



EURAM

EUROPEAN ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT

Rules and policies for Strategic Interest Groups (SIGs)

Creating a new SIG

Key Stakes and Issues:

- EURAM aims at providing visibility to and developing new themes and topics in management research
- Creating communities around leading research topics is done via EURAM's tracks
- Cannibalisation among SIGs, fragmentation of the conference into sub-conferences should be avoided as this might result in an anarchic proliferation of SIGs
- The creation of a SIG requires a fair, inclusive, transparent and standardised process

Guidelines:

- SIG proponents must be members of EURAM
- A new SIG should be proposed only after a track has run as an autonomous track for 3 years (minimum 30 papers) and has grown during that period
- The domain and mission of the proposed new SIG must be sufficiently distinctive from those of existing SIGs

Process:

- SIG proposals are examined once a year and preselected by the executive committee.
- Every SIG proposal is then submitted to existing SIGs for comments (to ensure that there are no major overlaps)
- Based on the comments stemming from other SIGs, the Executive committee makes a final decision regarding the creation of a new SIG or not. The name of the first chair is approved. Conditions and recommendations, if any, are also attached to the decision.
- The decision is forwarded to the SIG proponent and the first chair with conditions and recommendations attached.
- A new SIG lasts no less than 3 years before being revised and possibly confirmed or closed; during those 3 years a rotation of SIG officers is organised.



SIG leading team roles and positions

Key Stakes and Issues:

- Standard positions are set up for every SIG, to permit better accountability
- Beyond the SIG chair, the governance structure of the new SIG includes a programme chair and a communication officer

Policies

- According to the specificities of each SIG, there should be some flexibility in the way those positions are attributed, e.g.
 - several colleagues may be in charge of the programme chair position
 - some SIGs may duplicate/overlap roles over time (typically programme chair-elect and SIG Chair Elect and/or Past Chair)

SIG leading team's succession

Key Stakes and Issues:

- Volunteers to take a role in new SIGs' governance may be scarce. Large SIGs do not find many candidates to perform the work related to the conference and the other activities
- Good governance principles regarding SIG leading team nominations need to be put in place
- EURAM SIGs need to strike a balance between renewal vs. institutional memory to ensure knowledge transfer when a new leading team comes in.

Guidelines:

- SIG Chairs cannot remain in place longer than three consecutive years
- Every year, SIG leading team members must be confirmed / elected during the SIG's general assembly taking place during the EURAM Conference.
- The SIGs annual report includes a plan to ensure continuity regarding policies and activities.

Policies:

- A rotation of positions is encouraged, e.g.
 - adding "elect" positions
 - establishing a rotation path for leadership: General Track chair -> Programme chair -> SIG chair



Process:

- A call for positions is launched every year by the SIG leading team. This is sent to all the SIG membership.
- If SIGs request EURAM may organize electronic ballot

SIG continual improvement and evaluation

Key Stakes and Issues:

- EURAM sees a wide variety among SIG performance. Some are good regarding the conference process (reliability and respect of deadlines). Some others are capable of dealing with large numbers of papers while others perform qualitatively, returning useful evaluation to authors. Some SIGs still have much to improve on several counts.
- SIGs need continuous improvement of their practices. Sharing information among SIGs is highly desirable to compare stakeholders' satisfaction: members, reviewers, Local Organising Committees (LOC). Collective learning and improvements need to be promoted via a consolidated report of SIG activities.

Rules:

- Every SIG issues a report every year. This is done using a template common to all SIGs to facilitate comparisons (see Appendix).

Policies:

- Reports are consolidated by the VP SIG to identify trends and share best practices among SIGs.
- KPI for SIG leadership include:
 - Attending the SIG Video conferences organized by the SIG VP
 - Completing the conference process in time (reviewing process, session building process, SIG programming process)
 - Number of reviews/papers, Number of accepted papers (+ trend), number of delegates attending,
 - Response time to conference team, Annual report on time
 - Advertising for the conference
 - Contribution to EURAM's Newsletter
 - Maintenance of the SIG's webpage
 - Scientific by-products of the SIG activity (books, special issues) / trend
 - Organisation of kick offs, social events and or SIG plenaries
 - Smooth renewal of SIG governance



Appendix: Standard sections for a SIG's annual report

SIG:

SIG team:

Date:

I- Quantitative development of the SIG

(Statistics in terms of papers submitted and conference delegates attending, par track)

Given the size reached by the SIG over the three last years (see statistics below),

- How do you appreciate that evolution?
- What are the key factors explaining the quantitative development (or decrease) of the SIG?
- What would be your ambition for next year and for the next three years?

II- Quality of the SIG processes

(Statistics in terms of number of reviewers / paper, number of SIG video conf. attended / total number, delay in delivering reviews; delays in finalizing SIG programme for the conference)

Given level of process quality reached by the SIG over the three last years (see statistics below),

- How do you appreciate that evolution?



- What are the key factors explaining the quality performance of the SIG?

- What would be your ambition for next year and for the next three years?

III- Strategic Development of the SIG

- What have been the key objectives of the SIG over the last three years? For each of them, how do you assess the degree to which they were met?
 - Objective n°1 (1 not met at all, 2 somewhat met, 3 mostly met, 4 fully met, 5 exceeds expectations)
 - Objective n°2 (1 not at all, 2 somewhat met, 3 mostly met, 4 completely met, 5 exceeds expectations)
 - Objective n°3 (1 not at all, 2 somewhat met, 3 mostly met, 4 completely met, 5 exceeds expectations)

IV- Objectives and Actions of past year

- What is the ONE strategic objective identified by your SIG in 2018-2019 that you can proudly identify as your SIG's KEY achievement in August this year ?

- Why does your SIG team believe this VISIBLE result is meaningful/helpful to EURAM members AND related to your SIG's responsibility?

- What actions since August last year have been taking to achieve your SIG's objective and what are the visible results (externally observable) as of now?

V- Objectives and Actions of next year

- What is the ONE strategic objective identified by your SIG for the coming year that you would like to be able to proudly identify as your SIG's KEY achievement in August next year?



- Why does your SIG believe this VISIBLE result is meaningful/helpful to EURAM members AND related to your SIG's charge?

- What are your expected results and timeline for Actions during the following year?

VII. Comments and Suggestions

- What could EURAM do to improve dialogue between SIGs?
- What could EURAM do to improve the smooth running of SIGs?

CONFIDENTIAL