could support 7, and we would like to have 7 (just as a backup if nothing else). We had 6 last year, so we're in good shape if we keep the number of participants the same. As always, we may need to have a backup plan in case last minute conflicts of schedule arrive (while this was not an issue last year, it has been in the past). Would be great to minimize PDW conflicts that involve our fellows (at least from the OB side).

Faculty Panel. Last year, we followed on with the panel format of prior years, which worked well. The three panels followed up by round tables that covered three topics: Conducting High Impact Research, Having Impact as a Teacher and Mentor, and Surviving the Tenure Process and Work-Life Balance. We will have similar panels this year and we will allow some more time for general questions. Faculty Fellows will each be provided with a lead off question to start the panel. The starter questions are based on prior years and were developed through a survey of the 2011 participants. We should probably do a survey next year of participants to ensure these topics are still current and most important.

Editor Round Tables. We have lined up (associate) editors from *AMJ*, *AMR*, *ASQ*, *JAP*, *JOM*, *Organization Science*, and *Leadership Quarterly* to host a panel and round table discussion. We start off with a general panel and then participants will have the chance to meet with an editor from several different journals. We will do this in rounds ensuring all participants get to interact with multiple editors.

Total Number of Participants, Cost, and Selection criteria. We will seek 40 participants at \$150 each. The workshop fee has been \$150 since 2008. Enrollment was 40 in 2012, 41 in 2011, and 38 in 2010. The selection criteria have been discussed over the years. The target audience is participants with at least one year

of experience as assistant professors and a maximum of five years out, aiming for a mix of domestic and international scholars.

## **OB JUNIOR FACULTY WORKSHOP AGENDA & GUIDELINES [FOR FACULTY FELLOWS]**

The Junior Faculty Workshop (JFW) is on Friday evening August 1<sup>st</sup> (5pm to 9pm) and Saturday, August 2<sup>nd</sup> (8am to 5pm), followed by the general OB reception (INSERT LOCATION HERE).

### **Your Curators:**

D. Scott DeRue, University of Michigan  
Leanne Atwater, University of Houston

### **Faculty Fellows:**

Robin Ely, Harvard University  
Dave Hofmann, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Keith Murnighan, Northwestern University  
Sabine Sonntag, University of Konstanz  
Don Vandewalle, Southern Methodist University  
Fran Yammarino, SUNY Binghamton

### **Guidelines and Tips**

- Please see schedule for panel assignments (random assignment subject to schedule constraints). All faculty fellows will be involved in round table discussions following each panel.
- For panel discussions, have a few key talking points to begin and then we can open it up to questions. We will have a table up front for panel discussants, and one microphone for you to share. Feel free to chime in during panel discussions even if not assigned to that panel.
- For round table discussions, have a few questions prepared on each topic to get the group started.
- The purpose of the two research group discussions (on Saturday) is for you to provide input/feedback on the participants' abstracts and research ideas (see PDF file). The intent here is to be developmental and engage the junior faculty in a dialogue about their ideas. With two group discussions and 6-7 total participants in your group, you can focus on 3-4 participants in each session. Each session is one hour. We recommend spending 10-15 minutes on each student, and then spending a few minutes at the end for general discussion and identification of common themes. Of course these are simply recommendations, and how you manage the discussion is totally up to you.
- You are free to leave at 2pm on Saturday (but welcome to stay for the remainder if you would like).

If you have any questions leading up the Consortium, please email your Curators:

D. Scott DeRue ([dsderue@umich.edu](mailto:dsderue@umich.edu))  
Leanne Atwater ([leatwater@uh.edu](mailto:leatwater@uh.edu))

**Friday, August 1, 5:00pm-9pm**

**Location: INSERT LOCATION HERE**

- 5:00-6:00pm *Welcome, Introductions*
- Participants arrive at 5pm for introductions
  - Faculty Fellows arrive at 5:30pm for reception and introductions
- 6:00-7:00pm *Dinner & Discussion*
- Topic: How do I develop my research identity?
- 7:00-8:15pm *Conducting High Impact Research (XXX, YYY, ZZZ)*
- Panel discussion with 3 Faculty Fellows (7:00-7:45pm)
  - Round table discussions (7:45-8:15pm)
- 8:15-9:00pm *Networking*

**Saturday, August 2, 8:00am-5:00pm**

**Location: INSERT LOCATION HERE**

- 8:00-8:30am *Breakfast*
- 8:30-9:30am *Research Group Discussion I*
- Round table discussion with Faculty Fellow about your research papers
- 9:30-10:45am *Having Impact as a Teacher and Mentor (XXX, YYY, ZZZ)*
- Panel Q&A with 3 Faculty Fellows (9:30-10:15am)
  - Round table discussions (10:15-10:45am)
- 10:45-11:00am *Break*
- 11:00-12pm *Research Group Discussion II*
- Round table discussion with Faculty Fellow about your research papers
- 12:00-12:40pm *Lunch*
- 12:45-2:00pm *Thriving in the Tenure Process & Maintaining Balance (XXX, YYY, ZZZ)*
- Panel Q&A with 3 Faculty Fellows (12:45-1:30pm)
  - Round Table Discussions (1:30-2:00pm)
- 2:00-2:20pm *Break*
- 2:20-4:20pm *Journal Editors: Discussion & Roundtables*
- Panel discussion and introduction to journals
  - Round table discussions with Editors
- 4:20- 5:00pm *Networking and Feedback*



<b>Laura Erskine</b> <b>F5. Catering Report</b>
----------------------------------------------------

Reflecting on 2013, the catering and AV spending was:

<b>Event</b>	<b>2013 Budget</b>	<b>2013 Estimated</b>	<b>2013 Actual</b>
OB Doctoral Student Consortium & Reception	\$15,400.00	\$16,842.26	\$14,412.22
OB Jr. Faculty Workshop	\$9,500.00	\$9,475.73	\$8,403.14
OB Division Awards Celebration	\$17,000.00	\$16,927.51	\$16,021.96
Productivity Process PDW	\$1,600.00	\$1,330.72	\$1,264.80
Half-way There Consortium	\$1,600.00	\$1,312.45	\$1,143.28
OB New Member Networking & Research	\$1,600.00	\$1,218.52	\$1,158.16
LAA Presentation		\$1,709.33	\$1,833.00
Hot Coffee, Cool People	\$900.00	\$2,844.35	\$3,097.80
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$47,600.00</b>	<b>\$51,660.87</b>	<b>\$47,334.36</b>

The catering activities for the OB Division at the 2014 AOM conference will be taking place beginning on Friday, August 1 and ending on Tuesday, August 5. Based upon the 2013 Conference, the main events that involve catering and/or audio/visual needs include:

- a. Junior Faculty Workshop
- b. OB Doctoral Consortium
- c. OB-sponsored PDWs
  - o The Productivity Process
  - o OB Teaching Incubator / Networking and Research Forum
  - o Halfway There But Now What
- d. OB Reception
- e. Lifetime Achievement Award (continue with full video recording package?)
- f. Hot Coffee, Cool People (keep photo booth?)
- g. Network of Leadership Scholars Reception (NLS pays but OB orders food)

Topics to discuss at the mid-year meeting include:

- h. Increase budget for OBDC (breakfast is a problem)
  - i. Increase budget for Hot Coffee, Cool People as it is getting more popular
  - j. Chocolates
- Drink tickets (will depend on hotel rules)

<b>F7. Award Committees</b> <b>Cheri Ostroff and Deanne den Hartog</b>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Lifetime Achievement Award:**

Jone Pearce (chair)  
Lynn Shore  
John Schaubroeck  
Art Brief  
Susan Taylor

**Cummings Award:**

Peter Bamberger (chair)  
Francesca Gino  
Sandra Robinson  
Amy Kristof-Brown  
Joel Brockner

**Outstanding Publication in Organizational Behavior – needs 12**

- Daan van Knippenberg (confirmed)
- Ron Piccolo (confirmed)
- Amy Edmondson (confirmed)
- Sigal Barsade (confirmed)
- Neal Ashkanasy (confirmed)
- David Mayer (confirmed)
- Hui Liao (confirmed)
- Batia Wiesenfeld (likely)
- Ethan Burris (confirmed)
- TBC
- TBC
- TBC

**Outstanding Practitioner-Oriented Publication in Organizational Behavior – needs 6**

- Rob Briner (confirmed)
- Heidi Gardner (Confirmed)
- Robert Verburg (Confirmed)
- Angela Carter (Confirmed – in stage 2 available til May 9)
- Andrew Knight (confirmed)
- TBC

**Best Paper – needs 8**

- Bill Gardner (confirmed)
- Stefan Thau (confirmed)
- Lindred Greer (confirmed)

- Nicole Gillespie (confirmed)
- Roger Mayer (confirmed)
- Jennifer Behrdahl (confirmed)
- Scott Sonenschein (confirmed, needs papers by end of Feb as is off after March 10)
- Celia Moore (confirmed)

**Best Dissertation-Based Paper – needs 5-6**

- Mark Bolino (confirmed)
- Ronit Kark (confirmed)
- Nathan Hiller (confirmed)
- John Trougakos (confirmed)
- Barbara Wisse
- Ute Christine Klehe

**Best Paper with Practical Implications for Management –needs 5**

- Karsten Jonsen (confirmed)
- Jody Hoffer Gittell (confirmed)
- Simon de Jong
- TBC
- TBC

**Best Paper with International Implications – needs 5 - 6**

- Tsedal Neeley (confirmed)
- Wendelien van Eerde (confirmed)
- Michael Morris (confirmed)
- Martine Haas?
- Mary Sully De Luque?
- Arzu Wasti?

**Most Innovative Student Paper – needs 6**

- Frank Belschak (confirmed)
- James Detert (confirmed)
- Kerrie Unsworth (confirmed)
- Anat Rafaeli?
- TBC
- TBC

**Best Symposium - needs 6**

- Steffen Giessner (confirmed)
- Kelly See (confirmed)
- Sandra Ohly (confirmed)

- Suzanne Peterson (confirmed)
- Bart De Jong (confirmed)
- Christian Resick (confirmed)

### **Discussion points**

AOM changes in conference paper award nominations.

(This has just come to my attention via someone submitting a paper and asking if I knew about this “problem.” AOM apparently made a big change in dealing with division-specific awards this year and I followed up with AOM to confirm. In past years, when people submitted a paper, they could indicate if it was a student paper eligible for best student paper award, an international paper eligible for best international paper award, etc. People could tick multiple boxes. So theoretically, an author(s) could be considered for and even win best student paper award and best conference paper award, for example. Or best student paper and best international paper. This year, AOM changed the submission system so that people can only tick 1 potential award and they have to choose. This has many implications for the way we’ve done things

Rollovers for LAA.

(we have a limit that only 5 people can be rolled over for consideration the next year without a new nomination and I think we may need to consider making it larger, as last year the committee wanted 7 rolled over and especially after seeing this year’s pool of 12 candidate, 11 of which are amazing)

Should self-nominations be allowed for LAA and Cummings with the nomination letter written by the candidate?

(This year we received a self-nomination for Cummings. The award descriptions do not say anything about self-nominations)

How can we increase the pool of nominees?

(This year we had a strong pool for LAA, although a few years ago, we had to extend the deadline and work to get more nominees, but Cummings nominations were more problematic).

APPENDIX 1  
2014 Making Connections Committee

Committee Members

Name	Affiliation	E-mail
Rosalind Chow	Carnegie Mellon University	rchow@andrew.cmu.edu;
Bart de Jong	VU University Amsterdam	bart.de.jong@vu.nl ;
Crystal Farh	Michigan State University	farh@bus.msu.edu;;
Jaron Harvey	University of Wyoming	bharvey3@uwyo.edu;
Michael Johnson	University of Washington	mdj3@uw.edu;
Maribeth Kuenzi	Southern Methodist University	mkuenzi@mail.cox.smu.edu;
Jen Leigh	Nazareth College	jleigh4@naz.edu;
Robert Litchfield	Washington & Jefferson College	rlitchfield@washjeff.edu;
Jenni Carson Marr	Georgia Tech University	Jennifer.Marr@scheller.gatech.edu;
Jennifer Nahrgang	Arizona State University	Jennifer.Nahrgang@asu.edu;
Samir Nurmohamed	University of Pennsylvania (Wharton)	nurmo@wharton.upenn.edu;
Ron Piccolo	Rollins College	rpiccolo@rollins.edu;
Christopher Porter	Indiana University	colhp@iu.edu;
Kristie Rogers	University of Kansas	kristie.rogers@ku.edu;
Adam Stoverink	Northern Illinois University	astoverink@niu.edu;
John Sumanth	Wake Forest University	sumanthj@wfu.edu;
Shannon Taylor	University of Central Florida	sgtaylor@ucf.edu;
Ned Wellman	Arizona State University	Ned_Wellman@asu.edu;
Steve Whiting	Indiana University	whiting@indiana.edu;
Cindy Zapata	Georgia Tech University	Cindy.Zapata@mgt.gatech.edu;

Committee Mission Statement (see below)

PDWs and Organizers:

- Halfway There: Cindy Zapata, Ned Wellman, Maribeth Kuenzi
- OB Research Incubator: Ron Piccolo, Steven Whiting
- From Associate to Full and Beyond (2014): Rosalind Chow, Christopher Porter
- New Member Networking Forum: Bart de Jong, Kristie Rogers
- Junior Faculty Informal Dinner: Jennifer Nahrgang, Crystal Farh
- Essential of OB Division - Shannon Taylor, Adam Stoverink, Jenni Carson Marr

- OB Teaching Incubator: Michael Johnson, Robert Litchfield, Jen Leigh
- Productivity Process: Jaron Harvey, John Sumanth
- Mentoring PhD Students: Jennifer Nahrgang, Crystal Farh, Samir Nurmohamed
- How to Find and Build a Microcommunity (2015)

### **Making Connections Committee**

Given the large size of the OB Division, the mission of the Making Connections Committee (MCC) is to help develop and nurture relationships among OB Division members. We seek to help OB Division members foster high-quality connections with respect to four distinct needs:

- Relationships for new members: We help new OB Division members feel “at home” in our Division. We accomplish this goal in several different ways. For example, we have organized professional development workshops (PDWs; for the Academy of Management’s annual meetings) on topics that are likely to be of interest to new division members. We also host an annual research and networking forum where new OB members have an opportunity to discuss their research ideas and interests with senior scholars in the OB division.
- Relationships related to research: We help OB Division members form relationships that will be useful for their research. For example, for the past few years we organized the “Help I’m Stuck” PDW primarily aimed at assisting doctoral students, junior faculty, and international students with working manuscripts. We also sponsored the “Productivity Process”—an innovative PDW aimed at providing publishing advice to doctoral students and junior faculty.
- Relationships related to teaching: We help OB Division members connect to others doing innovative things in the classroom. For example, in the past we have sponsored PDWs dedicated to providing teaching tips that enable OB Division members who are passionate about teaching to spend time together.
- Relationships related to career progression: We help OB Division members meet others who will help with career progression. For example, for the past several years, we have organized a session of Ph.D. students who are “Halfway There” to completing their degree. The PDW focuses on topics ranging from launching the dissertation process to the intricacies of the job market process. Another example is the PDW we have organized for Associate Professors called “Moving from Associate to Full...and Beyond” that focuses on transitioning to Full Professor. This PDW covers a range of topics related to successfully making this transition, as well as topics such as designing an impactful career. Another event we sponsor is the “Junior Faculty Dinner” which is an informal dinner at each AoM Meeting that allows junior scholars at a similar career stage to get to know one another better.

**APPENDIX 2**

**ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR DIVISION  
Allocation, Revenue, & Expense Trends**

	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
<b>REVENUE</b>				**		
RESERVE BALANCE FORWARD	\$32,377.24	\$49,293.11	\$49,179.48	\$48,956.76	\$49,480.89	\$60,582.73
DIVISION ALLOCATION	49,730.00	52,412.00	53,969.00	55,985.00	69,206.00	68,810.00
<b>TOTAL OPERATING FUNDS</b>	<b>\$82,107.24</b>	<b>\$101,705.11</b>	<b>\$103,148.48</b>	<b>\$104,941.76</b>	<b>\$118,686.89</b>	<b>\$129,392.73</b>
<b>OTHER REVENUE</b>						
SPONSORHIPS	18,000.00	14,100.00	10,810.06	7,000.00	8,000.00	17,793.54
JFW / PDW FEES	5,400.00	2,850.00	5,400.00	6,300.00	5,850.00	6,330.00
MISC	900.00					
<b>TOTAL OTHER REVENUE</b>	<b>24,300.00</b>	<b>16,950.00</b>	<b>16,210.06</b>	<b>13,300.00</b>	<b>13,850.00</b>	<b>24,123.54</b>
<b>TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE</b>	<b>106,407.24</b>	<b>118,655.11</b>	<b>119,358.54</b>	<b>118,241.76</b>	<b>132,536.89</b>	<b>153,516.27</b>
<b>EXPENSE</b>						
ACADEMY CONF – CATERING	38,085.23	48,287.05	47,218.93	49,222.47	48,871.56	48,037.21
ACADEMY CONF – AWARDS	3,267.36	3,250.84	7,460.60	5,794.50	7,773.87	6,862.78
ACADEMY CONF – OTHER	3,062.00	2,456.15	2,695.47	2,935.40	3,908.56	3,887.54
MID-YEAR EC MEETING	11,728.59	14,681.68	13,143.78	9,499.00	11,525.56	11,735.34
COMMUNICATION	1,772.34	1,049.91	883.00	1,309.50	874.61	778.58
MISC	198.61	750.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,828.81
<b>TOTAL EXPENSE</b>	<b>(58,114.13)</b>	<b>(70,475.63)</b>	<b>(71,401.78)</b>	<b>(68,760.87)</b>	<b>(72,954.16)</b>	<b>(74,130.26)</b>
Endowment Adjustment*	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00		1,000.00	1,000.00

<b>NET FUNDS</b>	<b>\$49,293.11</b>	<b>\$49,179.48</b>	<b>\$48,956.76</b>	<b>\$49,480.89</b>	<b>\$60,582.73</b>	<b>\$80,386.01</b>
			**			
<b>ENDOWMENT FUND BALANCE</b>	\$34,128	\$33,459	\$33,189	\$32,833	\$31,833	\$28,011.28

\* The lifetime achievement award check comes from the OB Endowment fund. In those years when it is initially paid from the operating funds an adjustment is made to "replenish" the operating acct.

\*\* The Academy posted \$2,886.98 of 2011 transactions in 2010. Thus, their '10 & '11 balances and transactions amounts are different than these Finan. Statements. 2011 end bal. is same.

Academy Allocation:

Membership	5,768	5,941	6,165	6,246	6,210
\$ per member	\$9.00	\$9.00	\$9.00	\$11.00	\$11.00
	51,912.00	53,469.00	55,485.00	68,706.00	68,310.00
Plus lump sum	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00
<b>TOTAL ALLOCATION</b>	<b>\$52,412.00</b>	<b>\$53,969.00</b>	<b>\$55,985.00</b>	<b>\$69,206.00</b>	<b>\$68,810.00</b>



**APPENDIX 3  
Annual Catering and Other Costs for OB Academy Events**

<b>Event</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
OB Doctoral Student Consortium & Reception	\$8,646.64	\$11,849.03	\$9,707.89	\$11,015.85	\$11,678.55	\$13,743.22
Half-way There Consortium/PDW		4,630.71	4,421.53	1,323.90	1,429.50	1,143.29
OB Jr. Faculty Workshop	9,249.76	10,277.16	8,342.13	9,244.28	10,395.08	7,694.20
OB/HR Member Reception	1,790.97	3,422.78	3,800.00	3,818.44	5,381.54	
OB Division Awards Celebration	11,410.73	11,469.87	13,585.85	17,258.00	12,801.02	16,021.96
Joint OB/HR/OMT Jrnl Editor's Panel	240.51	602.82				
OB New Member Networking & Research	687.88	571.91	533.18			1,158.16
OB Thank-you Coffee	953.05	640.56	428.37			
OB Making Connections Coffee Break	1,035.87	1,691.44	702.25	793.00	1,308.40	
Hot Coffee Cool People						1,264.80
Leadership Reception (NLS)	2,053.99	1,954.15	3,310.06	1,830.00	1,735.00	4,118.00
PDWs (2013: \$1,350 OB/PNP, \$280 Inciv, \$1,265 Prod Process, NDSC \$1,300)				2,257.00	3,714.60	4,193.59
Special Items & Shipping (banner, chocolates, napkins)	1,955.06	1,086.63	1,339.97	687.00	652.88	1,239.87
"Staff Expense" (\$3,459 travel, \$147 luggage)						3,605.43
Misc AV (2013: 1835 LAA, 6 Doct Cons, 296 Jr Fac)	60.78	90.00	1,047.71	995.00	1,862.25	2,798.00
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>\$38,085.24</b>	<b>\$48,287.06</b>	<b>\$47,218.94</b>	<b>\$49,222.47</b>	<b>\$50,958.82</b>	<b>\$56,980.52</b>
less hotel catering adjustment					-\$2,087.26	
					<b>\$48,871.56</b>	<b>\$56,980.52</b>

OB Division Mid-Year Meeting, Jan 24-25 2014

less Revenue: sponsorship, ldrship reimburse, PDW reimb, and participant fees (2013 note, includes NLS sponsorships)	23,400.00	16,950.00	16,060.06	13,150.00	13,400.00	24,123.54
<b>Net Costs</b>	<b>14,685.24</b>	<b>31,337.06</b>	<b>31,158.88</b>	<b>36,072.47</b>	<b>35,471.56</b>	<b>32,856.98</b>

\* Note: In 2008 OB received all Wiley sponsorship for OB/HR reception, so 2008 revenue reflects \$2,500 that would not be recurring.