FIVE-YEAR (2011-2015) DIVISION REVIEW REPORT
BUSINESS POLICY AND STRATEGY DIVISION
ACADEMY of MANAGEMENT (AoM)

February 8, 2016

Submitted to the Division and Interest Group Relations (DIGR) Committee, AoM by:

BPS Division Review Committee
Matthew Bidwell, Executive Committee Member
Giada Di Stefano, Executive Committee Member
Alfonso Gambardella, Chair

In collaboration with
Christopher Zott, Past Chair
Brian Silverman, Chair Elect
Mary Benner, Program Chair
Xavier Martin, Assistant Program Chair
Michael Holmes, Secretary
Paul Drnevich, Treasurer

Contact Information:
Alfonso Gambardella
Department of Management & Technology
Bocconi University
Via Roentgen 1
Milan, Italy 20136
+390258363504
alfonso.gambardella@unibocconi.it

INTRODUCTION

This document reports the results of the Business Policy and Strategy (BPS) division's 2015 5-year review. A survey of our current members, an assessment of the division's metrics, and an examination of our health and governance related activities inform the report. The subsequent sections expand on our findings and offer goals and plans for the division's future development.

DIVISION REVIEW METRICS

We begin by discussing how the division has evolved in terms of size, membership composition, activity engagement, governance, and finances.

State of the Division

The BPS division is the second largest division by membership, constituting 26% of the Academy of Management. As of July 1, 2015, the division had 5,092 members, with a stable rate of growth across all years (-0.89% in 2011, +0.92% in 2013, -1.43% in 2014, -0.24% in 2015), except for 2012, when the division experienced a -4.15% decrease in membership.

These figures are in line with the overall AoM growth rate, which remained stable across all years (+0.4% in 2011, +1.7% in 2013, -0.1% in 2014, +1.2% in 2015), except for 2012, when AoM experienced a decrease of -2.5%. These numbers therefore suggest that BPS's drop in 2012 is related to a general AoM trend.

In line with the predictions of the last 5-year survey, and similarly to AoM as a whole, the rate of growth for the division has tapered off: the average annual growth rate was -1.2% in 2011-2015, compared to +2.3% in 2006-2010, and +8.5% in 2001-2005. A natural comparison is the other two large AoM divisions, OMT and OB. BPS is doing slightly worse than both. Their average annual growth in 2011-2015 is, respectively, -0.1% and 0.0%, in line with the overall AoM figure of 0.1%. BPS is distant from the high-growth mid-size divisions, like ENT (3.3%) or even TIM (0.9%); it is however doing better than IM (-3.0%). These figures, and the underlying comparisons, are not hard to explain. BPS is one of the oldest and most established divisions of AoM, covering one of the oldest and most established fields. The growth of ENT and TIM are easily explained by the rising importance of the topics that they cover in today's management and business activities. BPS's size and stability reflect the past growth and current maturity of the field. That said, we will discuss some actions in this report that may help to bring the division closer to the AoM average and to OMT or OB, which are comparable both in terms of size and maturity of the field.

The decrease in BPS membership is particularly pronounced for Executive members (average annual growth of -6.71%), especially if examined in conjunction with an overall AoM decrease of *only* -1.45%. Executive members now represent 4.9% of the total division members, vs. 7.1% of AoM.

New membership is also declining slightly with an average annual growth of -1.39% over the last five years, compared to an overall AoM growth of +0.55%. Also, the growth-rate of non-US membership seems to be tapering off, with a

slight decrease of -0.32%, compared to an increase of +2.62% for the AoM as a whole. We should note, though that non-US members, now constitute 48.9% of the division (they represent 49.0% of AoM), as compared to 46.6% in 2010 and 39% in 2005.

All other membership types are in line with the overall AoM trends, with US members (BPS=-2.09% vs. AoM=-2.11%) and Student members (BPS=-1.95% vs. AoM=-1.47%) being the most penalized categories.

A stable and consistent growth pattern can be observed for Academic members (BPS=-0.72% vs. AoM=+0.65%), whereas Emeritus members have experienced a sharp increase over the last five years (BPS=+5.98% vs. AoM=+7.08%).

Membership Distribution

The division's distribution of academic, emeritus, executive and student members roughly mimics that of the AoM. In line with the Academy as a whole, Academic members (BPS=71.4% vs. AoM=66.5%) and Student members (BPS=22.1% vs. AoM=24.3%) represent the two largest member types. Compared to the last 5-years review, when the division's average annual growth in student membership lagged that of the AoM by 2.1%, we now observe only a 0.47% difference between the two, possibly showing the results of a policy of active engagement of students by the division. It is worth noting, however, that both figures are slightly negative (BPS=-1.95% vs. AoM=-1.47%).

That said, the composition of US vs. non-US members is experiencing different trends in terms of annual average growth. US membership shows better trends with respect to Student members, which are decreasing more outside of the US (BPS=-2.12% vs. AoM=+2.37%) than in the US (BPS=-1.80% vs. AoM=-4.39%). Similarly, Emeritus numbers are increasing in the US (BPS=+15.26% vs. AoM=+7.61%) and decreasing outside the US (BPS=-8.22% vs. AoM=+5.67%).

On the other hand, academic membership is decreasing in the US (BPS=-2% vs. AoM=-1.44%), but slightly increasing outside of the US (BPS=+0.67% vs. AoM=+2.90%). Similarly, the decrease in Executive members is not as steep outside of the US (BPS=-4.12% vs. AoM=+0.24%) as it is in the US (BPS=-9.19% vs. AoM=-2.76%).

A comparison with the other main divisions at the AoM can help put these figures in context. Table 1 provides such a comparison.

BPS has a similar distribution in membership to ENT (51% US, 49% non-US). OB is more unbalanced in favor of US members (57% vs. 43% non-US), while IM (47% US vs. 53% non-US), OMT (45% US vs. 55% non-US) and TIM (43% US vs. 57% non-US) are more unbalanced in favor of non-US members.

As for the different membership types, we observe that:

1) Academic: while BPS is quite stable in non-US Academic members (+0.67%), ENT (+7.75%), TIM (+5.06%), OB (+3.54%) and OMT (+3.49%) are all growing more than AoM outside the US. OMT (-3.82%), TIM (-2.63%) as well as IM (-4.52%) are however performing worse (BPS: -2.00%) when it comes to US Academic members.

TABLE 1.
Annual Average % Change per Membership Type

		Annual Average % Change						
		BPS	**ENT**	**IM**	**OB**	**OMT**	**TIM**	**AOM**
Academic	**US**	-2,00%	0,92%	-4,52%	-1,02%	-3,82%	-2,63%	**-1,44%**
	Non-US	0,67%	7,75%	-0,52%	3,54%	3,49%	5,06%	**2,90%**
Emeritus	**US**	15,26%	4,15%	7,03%	15,58%	21,49%	12,17%	**7,61%**
	Non-US	-8,22%	20,99%	-0,82%	-1,50%	-3,64%	-4,09%	**5,67%**
Executive	**US**	-9,19%	4,37%	-6,94%	-0,51%	0,80%	5,67%	**-2,76%**
	Non-US	-4,12%	0,82%	-5,28%	-4,52%	-2,47%	-4,98%	**0,24%**
Student	**US**	-1,80%	-0,32%	-7,06%	-3,23%	-1,86%	-3,44%	**-4,39%**
	Non-US	-2,12%	2,93%	-2,38%	0,00%	-0,41%	0,81%	**2,37%**
Total	**US**	-2,09%	0,82%	-4,86%	-1,31%	-2,50%	-2,05%	**-2,11%**
	Non-US	-0,32%	6,46%	-1,15%	2,01%	2,07%	3,32%	**2,62%**
% Membership	*US*	*51,14%*	*50,88%*	*46,98%*	*57,36%*	*45,06%*	*42,63%*	*51,00%*
	Non-US	*48,86%*	*49,12%*	*53,02%*	*42,64%*	*54,94%*	*57,37%*	*49,00%*

2) Emeritus: All of BPS (+15.26%), OB (+15.58%), OMT (+21.49%) and TIM (+12.17%) display a double-digit growth pattern for US Emeritus members. Only ENT (+20.99%) displays similar trends for non-US Emeriti.

3) Executive: Similar to our division (-9.19% US vs. -4.12% non-US), IM is also losing Executive members inside (-6.94%) and outside (-5.28%) the US. Less severe decreases are also partially experienced by OB (-0.51% US vs. -4.52% non-US) and OMT (+0.80% US vs. -2.47% non-US). TIM balances the growth inside US (+5.67%) with the loss outside US (-4.98%). Finally ENT grows in both areas (+4.37% US vs. +0.82% non-US).

4) Student: similar to BPS (-1.80% US vs. -2.12% non-US), all the main divisions of the AoM show a decline in this membership type, with IM (-7.06% US vs. -2.38% non-US) showing a sharper decline. Different from our division, however, OB (-3.23% US vs. +0.00% non-US), OMT (-1.86% US vs. -0.41% non-US), and TIM (-3.44% US vs. +0.81% non-US) are doing better with non-US students. ENT (-0.32% US vs. +2.93% non-US) is the only division doing better than the AoM average, with a small decline in US Student members, and a steady growth pattern in non-US Student members.

Activity Engagement

The BPS division's members are actively engaged in the annual AoM meetings. From 2011 to 2015, 11% of papers submissions, 6% of the PDWs submissions and 6% of symposia submissions, on average, came from the BPS division. BPS paper submission growth averaged +2.6% annually for the 5-year period, with peaks of +13.7% growth from 2011 to 2012, and +13.6% growth from 2014 to 2015. While the division's paper submissions are up +18.3% relative to 2011, the annual average growth in paper submissions lags that of the AoM (BPS=+2.6% vs. AoM=+3.5%). In contrast, the average annual growth rate for symposia and PDW submissions was higher for the division that for the AoM as a whole (Symposia: BPS=+15.4% vs. AoM=+7.2%; PDW: BPS=+8.8% vs. AoM=+8.0%).

Overall, the general activity reinforces the division's reputation for high quality and robust program content.

Despite having a smaller share of members signing up as reviewers compared to AoM (BPS=20.4% vs. AoM=31.7%), the division has experienced an average annual growth rate of +1.3% in reviewers over the last 5 years. This increase is not as great as the AoM (+3.9%), but should also be compared to the average annual decline of 4% between 2007 and 2010. Still, given the higher rate of increase in number of submissions (+3.3%), we observe a slight decrease in the number of reviewers per submission from an average of 1.53 in the period between 2006 and 2010, to an average of 1.34 in the period between 2011 and 2015. Table 2 shows detailed data for the last ten years.

TABLE 2.
Number of reviewers and submissions, Annual Meeting, BPS Division

Year	Reviewers	Δ%	Submissions	Δ%	Reviewers/Submissions	Δ%
2006	1,169		613		1.91	
2007	1,135	-3%	718	17%	1.58	-17%
2008	1,063	-6%	722	1%	1.47	-7%
2009	1,135	7%	823	14%	1.38	-6%
2010	997	-12%	769	-7%	1.30	-6%
2007-2010	**1,100**	**-3.7%**	**729**	**6.3%**	**1.53**	**-9.1%**
2011	1,133	14%	707	-8%	1.60	24%
2012	1,053	-7%	827	17%	1.27	-21%
2013	973	-8%	767	-7%	1.27	0%
2014	1,065	9%	787	3%	1.35	7%
2015	1,043	-2%	882	12%	1.18	-13%
2011-2015	**1,053**	**1.3%**	**794**	**3.3%**	**1.34**	**1.3%**

Elections

Participation in the election process has ranged from 24.40% to 28.09% during the past 5 years – and has exceeded the AoM average in 3 out of these 5 years. The division's election process is fully compliant with Academy rules – nominations and elections run through AoM system. The division actively solicits nominations from the membership and also, seeks out nominees from diverse constituencies.

Over half (16) of the 30 individuals elected to the BPS Executive Committee in the last five years were nominated by the membership. Over a third (11) of these 30 individuals were affiliated with universities outside the United States at the time of their election.

In each of the last five years, at least one of the individuals elected to the BPS Executive Committee was nominated by the membership. In two of those years (2013 and 2015), five of the six individuals elected to the BPS Executive Committee were nominated by the membership. Four of the five individuals elected into officer positions during the last five years were affiliated with universities outside the United States at the time of their election.

Finances

Over the past five years, the BPS division has continued the prudent financial management policies that were established in the mid-1990s, while also transitioning to a new treasurer in 2013. The goals of those policies are based on maintaining a strong balance of funds and financial reserves to support sustainable spending on initiatives and programs that maximize the academic and career development of our broad and diverse membership over the long term. The division Executive Committee adheres to these goals through careful review of its historic spending patterns and by projecting forward spending projections on an ongoing basis. Over the previous five years the membership levels of the BPS division and its annual funding allocation from the Academy have been fairly stable. This stability has allowed the Executive Committee to maintain the scope and depth of the activities and programs it is offering to the division membership, and to do so with the confidence that these offerings will be financially sustainable for the foreseeable future. The BPS division is also fortunate enough to manage a set of endowment funds, and is committed to building these endowments (as permitted by the Academy) with the long term goal of having sources of sustainable funding for BPS division activities, programs, and awards independent of annual Academy membership dues.

MEMBERSHIP SURVEY: RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS

A customized survey was distributed to the current membership between October 15 and November 15, 2015; 914 members responded, yielding a 19% response rate (this rate is comparable to that of other divisions conducting 5-year reviews). The sample maps closely to the membership composition (e.g., member type and geographic location) discussed in the previous section. The following section reports the survey results and discusses their implications.

Member Profile

Demographics: The gender split of the respondents is 71% male and 29% female. Most of the respondents have an age between 30 and 39 (30%), with 66% of the respondents being below 50. Interestingly, we find a relatively equal distribution across academic rank with 29% Assistant Professors, 20% Associate Professors, and 25% Full Professors and Endowed Chairs. Doctoral students (17%) and Instructors (5%) are also represented. The majority of respondents teach at institutions granting all degrees up to the Academic Doctorate (80%).

In terms of membership tenure, 33% have been members for less than three years, 25% have been members for four to seven years, 15% have been members for eight to eleven years, 9% have been members for twelve to fifteen years and the remaining 18% have been members for more than 15 years. In terms of geographical residence, the majority of respondents (55%) reside in North America, with 26% residing in Europe, 10% residing in Asia, and the remaining 9% elsewhere.

Involvement with the Division: Overall, our members appear to be greatly attached to the BPS division. More than three quarters (77%) of the respondents consider BPS to be their primary division/interest group, with a full 40%

claiming no strong allegiances with any other division. Only 15% of the respondents indicated that they most identify with a division other than BPS. When loyalties are shared (for both those that cite BPS as primary as well as those that do not), respondents most commonly identify with the OMT (18% of the members who claimed any sort of allegiance with another division), TIM (17%), Entrepreneurship (14%), and International Management (9%) divisions.

The ability to gain and share information relevant to research is a key factor in attracting members to the BPS division. A full 87% of the survey respondents ranked this criterion as first or second in importance. The opportunity to develop and maintain social connections also ranked highly (1st or 2nd for 50% of the respondents). Members also value the possibility to gain and share information relevant to teaching (1st or 2nd for 25% of the respondents) and to learn more about a domain that is new to them (1st or 2nd for 23% of the respondents). The chance to gain and share information relevant to training and management practice was a much weaker draw (1st or 2nd for 15% of the respondents).

Not surprisingly, we find that a large percentage of the survey respondents are also members of the Strategic Management Society (76%) and attend the SMS conference regularly. INFORMS (12%) was another common affiliation. Other affiliations included AIB (8%), American Economic Association (7%), American Sociological Association (4%) and EGOS (4%).

Consistent with the above results, the primary publication outlet for BPS members is Strategic Management Journal (where 32% of respondents had published at least once), followed by the Academy of Management Journal (22%) and Organization Science (20%). The Academy of Management Review (13%), Management Science (11%) and Administrative Science Quarterly (8%) seem to have relatively less traction among members. It is noteworthy that 28% of respondents report having published at least once in equivalent top journals in economics, sociology, marketing, or psychology. Also 73% of respondents reported publications in other outlets.

Member Activities

Attending the Annual Meeting: BPS members continue to be highly interested in attending the AoM Meetings. A full 47% of respondents indicated that they attend the meetings regularly, even if they are not on the program. This is in line with, if not higher than, the other large divisions of the AoM. This suggests that the attachment of BPS members to the division goes beyond the presentation of their own research in the program.

The survey asked BPS members to rank different reasons for attending the meeting. Most respondents attend the meeting in order to present their research. The next most important reason was the opportunity to learn about the most recent work in the field; other important reasons include getting feedback on one's work and sharing one's work with other scholars. The meeting also plays an important networking/socializing function, although this is less important to survey respondents. It is interesting that respondents ranked academic-related reasons, like presenting research, getting feedback, or knowing/sharing others' research, higher than mere networking and socializing. Still the importance of

these social events should not be underestimated. Since many BPS attendees at the AoM meetings are not on the program, and therefore do not benefit from presenting or getting feedback on their own research, social events of various kinds are important to enhance their opportunities for interaction. BPS has been active in supporting social events of various kinds, and it will continue to do so.

The most common reason why BPS members do not attend the AoM Meetings is a lack of access to funding to support conference attendance (30%). Among attending respondents, 15% cover the costs with personal money. This problem has been relevant in the past as well, and it was highlighted by the BPS survey 2010: "*A continuing question regards whom the Program Chair should prioritize for selection as discussants and session chairs. On the one hand, it is desirable to invite very active researchers for these duties to ensure high quality sessions. On the other hand, active researchers tend to be well funded, and are likely to be active on the program as presenters, making it tempting to try to boost the breadth of meeting attendance by inviting less active researchers who require such a duty in order to gain funding. This question remains open, though the survey indicates that there are likely a large number of scholars who would like to attend each year but are financially constrained.*" We see no other solution than pushing this point further. BPS may also want to suggest to the AoM the possibility of using part of its funds to support, at least in part, members who would like to participate but cannot for financial reasons (e.g., students, or members from less developed economies.)

Submitting to the Annual Meeting: We also solicited information from members regarding the frequency of their conference submissions and the type of sessions that they submit materials to. Only 16% of respondents had never submitted to a paper session but almost half of them have never engaged in a symposium (43%) or PDW (41%) submission. Consistently, respondents who submitted between 1 and 3 times over the last 3 years show a strong preference for paper sessions (47%), followed by symposia (27%) and PDWs (26%). Paper sessions are also favored by the overwhelming majority of respondents who had submitted 3 or more times over the last 3 years (78%).

Other Annual Meeting's Activities: Table 3 displays the frequency of responses to the question: "During the past five years, how frequently, on average, did you engage in each of the following Annual Meeting activities for the BPS Division?"

Attracting reviewers to BPS continues to be an issue. A full 32% of members who responded to this question indicated that they have never served as a reviewer, or have served only once, during the past five years. [1] Only 36% percent answered that they review every year. Figures are comparable when looking only at respondents who identified the division as their primary division. As previously discussed, the analysis of division metrics confirms these concerns, but also shows some positive signs, which are reinforced by the fact that only

---

[1] Percentages are calculated by dividing the number of respondents who selected a specific answer by the total number of survey respondents who provided an answer to that question. In other words, we do not include survey respondents who skipped the question. This differs from the official AoM report, where such respondents are included and reported under the answer "N/A". This may suggest that there was an additional "Don't know" option, which was in effect not available.

14% of our respondents do not find the reviewers' feedback useful, underlining the good quality of the current reviewing process.

TABLE 3.
Engagement with Annual Meeting Activities for the BPS Division *

	1	2	3	4	Total
Served as a reviewer	159	123	279	316	877
	18%	14%	32%	36%	
Presented at a professional development workshop	470	109	200	56	835
	56%	13%	24%	7%	
Attended a professional development workshop	203	158	326	175	862
	24%	18%	38%	20%	
Attended an All-Academy (Sunday) event/session	323	182	268	71	844
	38%	22%	32%	8%	
Presented at a scholarly session (paper, symposium, etc.)	202	99	321	246	868
	23%	11%	37%	28%	
Served as a chair or discussant for a scholarly session	459	114	230	36	839
	55%	14%	27%	4%	
Attended a regular conference session	116	70	336	344	866
	13%	8%	39%	40%	
Participated in other activities (social events, business meetings, etc.)	145	111	308	299	863
	17%	13%	36%	35%	
Volunteered in some capacity (awards committee, social outing coordinator, etc.)	577	77	129	33	816
	71%	9%	16%	4%	

* 1=Never, 2=Once, 3=A few times, 4=Every year

All-Academy events and sessions do not seem to attract BPS members in great numbers, although the percentage of respondents having either never attended an All-Academy session/event, or attended only once did decrease to 60% from the 65% totaled in the 2010 BPS Survey. Regular sessions, on the other hand, continue to attract attendees, with 79% of respondents attending and 65% of respondents presenting at BPS sessions every year or a few times over the past 5 years. Social events also continue to be attractive, with 71% attending every year or a few times over the past 5 years. Although social events are not the primary reason for respondents to attend the annual meeting, most of our members attend them regularly, suggesting that social events have an important function once members are on site.

Member Evaluation

General Satisfaction with the Division: Overall, our members reflect positively on the division. Seventy-seven percent of respondents indicated they were satisfied with their BPS membership; 30% are very or extremely satisfied. Clearly, we cannot rule out the presence of selection biases where members satisfied with the division are more likely to fill in the survey. Still, the percentages are high enough to give us confidence in the general perception of the division. Moreover, if respondents are also more active members, it would suggest that satisfaction is high among the more active members of the division. The percentage of respondents to our survey is in line with the average percentage of responses at the AoM level, which suggests that BPS does not have

fewer active members than other divisions.

To capture additional insights, we asked respondents for open-ended comments on what they liked best about their membership and possible improvements for the division. A content analysis of the responses yielded the following results.

Responses to "What do you like best about membership in the BPS Division?" (N=206; 23% of all 914 respondents) clustered into 5 categories:

1) Networking opportunities (26%);
2) Access to research that is novel and relevant (26%);
3) Research identity and sense of community (22%);
4) Communication and annual meeting (17%); and
5) Division-specific elements, e.g. leadership, diversity, legitimacy (10%).

Four categories emerged from a content analysis of the responses to "If there is one thing you would most like to improve regarding the BPS Division, what would it be?" (N=173; 19% of all 914 respondents):

1) Level of involvement (34%);
2) Division – Size Related Comments (23%);
3) Leadership (21%); and
4) Program (16%).

The remaining responses were quite diverse in content and, as a result, did not align with any one general category or form a separate category.

The following provides a brief overview of the content of these categories. Comments related to the level of involvement with the division dominated responses, with respondents explicitly pointing at the need to increase international outreach (9%), diversity (6%), and involvement of junior faculty and new members (5%). The second category of comments centered around the size of the division as a negative attribute which contributes to a lack of community (8%), hampers quality (6%), and reduces mentoring opportunities (5%). Some portion of the membership is not satisfied with leadership, which is perceived as "clubby", "entrenched", and/or operating in a closed social network (13%). Despite the division's efforts to build and sustain an open and inclusive community of scholars, these comments suggest such efforts should continue to hold a strong presence in the division's agenda going forward. We will come back to how members evaluate leadership when commenting on members' satisfaction with the BPS division's Activities. Finally, comments suggested various potential improvements to the program, with most of the respondents agreeing on the need to connect research with practice (10%).

Satisfaction with the Annual Meeting Program: The survey results highlight members' satisfaction with the BPS annual meeting program. Table 4 displays the frequency of responses to the question: "Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following features of the BPS division's annual meeting program."

Among paper sessions, Traditional Paper Sessions are the most popular, with 67% of members who responded to this question being satisfied, very satisfied, or extremely satisfied with them. [2] PDWs continue to be popular with BPS

---

[2] See footnote 1.

members, with 66% of respondents satisfied (13% expressing extreme satisfaction with PDWs). Symposia rank third, with 63% of respondents satisfied. Other session types lag behind with Plenaries at 55%, Discussion Paper Sessions at 54%, and Divisional Roundtable sessions at 46%. Overall 72% of respondents expressed satisfaction with access to participation on the program, and 67% of them show appreciation for social and networking opportunities.

TABLE 4.
Satisfaction with the BPS Division's Annual Meeting Program *

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Professional Development Workshops (PDWs)	15	73	224	237	117	666
	2%	8%	26%	27%	13%	
Traditional paper sessions	46	169	327	184	50	776
	6%	20%	39%	22%	6%	
Discussion paper sessions	44	183	263	168	31	689
	5%	21%	31%	19%	4%	
Divisional roundtable paper sessions	62	168	224	136	31	621
	7%	20%	27%	16%	4%	
Symposia	22	92	249	220	74	657
	3%	11%	29%	25%	9%	
Plenaries	37	114	252	151	57	611
	4%	14%	30%	18%	7%	
Social and networking opportunities	27	122	272	223	85	729
	3%	14%	31%	26%	10%	
Overall access to participation on the program	24	103	310	234	75	746
	3%	12%	36%	27%	9%	

* 1=Not satisfied, 2=Somewhat satisfied, 3=Satisfied, 4=Very satisfied, 5=Extremely satisfied.

Satisfaction with the BPS Division's Activities: Table 5 displays the frequency of responses to the question: "Please rate your satisfaction with the following:"

Overall BPS members are satisfied with the activities that address the division's domain, with 69% of members who responded to this question giving positive feedback. [3] However, only 56% of respondents are satisfied with the sense of community within the division. In order to investigate the sources of these responses, we examined the level of satisfaction with the division with respect to: (1) teaching; (2) diversity; (3) collaboration; (4) communication; and (5) leadership.

(1) Teaching: Given the changes that have affected teaching in recent years, BPS faces challenges with the support the division offers to members in the domain of teaching: 44% of respondents indicate that they are less than satisfied with activities that help them improve the content and delivery of their courses. Anticipating the need to better focus the division's teaching-related efforts, we have asked survey respondents three questions focused on teaching and how the BPS division could help. First, we wanted to understand to what extent teaching is now taking up more of our members' time compared to 5 years ago. Table 6 displays the frequency of responses to the question: "Please indicate the extent to which teaching is taking up more of your time compared to 5 years ago."

---

[3] See footnote 1.

Results from feedback from members who responded to this question show a membership that has seen teaching hours increase (46% of respondents) rather than stay the same (40%) or decrease (14%).[4] Similarly half of our respondents (50%) have increased the time they spent preparing classes, with the remaining half mostly experiencing no change (34%) rather than a decrease in time (16%).

TABLE 5.
Satisfaction with the BPS Division's Activities *

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Sense of community within the division	113	219	297	96	30	755
	15%	29%	39%	13%	4%	
Activities that address the division's domain	43	188	325	154	25	735
	6%	26%	44%	21%	3%	
Activities that help members improve the content and delivery of their courses	63	204	245	79	20	611
	10%	33%	40%	13%	3%	
Welcoming of members from various demographic groups	71	138	248	122	55	634
	11%	22%	39%	19%	9%	
Efforts to reach out to international members	64	146	237	131	53	631
	10%	23%	38%	21%	8%	
Efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions/interest groups	48	159	282	132	42	663
	7%	24%	43%	20%	6%	
Encouraging participation in Academy and division-specific activities	58	147	293	150	54	702
	8%	21%	42%	21%	8%	
Opportunities outside of the annual meeting to network/collaborate with peers	112	206	217	100	36	671
	17%	31%	32%	15%	5%	
Encouragement from division leaders to form network communities for members like me	128	189	219	91	25	652
	20%	29%	34%	14%	4%	
Opportunities for members like me to receive mentoring	121	188	187	73	30	599
	20%	31%	31%	12%	5%	
Level of communication received from the division	51	143	327	174	61	756
	7%	19%	43%	23%	8%	
Quality of newsletter	37	131	306	172	66	712
	5%	18%	43%	24%	9%	
Usefulness of website	47	160	290	126	51	674
	7%	24%	43%	19%	8%	
Value of listservs	51	128	223	167	66	635
	8%	20%	35%	26%	10%	
Responsiveness of division officers to member concerns	41	75	200	93	42	451
	9%	17%	44%	21%	9%	
Ability of interested members to become leaders in the division	71	118	221	102	40	552
	13%	21%	40%	18%	7%	
Opportunities to influence the division	91	149	226	96	29	591
	15%	25%	38%	16%	5%	
Fair and open elections	36	61	267	169	150	683
	5%	9%	39%	25%	22%	
Selection process for awards and recognition	44	102	279	127	68	620
	7%	16%	45%	20%	11%	

* 1=Not satisfied, 2=Somewhat satisfied, 3=Satisfied, 4=Very satisfied, 5=Extremely satisfied.

---

[4] See footnote 1.

TABLE 6.
Engagement with teaching *

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Compared to 5 years ago my teaching hours have…	120	223	298	84	20	745
	16%	30%	40%	11%	3%	
Compared to 5 years ago the time I dedicate to teaching (preparation, office hours, etc.) has…	121	244	246	96	22	729
	17%	33%	34%	13%	3%	

* 1=Increased considerably, 2=Increased, 3=Remained the same, 4=Decreased, 5=Decreased considerably.

Next, we asked our members how likely they would be to attend teaching related PDWs on a variety of topics. Here, most of the interest was given to teaching innovations (with 65% of respondents being interested, very interested, or extremely interested) and bringing research into the classroom (64%). Next, survey respondents expressed an interest in case-based teaching (57%), new course development (56%), with teaching simulations (52%) and online teaching (49%) following right behind. Less interest was expressed for case writing (41%) and no interest at all for bridging the strategy formulation and implementation divide in the classroom (0% of respondents).

We finally solicited suggestions from our respondents with an open question. Responses to "Would you indicate briefly any other PDW topics or format that BPS could promote in the Annual Meeting?" (N=70; 8% of 914 respondents) clustered into 4 categories:

1) Innovative teaching methods and materials that could help revitalize the core strategy course (17%);
2) Research methods (16%);
3) Conducting research that is relevant to practice (16%);
4) Publishing process, from the perspective of both authors and reviewers (14%)

The remaining responses were quite diverse in content and, as a result, did not align with any one general category or form a separate category.

(2) Diversity: As a large and diverse division, BPS continues to face challenges with engaging members from various demographic groups: 33% of respondents indicate that they are less than satisfied with division efforts to welcome diverse members and reach out to international members. Among non-North American respondents this percentage rises to 38%. That said, 68% of international (non-North American) respondents are satisfied with the opportunities that exist for becoming more involved in the division. Fostering diversity and increasing engagement with international members have been, and continue to be, a priority for the BPS division.

(3) Collaboration: BPS members appear to be quite satisfied with the division's effort at integration with other divisions at the AoM and within the AoM as a whole. Among members, 69% of respondents are satisfied with the efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions, and 71% are satisfied with the encouragement to participation in Academy and division-

specific activities.

However, the BPS division clearly faces its most serious challenges with respect to the opportunities it creates for fostering collaboration among members outside the annual meeting. An important fraction of our respondents indicate that they are less than satisfied with opportunities outside of the annual meeting to network/collaborate with peers (47%), encouragement from division leaders to form network communities (49%), and opportunities to receive mentoring (52%). These results will inform our action plan going forward.

(4) Communication: Overall, BPS members appear to be satisfied with the division's communication efforts. Among members, 74% of respondents are satisfied with the level of communication received from the division, 76% are satisfied with the quality of the newsletter, 69% are satisfied with the website's usefulness, and 72% with the value of listservs.

(5) Leadership: Overall BPS members are satisfied with the leadership of the BPS division in terms of both responsiveness and opportunities for participation. Overall 74% of members say that they are satisfied, very satisfied, or extremely satisfied with the responsiveness of division officers to member concerns. Satisfaction with the election process and the selection process for awards and recognition is also quite high (86% and 76% of respondents ranking these as satisfactory or better, respectively). Some of our members still perceive there to be some barriers to the opportunities given to individuals to influence the division – with 59% of members being satisfied with the opportunities currently provided. On the other hand, 66% indicate that they are satisfied with the ability of interested members to become leaders in the division. These results confirm the statement in the 2010 BPS Survey that "*while ensuring access to leadership positions is a continuing challenge for the BPS division – as for all of the large divisions within the Academy – our efforts in this regard appear to be having a positive impact on our members' feelings of inclusion in the division.*"

New Initiatives/Services & Major Changes in the Environment: We queried members on their preferences regarding areas for new initiatives and/or resource investments. Responses to "What new initiatives or investments of resources would you like to see the BPS Division pursue?" (N=95; 10% of 914 respondents) clustered into 6 categories:

1) Offer mentoring and support activities (19%);
2) Improve quality of annual meeting (17%);
3) Make division more inclusive and processes more transparent (15%);
4) Help connect research to practice (11%);
5) Provide opportunities to connect outside of the annual meeting; and
6) Increase international outreach (8%).

The remaining responses were quite diverse in content and, as a result, did not align with any one general category or form a separate category.

Among the suggestions offered to improve the quality of annual meeting, respondents mentioned: the creation of a couple of non-US based, BPS mini-conferences; a longer annual meeting or a stricter selection process; the possibility to attend sessions remotely and to access presentation materials online.

In order to better capture the environmental challenges faced by membership, we also asked members suggestions on the major changes that BPS should address. Responses to "What are the major changes that you are seeing within your institution or within the field that you think that the BPS division should be addressing?" (N=127; 14% of 914 respondents) clustered into 4 categories:

1) Teaching-related changes (27%);
2) Increasing disconnect between research and practice (18%);
3) Research-related changes (13%); and
4) Rise in gender and international diversity (12%).

The remaining responses were quite diverse in content and, as a result, did not align with any one general category or form a separate category.

With respect to teaching, respondents mentioned the need to accommodate teaching innovations, overcome the difficulties in teaching millennials, better manage the distinction between research faculty and clinical faculty, and improve the legitimacy of MBA training.

With respect to research, respondents mentioned the need to keep up with the new methods and new data sources available, protect the quality of published research and fight against fraud, and change the standards for tenure decisions (focusing on quality and relevance).

Action Suggestions for Tomorrow Morning & the next 5 years: We concluded the survey with two, open-ended questions, which were meant to suggest long-term and short-term priorities for the division. Table 7 displays the main areas around which responses clustered, with an indication of the percentage of responses and a sample of respondents' action suggestions for each the main areas. These suggestions inform the following section of this report.

First, we asked about the long run. Responses to "What issues should occupy the BPS division's time over the next 5 years?" (N=201; 22% of 914 respondents) clustered into 4 categories, with the first two categories dominating responses:

1) Increase involvement with the division (34%);
2) Reflect on the role of BPS for the field of strategy and as a tool to push standards for the profession (33%);
3) Support members for teaching-related issues (6%); and
4) Support members for publication process (4%).

Responses to "What can the BPS division do tomorrow morning that would increase its effectiveness?" (N=126; 14% of 914 respondents) also clustered into 5 categories, three of which (marked with *) perfectly overlap with our long-term recommendations:

1) Increase involvement with the division (41%) *;
2) Improve communication within the division (23%);
3) Reflect on the role of BPS for the field of strategy and as a tool to push standards for the profession (20%) *;
4) Recommendations regarding the Annual Meeting (7%); and
5) Support members in the publication process (5%)*.

The content of the remaining responses was very diverse and, as a result, did not align with any one general category or form a separate category.

Overall, three areas stood out among the responses: Involvement, Role of BPS, and Communication.

TABLE 7.
Sample of actions suggested for next 5 years and tomorrow morning

Suggestions for next 5 years (N=201; 22% of 914 respondents)	*Suggestions for Tomorrow Morning* (N=126; 14% of 914 respondents)

Involvement (34%)
- Involve a more diverse membership (15%)
  • Minorities, juniors, different approaches to research, different disciplinary roots.
- Increase international outreach (9%)
  • Create small BPS conferences outside of US, create local offices, and foster research collaborations among scholars from different locations.
- Mentor scholars, in particular juniors (4%).
  • Mentoring should focus on productivity, tenure requirements, and effective time management.
- Improve sense of community (6%).
  • If necessary form sub-groups or interest groups in order to allow smaller communities to emerge.
	Involvement (41%)
	- Involve a more diverse membership (16%)
	  • Minorities, juniors, different approaches to research, different disciplinary roots.
	- Increase international outreach (5%).
	  • Create small BPS conferences outside of US, create local offices, and foster research collaborations among scholars from different locations.
	- Mentor scholars, in particular juniors (7%).
	  • Mentoring should focus on productivity, tenure requirements, and effective time management.
	- Improve sense of community (10%).
	  • If necessary form sub-groups or interest groups in order to allow smaller communities to emerge.

Role of BPS (33%) - Reflect on future of strategy as a field (7%). - Enhance the quality of research (7%). - Increase relevance to managerial practice and public policy (17%).	**Role of BPS (20%)** - Reflect on future of strategy as a field (2%). - Enhance the quality of research (4%). - Increase relevance to managerial practice and public policy (15%).
Publication Process (4%) - Lobby management journals like AMJ to increase space for strategy research (2%). - Train reviewers and lobby journals to reduce turnaround times (1%). - Promote the creation of new journals for strategy research (1%).	**Publication Process (5%)** - Lobby management journals like AMJ to increase space for strategy research (2%). - Train reviewers and lobby journals to reduce turnaround times (1%). - Promote the creation of new journals for strategy research (2%).

Teaching-related issues (6%)
- Help members adjust to changes in teaching, including:
  • Innovative formats, such as online teaching and business games (2%)
  • Different faculty, such as international faculty and clinical professors (2%)
- Support members in keeping up to date and maintaining high quality teaching (2%)
	Communication (23%)
	- Improve effectiveness and find optimal frequency (12%).
	- Updating online resources (5%).
	- Developing new technologies (3%).
	- Using social media (2%).
	- Experimenting with new tools (3%) - TED BPS Event, working paper series, podcasts of conversations with experts, etc.

	Annual Meeting (7%) - Involve executives, policy makers, and consulting companies in sessions to increase relevance (4%) - Increase quality of accepted papers and feedback provided, and allow early work (not full paper) to be submitted (2%) - Introduce virtual sessions or allow sessions to be podcasted (1%)

In the "Involvement" category, respondents recommended involving a more diverse membership, increasing international outreach, mentoring scholars and in particular juniors, and improving the sense of community within the division.

In the "Role of BPS" category, respondents emphasized the need to reflect on the future of strategy, enhance the quality of research, and increase relevance to managerial practice and public policy.

In the "Communication" category, respondents offered specific suggestions on how to improve and/or leverage the current communication efforts, by updating online resources, developing new technologies, using social media, and experimenting with new tools (TED BPS Event, working paper series, podcasts of conversations with experts, etc.).

OBSERVATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND EXPLORATION: GOALS AND ACTIONS

The following section summarizes what we believe are the main points of strength and weakness that emerged from the survey, and details an action plan that should help the leadership set the way forward.

Strengths of the BPS Division

Overall, the survey results paint a positive picture of the BPS division. Our respondents are greatly attached to the BPS division, for which they show a great sense of loyalty. They report being satisfied with the division's efforts to involve members in Academy and division-specific activities, and to communicate about the division through a variety of media. Respondents are satisfied with the leadership in terms of both responsiveness and opportunities for participation. And although a few respondents still perceive barriers to individuals' ability to influence the division, and see the leadership as "clubby" and "entrenched", most of them report being satisfied with the ability of interested members to become leaders in the division.

The BPS division's members are actively engaged in the annual AoM meetings, to the point that almost half of our respondents report attending the meeting regularly, even if they are not on the program. Moreover, official division metrics show that our members are providing an increasing number of submissions for papers, PDWs and symposia, and help the division deliver what is perceived as high quality and robust program content. Two thirds of our respondents expressed satisfaction with the quality of the sessions, with particular enthusiasm for the value of PDWs. The results of the 2015 Survey indicate that PDWs are one of the strengths of the BPS division, in terms of quality, diversity of approaches, and originality of the themes. Social events also constitute an important meeting-related deliverable from the division, with an overwhelming majority of our respondents attending them regularly, and showing great appreciation for the networking opportunities they provide.

Weaknesses of the BPS Division

Despite the many positive results that emerge from the membership survey, the

findings also suggest areas for improvement and exploration. In particular, we believe that the survey highlights three equally important priorities:

1) The membership is getting more academic, and the gap between research and practice may be mounting;
2) The membership is facing increasing pressures on teaching, and the division is not seen as providing enough support in this domain;
3) The membership is getting older, and the younger scholars feel they do not receive enough mentoring and are not involved enough.

The following provides a brief overview of the nature of these issues.

A widening gap between research and practice. The balance between academic and executive members within BPS is changing, with academic membership being quite stable and executive membership in sharp decline. An increasingly academic membership squares with repeated concerns about the link between research carried out by division members and business practice. Throughout the survey, we have heard that respondents do not attend the meeting to gain and share information relevant to practice. They suggest improving the program, by connecting research that is presented at the conference with real-world issues. They believe the BPS division should take responsibility for fixing the increasing disconnect between research and practice.

A changing teaching landscape. Results from the survey show a membership that has seen teaching hours and time spent preparing classes increase. Because students generally teach very little, junior faculty are protected from teaching, and more senior faculty have heavier loads and/or do more overload teaching, this may partly reflect our members advancing through the career stages. That said, the membership clearly wants more support on teaching topics. In particular, our membership puts teaching-related changes at the top of its list of the major changes that are affecting the field as a whole. In the face of such a changing landscape, our respondents turn to the division for support and lament not seeing teaching featuring properly in the BPS conference program. Respondents specifically mention the need to accommodate teaching innovations, overcome the difficulties in teaching millennials, better manage the distinction between research faculty and clinical faculty, and improve the legitimacy of MBA training. They express a strong interest in attending sessions related to teaching innovations, bringing research into the classroom, and any innovative teaching methods and materials that could help revitalize the core strategy course.

Incoming information from the 2016 AoM submissions suggest a moderate increase in the number of submissions of PDW related to teaching. However, this may simply confirm the rising demand for these topics, and further encouragement for BPS to take the matter seriously by encouraging these activities and proposing specific actions.

The survey did not ask about service, but it is likely that our members face similar issues there. BPS may want to anticipate this trend, and launch a collective reflection on the matter, very much like teaching. It might also propose actions to support members' interest in coping with the growing demand for service by institutions.

An "aging" division. Division metrics show that the population of BPS members is changing. We are losing students and new members more than the other main divisions within AoM. At the same time, the numbers of emeriti are rising.

Although this trend is generally in line with what is happening in the AoM as a whole, some areas are worth monitoring – for instance, new membership for BPS shows an average annual growth of -1.39% over the last five years, compared to an overall AoM growth of +0.55%.

Why is this? Is it a problem at the level of the field? Is the field getting less attractive to younger scholars? Or is it too mainstream and generalist, and not cutting edge enough? Or is the problem at the level of the division? Is the division not pushing attractive themes enough? Or is it perceived to be too clubby, so that fewer young scholars feel free to join and be able to make a difference? Unfortunately, our results cannot speak to these questions directly, but we do find evidence for both explanations in the qualitative answers provided by some of our respondents. For instance, most of our members believe that the two top priorities for the division over the next 5 years are increasing the involvement of members with the division and reflecting on the role of the division for the field of strategy.

Suggested Actions

This section identifies potential areas for improvement and innovation over the coming years in response to the weaknesses that emerged from the survey. BPS plans to discuss all these items, along with a general discussion of the survey and this review, in its incoming winter meeting of March 4-5, 2016, to perfect the assessments and define the execution of the proposed actions.

1. *Bridging research and practice*

While we recognize the applied nature of the knowledge we generate, we believe that it takes some effort on the part of both the researcher and the practitioner to generate a fruitful encounter between research and practice. The researcher should be aware of what is going on in the real world, and the challenges that real firms are facing. The practitioner should understand the difference between research and consulting, and appreciate the value that both can offer. Based on this premise, we intend to act on two fronts:

a. **Increasing the involvement of practitioners**. To this end, we intend to:
   i) Increase the number of practice-oriented PDWs during the annual meeting. The idea is to use these as a platform to discuss the research/practice gap and how to produce meaningful research, but also as a tool to challenge theories, launch ideas, and suggest themes that research should address.
   ii) Include a number of symposia that involve executive and managers and bring them to the attention of the BPS community. A specific suggestion would be to invite leading executives to our plenary session in the next AoM, and in showcase PDW or symposia, debating important topics with strategy scholars.
   iii) Launch a communication campaign using the BPS communication tools to encourage these types of events.
b. **Promoting more impactful research**. To this end, we intend to:

i) Increase the number of practice-oriented PDWs during the annual meeting. See above.

ii) Sponsor events that bring research to the attention of a broader public and favor the "translation" of research efforts. Examples include: a series of TED BPS-sponsored events, and podcasts of conversations with scholars on the applicability of their research to practice. The division could create a small body within its Executive Committee to design such activities and possibly encourage related PDW and symposia on the matter.

iii) Create a short manifesto, meant to create excitement around these issues and communicate the involvement of the division with these issues. Among other things, the manifesto should clarify the difference between academic research and consultancy and note that academic research should address in a rigorous way important questions for managers and executives, while preserving its natural rigor and independence.

2. *Providing support for teaching*

It is clear that teaching is of growing importance for our members and an area to which we should be devoting increasing attention. Among the steps to consider in order to improve our service to our members in this domain, we can:

a. **During the Annual Meeting**
   i) Make a concerted effort to increase the number of teaching-related PDWs.
   ii) Solicit symposia dedicated to teaching as part of the regular program.
   iii) Use BPS communication tools to campaign about these issues, and underscore the need to highlight links with research and teaching innovations (note: this does not necessarily mean new technologies, but teaching innovations in terms of content, deliver, and method).
   iv) Include an item in the agenda of the BPS Executive Meeting of the 2016 AoM to discuss how to promote teaching matters throughout the year, and how to encourage submissions of PDWs and symposia on the subject

b. **Throughout the year**
   i) Involve and empower the teaching committee, as part of a broader attempt to raise the visibility and motivation of younger members in BPS. The division could create a small body of teaching committee members headed by an Executive Committee member to design such activities and possibly encourage related PDW and symposia on the matter.
   ii) Continue to publicize the resources available for teaching, such as the online toolkit maintained by Russ Coff at University of Wisconsin. Possibly through the body created in i), the division could promote a census of interesting teaching or related material by its members and find ways to diffuse it, or could highlight interesting teaching innovations.
   iii) Include empowerment of the teaching committee, and related discussion on the topic, as an item in the agenda of the BPS Winter meeting of March 4-5, 2016, and then ask the teaching committee to

follow up on i) and ii) and report to the Summer AoM meeting 2016

   c. **Service**
  - i) Encourage the teaching committee to think carefully about service as well, possibly launching an independent survey about it among members.
  - ii) Based on the results of the survey, and some broader thoughts on the matter, encourage actions, like in a. and b. above.
  - iii) During the discussion in the winter meeting 2016, consider whether to launch the survey on service before Summer 2016 so as to be able to discuss its results in the BPS meeting at AoM 2016.

3. *Targeting young members*

   a. **Leadership.** A major effort for the division in recent years has been to increase the diversity of the leadership and to ensure inclusion of many different groups in staffing the Executive. While we have achieved strong membership involvement and international diversity, it is clear that this remains a priority for our members. Based on these considerations, we suggest that leadership may be one of the best channels to attract young members, increase their involvement with the division, and incorporate the needs of this portion of our membership. In particular, we suggest:
  - i) Include 1-2 PhD students or very junior faculty in the junior bodies of the division (teaching and research committee) or even in the Executive Committee. For PhD students in particular, this should include financial support for travelling expenses.
  - ii) Enhance the involvement and visibility of junior bodies, particularly the research and teaching committees. Examples of targeted activities could be: participation in BPS plenary session or showcase sessions; involvement in bodies like Irwin or other awards, and active roles in award sessions.
  - iii) Create a task force of students and junior faculty that could think about issues/actions to attract young members.

   b. **Annual meeting**. Another important channel to target young members is the annual meeting. Here we suggest actions that could help increase the involvement of young members with the division as a whole, and with the program in particular. To this aim, we suggest:
  - i) Develop a mentoring program within the division to connect more senior members with those who are more junior. While mentoring programs can be hit or miss, we believe that careful attention to matching people on their interests and needs would meet members' needs for mentoring and community
  - ii) Launch a small communication campaign with the standard BPS communication tools for encouraging applications for PDWs or symposia with students or very junior faculty, alongside junior-mid career (to attract people and increase their visibility).
  - iii) Explore the possibility of raising external funds to support, at least in part, members who would like to participate but cannot for financial reasons, such as students and young faculty (or members from less developed economies.)

   c. **Best practices**. BPS will also collect and follow best practices from other

divisions.

4. Miscellaneous.

Results from the survey also highlighted other broader issues, such as the need to maintain diversity within the division, and the need to increase the sense of community within the division. We expect that the actions previously described should address both issues. In order to complement them, we also intend to:

a. Increase efforts to solicit a wider variety of nominations from members and communicate their importance.
b. Maintain diversity as a critical criterion when nominating individuals for involvement in every area of the division.
c. Explore networking events around the conference tracks. One of the successful innovations of recent years has been to organize the conference sessions around different tracks representing the diversity of interests within the division. It is possible that we could add networking sessions to those tracks to try to build communities of interest around smaller groups.
d. Increase activities and initiatives outside the annual meeting. This is likely to be particularly important for those who cannot afford to attend the meeting. BPS leadership should coordinate all of these initiatives, so to assure their relevance and coherence.